

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

**Members Present:**

Bruce Stevens, Chairman	Brian West, Alternate
Ken Christiansen, BOS rep	
Steve Hamilton	Town Planner Glenn Greenwood
Mark Kennedy	
Kevin Johnston	

**Open**

Chairman Stevens opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Kennedy, to give West voting rights. All were in favor. Motion carried.

**7:00 p.m. Public Hearings**

**7:00 p.m. Site Plan Review Application:** Applicant: Trident Project Advantage Group; Owner: Emma Brentwood Realty, LLC; Tax Map 223 Lot 063; 316 South Road; Site plan application for a new two-story building, approximately 48,400 sq. ft. +/- with associated sitework; utilities, signage, parking and landscaping. The uses will include an educational facility, approximately 34,000 sq. ft. +/- and commercial office/retail space(s), approximately 14,400 sq. ft. +/- in the comm/ind. zone.

Present: Frank Montero, Civil Engineer with MHF Design Consultants, design consultant on the project representing the owner and developer; Gino Baroni with Trident Project Advantage Group; (Landowner, Chuck Morse-*not sure if he was present*); Developer, Ken O'Brien; Architect Ken Feyl; Traffic Consultant, Heather Monacup with GPR; Kathy Harris of Seacoast Learning Collaborative (SLC); Patrice Chandler of SLC; Brentwood Police Chief, Ellen Arcieri; Abutter Georgette Vitale of South Rd., Abutter Heather Goodwin of South Road; Abutters Lisa & Gary Lewis of Lewis Motors; Resident Kurt Culligan of South Road; Resident Kelly and Brett Ramsdell of South Road.

Stevens said the paperwork is in order and abutters notified from the list provided by the applicant.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Johnston, to invoke jurisdiction and accept the application. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Frank Montero with MHF Design gave an overview of the project. Location is currently Granite Creek Farms, landscape nursery built around 2007 with access off of South Road. Wetlands reflagged by Jim Gove's office in 2018 and most recently, January of 2019; he flagged a substantial area on the left side of the site. A finger here and a wetland swale along the side of the road. Drainage flows across the site to drainage swale and across the street. The proposal is to remove the landscape nursery and construct this building; a 48,400 square foot, two-story facility with two main components; office/retail component that's 14,400 sq. ft., smaller areas for lease and the educational facility would be 34,000 sq. ft. two-story at the back of the facility. The access is proposed off of South Road. We're moving the existing driveway slightly further

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

back on South Road and proposing a secondary access. Circulation pattern; school buses would enter at first entrance and circle (*counterclockwise*) around the building drop off and exit. Trash enclosure facility shared at the back. 50 parking spaces for the education facility, plus 12 bus parking spaces. Office/retail requires 48 spaces per zoning; 61 provided; total parking is 123 spaces.

Wetlands: 25' no disturb buffer from poorly drained soils. No disturbance to the 25' buffer. Remove existing concrete bins (mulch storage etc.) and restore that area with loam and seed. No impact to the buffer. There's a 50' building setback from poorly drained soil; a CUP (conditional use permit) will be required to work within that 50' area. We will be seeking a CUP on that impact.

Utilities: Site serviced by expansive drainage system and an AOT permit will be obtained from NHDES. Four (4) rain gardens throughout the site. Large detention pond/micro-pool for surface treatment designed to NHDES standards and obtaining permit from DES. All the drainage is contained on site and treated with those facilities. New septic with force main to pump effluent up into the beds; new drilled well to service entire facility. Above ground propane tanks; electric will be underground from utility pole. There's a large amount of landscaping proposed. Residential zone to left of the property and an evergreen buffer along the edge of the parking is proposed. Intent is to move entrances and trash area as far from that residential zone as possible.

Traffic concerns: Discuss the scope for Heather (*Monacup*) to study and then we can perform that and come back with that information at the next meeting. Heather Monacup with GPR will be the traffic engineer on the project.

Monacup said we reached out to the Town Planner after the Design Review in February for the scope of the study but were told it needed to be discussed in a public forum. We researched the NHDOT data for the intersection of Rte. 125 and South Road, the last 5 years available, 2012-2016. NHDOT records showed a total of 9 collisions reported there; 2 per year. We wouldn't consider that a safety concern. We'd need more data from the local police department for types of crashes. There was a rear end collision and someone hit a fixed object but 7 were unidentified. We can request 2017 and 2018 data from local police department and that would be part of the traffic scope. We also looked at collisions at the existing site driveway with the driveway opposite and during that time period, there was only one collision. I received Glenn's notes for a possible scope for a traffic study and we assume it would be the unsignalized section of South Road at Route 125 and the site driveway. Would Steve Pernaw be the Town's peer reviewer on the study?

