

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of November 2, 2016
APPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: Al Hall, Vice Chair; Tom Giffen; Ken Kustra; Mike Santa; Judi Lindsey; Rudy Cartier Alt; Joyce Bedard, Alt; Carleton Robie, Alt; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dave Murray, Building Inspector

Absent: Chair, S. James; S. Komisarek, BOS Representative

Vice Chair A. Hall called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Vice Chair Hall asked Alternate Rudy Cartier to sit in for S. Komisarek and C. Robie to sit in for S. James.

Residents Present: Dick Snow

Minutes October 19th:

J. Lindsey made a **motion** to accept the minutes of October 19th, 2016 as presented. R. Cartier **seconded**. Al Hall, Vice Chair and Ken Kustra; **were in favor**. T. Giffen, M. Santa and Carleton Robie, Alt; **abstained. Motion passed (4-0-3)**.

Change of Use Permit:

16-014 Application for Use Permit: Applicant: Jacob Renaud, 318 Circle Road, Manchester, NH 03103; Owner: A1 Ventures Group, LLC, 59 Forest Street, Londonderry, NH 03053; Property location: 240 Old Candia Road, Candia, NH 03034; Map 409 Lot 063; Intent: To lease the location and have an Automotive Sales at existing lot in the commercial district.

Applicant Jacob Renaud and his business partner, Mike Kiriakoutsos were present. Joe Sobol from A-1 Ventures Group, LLC (*owner*) was present. *Craig referenced here is Craig St. Peter.*

A. Hall confirmed that the location was the old BP Station. J. Renaud answered correct. J. Renaud confirmed that they have already talked to the Building Inspector. J. Renaud continued with the background and said that Mike is the sole owner of Mike K Auto Works and we partnered up and it's going to be called Turn Key Auto Sales. We fix all the cars at a different location. Once they are all fixed and ready to go, inspectable cars, we want to bring them to this location and have them for sale. M. Kiriakoutsos stated strictly sales at the location, no repairs at that location. J. Renaud handed out a revised parking lot plan saying in the first plan; he made the spaces too small. J. Renaud continued that it's going to be a sole office building, with the cars lined up, just for sales. The extent of working on them would be to make sure they stay clean next to the road.

T. Giffen commented once upon a time that was a service station so there was space, bays, so if you ever wanted to open it up and maybe have a wash bay indoors. J. Renaud said our lease that we agreed on with Craig and Joe was that it has to stay just an office. There can't be any repairs going on, strictly just cars being parked for sale with for sale signs on them, numbers.

K. Kustra asked how many cars do you expect to have. J. Renaud replied we'd like to have as many as we can. K. Kustra said 15, 20? J. Renaud replied we'll try to be around the 20-25 range. Whatever can legally fit. K. Kustra asked about lighting. Currently there is none. J. Renaud said that Craig had said there are two lights on each side and three up front that they are putting on the building as part of the lease, that they will put lighting in there. M. Kiriakoutsos commented that they will revive the sign too. J. Renaud said they will bring the sign back, put a nice sign out there that lights up. I think there's a pole in this grass area right here. Maybe

we can get a light to go out but it is also a high traffic area so I don't know how many lights you can put up at night, might be blinding.

A. Hall asked if they are using the whole parcel of land themselves. J. Renaud replied no, we want to fit as many cars as we can that are without obstructing any areas.

K. Kustra said the biggest obstruction would be right at the actual point itself with cars coming off of Main Street and cars coming on the highway there, Raymond Road, they have a hard time getting out off of Main Street. How much distance is there from where you intend to have your last car to the point?

J. Renaud said where this says grass right here, this is almost where the sign is. So this area is just a paved area so there is this whole grass area. T. Giffen said so the paved area will remain the same. J. Renaud responded yes.

