

TOWN OF RAYMOND

Zoning Board of Adjustment Agenda

May 25, 2022

Raymond High School, Room 109, 45 Harriman Hill Rd.

7:30 pm

Work Session

Public Announcement

*If this meeting is canceled or postponed for any reason the information can be found on our website, posted at Town Hall, Facebook Notification, and RCTV. **

1. Call to Order

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Public Meeting-

A. Election of Officers

B. New Zoning material distribution.

3. Approval of Minutes

- 12/15/2021
- 03/23/2022

4. Other Business

- Staff Updates –
- Board Member Updates
- Any other business brought before the board-

5. Adjournment of Public Meeting (NO LATER THAN 10:00 P.M.)

Note: If you require audio or visual aids, please contact the Selectmen's Office at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. If this meeting is postponed for any reason, it will be held on a date TBD.

TOWN OF RAYMOND
Zoning Board of Adjustment Agenda
May 25, 2022
Raymond High School, Room 109, 45 Harriman Hill Rd.
7:30 pm
Work Session

2022 PUBLIC HEARING DATES AND APPLICATION DEADLINES

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (Public Hearing- 4th Wednesday)	
Public Hearing Date	Application Deadline
January 26,2022	December 30, 2021
February 23,2022	January 26, 2022
March 23, 2022	February 23, 2022
April 27, 2022	March 23, 2022
May 25, 2022	April 27, 2022
June 22, 2022	May 25, 2022
July 27, 2022	June 22, 2022
August 24, 2022	July 27, 2022
September 28, 2022	August 24, 2022
October 26, 2022	September 28, 2022
November 16, 2022	October 26, 2022
December 28, 2022	November 16, 2022

Note: If you require audio or visual aids, please contact the Selectmen’s Office at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. If this meeting is postponed for any reason, it will be held on a date TBD.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80

Mrs. McCarthy 2:06
We're missing one. Paul McCoy.

Mrs. Wood 2:36
I was told that Joe Povilaitis was leaving the board because he was moving out of town. And then I also heard that Brad Reed was also leaving us as the chair of the planning board, he felt that there were too many conflicts between his role as chair of the planning board and being a planning board representative on the zoning board. So, I panicked a little bit. Somebody told me that you had resigned. I should have come to you to confirm rather than going to Christina. Thanks.

All right, we have one application to deal with this evening. It's application 2021-012. A variance application has been submitted by Kathleen Morneau and John Littlefield for property identified as Raymond Tax Map 42/ lot 10 located at 72 Mountain Road, Raymond New Hampshire. 03077. Within zone B, the applicant is proposing to build a shed 21 feet from the side property line and 15 feet from the rear property line where 25 feet is required. The applicant is requesting relief from article 15.2 section 2.1. excepted from this requirement are all buildings on any pre-existing lots on zones B C, D or E are less than two acres, which shall require setbacks of 25 feet from all property lines. Everyone understand that exception?

Mrs. McCarthy 4:23
If a property is less than two acres, the setbacks are 25 feet.

Keith Smith 4:32
I have a point of order with regard to the 25 feet, and less square footage of the building on 5.2.2, it says accessory buildings 100 to 444 square feet or small shall be no closer than 25 feet from side property lines, larger accessory buildings shall be permitted. no closer than 30 feet. This building that's being proposed is 192 square feet. It's 12 by 16. So, I think 5.2.2 would apply.

Mrs. Wood 5:48
I think you're right. I guess I forgot the size of the building mattered when it comes to setbacks.

Keith Smith 6:09
Rather than 25. That would be from 30, as far as I read.

Mrs. McCarthy 6:21
Greg's citing here too. I agree with that assessment. So, if you guys believe that that's the one that you want to go with. That's fine.

81 Scott Campbell 6:33
82 So, Keith, what you're saying is the setback should be 30. Not 25. So, he falls within what he
83 needs to be done.

84
85 Keith Smith 6:40
86 No, he's, he's when he's looking for greater relief. So, 15 versus 30. Where he was asking for
87 15. It would be 20.

88
89 What's the square footage that he's over by?
90
91 48 square feet? I wrote it down to 48 square feet is what the footage is built footprint of the
92 buildings over by.

93
94 John Littlefield 7:14
95 It's just a shed. It's not a permanent structure, actually.

96
97 Scott Campbell 7:36
98 Gambrel style.

99
100 John Littlefield 7:37
101 I'm building it with just rough-cut lumber. Basically, just so we can take care of stuff, you know,
102 run out of room. So, what I did, because Troy, had had the property around us surveyed, so
103 there were recent survey markers. So, I measured off of those and I actually slid the shadow
104 over a little bit. I think it's like 23 on one side and 16 on the other. I'm still within the distance, you
105 know what I mean? Like, I don't have the room for it, but I really have nowhere else to put it. I
106 mean, I'm not going to put it in the front yard. And I can't put it in the driveway. So, the property
107 that Troy just sold the house in front of the trading post in our trading posts. Yeah, it's right after
108 that.

109
110 Scott Campbell 8:45
111 Same side of the road.

112
113 John Littlefield 8:46
114 Yep. Same side of the road.

115
116 Keith Smith 8:52
117 Why wouldn't you go with the existing shed that's like right on the centerline of the property, that
118 sheds gone. And while the whole yard is shed and replaced with that, that whole layer of the
119 land has changed. Okay, that was another question of mine, and not knowing what type of soil
120 condition or land is on this is no wetland.

121
122 John Littlefield 9:18
123 The wetlands are on Troy's property on the it's probably 100 feet or so from us.
124
125 Scott Campbell 9:28
126 You're trying to keep in the backyard, so it's out of sight.
127
128 John Littlefield 9:30
129 Yes. Correct. Yeah.
130
131 Keith Smith 9:40
132 So, you're saying 23 and 16?
133
134 John Littlefield 9:43
135 Yeah, yeah, I'm still you know, under the, which is why I'm here.
136
137 Keith Smith 9:50
138 That's why I brought up the 30 feet.
139
140 John Littlefield 9:54
141 I'm still I'm under any way you look. I mean, it's just a shed. It's not living quarters.
142
143 Are you trying to keep it off the septic?
144
145 Yes, correct. Yeah.
146
147 Kathleen Morneau 10:23
148 It's a small lot under half an acre. So, it's not a whole lot of room to play with. But we need a
149 place to put the lawn mower and stuff like that.
150
151 Scott Campbell 10:45
152 There's nothing in our ordinance that talks about removable buildings like this, right. It's not a
153 permanent structure. He's not pouring footings. It might be something you might want to look
154 into. Because that would make a world of difference in the future.
155
156 John Littlefield 11:13
157 Well, I mean, for instance, if I was to buy a shed from a shed builder, and they came and
158 brought it to my house and dropped it off, but I need a variance that.
159
160 Keith Smith 12:56