Greenwood agreed. Steve Pernaw would do the peer review. Those items indicated in my notes are listed specifically in the site plan regulations.

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

Monacup overview: A normal traffic study will look at existing conditions at the study area and any areas requested. Opening year, which is 2020 and 10 years beyond that, that is what NHDOT requires. We look at approximately 11 years of collision data, speeds, site distances at the driveway, capacity and Q&A, run signal warrants at that intersection. People want a light at that intersection but we need more data to see if it meets warrants. On-site circulation, pedestrian access, bus drop-off; we'll look at these and other Town projects in the area approved before us that can be included in the traffic study and take those into account. We're following NHDOT guidelines and can work those out with Steve (Pernaw).

Greenwood clarified to Montero that a NHDOT driveway permit is not required. Monacup added we need to let Division 6 (NHDOT) look at this intersection. Greenwood commented our Town Engineer, Steve Cummings; issues driveway permits. Monacup spoke with Jim Hewitt at Division 6 who would like to look at it and if there are any improvements at this intersection, it would require a driveway permit from the Town because the Town of Brentwood has a driveway permit with the State for South Road. A driveway permit would be filed, the applicant would be the Town, but only if improvements are needed. Greenwood said the existing site only uses one driveway, so the second driveway closer to the residential zone doesn't exist and is related to this project. Greenwood offered to contact Steve Pernaw.

Montero said Heather will set up a scoping meeting with Steve (Pernaw) and Greenwood. Does he then give you a cost proposal to review and it's set up in escrow? Greenwood agreed.

Monacup replied we will work the details out with Steve but we count the cars, a.m. and p.m., extend that p.m. longer than normal for school pick-up and the retail component, we'd look at Saturday from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. A resident asked about data collection/times of day. School's out now, less traffic now so how is that accounted for? Monacup replied there are seasonal adjustment factors to take that into account.

Abutter Georgette Vitale asked about a driveway off of 125 or not and was concerned about the amount of traffic, accidents and wants a light there. Kennedy clarified the State of New Hampshire will not issue a driveway permit off of 125 if you have access by other means. Monacup agreed. Kennedy said it's up to the State of NH to decide if there will be a light there or not. Greenwood added there will be another meeting to discuss the traffic study results.

Vitale commented on the following: the culvert; small site for this development; water on the site; marshland. The dug well, it's contaminated. Too low of land in swampland; you'll get a lot of water but it won't be quality. Concerned with the amount of people using the facility, bathroom facilities, cafeteria at the school etc.; the water in the brook from her property and the culvert; concerns with the building foundation cracking/structure of the building.

Montero addressed Vitale's concerns: There is no cafeteria at the school. The leach field will be in the high land in the corner, which is why it has to be pumped up there. Where the building is proposed, it will be filled and raised about 3 feet. Anything coming from your land is running

## Brentwood Planning Board

### Minutes

June 20, 2019

into this wetland going into this pipe. Stevens clarified that only the building footprint is being raised 3 feet, not the entire site. Montero explained the building will be the high point on the site and the water all goes away from the building and is caught in catch basins in the parking lot. Structural engineers will design the foundation for the building, structural fill/culverts, and it's reviewed by the Town Building Inspector and SFC is the Town peer review for life and safety issues and they've reviewed the preliminary plan but after the site plan review process, the 2<sup>nd</sup> step is that the developer would have to file a building permit application with the code enforcement officer with more detailed building plans and all the questions would be addressed in those plans. Architect Feyl commented they will hire structural engineers and geotechs to recommend foundation system.

Hamilton asked where Seacoast Collaborative was now. (*Note: All responses from Harris or Chandler from SLC will be addressed as SLC as they did not identify themselves when speaking- names taken from the Design Review minutes*). SLC responded Gonic, NH. We were unexpectedly displaced 2 years ago from the Castles in Brentwood due to mold issues. We've been in Gonic for 2 years but it's not an ideal location. We're a Rockingham County based Collaborative.

