

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of May 7, 2014
APPROVED

Present: Sean James Chairman; Albert Hall III Vice Chair., Judi Lindsey; Ken Kustra; Mark Siemonsma; Amanda Soares, BOS Rep; Dave Murray, Building Inspector; Carleton Robie, BOS; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent, Rene LaBranche Town Engineer from Stantec.

Absent: Ginny Clifford; Michael Santa. Chairman James asked M. Siemonsma to sit for G. Clifford.

Chair James called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, he asked everyone to remain standing for a moment of silence for a former Board Member Bob Bruce who had passed away.

Minutes April 16, 2014

A. Hall **motioned** to accept the Minutes of April 16, 2014 as amended. J. Lindsey **seconded**. S. James, A. Hall, J. Lindsey, K. Kustra, A. Soares **were in favor**. M. Siemonsma **abstained**. **Motion passed (5-0-1)**.

Chairman James re-opened the public hearing for the continuance for the Major Site Plan 20 Main Street at 7:02 pm.

Continuance Major Site Plan: Applicant: Scott Komisarek 39 Fieldstone Lane, Candia NH 03034; Property owner: Pensco Trust Co., P.O. Box 173859 Denver CP 80217-3859; Property location: Main Street, Candia NH 03034 Map 409 Lot 204 ; Intent: To construct a year round farm stand with several outdoor venders to market produce & products from local farms & home makers within the Mixed Zone. For additional information, please call the Land Use Office at 483-8588. Scott & Amy Komisarek 39 Fieldstone Lane, Candia NH 03034, Dan Muller of Cronin Bisson & Zalinsky Law Firm 722 Chestnut Street, Manchester NH 03104, Alden Beauchemin, Keyland Enterprises, L.L.C. 412 West River Road, Hooksett NH 03106, Harold Wood of Wood Engineering and Brian & Karen Johnson owner of Johnson Golden Harvest 412 W River Road, Hooksett NH 03106 were present for the applicant. Abutters Richard Fitts Sr and Richard Fitts Jr 23 Main Street and Michael Vaillancourt 14 Main Street were present.

Chairman James noted that they had previously asked for year round business but are now asking for seasonal. A. Beauchemin passed out revised plans to the Board and audience. The applicant was agreeable to go through the second review letter from Stantec dated May 6, 2014 point by point. A. Beauchemin said the first item is the waiver request for the landscaping plan section 4.03n. He said it is a seasonal farm stand and keeping that in mind have proposed leaving the existing tree line around the perimeter and added greater detail to the plan showing the tree line. He said areas that are being disturbed will be re-loamed and grass wildflowers planted and other than that they would like to plant some perennials around the sign. He said they weren't planning on any type of extensive landscaping plan at this stage and if at some point they come back to establish a year round farm they will do a full landscaping plan. A. Hall asked for their definition of seasonal and A. Beauchemin said May through October. A. Beauchemin said he had submitted the waiver with the original application where 2 out of the 3 waiver requests were voted on a previous meeting. R. LaBranche said he did notice on the revised plans on the left side where the snow storage area it is noted wildflowers plantings which can be considered a form of landscaping. He said he wanted to point out relative to land clearing about cutting back a bit more to make the sign more visible. Chairman James asked R. LaBranche if he had seen the letter from DES which has a comment about not cutting trees within their right of way without permission. R. LaBranche said he doesn't believe this to be the case because the trees are shown out of the right of way.

A. Soares made a **motion** to grant the waiver request 4.03N landscaping plan. A. Hall **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (6-0-0)**

A. Beauchemin continued with general comment #4 the applicant was to submit architectural renderings of the building which were submitted at the last meeting. S. Komisarek said it was a rendering without elevations. A. Soares remembers seeing the drawing. A. Beauchemin said #5 was concerning a discussion about the site surety requirements. Chairman James said in the past the Town's engineer makes a recommendation on whether to have it and the amount. R. LaBranche said it does not include the building just the site work. A. Beauchemin said #6 is regarding the NW corner marker monument which is missing. He said it is located in the

abutter's driveway. D. Muller said they are willing to mark the corner and to make a formal arrangement either through a license or easement with the neighbor to allow them to use and maintain the driveway and also some type of indemnification in writing. R. LaBranche asked to have that put on the plan as a note. D. Muller said #7 was concerning lighting and said the hours of operation are until dusk and the only lighting needed would be some on the building for security. He said if it became a year round business and would be operating in the dark; they would amend their site plan to address the lighting. A. Hall the lighting would be from May until October so there will conceivably be no lighting in the winter months. D. Muller said there would be security lighting then.