161 Now, Troy's property goes both. It's on the south side. Have you on both those time and? No?
162 No, because I was trying to remember where they subdivided that.
163
164 Mr. Reed 13:21
165 Yeah. How close were you to the neighboring house that is on that new lot that they subdivided?
166
167 John Littlefield 13:27
168 The one they subdivided. That's the 23 feet size. Like 15 to 16 away from the back, which is
169 actually Troy now.
170
171 Scott Campbell 14:02
172 The reason I asked is because it's not like there's a residential unit right in the back where you're
173 at the closest plotline that they would have to look at it. It's basically storage for a business.
174
175 John Littlefield 14:12
176 I mean, it's actually I'm going to actually make it look decent.
177
178 Scott Campbell 14:16
179 So, you don't have his storage. Yeah.
180
181 Kathleen Morneau 14:19
182 Right, but they're right. It's storage on that side. And yes, no potential. That's all wetlands.
183
184 John Littlefield 14:25
185 He actually can't go any further back. State wise.
186
187 Mrs. Wood 14:32
188 There's an office located at the south, south southwest corner of your property. The north-
189 northeast corner is that all wetlands?
190
191 John Littlefield 14:45
192 We don't have wetlands on our property.
193
194 Mrs. Wood 14:49
195 I'm wondering why you decided to put it in this corner of the lot rather than this one because it
196 looks like there's a lot of space.
197
198 John Littlefield 15:10

199 Here's the house. Okay, so yeah, this is the road here. And the driveway comes around now.
200 Like up all the way to the back and this is a lot that we were talking about that was just sold off of
201 the Old Trading Post. And this is Troy here in the back. This is all Woods up in the back.
202
203 Scott Campbell 15:31
204 Oh, I was under the impression your lot went all the way like you had a giant front yard. That's
205 what I thought this was.
206
207 John Littlefield 15:36
208 It looks it on here, but it's really not that big.
209
210 Scott Campbell 15:39
211 Where's the road then? The roads right here. Okay. And your driveway comes with your curb
212 cuts. So, on this side also?
213
214 John Littlefield 15:46
215 It comes right here. And it comes all the way to the back.
216
217 Mrs. Wood 15:50
218 Okay. So, putting in a shed on the side would interfere with your driveway.
219
220 John Littlefield 15:54
221 It'd be in a driveway. So, this is the old shed here. So, I can't come away from the lot line,
222 because this is banking. And this is septic. And this is the driveway. And I really don't want it in
223 the front yard. There's a vinyl fence. A vinyl fence here comes off the back corner. And then
224 there's a fence that comes down this line. But nothing here. I mean, I actually have a fence here,
225 because this is a seven-foot-high wall between us and the neighbor that we did. We're probably
226 100 feet because he's back here with his wetlands. I think there's a 50-foot buffer that you
227 grabbed from the buffer on wetlands.
228
229 Mr. Reed 16:59
230 Well, the minimum is 25 feet.
231
232 John Littlefield 17:00
233 So, 25 or a buffer. We got I brought it this way. So, I actually brought it this way. Okay to get it a
234 little bit more here.
235
236 Keith Smith 17:50
237 30 would be nine feet for a variance there and 15 in the back. Versus
238

239 Mrs. Wood 18:05
240 Board members or board members who have questions for the applicant?
241
242 Scott Campbell 18:10
243 I have one you're not running a business or anything out of it. Right. So, it's just basically just a
244 storage building just on post. So, it's actually a movable building. Yeah,
245
246 Tim Cahill 18:22
247 You're not pouring the slab you're putting it on?
248
249 John Littlefield 18:26
250 Correct.
251
252 Tim Cahill 18:26
253 Which means it's movable. Yeah.
254
255 John Littlefield 18:33
256 Yeah, and I mean, I'll go through Gray, I build it to code. Whatever code may be for a shed I was
257 going to do all two by six.
258
259 Scott Campbell 18:43
260 Two by six on the shed to tell you the truth. It's a nice shed.
261
262 John Littlefield 18:48
263 That's what I have to work with all rough cut two by six. It'll be rugged. You know, it's not going
264 to blow away. It would withstand a move might be in town. Yeah. If I had to move it, I could move
265 it. Yeah.
266
267 Mrs. McCarthy 19:06
268 I do have a letter of support for this variance. So, it's Hi Christina. I'd like to ensure the ZBA
269 knows this application for a variance on side and rear setbacks for the purposes of building a
270 shed has my full support as the butter impacted by the rear setback. Granting this variance will
271 have no adverse impact on anyone now or ever. The lot line to the rear separates the applicant's
272 home from my business mountain road trading posts. In addition to the benefit of storage, such a
273 structure would have the added benefit of providing some degree of visual and sound barrier
274 between the residents and the business. I trust the ZBA will find this variance request acceptable
275 and vote to approve it. It's straightforward, simple, and again, has my full support. Troy Brown
276 owner of the mountain road trading post.
277
278 Mrs. Wood 19:57

279 Thank you.
280
281 Scott Campbell 20:24
282 Can we make a motion Joyce?
283
284 Mr. Reed 20:27
285 they think if you make a motion and if we go into deliberative to talk about this, we should
286 request a variance from 15.2.1 and 15.2.2, just to make sure we've got it covered for the
287 distance and the being a preexisting lot, I think both need to be in there.
288
289 Mrs. Wood 20:52
290 Is 15.2.2. the one that requires a 30-foot setback, because of the size of the builders.
291
292 Mr. Reed 20:57
293 Because if the size of the building .the 15 .2.1 is the one that really allows, you know, this type
294 of building on us substandard lot by today's standards, because it's preexisting. I don't mean to
295 say it's sub
296
297 John Littlefield 21:10
298 No, no, I got it.
299
300 Keith Smith 21:25
301 That's why we're here. Right.
302
303 Mr. Reed 21:28
304 Motion:
305
306 Mr. Reed made a motion to go into deliberative. Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. The motion
307 passed with a unanimous vote of 5 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.
308
309 Mrs. Wood 21:45
310 All right. Let's run through the variance criteria. Criteria number one, granting a variance would
311 not be contrary to the public interest, because the applicant says the shed will be located on the
312 landowners of landowner's property behind the home and not cause any disturbance to abutters.
313
314 Tim Cahill 22:21
315 I don't think it's contrary to the public interest. I think it's totally fine.
316
317 Scott Campbell 22:29
318 I agree with him.