R. Cartier asked you said there were three lights on the building. Those have always been kind of a hazard for traffic coming down there. I don't know if they've changed them or not. J. Renaud replied they actually aren't even installed yet so it's something the property owner's will actually be doing. R. Cartier said when you're coming down Old Candia Road at night it causes some...M. Kiriakoutsos asked if they pointed straight out. R. Cartier replied yes, they were straighter out than they were down lighting. J. Renaud said ok. D. Murray replied those lights have been replaced with a new style.

A. Hall asked that they aren't going to do any repair jobs there. Only buy sell so to speak. J. Renaud said no repairs. He has a separate location in Hooksett. M. Kiriakoutsos replied that repairs are going to be done in Hooksett, the location of my business.

M. Santa asked if they would be using the same curb cuts that are there now. Basically if you were looking at this plan, the circulation would be how? This way? J. Renaud said this is Old Candia Road here and there's already an existing curb there so we would face all the cars. M. Santa asked no the circulation through the site, are you going to use these two locations, that's typically what's been done in the past. J. Renaud said yes. There's also, it's hard to see, this is actually like 20 feet. If there was another car parked here, there's another 20 feet, so you can still use this entrance. The only one that's useless is this front one. M. Kiriakoutsos replied theoretically you'd be able to get all the way around where those cars are parked.

A. Hall asked any issues with the State at all? J. Renaud replied no, I think they are making sure that you guys were okay with it. M. Kiriakoutsos replied they wanted it cleared by the Town before we put in our application for a license. I know the gentlemen involved through getting other licenses and I talked to him first and he said get everything squared up with the Town and then put your application in.

D. Murray asked for a copy of their new parking plan there. You say you're going to put as many cars as you can but you're parking plan here, so that's the maximum right here. J. Renaud agreed.

R. Cartier asked if they only expected about 3 customers at a time. J. Renaud said I'd hope there'd be more. I would assume people might stop and look, park and try to keep them off the road. There's this big area here, not that there's designated parking spots, but I think there's enough room to get people out of the way. M. Kiriakoutsos commented there's more than enough room to have people in the lot, away from the road.

R. Cartier said that would be a concern, people parking alongside the road just from a safety standpoint.

K. Kustra asked if you sell one or two cars during the course of a day, would you be bringing in those one or two cars to replace them immediately or would there be open space. J. Renaud responded that there could be open space if we don't have enough but we would like to keep it full.

A. Hall asked if the Road Agent had any comments. D. Lewis replied they are State roads, I've got nothing.

C. Robie asked if they had a dealer plate or are you going to apply for a dealer plate? J. Renaud replied we have to apply. C. Robie said you have no dealer plate now so there would be no test drives until that is completed. J. Renaud said correct. C. Robie said and you have 19 spaces available, I see no problem. A. Hall asked for any input or a motion.

T. Giffen **motioned** to approve the application for the use permit as submitted. K. Kustra **seconded**. Al Hall, Vice Chair; Mike Santa; Judi Lindsey; Rudy Cartier Alt; and Carleton Robie were **All in Favor. Motion passed. (7-0-0)**

Informational Only: Applicant: Ron Severino; Owner: Candia South Branch Brook Holdings; Property Address: 13 High Street, Candia, NH 03034, Map 406 Lot 200; Intent: Additional paving.

Applicant Ron Severino was present. Tom Severino was present.