D. Murray said since they changed from year round to seasonal, they are not looking to put a well or septic on site. A. Beauchemin said they have talked to the Johnson's who are in the audience who run a similar business without onsite septic or water. He said the Johnsons are here to explain how they have operated for the past 4 years without incident without water and septic onsite. D. Muller said the Johnsons have a system of how they bring in water and dispose of it. B. Johnson said they have a 2 5 gallon portable water tanks, one being for water and one for waste with a small hand sink and they use a sanitizer approved by the health department, a Cisco product, and have operated for 4 years with zero incident. He said they use the water to wash your hands and do not wash produce which will ruin the produce and continued no one washes their produce and people usually wash their produce when they get home. He said it is all pre-packed and no cutting of vegetables. A. Beauchemin said the Johnson's operation is a year round facility. He said the S. Komisarek has talked to the state who have told them about they can keep the place clean without onsite water therefore again keeping with the notion this is something they are trying to get established and at the same time recognizing the Board probably may not be comfortable going forever without onsite water or septic but would like to ask them to go forward for the rest of this season and next year full season because at that point they will have a better idea if this business is going to be feasible long term and will have a good idea if investing in a well and septic would be a good idea and if the Board is willing perhaps a conditional review hearing at the end of the first full season would be willing to do that. Chairman James said the Board will entertain that.

S. Komisarek said another option is to use a mobile structure but feels it would not be desirable from the Town's standpoint and theirs and would not be esthetically pleasing to have something mobile. He said he has sat down with the state on 2 occasions with a plan to adhere to state regulations for food safety and said the Johnsons are here tonight to answer any questions from the Board.

A. Hall asked about bathroom facilities and B. Johnson said they use a bathroom that is located in a nearby office building. S. Komisarek said they would use a portable facility that would be concealed and not seen. R. LaBranche said the plans show a potential future septic system location and asked what the ground water table was there. A. Beauchemin said he dug a preliminary hole with augers to determine the water table and continued he is a licensed septic designer along with as being a wetland scientist. He said he put together a conceptual septic design for possible future use and he wanted to figure out grades because wanted to position the building and leave the site in a way that wanted to put in leach field it is just a matter of grubbing it out. He said they wanted to make sure the building was set high enough that it would be gravity fed into a future tank and leach field. M. Siemonsma asked if he was confident to know what the soils were without a test pit and A. Beauchemin said he has good soil auger and is able dig right down. A. Hall said in essence when it comes the time you want the septic you are ready to go.

Chairman James said #9 was for a boundary survey which they now have a copy in the folder and the only comment would be to include it with the plans. A. Beauchemin said #10 talked about a privacy fence. They are proposing 3 sections consisting of two sections of 6 foot high fencing as shown on drawing to create a buffer from the abutter with detail on page 4. He said it would be staggered to give character and is not meant to keep people from passing through, for visual effect only and will be about 48 to 50 feet. A. Hall asked if this was agreeable with the abutters and A. Beauchemin said he did meet with them on site and said putting the fence on the property line would have been disruptive to them so they brought the fence in. The fence would be made of rough sawn wood to go along with character of the Farm Stand.

Concerning Sheet 3 comment #15, A. Beauchemin said they met with Stantec who noted in the review letter that an offset between a commercial driveway and a residential driveway is not necessary because of the impact. R. LaBranche said their reviewers typically try not having opposing driveways and he actually got their traffic engineer who specializes in this to review it and they said it is not necessary to have an offset with a commercial driveway and a residential driveway. A. Beauchemin said one neighbor wanted it pushed further

away and the other neighbor didn't want it any closer so they stayed with this location shown on the plan which will also keep headlights from going directly in the abutter across the street. H. Wood said the driveway is offset by 40' and would like to keep it that way so if at some point the farm stand becomes year round, customers leaving would not shine their headlights into the abutter's driveway.