319
320 Mrs. Wood 22:33
321 I agree. I don't see anything here that would be contrary to the public interest. I also agree.
322 Okay, granting a variance would be consistent with the spirit of the ordinance because the
323 applicant states This would allow storage space for the homeowner, and it would not have a
324 negative impact on property value for the existing home or surrounding properties. Starting with
325 Brad this time,
326
327 Mr. Reed 23:11
328 Yeah, I would agree with their assessment, it's not going to have a negative impact on their
329 neighbors and it's not going to cause any problems, so I believe it is within the spirit of the
330 ordinance. Okay.
331
332 Mrs. Wood 23:26
333 I think it is within the spirit of the ordinance the spirit of the ordinance the purpose of the
334 ordinance is to prevent overcrowding and to allow adequate light air and space. And I don't see
335 that this is going to impinge on or create any crowding. So, I believe it is okay with the spirit of
336 the ordinance.
337
338 Scott Campbell 23:54
339 I agree with you.
340
341 Tim Cahill 23:58
342 I agree with Scott.
343
344 Mrs. Wood 24:02
345 We're all in agreement. All right.
346
347 John Littlefield 24:14
348 You know, we didn't really understand these questions fully either. I'm just a utility worker and
349 not a lawyer. So, I didn't understand these questions. And I was trying to pick her brain and you
350 know, neither one of us can really Yeah. To me, it's nothing really to write a book. Alright. I just
351 want to build a shed within the within the footage. You know, I'm in cringing on the footage,
352 which is really reason why I'm here, otherwise it would already be built.
353
354 Mrs. Wood 25:09
355 Three granting this variance will do substantial justice. Tim,
356
357 Tim Cahill 25:16

358 I think it will do substantial justice. They've come prepared and their butters agreed with their
359 plan. And I think it would do substantial justice.

360
361 Scott Campbell 25:30

362 I agree the abutters don't have a problem with it. And I think it's just basically for storage. And,
363 you know, I'd rather see this snow machines or whatever stored inside a shed where we know if
364 there is a potential for a leak, it's on the wood, it could be cleaned up versus on the ground and
365 getting into the water.

366
367 Mrs. Wood 25:55

368 I think this would do substantial justice; it allows the property owner to make more complete use
369 of his property. And that interest of the property owner away with any possible or perceived
370 detriment to public interest.

371
372 Keith Smith 26:25

373 I agree with what you're saying.

374
375 Mr. Reed 26:32

376 No, I agree, also that this would do substantive justice that allows him to use his property and
377 indeed make improvements on it without impacting his neighbors in a negative way.

378
379 Mrs. Wood 26:53

380 Okay, granting this variance will not diminish the values of surrounding properties.

381
382 Mr. Reed 27:03

383 I mean, it looks to me like he has this well planned out. And I believe if anything, it's going to
384 increase the property value, which when he increases his property value and keeps things
385 neater and more in order here, then that increases everybody's adjacent to him as well.

386
387 Keith Smith 27:20

388 I agree the aesthetics.

389
390 Mrs. Wood 27:26

391 I have to agree to

392
393 Scott Campbell 27:28

394 me too.

395
396 Tim Cahill 27:29

397 I agree.

398

399 Such an agreeable crowd tonight. Owing to the special conditions of the property that distinguish
400 it from other properties in the area, a literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would
401 result in unnecessary hardship, because A. no fair and substantial relationship exists between
402 the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that
403 provision to the property.

404

405 Mr. Reed 28:05

406 I really believe these dimensional requirements are to protect neighbors in you know, on smaller
407 lots, if the homes were all close together, and he wanted to put the shed right in the middle of
408 that, then that would be unacceptable, because they'd be too close, they wouldn't have any
409 room distance or so forth. But the way these are laid out in the way he's got this design, he's not
410 impinging on his neighbors, he's close to his lines closer than we allow. But we allow those
411 things to maintain minimum distances if there is not already distance there, you know, so if you
412 were in a lot where the houses were right, close, and then your shed was going to be right in
413 your neighbor's front window or something right, then I would see it's a problem here, I believe it,
414 it does not have a fair and substantial relationship between what we're trying to accomplish and
415 enforcing this variance. So, I believe that I mean, enforcing this regulation. So, I believe that this
416 provision does allow for him to build this, and it does not impact the as neighbors.

417

418 Keith Smith 29:10

419 I agree with Brad given the circumstances of the property and the adjacent properties.

420

421 Mrs. Wood 29:20

422 The public purposes of the ordinance to prevent overcrowding, and to maintain adequate air,
423 light, and space and I don't see how this shed and the limited relief that the applicant is looking
424 for would be contrary to the public purpose of the ordinance.

425

426 Scott Campbell 29:43

427 Well, the original way this ordinance came into play was back when there was a fire in green
428 hills, and that's why they did all these setbacks way back and that's why they started doing this.
429 You're out what your next-door neighbor might have. I don't know what your neighbor got 10
430 acres. You get a lot of sparse land over there. You're up by Bob Holes is right up the street from
431 here, right? There's a lot of land right there. So, this whole thing started in Green Hills really
432 started doing all these setbacks like this because it was a fire. And that's why this whole thing
433 came. They couldn't get it out there. And they put it as a blanket on the town, which is not what
434 they should have done. When you're in an area like that, where everything's a quarter acre lot
435 that comes into play, a lot of situations like yours. We've got miscellaneous size lots, it's a whole
436 different ball game.

437

438 Tim Cahill 30:35
439 I totally think that this isn't a reasonable solution.
440
441 Mrs. Wood 30:46
442 Part B, the proposed use is a reasonable one. Brad?
443
444 Mr. Reed 30:51
445 Yeah, it's absolutely reasonable. He's placing it in a good location. It'll be a little too close to the
446 line per the regulation. But we've already discussed all those aspects. So, it's reasonable.
447
448 Keith Smith 31:04
449 Yes, very reasonable.
450
451 Mrs. Wood 31:14
452 Yeah, it's reasonable to have a shelter for your lawn equipment.
453
454 John Littlefield 31:24
455 To keep everything under cover and not in the basement.
456
457 Scott Campbell 31:29
458 Yep, I think it's reasonable. It's reasonable. Okay.
459
460 Tim Cahill 31:33
461 I think it's reasonable.
462
463
464
465 Mr. Reed 31:34
466 Motion:
467 Mr. Reed made a motion to come out of deliberative. Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. The
468 motion passed with a unanimous vote of 5 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.
469
470 Mrs. Wood 31:44
471 Unanimous so we're out of deliberation. Would somebody care to make a motion?
472
473 Scott Campbell 31:48
474 Motion:
475
476 Mr. Campbell made a motion that we accept the plans as seen. In including what was it you
477 said, Keith about amended to add 15.2.2. That speaks to 30 feet versus 25 feet by those square