R. Severino said this is about the 13 High Street project down here, the old marina, and we've talked about this before, what we're doing there, what we plan on doing there and whether we need site plan review or not. At this point, we've done a lot of work over there (*he hands out his site plan*). So at this point, we pretty much have the site work under control and the only thing left to do is we want to pave the area behind the building. What we've done, in the back of the building, which is on the bottom of the plan, that lawn area, that's the area we talked about where we'd cut the trees and I just needed to re-grade things and have some room out there. But basically that all went back to green space so we didn't add any footprint back there. We've actually added some green space on the front and the gravel areas; it was pretty much gravel all the way down through there and over the years it had been added to and added to. What I'm trying to do is get this little bit of extra paving done and I don't feel that I need minor site plan approval because of what I read in the regs. When I read in the regs, the 1,600 square feet isn't under Section A, which is a requirement...there are only 2 things you need to do to meet the requirement and the 1600 feet is mentioned later as an exemption. Which it sounds like to me if you meet the criteria, in section one, say you're adding on a 1,000 sq ft to your building and you're able to do it here, but the paving is beyond a certain amount, or below a certain amount, it kind of steers that. So I feel like we have an existing site that we haven't changed, we've given back some green space, we haven't added any entrances, we've eliminated two and I would just like to get this paved and obviously in the next week or two and to try to go through the rigmarole of a site plan review at this time, when I don't feel I need it, is going to put me into winter. The 1,600 sq. ft. thing just doesn't make sense to me. What does 1,600 sq. ft. mean if you have a half acre site or a 50 acre site? I don't know where the 1600 sq. ft. comes in. This isn't even all the land we own, there's quite a bit of land out behind here still. The 8,000 sq. ft. that we're going to add on is...6 or 7% of the lot? T. Severino said yes, its 120,000 sq. ft. lot. It's an existing, hard packed surface, an existing gravel surface. All we're doing is paving that surface. It seems like the 1,600 sq. ft. is more geared towards if someone was cutting the trees down, creating or adding a parking lot. This isn't adding there was always an existing gravel roadway around that parking lot. We've cleaned everything up. We're not changing the surface; it's already a hard packed surface. We're just paving it.

A. Hall said you already paved the front part. T. Severino replied we paved the front part because that was paved before. We actually eliminated the multiple entrances because the site distance, the entrances that were closer to the intersection, we deleted those. We didn't want to change the area that was already paved because when we came in to speak to everyone.

A. Hall said so the only part you're paving is the 8,600 sq. ft. T. Severino replied is just adding the 8,600 sq. ft. to an existing gravel parking lot. A. Hall asked if that was less than the regs. T. Severino said no the regs are 1,600. R. Severino said it's 1600 on pavement but it's not under the definition, it's under exemption. Under the definition it's all about disturbing land of 2,000 sq. ft. but we had that discussion with the half acre out back but the disturbed land includes, again, not limited to, basically parking, driveways, septic, leach field, drainage pipes, ditches, and building footprint. The intent there is not to include landscape areas, because you can go out and still landscape your property. So it's the 2,000 sq. ft. which has to do with buildings and parking areas, basically. And we didn't change that. The building didn't grow, the parking area didn't grow. So under that, we don't even really hit the definition of the minor site plan review. But then when you go to the exemption, it just says, it's an exemption but it's in a different section and I'm not sure how it refers it. It's very confusing. And having said that, we're 95% done with this project and would really

like to finish it up. I think we've made a big improvement to the Town; we've cleaned up a lot of stuff out of there. We had boats that were left behind and all kinds of stuff and we made a good faith effort to do that and I don't want to put the Board in a spot but I just feel that we have the right to go and pave that.

A. Hall said it's too bad you didn't have the okay before you had the pavers come and they could have done the whole thing at one time.

R. Severino said I know, it's too bad but I told the Board I would come back before I paved it. I started to do an application and it just didn't fit. I even went to my abutters, I only have 3 abutters. I'm surrounded on three sides by 3 abutters and one of the abutters is also across the street and they've actually all signed waivers of notice because if I was going to get to the point of having a hearing and not make the notice time, I was going to try to do it that way. But it just didn't seem like that was worth it. All my abutters have looked at my plan and signed off saying that they don't have a problem with it.

T. Giffen said the gravel is considered an impervious surface so basically what you're doing is changing from a low quality impervious surface to a high quality impervious surface that can be more easily maintained and more attractive, so we would want to hold you up why? R. Severino commented you know the biggest reason for all this paving and impervious surface and changing, is to protect the abutters against flow. But we're not in a city and in this situation, I own 200 acres behind this site, that this water goes through so any increase in flow, other than going through one abutter next door who doesn't have a problem with it, it basically all ends up on my property until it hits the river and leaves town. So it's just another reason, it's not a sensitive area. If I had a housing development back there that would be a different story because you have to make sure you're not increasing flow.