R. LaBranche asked the Board what they wanted to do about sheet 4, comment #27 concerning lighting. He said he is not sure when the Town's lighting ordinance was established but typically when you establish a lighting ordinance it is for public safety, security and for employee safety. He said the light provided will address site security and being seasonal from dawn to dusk public safety will not be an issue and continued employee safety is not addressed. He said if employees are cleaning up it may become dark and suggested putting a light in the parking area that could be on a two hour timer after dusk. He said I wouldn't want to get too carried away with it as it is farm stand and not a Shaw's parking lot. He showed the suggested location and said he is talking about low wattage. K. Kustra suggested a dimmer. S. Komisarek was agreeable to add one light in the parking lot area.

A. Beauchemin said concerning comment #29 on sheet 5, they didn't want to grub out the whole site only areas that are disturbed and areas not disturbed they would rotor- tiller it and plant wild flowers. He said areas that are to be maintained and mowed to be prepared with 6" layer of screened loam as necessary. He said it is not his client's intent to be mowing all the wild flowers on a regular basis. K. Kustra asked if there was any clay on the property which would hold water and then they would not need as much loam. A. Beauchemin said the soil is very loamy no clay. Chairman James asked then you are suggesting some areas 4" and some 6"? A. Beauchemin said the proposed areas; to have wild flowers is already 6" or more of native soil. R. LaBranche said the site has a lot of Pine trees which once removed the soil will need to have lime put on it and sticks removed. He said they can make sure the organic soil is 6" thick and this can be verified in the field. A. Hall said in summary leave most of the lot in its natural state and just address parts around the parking area and building leaving naturalized areas and mowed areas. R. LaBranche suggested adding a note to that effect.

Chairman James asked about any details along the line of the storm water detention area. H. Wood said to see an example, Hannafords in Raymond has an area depressed about a foot into the ground to collect water and in this particular example they mow it and on a regular day looks like part of the lawn but serves as a detention area. He suggested the detention area on site be kept mowed and they could use this lawn area to set up picnic tables because the majority of the time it is dry. He said water will collect in the front half of the improved area and if there is erosion from the parking area that would be the area to collect it and would be easy to clean if necessary and said the drainage analysis shows the runoff coming from the front of the building parking lot going to the detention area and it actually decreases the pipe flow under Route 27 where everything on the lot eventually ends up.

H. Wood said there is a berm around the parking area and at the midpoint of the building down along the east side of the parking lot and then along the south side of the parking lot that will collect all of the runoff from gravel space and run it right into the detention area. A. Beauchemin said the timber curb is 6" anchored with 1/2" x 2" long rebar every 6 feet which starts midway of the building to the parking lot so the grades all work to drain to the low spot. R. LaBranche said they looked at this and the revised copy and they still have some issues with the drainage analysis which they can work out. He said he thinks the detention basin may have to be increased in size a bit and they are not seeing a direct drainage course and there are no grades or topography in that area to know whether it is all going to go that way and they see a high point and not sure if the water will end up where there. He said conceptually the approach is valid but they need to work out the details once they get into construction want to make sure don't have to dig into anything that they don't have permission to go to. H. Wood said the problem with the lot, in order to get any reasonable thought process to know how the water goes they had to go with 1/2 foot contours and even then it was still tricky. He said that is one of the reasons they raised the sight not only for the septic but for drainage. R. LaBranche said on the curb line there is a 3/10 of a foot drop along the back straight away which is .004 slope on gravel below what is should be and on pavement you don't want to go below 1% and gravel below 2%. He said getting the water there is possible but they may need to tweak the elevations.