478 footage of the building. Keith Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous
479 vote of 5 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.
480
481 John Littlefield 34:04
482 Thank you.
483
484 Mrs. Wood 34:08
485 Right, the last item on our agenda is the approval of minutes of the November 17 2021 meeting.
486
487 Scott Campbell 34:18
488 And make a motion to approve the minutes as written
489
490 Brad Reed 34:24
491 and a couple of just a couple of minor things.
492
493 Joyce Wood 34:27
494 I had a couple of minor things to let me see if I can find them.
495
496 Brad Reed 34:31
497 Alright page choice line 81.
498
499 Joyce Wood 34:41
500 colored papers in between here so that I can separate them the times that are noted in these is
501 that for finding it in the RCTV recordings now.
502
503 Christina McCarthy 34:57
504 What so we started using A new program called otter AI. So you'll find small inconsistencies if
505 we don't catch them a word that you might have said cake and they picked it up as take or
506
507 Brad Reed 35:14
508 things like that. That's all that's all I have is just a couple of things like that.
509
510 Keith Smith 35:17
511 Yeah, as we as
512
513 Christina McCarthy 35:20
514 I just as we keep as we use the program more and more, it gets smarter and smarter hence the
515 AI part. So it'll start picking up more and more.
516
517 Joyce Wood 35:29

518 So what do those numbers mean in the minutes
519
520 Christina McCarthy 35:33
521 those are just the numbers in the in the recordings.
522
523 Joyce Wood 35:37
524 Okay, so that is an indication of the time I
525
526 Christina McCarthy 35:40
527 don't know that I can't say that for sure. Sure. Looks like it may be depending on but not every
528 meeting is recorded so I can't say that that's so for every meeting.
529
530 Joyce Wood 35:51
531 Okay. You said Line 81
532
533 Brad Reed 35:54
534 Line at one it says brand I believe that was the ranch side. Keep the current kitchen
535
536 Joyce Wood 36:03
537 page you said on please. Page three okay, yeah. Oh, okay. So you think that should read
538
539 Brad Reed 36:25
540 ranch they were talking about the ranch and the cake side of the building and I believe it was
541 ranch. Yes. Yeah. I agree.
542
543 Brad Reed 36:38
544 Page five line 164 64 164. Yeah, I believe what I said was, that's why I am asking the question,
545 right. But the AI's might be smarter than me too. So
546
547 Tim Cahill 36:59
548 I was wondering what happened because there was a few words here and there that were
549 strange. So there's a new, a new program.
550
551 Christina McCarthy 37:06
552 Yeah, literally transcribes that we downloaded the meeting into the system it transcribes the
553 whole meeting. You'll find all doesn't write these minutes you'll find that some of your minutes
554 are going to be like pages and pages long. Yeah, I tend to cleanto it a little bit of takeout I take
555 out stuff dressed like this conversation I wouldn't include in the minutes because it's not you
556 know,
557

558
559
560
561
562 Keith Smith 37:32
563 There not required to be verbatim anyway.
564
565 Christina McCarthy 37:34
566 They're not but this program will get it as close as we can.
567
568 Keith Smith 37:37
569 It is, I'm quite familiar with similiar programs like Dragon speak.
570
571 Christina McCarthy 37:42
572 And as we get more affiliated more used to it, we'll be able to clean them up more and get them
573 very precise.
574
575 Joyce Wood 37:53
576 On page 7 line 57 I believe that was phrased as a question so let's start with the September
577 minutes so so has everybody had a chance to read the September 22 minutes I think that's what
578 I said. I think that was a question rather than a statement
579
580 Tim Cahill 38:20
581 So is this new program running now?
582
583 Tim Cahill 38:24
584 No, we load the minutes, we load the meeting into it we have to sign into it
585
586 Joyce Wood 38:46
587 Okay, I am. Next to motions between line 259 to 268. motion was to accept the minutes as
588 amended, but there's no discussion about what the amendments are. Are those recorded
589 somewhere?
590
591 Tim Cahill 39:10
592 Yeah, they would be on the on the film.
593
594 Joyce Wood 39:14
595 Okay, well, there's no film but no film that would be on the recording.
596
597 Christina McCarthy 39:21

598 So it would be on RCTV I think it was two doors to two so I can I can look them up and add
599 them here. Okay.
600
601 Tim Cahill 39:31
602 I think there was a name spelled wrong and something else. There's two.
603
604 Brad Reed 39:35
605 The only other thing I had Joyce was page 8 293- 294.
606
607 Joyce Wood 39:39
608 Yeah, Joe Povillatis. That's a butchered spelling of his name should be Joe Povillatis his
609 resignation.
610
611 Brad Reed 39:53
612 Pretty jovial guy come on.
613
614 Brad Reed 40:00
615 Okay that was the only other thing I have.
616
617 Joyce Wood 40:03
618 In the line above that 293. Says you have a copy of the meaning process I think that should be
619 meeting process instead of meaning process. Page 9 line 146 Says you guys have been flipped
620 flipping flopping for the last yet I think that should be year 1141 46 I don't know it's kind of cut off
621 is that 246 or 346? I think it's 346.
622
623 Brad Reed 40:55
624 Trust me came out on mine okay, got chopped I believe you're right.
625
626 Joyce Wood 41:45
627 Well, that's all I have. Does anyone else have any further comments on the minutes?
628
629 Keith Smith 41:52
630 I had a question regarding what Scott had brought up before that if this could be done in tandem
631 with the video that you approved the minutes with the video.
632
633 Scott Campbell 42:02
634 Video don't lie that's why I'd rather.
635
636 Keith Smith 42:04
637 I like that idea.

638
639 Scott Campbell 42:06
640 They told me that you can't do that I think it's that's wrong. I think you can do it along withthe
641 minutes.
642
643 Christina McCarthy 42:13
644 First minutes are not verbatim they never are and they never will be.
645
646 Joyce Wood 42:17
647 They shouldn't be.
648
649 Keith Smith 42:18
650 Could we refer to the video?
651
652 Christina McCarthy 42:20
653 This is as close as you're gonna get for us.
654
655 Scott Campbell 42:23
656 The problem is when you accept the minutes that means you're accepting. If there's no video
657 there to back it up then people think that's how it was played out. And that's not how it was
658 played out. That's why I say the video is really the truth.
659
660 Keith Smith 42:36
661 So with technology. Video is archival history now.
662
663 Tim Cahill 42:42
664 Well, not so the it's our it's an RSA and not all towns have video not all Towns broadcast.
665
666 Scott Campbell 42:50
667 I think we can actually modify on top of our RSA and add to it though, which we ought to.
668
669 Keith Smith 42:55
670 The question, if these are ever reviewed, because that subject they come up at the last meeting
671 about, you know, when I brought up something out of the procedures, and how often they looked
672 at.
673
674 Scott Campbell 43:10
675 We should look into the RSA and see if it could be more I mean, I just found out that I don't
676 have to sign off on a wood cutting permit on a board of selectmen. I don't have to do that. Yeah.
677