R. Cartier asked if there was a change of use. Are you changing the use of the building? R. Severino said no, the same tenants are staying there. That was the other thing, a change of use triggers a minor site plan but it's still a car repair and body shop. R. Cartier reiterated so you're not changing use and you're not expanding an existing legal non-residential use. R. Severino replied no, we're not expanding the use, we're expanding the pavement. R. Cartier said so if I look at the definition, because the definition specifically states that "*A minor site plan review project is defined as a change or expansion of an existing legal non-residential use or a change from an existing residential use to a non-residential use in the commercial zone, where the overall effect on a lot would be the lesser of either.*" The way that I look at it, where we just did that approval for change of use down at the intersection, that was a change of use. It doesn't look like you have a change of use if you're having the same people that are in there. R. Severino said I've been through that before; if I change that into a convenience store, a change of use triggers that which means it's a whole new ball game. Basically we have to start all over so we don't want to change the use. R. Cartier said by looking at the strict interpretation of the definition, it says it has to be a change or an expansion of an existing non-residential use and you're not doing either one.

A. Hall asked if the Building Inspector or the Road Agent had any comments. D. Murray said even if this were kind of suggested to be a minor site plan, under the minor site plan regulations, *7.03A Application shall not be required to pave the existing or proposed area.* This is not a big deal. The area was already there; its gravel and they just want to pave it.

T. Giffen commented it's the same thing I was getting at. I don't think we have a reason to require an application of any kind and go forth and prosper would be my suggestion. A. Hall asked Mr. Lewis? D. Lewis said no, the only thing I can say is that it looks better than it ever has.

C. Robie said with the information provided, I think it's fine that he does what he needs to do to pave it. T. Giffen reiterated no application is needed. *Consensus: Approved without a motion as there was no application for the paving required by the Board.*

Impromptu Informational regarding CoPart Expansion: Ron Severino, Owner of Candia South Branch Brook Holdings of Candia was present. Tom Severino was present.

R. Severino said Item number 2 is that we have another project that will be coming in next month, actually in December, for the CoPart Expansion. That will be a Major Site Plan Review. There are no buildings, no pavement. Nothing but a parking lot but because I'm disturbing a lot more than 2,000 sq. ft. it will require a Major Site Plan Review. So we're getting that ready to go. I'm been asking what the policy is when I come into the office about third party review because it seems like Major Site Plan Review, sometimes they do it, sometimes they don't. The problem I have with the process, is that we have to have our plans in 30 days in advance, which is supposed to allow time for all these people to get something done, so that when we come to the hearing, we can actually do some business and either maybe come to an approval or at least find out what we need to do to go to the next step. And from what I've seen here, the last few times I've come up, which is the same it happened years ago, the Stantec approval, if it has to go to that, comes in the same day as the Planning Board Meeting if not the night before. So no business gets conducted other than accept the application and we don't have a chance to even do anything with our plan. There are two questions. One is at what point is it decided whether I need to go to have that third party review and if I do need a third party review, in the RSA for third party inspections and review, it says, "*The applicant may request the planning board choose a different third party consultant and the request may include the name of a preferred consultant. The planning board shall exercise reasonable discretion to determine whether the request is warranted.*" So I've stated my case before, I have a problem with Stantec for how this is handled, mainly because of the reason of time. They were very late getting back to us and also, they do too much. They redesign all these projects for everybody. We're spending plenty of money to get this done. So I guess to my first question, if I'm putting in, we're down to what five acres now? T. Severino confirmed four acres. Its four acres of eight inches of gravel topped with four inches of stone. Four acres of a stone surface. R. Severino continued that there would be no entrance onto the main road. There would be access, it would be abutting their property and it will be leased to them. They will be accessing it through their property. The only thing that might show up there is a perimeter fence but other than that, there's no roads, it's getting reviewed for an AOT permit and DES so whatever we need for retention purposes for the water. I'm not sure what the policy has been for sending out site plan reviews for third party review, is that something I can maybe get some direction. Because if you think it's really going to go there, I really want to think about recommending someone else to do it. I haven't heard of that being done yet. I know other Towns have been doing it, a lot of Stantec towns.