K. Kustra asked where does the water go from the 15" corrugated drainage pipe that is noted on the DOT letter #6 and A. Beauchemin said the water goes now about 15 feet and then dissipates into the ground and what they are proposing to do is redirect road drainage. H. Wood said very little water goes through the pipe and picks up the water from that 1/2 of the pavement and maybe ditch line and if you look beyond the ditch line at the

property it is fairly level and not sure if the run off goes into the ditch or goes the other direction and there is no steady flow. R. LaBranche said he has a valid point you are not designing for a 1/4" of rain in June you are designing for 25 year storm and you certainly do not want an erosion problem across the site so dropping in a culvert across the driveway so water can be directed to the catch basin may not be a bad idea if that is the direction the water goes. H. Woods said the water goes around the site. Chairman James said the culvert is labeled as in disrepair on the plan and DOT said it is in satisfactory conditions. A. Beauchemin said when they first went out and looked at it buried with snow and they saw some headwall rocks down that is why they said in disrepair but they are going to put them back in place when they do construction and he said the state inspected as well and said it was in satisfactory condition. A. Beauchemin said comment #30 it was Stantec's recommendation to specify a temporary stone check dams consisting of 3" to 4" stone but initially they wanted the old fashioned hay but now they have provided a nice stone detail on page 4 top right hand side.

Chairman James asked R. LaBranche if there anything else they did not cover and he said no and asked if the Board had any further questions or comments and hearing none asked if an abutter had any questions or comments. R. Fitts Sr. 23 Main Street, said his biggest concern was if they take out any of the trees across the street they are going to get plastered with lights from cars from Route 27 like they do in the winter time when the leaves are down it is just like daylight in the house now they are going to get the headlights year round. A. Beauchemin said they are going to do a selective cut to pull out dead trees and pines and leave the hardwoods leaving a buffer. Chairman James said it appears there is a tree buffer the whole way. A. Beauchemin said when they come back for the septic and water and lights from 27 are still an issue they would be agreeable to plant some hemlocks. He said there is a significant distance from Raymond Road to their house. Chairman James confirmed with Mr. Fitts that during the winter the lights come from Rt 27 right into their house which means it is an existing condition now. S. Komisarek can't preserve the entire site but be as respectful as they can. K. Kustra asked how far when you see the initial lights to when you don't see them and R. Fitts Sr. said at Seavey's old house clear down past the CYAA building. K. Kustra said considering the distance and speed how long does the light last? R. Fitts Sr. said depends on the traffic sometimes it is consistently. Chairman James said he understands the concerns but not sure what they can do about it short of lining the whole site with something which is not reasonable. H. Wood said there will still be a buffer and will grow in larger. A. Soares said maybe the building itself may block some of the light. R. LaBranche said if you look at the plan what may cause it is as you go into the bend grade drops off near the culvert and now are on an angle that goes towards the house then it levels off and is at least 1200 feet away from the house. A. Hall said the DOT met with the town last Friday about modifications to that intersection. S. Komisarek said he was at the meeting too.

R. Fitts Sr. said another concern he has is that when they had their stand in the 80's, 90's until 2001 he had to grow at least 35% or more produce onsite per state regulations. S. Komisarek said what he is talking about is an RSA that helps growers who want to have a farm stand down by the road if you grow a certain percentage of produce you get relief from zoning but this is a mixed use. R. Fitts Jr. said when they spoke to the state recently it was any farm stand. He said in a couple years it is going to be illegal because all farms stands will have to be on a farm. D. Murray said the farm stand that the Johnsons have is not on a farm and they have been in compliance with the State for 4 years now. A. Beauchemin said there is a note on the plan saying they will comply with all state food requirements.

Chairman James said they have 65 days to decide the application and there is one more meeting until then. He said he has 8 conditions and if they are looking for a conditional approval or if they want to come back as he does not want to drag it so they can get part of this season. Chairman James said he had the following conditions written and waivers; 1. NHDOT Driveway Permit driveway permit required. 2. Site surety in amount TBD by Town Engineer and agreed upon with applicant. 3. Add note to plan on right of use of residential drive at NW corner. 4. Seasonal use May – October during daylight hours. 5. Add one light at far parking area for employee safety. 6. Finalize storm water design based on Stantec's comments and the following waivers: Section 8.03a paved parking, Section 6.02 dimensional requirement of 2 acres under Candia Zoning Ordinance Section 2.02e acre and Section 4.03n landscaping plan are granted. Chairman James said they had offered a compliance hearing and asked the Board for their comments and there were no comments so he said they do not need to make this condition and thanked the applicant for offering that as a condition. R. LaBranche said on the storm water detention area wants to see an expanded general comments associated with storm water. K. Kustra asked when they could become operational with all the conditions and S. Komisarek said the end of July as it is a very simple structure and conditions will be met.