678 Keith Smith 43:25
679 But I looked into the I couldn't find any RSA to speak to it. That's why I'm asking stuff.
680
681 Christina McCarthy 43:30
682 You can't change zoning ordinances at will not only when we vote on them in March, that's when
683 they change.
684
685 Scott Campbell 43:41
686 But this isn't a zoning ordinance.
687
688 Keith Smith 43:42
689 This isn't a zoning ordinance. This is speaking to the archives of the meeting.
690
691 Christina McCarthy 43:47
692 You you are pointing to the zoning ordinances. That's why I thought.
693
694 Scott Campbell 43:52
695 The minutes, the minutes.
696
697 Tim Cahill 43:53
698 That's a jaunt to the statehouse to change an RSA.
699
700 Keith Smith 43:59
701 But it is something in place already.
702
703 Tim Cahill 44:02
704 For what?
705
706 Christina McCarthy 44:05
707 Keith for what?
708
709 Keith Smith 44:06
710 For whether or not we can use video to attach it to the minutes.
711
712 Christina McCarthy 44:11
713 There's no way of doing that. RCTV has all the video and we have all the minutes at the town
714 hall.
715
716 Joyce Wood 44:20

717 The minutes of the official record of the meeting is correct. I've been told by counsel that the
718 video is not the official record, correct?
719
720 Tim Cahill 44:28
721 That is correct. And we are not going to be ever used in court.
722
723 Brad Reed 44:33
724 When we talked about the minutes a couple of years ago at another meeting with legal. The
725 point that was rushed to us was to make sure that the minutes reflect the decisions accurately.
726 That is the important thing that they reflect for decisions so that the minutes accurately reflect
727 any decisions you made. That's the important thing from a legal standpoint. That's all that's all I
728 remember about minutes from legal
729
730 Keith Smith 44:59
731 Yeah, I was just wondering if it is.
732
733 Scott Campbell 45:09
734 I don't like to say the minutes. I'd rather do the video because I know it's it's 100% There's no
735 question. Yeah, I think they should be unified.
736
737 Scott Campbell 45:23
738 And the reason they haven't done that is because there's a bunch of

739
740 Keith Smith 45:25
741 Because there are things in the context of the video that aren't reflected in the minutes.
742
743 Brad Reed 45:33
744 Well, if it's if it's something that we voted on, it should be reflected in the minutes. Yeah. And I
745 mean, I understand what you guys are saying, because with the video, you can get the whole
746 train of thought you can give it a whole lot more. That was a lot more detailing. Oh, yeah. And
747 then for sure, but that's a whole new light on it. Yeah. But that would mean starting a whole new
748 town library for videoing and recording.
749
750 Keith Smith 45:55
751 I think we have one, I would have to check. You know, we would have to check.
752
753 Keith Smith 46:01
754 Yeah. But I thought digital was allowed now.
755
756 Scott Campbell 46:06

757 Or is in most cases,
758
759 Keith Smith 46:08
760 yeah. It could be used in court. But I don't know. That's question why I wanted to go to staff.
761
762 Joyce Wood 46:22
763 Okay, so we have a motion on the floor to approve the minutes as written.
764
765 Christina McCarthy 46:27
766 As amended,
767
768 Tim Cahill 46:28
769 As amended,
770
771 Joyce Wood 46:29
772 As amended. Okay, is there a second? remember hearing a second on that?
773
774 Tim Cahill 46:34
775 I'll second,
776
777 Joyce Wood 46:35
778 Okay, all those in favor of approving the minutes as amended. I, I,
779
780
781 Motion:
782 Mr. Smith made a motion to accept the minutes from November 17, 2021 as amended. Mr.
783 Cahill seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 4 in favor, 0 opposed and 1
784 abstention.
785
786 Scott Campbell 46:39
787 I was not at the meeting, so I will not be voting on it.
788
789 Mrs. Wood 46:49
790 Other business staff updates? Do we have an update from staff?
791
792 Mrs. McCarthy 46:52
793 And just that you guys don't have any applications yet for January? I do have the calendar
794 already for next year. So, I'll email that out to everybody. So, you'll have it for the year. Okay.
795 The only date that came into question was in November. It falls the night before Thanksgiving

796 again. So, I moved it up the week. Okay. But other than that, everything else falls into the regular
797 fourth Wednesday. Okay. That's all I have.

798

799 Mrs. Wood 47:33

800 Okay. And training. Training. Is there any training in the works?

801

802 Mrs. McCarthy 47:38

803 No. Training won't start until spring again. Okay.

804

805 Mrs. Wood 47:58

806 Any board member updates. Brad, I understand you're with us until the end of March?

807

808 Mr. Reed 48:13

809 So, after we vote in March. And then when the next Planning Board meeting will take a vote for
810 new representative. So, there'll be our first meeting in April, I would expect you'll see somebody
811 new.

812

813 Motion:

814

815 Mr. Reed made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. The motion passed
816 with a unanimous vote of 5 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

817

818 Mrs. Wood 49:00

819 Thank you

820

821 Respectfully

822 Jill Vadeboncouer

823

1 **Joint Zoning Board of Adjustment and Planning Board**
2 **Draft Minutes**
3 **March 23, 2022**

4 **Raymond High School, Media Center, 45 Harriman Hill Rd. - 7:30 p.m.**

5 **Zoning Board Members**

6
7 Joyce Wood - Chairman
8 Paul McCoy - Member
9 Brad Reed - Planning Board Representative
10 Tim Cahill - Member
11 Scott Campbell - Board of Selectmen Representative

12
13 **Planning Board Members**

14 Brad Reed - Chairman
15 Patricia Bridgeo - Vice Chair
16 Gretchen Gott - Member
17 Jonathan Wood - Alternate (Seated)
18 *James McLeod was also present but hasn't been sworn in yet and was not seated.

19
20 **Staff Present:**

21 Madeleine Dilonno -Circuit Rider Planner, RPC
22 Glenn Coppelman - Circuit rider

23
24 Pledge of Allegiance

25
26 Application #2022-001: An application for a Special Exception has been submitted to the
27 Raymond
28 Zoning Board of Adjustment by John Lorden of Tighe & Bond on behalf of Pinard Waste
29 Systems. The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to allow a Recycling Processing
30 Center on a parcel located in Zone D, Industrial. The proposed use is allowed in Zone D by
31 Special Exception. The
32 property is identified as Raymond Tax Map 28.4, Lot 2; 3 Otter Court.

33
34 Mrs. Wood opened the Zoning Board meeting and had the Board introduce themselves.