R. Cartier commented from what I've seen and heard from the time I've been on the Board, Ron brings up a very good point. We're now pushing to have people supply their plans ahead of time, so we're not getting something the week before. But maybe it would be prudent to have Stantec under the gun, if this stuff comes in 30 days ahead; you should be able to get the review done within 15 days so that you can make comments on whatever their looking at. R. Severino said right but it doesn't happen and even after the meeting, when we talk about the comments at the meeting and say we want to come back in two weeks, or four weeks, they don't respond until you get on the phone the next day and let's crank this out because we need a few days to go back and forth and they say we'll get to it, we'll get to it and then you get your letter back the day before the meeting again. So you can't ever get it...it waste's everybody's time. T. Severino said I mean we do a lot of work in the cities, Dover, Portsmouth, and our plan goes in a month before. Two weeks later we have a meeting with technical review, so they've made all their comments. We hash everything out at technical review. The owner now has two weeks to make those corrections prior to the meeting. When you show up to the Planning Board meeting all the work, the heavy lifting was done. The Planning Board meeting is a process to go through to make it official but the work of the review and making those comments, whatever corrections have to be made get made and by the time you get to the Planning Board, all that work is done. In this scenario, it can never be done. It's almost like it comes in the night before, there's nothing you can do.

T. Giffen agreed it's a big timing problem. T. Severino continued and I don't know what there is to review if you create a four acre, even our engineer, Tighe & Bond, who has 20 offices throughout Massachusetts, they said with this stone surface, it's porous, they don't even know if they'll need detention ponds, their doing the calculations right now, but if they do, they said it would be very little because it's all

stone going into gravel, so it's all going to infiltrate. But again, it goes to AOT. AOT reviews their drainage calculations. I've got an engineer designing a plan that the state's going to approve from a drainage standpoint. It's so hideous to pay another engineer and usually that person reviewing it isn't even an engineer. It's just someone from that office that's reviewing an engineer that we paid to design the plan. I can see, there's no pavement, there's so little for him to look at. There's no access to the highway, there isn't a traffic issue, I just wonder in this particular case, it's just so simple. Maybe that's something when we hand the plan in, on Monday, we're handing the plan in. Maybe at that point is the time to ask the question. Look at the plan and determine does this plan warrant a review? You'll see it, it's so simple.

R. Severino stated that was the other part, I'm just throwing this out, I don't expect everyone to have an answer but I don't want to turn the plan in 30 days in advance and come into the office and ask Andrea does this have to go to third party review and we won't know until the Board gets together, well the Board won't get together until my hearing or maybe an interim meeting but I don't know when that will get discussed. I don't know what that procedure is. When I turn a plan in 30 days in advance, it's to not only get it to them but to fire and building inspector and highway department and everyone else. T. Giffen commented so you can work out all the details. R. Severino agreed and it saves a lot of time. I guess that's what I'm asking, if I bring it in, if you guys can figure out what your procedure is.

C. Robie commented in the past AI, people came in with their application for acceptance and at that time they told them whether they would accept it and it would go to third party review and they would put a number on that so that's where the process started. But you need to move this up a month. And it needs to move up a month for everybody, not just these gentlemen. Last time with the gas station, Joe and Craig were here, for the Irving, they went through this for 8 weeks.