S. James made a **motion** to approve the Major Site Plan 20 Main Street plan subject to the conditions and waivers just listed. A. Hall **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried 6-0-0**. S. Komisarek thanked the Board. Chairman James said they will take a 5 min break and start back at 8:15pm.

Major Site Plan: Applicant: Tony Fiore 103 Chadwick Street, Bradford MA 01835 & Michael Pelletier 31 Garfield Street Lawrence MA 01841 owners of Merrimack Valley Paint Ball, 103 Chadwick Street, Bradford MA 01835; Property owner: Rita Hobbs, P.O. Box 11, Candia NH 03034; Property location: 275 Old Candia Road, Candia NH 03034 Map 410 Lot 160; Intent: To re-establish and operate an outdoor paint ball facility in the woods & fields within the Light Industrial I District. For additional information, please call the Land Use Office at 483-8588.

Tony Fiore, Michael Pelletier and Douglas MacGuire, P.E. Dubay Group, Inc. Engineering Manager were present for the applicant and no abutters were present. Chairman James said they have had a couple meetings prior and are back with plans tonight. T. Fiore said they were requested to present the Board with a Major Site Plan and they hired the Dubay group who will be talking on their behalf tonight. D. MacGuire said he was not here at the last meeting but has read the minutes and is familiar with what some of the concerns were and said it seems like the main concern there wasn't an understanding of what had been done concerning some earth work that had gone on and the Board did not have a plan to look at that. He said the first sheet shows the existing conditions which an actual ground survey was done and shows the actual disturbed area outlined with a bold line. He said they did not survey the woods area and used previous approved plans that were on file. He said they tried to provide level parking and actually were successful. He said he had reviewed the existing area before any work had been down and anyone familiar with the site there were 2 gravel access roads that were x shaped that came in and an out were quite steep 8 to 15%. He said the entrance is in the exact same spot and pointed out where they used to park. He said they provided a level area with a 6-8% slope. He said in the pre-development conditions the water flowed from the NW corner to the SE corner of the property and collected into two wetland fingers shown on the plan and then collects at the bottom right by the rail trail and said although they did change the grade to make it less steep all the water is directed to sheet flow across the parking area and continue across the site like it did before. He said they matched that condition successfully.

D. MacGuire said although this is phase one plan the applicants have a larger picture in mind but as of right now they are just looking to have a parking area which has been established and have access to the existing woods ball area where paintball was played previously. He said they also want to add a regulation grassed competition field and a grassed practice field. He said these fields are for a different type of player than a woods ball player where there are leagues and are team orientated more like a professional sport and all the games are officially refereed in the field. He said the plan shows pictures similar to what they want to have and are looking to add this field and have laid it out in the plan which is relatively flat now with netting around it. He said they are asking for two additional storage containers and the plan shows the container they have currently. Erosions control measures were added to the plan and they are providing some silt fencing and proposing an area to be jute matted with erosion control fabric near the field to help in preventing any type of erosion.

D. MacGuire said the woods ball is ready to go and the parking is acceptable for their use and are now are looking to go forward with the field. He said there is one additional plan sheet in the set that is a conceptual phase two layout to show the Board why they orientated certain things on site the way they did. The competition field was pushed back and the practice field in front which could potentially be converted into a building site which is why the laid out everything like they did. The final page shows erosion control detail related to phase one improvement.

A. Soares asked if they had installed the culvert for the woods ball area and T. Fiore said they had installed it. K. Kustra asked about the viewing area and D. MacGuire said since the field games are completion games there are often spectators and an area for other teams waiting to use the field. He said they are going to be safe behind the netting and may put benches there. K. Kustra said in the phase 2 the viewing area is to change to a septic system. D. MacGuire said what they are proposing in phase is a very small septic system and the viewing would change to be from the building looking out onto the field from the building.

D. Murray said at the last meeting they gave the applicants a good set of guidelines to go by and he said they got a little carried away with the pavilion over the weekend due to the rain. He can see their point but he did issue them a cease and desist. He said he wanted to see a guardrail which they discussed at the last meeting. D. MacGuire said that is on the plans to do. D. Murray asked if the additional storages trailers they are asking for are 40 feet like the existing ones and T. Fiore said the proposed trailers would be 8x8x20 feet side by side.