35
36 Mrs. Wood

37 We deal with five criteria for special exception.

- 38 • The first criteria is the specific site is an appropriate location for the proposed use or
39 structure.

- 40 • Secondary criteria considering the zoning designation of the proposed location, a
41 proposed use will not unreasonably impact the quality-of-life character or public health,
42 safety, and welfare of the area.
- 43 • Criteria number three, the proposed use will not create an undue nuisance or hazard to
44 vehicles or pedestrians.
- 45 • Fourth criteria is for adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided for the
46 proper operation of the proposed use.
- 47 • The proposed use will not result in unmitigated additional municipal expense.

48
49 John Lordon introduced himself, Chuck Huggins, the CEO, Tony Belanger, vice president of
50 sales. And Donna Dunn Operations Coordinator in the event that there are some additional
51 questions.

52
53 John Lordon

54 As discussed, we're here tonight, for a special exception to allow a recycling processing center.
55 This is allowed in the industrial zone D by special exemption. This is the same special exception
56 that was approved at the end of 2015 by the ZBA. And it was related to the site plan approval
57 granted in March of 2016. That has since expired last March. So, we've been working to try to
58 catch up. Just want to give you a quick status of where we're at. We've had several meetings
59 with the Community Development Board and Planning Department. We've discussed phasing
60 and approaches and the best way to try to present this to the town. We've made the
61 simultaneous submittal to the planning board for site review, as well as the ZBA for this special
62 exception. We received comments from the review engineer. We're in the process of addressing
63 those. We had a follow up call to get into more detail on those. There was a TRC meeting last
64 Tuesday, March 15, followed in the afternoon, late afternoon with a site walk that hopefully most
65 of you were able to attend just to get your bearings about what is existing on site. This is the
66 Pinard site that that act of the property itself comes down otter court, it hits the Lamprey River,
67 and then comes up Otter Road, and then there's just a little notch a bit taken out where there's a
68 residential home. You can see that this area, this is 101. This is Freetown Road. This area up in
69 here, there's a little bit of wetlands, it ties into these wetlands and it all ties into a larger wetland
70 system that ends up down towards the river. The site itself was originally developed for a
71 concrete, precast concrete plant in 1986, that closed in the late 1990s. And this property sat
72 vacant for several years before Pinard purchased it in 2014. Again, it's zoned industrial. And
73 currently just want to give you a feel for what's currently happening We are looking at two
74 phases. So, I'd walk you through each of the two phases. Currently, the operating hours are 3am
75 to 11pm, six days a week, Monday through Saturday, there are two employees that make up the
76 office space. Eight employees that make up the container delivery, repair, and storage area, two
77 to four employees in the fleet maintenance, and 10 drivers that go out and route drivers that
78 therefore it's 10 vehicles.

79 The first phase is something Pinard is very anxious to get started on, it's sort of this lower part of
80 the of the site that includes just some parking a building condition, we'll walk through it, the
81 second site, the second part is phase two, which is probably between now and two years, it'll be
82 complete. That's why we're here tonight. This is the recycling processing center. Phase one is
83 no changes to the operating hours, no changes to the number of employees for the container
84 delivery, repair and storage, and no changes to the number employees for the fleet
85 maintenance. What they are looking to do is add additional office space that's just kind of tucked
86 into this little existing corner here, right now just slopes down into the building. So, it's a great
87 spot to tie into the existing building with the hallway for additional office space. But they'd be
88 looking to do is expand from two to five employees. They're also looking to construct a 40 by 30
89 metal building. And that's for storage of automated waste carts, there's large totes that get
90 picked up and dropped into the back of the trucks. Part of that too, is just cleaning up this area
91 by paving it and adding additional parking in this area. And then this area will be improved by an
92 infiltration basin for stormwater management. You're also looking to expand the route drivers
93 from 10 to 15. Largest area over on this side here is this area. Anyone who was on the site walk
94 could see how broken up this pavement is they're looking to repave that make it a nicer, more
95 improved area. We are reducing the limits of the pavement, the pavement kind of extends out a
96 little bit. We're keeping all disturbance and all pavement outside of the wetlands and the wetland
97 buffer. So, we're not going into either of those. We're also looking to add lighting out in this area.
98 And as well as receptacles power receptacles. And again, improving the stormwater this is a
99 significant improvement because we're putting some gravel wetlands in high groundwater table
100 adjacent right next to the wetlands gravel wetland is the perfect solution to this. Also looking to
101 upgrade the septic system because they're adding more employees. The septic system that
102 comes out here is the leach field that needs to be updated. Design has been submitted to the
103 state and also approved by the state. Phase two and that's kind of what we're getting into tonight
104 is the recycling processing center up here. Again, no change to the operating hours, maintaining
105 eight employees for the container delivery parent storage, looking to expand the fleet
106 maintenance crew from two to four employees, potentially two to six employees. And then
107 looking to potentially expand the number of employees for the office from five to 10. Looking to
108 this will be a building extension this this lighter yellow, this lighter orange is existing. And then
109 this area up in here is the darker orange. That's for the recycling processing area on the north
110 end of the existing building, they'd be looking to have three employees that wouldn't be working
111 in that area. And that would be where the recycled material comes in. We are not collecting any
112 hazardous material here. It's just anything that's recyclable. So, there are collection vehicles, all
113 vehicles, those will go out to the different sites, collect the recyclable material, and bring it in hop
114 on the scale and then work their way over to here where they unload into larger vehicles larger
115 long distant transport vehicles that that'll be stored in the building and take that off into landfill or
116 other treatment disposal areas. They are looking to expand from 15 vehicles today. to
117 approximately 65 vehicles a day, so that averages to be about three an hour work during the
118 times that they're open. So as the chairwoman mentioned, there were five criteria that needed to

119 be met in order for the ZBA to grant this special exception, I'd like to march through each five of
120 those please.

121 The first one is that a specific site is an appropriate location for the proposed use of structure.
122 The site is located in the industrial zone, specifically designed for industrial office truck repair
123 and sales warehouse in the wholesale uses. The proposed use as recycling processing center is
124 allowed within this use in this zone with the approval of a special exception from this board, but
125 it's not permitted in any other zone. This is the only district that it would have allowed him this
126 property does

127 abutt Otter Road, which is comprised of some residential houses, but they are all located in a
128 commercial district. Therefore, they are legally non-conforming uses.

129
130 The second criteria is that the proposed use will not adversely affect the property values
131 character or public health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood. The use of the recycling
132 processing center is not significantly different than any other rights allowed in the industrial zone.
133 The property within the neighborhood consists of a manufacturing business in single family
134 residential homes in the commercial district, which again are not allowed by right or by special
135 exception. The vicinity consists of heavily used roadways in the traffic noise lighting and odor
136 from this use is similar to any of those uses that are permitted on this property. As outlined in the
137 attached report, and the Stanhope Group that was submitted as part of this, the proposed
138 project in their opinion will not adversely affect the property values character or public health,
139 safety, and welfare of the neighborhood.