T. Giffen replied that one of the things that struck me was you end up with a miniature draft of War and Peace and I see something coming in from Stantec and its 59 or 60 or however many it was, points of contention and as soon as you go through and talk about them one at a time and pick them off, you find that 2/3rds of them are immaterial. T. Severino said there suggestions. They shouldn't be suggestions, it's black and white. Open the regulation, look at the plan. Tell me what doesn't meet the regulations. They have a right to do that but the suggestions. T. Giffen said it's a preference item from somebody who has no skin in the game and it doesn't help the Town, it doesn't help the Board, and it doesn't help the applicant. It absolutely kills me when I see somebody come in. R. Severino said we've been talking about this for twenty years. T. Severino said I know in other towns you have a choice or you can choose from three engineers, but you can suggest to them and they make a choice from the three, you're not pinned to one. I'm not sure if the RSA says that. R. Severino said it's basic in here. C. Robie said that's a new regulation. R. Severino said something else came out and someone gave me a copy and said we can do it this way now. I know in Londonderry, you provide them with three names and then they will pick one of them. Keach-Nordstrom in Deerfield, you have Dubois & King in Raymond, just pick one of those, and if nothing else, it will get Stantec to say oh geez maybe we better pay attention. We work with them a lot too, they come out on a lot of our jobs, they do inspections, we get along fine with them, there's a lot of good people there, but the review process is really...it's never an engineer. And whenever you come in and you question stuff about something they picked on they say oh well we're not an engineer, that's just something we see that we don't like. Even what you guys don't see, even between meetings, is really brutal.

R. Cartier commented that when you submit your plans you already know there are certain things that you're going to have to get approval from, fire department. If you know ahead of time you've got all the docs in the package, which takes care of all of that. I understand what you're saying, the only concern I would have with choosing another engineer to review it, is their not necessarily going to be looking out's for the Town's interest per se. I don't know if we contract with Stantec right now or if it's just a recommendation. They aren't our Town engineers are they? D. Lewis said they are but I don't think we have a contract with them. R. Cartier said so we just use them. D. Lewis agreed, that's just who we use. It's not a contract that we renew every year. C. Robie said that's why this RSA came into effect because towns had agreements with certain engineers and they do the same thing we do, always went to Stantec and the applicant had no choice. Then the RSA, the law

was changed, the applicant does have a choice. T. Giffen commented keeps everyone on their toes and honest. C. Robie continued Stantec treats the Town of Candia very well. Some of the review process, I'm not so sure about. When an engineer designs a plan, it doesn't matter who it's for, and he meets the regulations, that's all that it should be for, to make sure the engineer meets the regulations. How he got to it, two or three ways to get to the same thing. T. Giffen said it doesn't matter. C. Robie agreed and continued and that's where the 69 questions come from.

R. Severino commented and it sounds bad. When someone says oh you have 70 comments on your letter but like you say, a lot of them are you're waiting for a wetlands permit, you're waiting for an AOT permit, well we already know that. But that's all peppered in there so it makes a big long list. Instead of, ok these are the permits you're waiting on, these are the regulations you don't meet, these five items, ten items and these other things...D. Lewis said I was just going to make a statement. The review process has always been lengthy and bad timing with Stantec, however the reason we use one engineer is for the continuity from year to year and with the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen and they've always given us good service that way. But it's always been the day before when the letter comes in and no one has time to review it. The issues and questions are lengthy, some of them, like Ron just said, they answer themselves. We don't need to have them on the list and that needs to be addressed.

R. Cartier asked if the Planning Board or anyone in the Town has the authority to talk to Stantec and say look, you'd better get looking at the regulations and not everything that's been going on and get it in a timely basis or we're not going to use you? M. Santa said I think we'd do that. The Board would do that. C. Robie said they've just done it this way for so long I think they just think that's what everyone expects from them and I'm not so sure that is, it might be changing a little.