D. Murray said he had Fire Chief Dean Young look at the access roads and he was very pleased saying they did an excellent job going down into the parking lot. M. Siemonsma agrees 100% with the guardrails. J. Lindsey asked about restroom facilities and T. Fiore said they are using port potties. T. Fiore said business is seasonal and runs from beginning of April to end of November weather permitting and open presently weekends 8am-4pm.

Chairman James asked if there any plans for the canopy and how did that come about. M. Pelletier said the 1 x 20 trusses over thick corrugated steel are supported every 5 feet with telephone poles with a 3" pitch. He said the trusses came from carport at Nashua Ford in Lawrence and have shown to be very sturdy. Chairman James asked D. MacGuire if he had any involvement with the canopy and he said he had not but there is a canopy proposed. T. Fiore said only half is installed and what is proposed is 40 x 40. It was asked if the Building Inspector was involved and D. Murray said he has not been hence the cease and desist. A. Soares asked if the steel trusses were secured to the storage container so there would be no possible liability on your part.

Chairman James said we just got the plans tonight and they need to have the Town Engineer review them. D. Murray suggested go back to the original agreement to continue to work they have agreed to and have the games in the woods. Chairman James said he has concerns about the canopy it may be great but they need to have it reviewed before it is opened up for public use. M. Pelletier asked if they could have D. Murray inspect the canopy when it is completed for approval and Chairman James said he wants an engineer to review it. D. Murray said the girders look okay but needs work where it is attached at the trailer in his observation. M. Pelletier said it is overkill and why pay an engineer to say it is overkill which costs more money. He said he understands public safety and all the work he has done so far is good. D. MacGuire said he wanted to clarify that the big focus is the competition field which is a big part of their business and being a grassed area are they able to start prepping that area. K. Kustra asked what they had to do as there are logs and trees that have been cut in there now. D. MacGuire said they will set the corners of field to know exactly where the field is and their goal is to bring grade a bit down in front and up in the back to begin leveling out they would use any excess materials and starting bringing down some of the piles that are onsite right now to flatten and start prepping the fields and plant natural grass so it can start to grow and mature before they have players on it. He said this is one of their main concerns. A. Soares said the piles outlined are the ones they want to use to level the field out. T. Fiore said he would like to screen to remove sticks and rocks and then be able to spread it. Chairman James asked if that would that include the 6 foot boulder wall and slope behind it or just the flat area. D. MacGuire said the boulder wall proposed was to just make sure there isn't any disturbance to wetland area and certainly doesn't need to be the first thing that they would do if that is a concern of the Board. He said the time the application is being reviewed they could still be prepping other portions of the field to get ready. M. Siemonsma said would there be an advantage to build the boulder wall before they place the fill. Chairman James said it sounds reasonable but his concern is from past meetings they talk about one thing and something else happens. He said this isn't exactly what he had envisioned when they talked about this in January. A. Hall said it seems like a design build. Chairman James said he was not sure if you had enough silt fences as there isn't any at the bottom of the slopes. D. MacGuire said they can add it in. T. Fiore said he want to point out this is the end of all the earth moving and once they grade the competition field they are done. D. MacGuire said the wetland delineated is part of this. A. Hall asked if they had removed the boulder in the parking that broke their equipment and T. Fiore said it is on their "to do" list and may need to jack hammer it.

Chairman James asked if the public had to go under the canopy and T. Fiore said no. He confirmed with D. Murray if they installed the guardrail and kept the public out of the canopy and did limited screening of the loam for this area would that be acceptable? D. Murray said yes. Chairman James said they will have the town engineer get a proposal to review the plan and asked the applicant if that sounded reasonable and they said yes. A. Hall said can they still operate and Chairman James said yes if they put the guardrail and keep the public out of the canopy. He said to the applicants they are trying to work with them to keep them operating while getting the review going as well.