140
141 Criteria number three, the proposed use will not create an undue nuisance or hazard to vehicles
142 or pedestrians. The proposed recycling processing center will not create in our opinion any
143 undue nuisance or hazard to vessel vehicles or pedestrians. As all the vehicles will remain on
144 Otter Court, they don't pass by the residential homes. The transfer of recycled materials is
145 expected throughout the day through approximately 65 trucks. And it'd be similar to any type of
146 use such as warehousing or truck sales and maintenance that are allowed on the property.

147
148 Criteria number four, adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided for the
149 proper operation of the proposed use. The proposed use, as stated, will not require additional
150 utilities that do not already exist on the site. All your new utilities will come through the existing
151 building and structure, a new scale will be added to weigh the trucks in areas where trucks will
152 be traveling. Those will be updated with new pavement and will also be fenced in for security.

153
154 Criteria number five, the proposed use will not result in unmitigated additional municipal
155 expense, since the overall site will continue to be similar to the existing conditions. With the
156 addition of the recycling processing center. There are no expected municipal expenses as a
157 result of the new use or site improvements. So, no new route, no new route roadways, and no
158 upgrades to the existing utilities.

159
160 Mr. McCoy asked if it was all going to be recyclable items and Mr. Lordon confirmed that it would
161 be all recyclable items not household trash.
162
163 Mr. Campbell said it would be a municipal expense, and that it's going to cost more in roadwork.
164
165 Mr. Reed
166 I do have a couple questions at the site walk, it was shared that the noise outside the building
167 was not going to be any louder than the existing. And you said you were going to test that? And
168 you were going to make sure that if there was louder noise, you're going to mitigate that noise?
169
170 Tony Belanger from Pinard Waste System. In the original special exception, this question came
171 up about the building that the actual material goes into initially up top, and then gets pushed
172 down onto the lower level into a truck that's parked in an inside bay down below. And the
173 concern from the board and the public was, as we're operating inside that building, will it contain
174 the noise of the rolling stock? And the materials being pushed down into that truck? And that
175 was a question that we couldn't answer until we encountered it. But that certainly would buffer
176 the noise from where it is in comparison to where the neighbors are. But I believe we were held
177 to a standard of the noise ordinance that we may have to redo once we started doing the testing
178 to find out if we have to acoustically improve that building to meet the noise ordinance.
179
180 Mr. Reed
181 The second thing I had was at the sidewalk, there was concern about adequate buffering
182 between the site and the residences that did not go down the road far enough. And you guys
183 were going to take a look at that. Have you taken a look at that?
184
185 John Lordon
186 That's part of the comments we have that need to be addressed.
187
188 Mrs. Wood asked, will these additions result in an increased use of water?
189
190 Tony Belanger
191 The only increased use of water that we will reasonably be able to predict would be the use of
192 water from the increased personnel drinking and using facilities. processes that we're looking for
193 in our low-tech processes. The only cardboard requires no water. I'm not familiar with how you
194 determine in like a fire extinguishing system, we're looking at putting a dry system in. So, I'm not
195 sure that you'd have to answer that question from a planning board perspective, I think, but for
196 our uses, we're not adding any water uses other than increasing employee quantities.
197
198

199 Virginia Fernald
200 I'm Virginia Fernald, 7 Otter Road. First of all, I'd like to thank you all for, you know, providing the
201 services that you do for us. I found Pinard to be very responsive to any requests or concerns
202 that I've had; they've been good neighbors in general. And I just wanted to say that it's my
203 opinion that they will follow through based on what they have already done for us in our
204 experience with them, that they will follow through I think to continue to be good neighbors, I
205 think that they oftentimes go out of their way to do speaking in support of this application.
206

207 Motion:

208 Mr. McCoy made a motion to go into deliberative. Mr. Cahill seconded the motion. The motion
209 passed with a vote of 5 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.
210

- 211 • Criteria number one, the specific site is an appropriate location for the proposed use or
212 structure.
213

214 Mr. McCoy

215 I would say it is its industrial site, the way that property is laid out, you're in a way they've set this
216 up. They're keeping it away from the residents. And away from the river and the wetlands area.
217 And it would not be an appropriate site for it because of the zoning. And the way that we
218 actually have set this the site plan up to keep residences away as much as possible. And so, I
219 say it's the safest thing. The structures again, they've always been industrial. We had a concrete
220 company there. Like I said for many years. It was vacant and we've had access there and I don't
221 believe we've had too many complaints, if any, since they've been there.
222

223 Mr. Reed

224 I agree with everything Paul said so I'm not sure about the complaints. I did not check into that. It
225 is a good site for what they're proposing. It's good.
226

227 Mr. Campbell

228 I agree. I think the traffic's The only thing I have a question about but everything else I don't have
229 a problem with.
230

231 Mrs. Wood

232 The planning board will deal with the traffic or the need for traffic study.
233

234 Mr. Cahill

235 I agree with the other members of the board and what Scott's talking about potential for
236 increased traffic, stuff like that. But it is an appropriate location for what they're proposing to do.
237

238 Mrs. Wood

239 I just made the observation that the structure exists in the proposed structures, a small addition
240 of a storage building and an office building. And I do think that this is an appropriate location for
241 that sort of structure. As far as uses go, I think there are uses of this property that could be
242 considerably more intensive than what Pinard is proposing. So, I would have to agree that the
243 site is an appropriate location for this proposed use.

- Criterion number two, considering the zoning designation of the proposed location, a proposed use will not unreasonably impact the quality of life, character or public health, safety, and welfare of the area.

247
248 Mr. Reed

249 Yes, it's already an industrial site of budding a preexisting neighborhood that that is in C one, as
250 they pointed out, it should not have I can't say that it's going to change anything in regard to that,
251 especially if they follow through with the buffering that they're promising

252
253 Mr. McCoy

254 I agree with Brad.

255
256 Mr. Campbell

257 No, I agree. Its buffering will help you know.

258
259 Mr. Cahill

260 I mean, I think most of the things that they were talking about are going to bring improvements,
261 the area with the water collection and security and a few other things. So, I think that it's going to
262 be a positive thing. But the buffering that they promised to look into for the other homeowners.

- Third criteria, the proposed use will not create an undue nuisance or hazard to vehicles or pedestrians.

266
267 Mr. Reed

268 Yeah, I honestly believe this. This is a personal guestimate that's all this says but that their
269 proposed truck traffic is probably less than when the concrete plant was there. That was a pretty
270 busy road back then.