T. Severino commented that competition is healthy. We bid our work every day. They provide good service yeah but there's no competition so they could hand it in the night before. The minute there's one person that they say, oh my goodness, they are going to two people, they're going to sharpen their game up and maybe they perform even better than they are performing right now and then they'll say ok we can get it in within 15 days because they don't want to lose that work. R. Severino agreed. I would hate to see five different reviewing engineers coming in here for you guys to deal with but something has got to snap this into place. I think Stantec is just too big of an outfit, that's the other thing. They are not a local outfit. Their very very big and I've worked with them in all different aspects and have done a lot of stuff with them. And in some areas they do a very good job but these people in their office in Auburn, have no control over what you're asking right here. They're told to do these things a certain way and we see this pattern, it's not just here, we see this pattern in other towns and it's the same thing. It seems like no one can break that mold. Someone's obviously gone to Concord and said we can't have this. M. Santa asked when was that passed, that language. R. Severino said this was August 2015. M. Santa said so the game's changed and I think it's recognizing what you've said, we should be open to that and we need to discuss that as a Board. R. Severino said I'm doing this now, it's coming up and everything is time sensitive. We've had a lot of problems with people trying to get things done. Survey issues and everything else and we have a customer we promised we'd have a product here by the end of the year that we might not be able to make. So if I lose 30 days because of Stantec, it's very very frustrating, it could blow the whole deal.

R. Cartier responded that the toughest part for the Board is the comfort factor too. Stantec's been doing this for a long time. Everybody was, I don't want to say happy with them, but they knew that they were looking out for the best interest of the Town. I think the hardest thing that the Town or the Planning Board would have to come up with an acceptable list of people. I hate to say that, that's not the way it should be. An engineering firm should be professional and above the board so if you hired one engineering firm and there was another one that came in to check their work. We do that all the time, my registrations in mechanical engineering and anything that I do, I have another engineer check it because I want to make sure that everything's done. They are going to do that, peer review. I'm comfortable if it's a registered engineer that's doing it, it doesn't have to be Stantec.

T. Severino said its one phone call, you call the town of Deerfield, Keach-Nordstrom as Ronnie mentioned does them, Dubois & King, they inspect many of our jobs. I know they do Somersworth; they are doing Raymond for us. There are a few towns. All you have to do is call a couple of these towns and these are people that do the same thing Stantec does. That's what they do for work. They review plans, they inspect jobs. R. Severino commented I know enough, we would call somebody that that is what they do, inspections for other towns. I'm not going to call somebody who's never done that, that's not fair to you guys. I don't know how to shake these guys up we've got to move along a little bit better. R. Cartier replied in all fairness, you have a reputation that you have to maintain. Someone coming in may not have that same altruistic goal of what they're doing and maintaining that type of thing. It's rough on the Board. They don't know the engineering firms. I know some engineering firms but some Board members don't.

A. Hall asked would it delay your project if we continue this when our Chairman is at the next meeting. R. Severino said we're bringing in our plans. We're trying to make the December 7th meeting. C. Robie asked so you want that meeting day. R. Severino replied, yes so we need to be in here in 30 days. We were promised the plans by the end of the week so by November 7th, which is Monday, is my deadline to get plans in. Obviously it could sit here for a day or two but I hate to have them sit here for 2-3 weeks not knowing if it's going. A. Hall said the next meeting will be the 16th. C. Robie said and his plans will be here for a week. R. Severino acquiesced.

T. Severino commented we're happy to send them to Stantec if someone made the phone call and said hey you've got a week. Take a look at these plans, it's a gravel pad; have them back in a week. That's all we're saying. We're happy to do that if someone just lights a fire under them. Then you don't have to change anything.

R. Severino said Andrea can call them up and they can look at our plans and they can give her the price and we can bring her a check. That can all happen in a couple of days, we don't need to wait for the Planning Board to say we need to send a check. We do that all the time. Now we have things rolling in a few days. Now they can take a week or two weeks and then we get them back, we try to fix things. We come to the meeting. If there are still problems, we go onto the next meeting. We want them to come in here for once and say yes these look good now. It always sounds so bad.