T. Fiore confirmed they can spread the screened loam. M. Siemonsma asked what the elevation was for the field from the plan it looks like a 6 foot elevation difference. D. MacGuire said the elevation on top is 443 and the bottom of the field 438 and they are looking to split that difference and make the field 440 with a slight pitch on the field for drainage but keep mostly flat to promote filtration right back into the ground. M. Siemonsma said he didn't see enough fill to make up the difference. D. MacGuire said from what they are

looking at cutting 2' down on the high side and adding/filling 2' on the low side so should have sufficient material.

D. Murray said you need to get this work done to spread the loam and he asked the Board if they were okay to do this. M. Siemonsma said the practice area marked has a stock pile of material currently in it. D. MacGuire said they are not going to re-grade the practice area the goal is to leave it for phase 2. D. MacGuire asked that they don't review the 2nd phase as what they gave was conceptual and would like them to focus on erosion control. He said to ease the Board's concerns on erosion control he said with any disturbance of an acre of land you should have a storm water pollution plan "SWPP" a federal EPA mandated permit and the applicant is moving forward with the permit working with Bruce Gilday the wetland scientist that did the delineation and wetland crossings with a plan to implement any erosion plan that will be needed.

Chairman James said the Town Engineer would not be looking at phase 2. He said it is helpful looking ahead but as far as the competition field if you want to screen loam for it that is fine and continued they have just seen the plans tonight without any comments or review. He said the Building Inspector is comfortable with you putting up the guard rail and keeping the public out of the canopy and screen loam to operate but not to start construction and in the meantime will ask our Town Engineer who is present to get a proposal out in a week which he said he would.

Chairman James said the Major Site Plan will be continued to May 21, 2014. M. Pelletier asked if they got the Building Inspector and an engineer to say the canopy was okay so the public could use it. D. Murray said the engineer would have to look at it first. Chairman James said you want a structural engineer to sign off on it? M. Pelletier said it is supposed to rain Saturday. Chairman James said he understands but they have enough concern with the canopy that it needs to be reviewed. A. Soares said the town engineer needs to review as it is public safety because even through it is your property it will come back to the Town. R. LaBranche asked if he could make a comment said in order for Stantec to evaluate they would have to have their structural engineer come down which would be a costly exercise and suggested he find someone local go out and put together an evaluation which would be more cost effective. M. Pelletier said they would do that. K. Kustra suggested a portable tent M. Pelletier said they tried that and the wind knocked it down.

Chairman James said seeing no abutters and no more discussion closed the public hearing and continued the public hearing to May 21, 2014. Chairman James said once the guardrail is in place and you keep the public out of the canopy they can operate the woods ball. He also they can screen the loam and stock pile it but no grading of the field and no containers are to be brought in.

Other Business

Raymond Planning Board Meeting Thursday June 19, 7:00pm

Chairman James said the Board was invited to attend a meeting on Thursday June 19 at 7:00 p.m. at Raymond High School (45 Harriman Hill Road). He said the purpose of this meeting is to get together with members of the Planning Boards of all the towns abutting Raymond (Candia, Chester, Deerfield, Epping, and Fremont & Nottingham) to discuss issues of common concern. J. Lindsey said she was interested.

ZRRC Meeting May 21, 2014

Chairman James said as reminder if you have any comments on the Land Use Control Regulations Table of Contents to be discussed on May 21, 2014 please email or bring with you for the next ZRRC meeting.

Major 1 lot Subdivision June 4, 2014

Chairman James said a Major 1 lot Subdivision is scheduled for June 4, 2014 and asked about setting up a plan review meeting. A. Hall suggested after the 21st meeting and Chairman James suggested before the meeting on June 4th at 6pm. The review meeting was set up for 6pm June 4th before the Planning Board regularly scheduled meeting at 7pm and the applicant will be contacted to confirm.

Signing of 378 South Road Major Site Plan & Liquid Planet Minor Site Plan for Starry Night Digital Drive In Plans Chairman James asked the Board before they left to sign plans for 378 South Road Major Site Plan and Liquid Planet Minor Site Plan for Starry Night Digital Drive In.

The next scheduled Planning Board meeting is May 21, 2014 at 7pm at the Town Hall.

A. Hall **motioned** to adjourn at 9:12 pm. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor.**

Respectfully submitted,
Sharon Robichaud
Land Use Secretary