271
272 Mr. Campbell

273 I worked in a concrete that's a lot of concrete, 65 trucks.

274
275
276
277 Mr. Reed

278 I'm saying 65 concrete trucks, but between deliveries and people in and out. And so that was a
279 busy plant when they were doing away with ever being a plant. Oh, yeah. The pipe and
280 everything. Yeah, that was pike hype. Oh, the concrete pipe and that kind of stuff. Yeah. So, I
281 would guess that's pretty much a trade off from back then. If I were to guess, and I mean, 65
282 trucks. And that's a couple, three an hour. I mean, it's, you know, we're not talking a lot of trucks,
283 you know, in the length of the day they work from 3am to 11pm.

284
285 Mr. McCoy

286 Yeah. Also remember, we had more business forms here. Yeah. That was a pretty big operation.

287
288 Mr. Cahill

289 I mean, there really shouldn't be too many pedestrians walking around back there. Maybe on the
290 neighborhood side, but back on that industrial side.

291
292 Mrs. Wood

293 I think it might be a different issue if the trucks were going down on a road instead of Otter Court
294 where the trucks are going to be confined to our outer court, I don't see an issue here.

- 295 ● Criteria number four, adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided for
296 the proper operation of the proposed use.

297
298 Mr. McCoy

299 I would say that, according to what the testimony here and what we saw right at the sidewalk,
300 they're going to basically use the same utility so that they have now just cost them more money.

301
302 Mr. Campbell

303 No, I think what they're doing for an expansion there is a good idea. It's just going to help them
304 increase their business. And I don't see a problem with that. I think we all like to recycle. So, if it
305 helps the recycling situation, so long as there's no garbage, right?

306
307 Mr. Cahill

308 I mean, they already have existing utilities, they're going to be expanding, and probably
309 improving their utilities over there.

310
311 Mrs. Wood

312 Well, I guess the one utility that concerns me is the water usage. And according to the testimony
313 that we've heard tonight, there's not going to be a significant increase in the water usage.

314
315
316 Mr. Campbell

317 Because you don't, it's not like you spray anything down. You don't cardboard, it has to stay dry.
318 It doesn't sound like you'd be used easily with sprayers or anything for dust control or stuff like
319 that.

320

321 Tony Belanger

322 And these are like what you'd see in Raymond. Collecting at the curb right now, the average
323 weight is about five tons per load. And they get pushed into a bigger truck that will handle up to
324 18 tons per load. So, it's very fast, you know, you wait until you have just enough to get in there.
325 With the weights, it's a slow-moving operation, trash is the fast-moving operation that's heavier
326 and more trucks. And unfortunately, the ratio from trash to recycling is, upside down there is
327 more trash than there is recycling. But it's a dry operation.

328

- 329 ● Criteria number five, proposed use will not result in unmitigated additional municipal
330 expense.

331

332 Mr. Cahill

333 Well, as we had mentioned, during our questions, my concerns were just maybe increased
334 traffic. But as Brad pointed out, they're not going to be all coming to all 65 trucks at the same
335 time, it's going to be spread out throughout the course of a tender. I'm not exactly sure how long
336 your shift is, how long is your shift, sir?

337

338 Tony Belanger

339 So, the early morning until late at night is more maintenance related. That's those few people
340 that work on trucks. Some of the drivers come in early, they leave, they go out, they don't come
341 back until three o'clock in the afternoon. The operation of the recycling would be more towards
342 the hours of maybe seven to five or something like that .

343

344 Mr. Campbell

345 Confines at 7am to five, right.

346

347 Tony Belanger

348 Yeah. And like I said, we also included those 100 yards trailer trucks divided by A guesstimated
349 number of tons, which we don't know yet because we really were doing this for ourselves not for
350 making people come to us. Yep. So, we have to put in the possible, you know, ceiling numbers.
351 So, I think 65 is fairly inflated per day. It's probably cool. maybe 30 or 40, but we have to look at
352 the worst-case scenario.

353

354

355

356 Motion:

357 Mr. McCoy made a motion to come out of deliberative. Mr. Reed seconded the motion. The
358 motion passed with a vote of 5 in favor, 0 oppose and 0 abstentions.

359
360 Motion:

361 Mr. McCoy made a motion to grant a special exemption to allow the use requested. Mr. Cahill
362 seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 5 in favor, 0 oppose and 0 abstentions.

363
364 Thomas Luszcz

365 Thomas Luszcz 39 Old Manchester Road, just looking for acknowledgement of my presence at
366 the ZBA meeting to fulfill my appointment as a ZBA Alternate. The second meeting.

367
368 Motion:

369 Mr. Campbell made a motion to adjourn the Zoning Board Meeting. Mr. Cahill seconded the
370 motion. The motion passed with a vote of 5 in favor, 0 oppose and 0 abstentions.

371
372 Mr. Reed

373 What I wanted to get done tonight, is I want to recognize that we have a complete package and
374 that we have a complete application so that we can accept jurisdiction of it and ask you as the
375 Planning Board having sat through their presentation having walked the site, do we need to
376 schedule another site walk now that now that they have the special exception?

377
378 Ms. Gott

379 I have a question first. There were a number of things that were outlined in the packet that were
380 unresolved as far as we knew from TRC. And some of them seem fairly significant. And to me,
381 they seem that the packet would not be complete then if we didn't have that information. So, I
382 would like to have resolution on the TRC items. I understand they had a meeting. I'd like to get
383 the minutes and get all of that information. So, then we can consider that it's complete because
384 right now in my mind it is not.

385
386 Mr. Reed

387 So, we do not have to accept this tonight. As the applicant, how long is it going to take you to
388 respond to all the questions that are listed from our engineer and the TRC? We have you
389 scheduled for a site plan review on April 7, is that adequate time to do everything you're asked?

390
391 John Lorden

392 We still need to work with Dubois and King to verify the scope of the traffic study. They don't
393 always study any of that, submit it to them and have them review it and comment back so it
394 could be three weeks.

395 Mr. Reed

396 Would you talk to staff and reschedule your hearing? . If you can get it together, we're fine with
397 it. But we would like a complete application, as complete as possible.

398
399 Ms. Gott

400 The one difficulty is re- noticing will it have to be re-noticed if we don't open it tonight.
401 Has it already been noticed?

402
403 Maddie Dilonno

404 Yes.
405

406 Mr. Reed

407 It is on you guys right now. I just wanted to make sure we are clear on that. We need a complete
408 application in order to accept that and start our job. And wanted to make sure you knew you had
409 time enough to do that.

410
411 Motion:

412 Ms. Bridgeo made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed with
413 a vote of 4 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

414
415 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:25pm.

416
417 Respectfully submitted,

418
419 Jill A. Vadeboncoeur

420
421
422
423