T. Severino said yeah, we had 18 items, they fixed them all over the past two weeks, it would be nice to have them come in and say they've made the changes we've asked them too. It can be done if we have a week or 10 days, we can do that with our engineer. R. Severino responded rather than another engineer, maybe just a phone call from Sean. C. Robie said why don't we try that. R. Cartier replied with a Major Site Plan Review, we have a technical review correct? C. Robie said well the technical review would be within the 30 days, drop the plans off, we can look at the plans and then we make our decision as to whether we're going to accept them or not, the applicant. R. Cartier replied if we tell Stantec that we need the review or the Board's technical review. R. Severino said that would be nice. R. Cartier continued I've been on a couple of technical review committee's and sometimes you don't have all the information. We should have it. We might not get an Alteration of Terrain permit in there but that's one of the things you know will happen later. C. Robie said bring your plans. R. Severino said our plans near the 7th, sometime between the 7th and the following couple of weeks, we should be getting things rolling but I don't want to have to come in, I can't come in and ask Andrea what do I do, it's not her decision,. She has to start calling all the Board members or wait for a Board meeting so I'd figure I'd come in now and just voice my concern and if you guys agreed to at least tell them that or let her know that it's okay to send the plans over there and get an estimate.

C. Robie reiterated get your plans, Andrea can call Stantec, get a price to review, bring your check, tell Stantec we want them reviewed immediately and get back to them by 20th. R. Severino said it would move the technical review quicker because they're going to look at all this anyway.

A. Bickum stated I could just, if you send the plans, well you have to do the application anyway, bring that in and then I can forward that to the Board and check with Sean anyway and say does this even need to go to Stantec first and foremost. Let you guys review it and it's up to you guys whether you want it to go to the next level. R. Severino said it's premature to answer that because you haven't seen the plans but once you see

the plans, that's the first decision. The second decision is if it goes there (*to Stantec*); see if we can get it done before the meeting. I'd like to start a precedent that people can do this.

Other Business:

304 Raymond Road Storage, Third Party Reviews, Severino-CoPart Major Site Plan Technical Review

K. Kustra asked about the Storage, did that person come back in. D. Murray replied no he hasn't. He emailed me and he is having some business difficulties, maybe some finances or whatever the case may be. But he will be back in once he gets things squared away. He apologized to me and the Board. He just wasn't available.

T. Giffen asked A. Hall, Mr. Chair, can we put something on the Agenda for the next meeting to discuss means of improving our process with respect to third party reviews. A. Hall said certainly. T. Giffen said have it as an Agenda item and throw it out there and see if we can brainstorm something that will actually work instead of frustrate and confuse and terrorize and prolong. C. Robie commented that we just proposed something here let's see. A. Hall the process of updating our procedure. T. Giffen said yes we need to revise our policies and procedure with respect to third party reviews. C. Robie said I'm not sure if we have a policy on that. T. Giffen replied we should have one and it should conform to the reality on the ground instead of what it is now.

J. Lindsey asked if there was anything on the Agenda for the November 16th.

C. Robie said we could do a technical review of Mr. Severino's plan. His plan needs to go to a technical review by us, the Planning Board. We could all do that together. A. Hall said we can do that at the November 16th meeting. R. Cartier asked if Andrea could contact Stantec we really need their review by the 16th. C. Robie said that isn't going to happen. T. Giffen said we're looking for a two week turn-a-round on technical reviews. We need to talk about the scope of technical reviews as well and give them some direction. C. Robie said I agree.

K. Kustra asked if Andrea could have the actual RSA to that. I thought it was brought up a year ago. C. Robie a year ago last August. But I haven't seen the actual wording of it. D. Murray said yes we can get some copies of that.

R. Cartier said if we call Stantec and ask them to do it within a week and if they can't, call the applicant and see if they have suggestions for another engineering firm.

MOTION:

A. Hall asked if there was a motion to adjourn. J. Lindsey **motioned** to adjourn at **7:55 pm**. T. Giffen **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (7-0-0).**

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary
cc file