Hamilton asked if the school was tax exempt. *Speaker didn't identify himself* – (Morse, Baroni or O'Brien?) said no because we own it. It's a full tax on this 48,000 sq. ft. regardless of who's in there. The developer owns the project and he would have a lease with the school, just like a lease with the retail component in front. Hamilton stated so regardless of what's in there, Brentwood taxes it at 48,000 sq. ft. (Morse, Baroni or O'Brien?) agreed.

Montero summarized what is needed:

- NHDES approval for a well. Kennedy asked if the well radius was 125' or 100' as it's a public water source? Montero replied it's based on anticipated flow of the well, which is based on the need. On this building, it's 125'.
- NHDES approval for septic
- NHDES AOT (alteration of terrain permit) due to 100,000+ sq. ft. of land.
- NHDES will review the drainage
- Driveway permit a local permit with NHDOT involvement

Hamilton asked if the Brentwood Police Chief could get records from the Town of Gonic regarding the school, opinion of the school. Stevens and Hamilton commented that this approval would be for the use of the building. Hamilton added that's really important, what is going inside this proposed building and how that use will affect the Town of Brentwood.

Montero had a question on the CUP process. Typically, it's a separate application/process. Greenwood confirmed its all incorporated within the process if it's part of the site plan or subdivision process. Montero agreed to address the CUP conditions in a letter. In terms of comments, we'll get to those. Tonight's meeting was to get the traffic study scope, allow us to talk to Steve Pernaw and get that going, re-introduce the project. We expect more abutter

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

input when we're back. The Police Chief will speak her mind, maybe we can meet with her outside of this meeting, separately and try to resolve her concerns.

Abutters Gary Lewis was concerned about a lot of commercial trucks, turning around in his driveway at Lewis Motors when they're not supposed to be on that road, affecting his customers. Vitale and other residents commented on the beeping of buses backing up and the carbon monoxide. Stevens asked if the 12 buses are stored there? SLC replied some, a lot are at the driver's homes.

Resident Kurt Culligan of South Road was concerned about the traffic backed up on South Road during commuting times and whether the State considers the drop off traffic in the morning and afternoon. It's not about the accidents, it's about the traffic backed up on South Road.

Abutter Lisa Lewis asked with the traffic study, do they consider all the traffic going into that building? Monacup replied yes, we do an existing condition and two future no build conditions, open year plus one without the project and then with the project; five analyses. It's a 10-year horizon. Residents were also concerned with dangerous "passing" zone on 125 past South Road; need a light. Stevens commented the Board can only have jurisdiction to do the study and rely on the engineer's results. Based on our past history of studies, a light probably won't be advocated for. Christiansen pointed out that it took eight years to get lights on North Road and Middle Road.

Resident Kelly Ramsdell commented on a previous traffic study on two developments down the road which implied no extra traffic. From living there, that's not the case. The studies aren't always accurate. Stevens replied it said no excessive queuing of traffic. Resident Brett Ramsdell said worst case scenario, after school, pick-ups, they'll be queuing up in the parking lot coming out onto South Road. Montero said this is different from a normal public school, we'll get into the operation details.

Developer/Builder Ken O'Brien commented about his 40 years of experience building projects such as Gillette stadium, Terminal A, Tuscan Village, this is not a significant construction project. We'll comply with all engineering studies and codes to do what is right here.

Board concerns: Stevens said the Board has concerns about safety and police activity there and the Board feels that the school be required to have two full time accredited police officers there on site.

Chief Arcieri said two (2) resource officers to handle the demographic of that school. SRO's (school resource officer's) receive some training, specifically trained to work with school age children; primarily middle and high school. I commend SLC for their work, they do an amazing job and there is a need, however, wherever you put that, you need to have a full time, and based on the demographic of the students at this school, I'm going to advocate for two (2) full time resource officers, which needs to be funded from the school. Even with full staff, we're

## Brentwood Planning Board

### Minutes

June 20, 2019

strapped. If we don't have an SRO at that school, 25% to 50% of our time will be spent over there. Juvenile matters are very involved to do it right. Chief Arcieri's stats; 580 calls for service since they've been in Brentwood. Assaults, 192 juvenile offenses, 110 motor vehicle stops, runaways...these are labor intensive investigations; you need someone doing it full time. Brentwood can provide the training but they're assigned to the school. They are there for safety, to do investigations. SRO's are sworn police officer (by State of NH). Kennedy confirmed so they would be police officers, employees of the Town of Brentwood, funded by the school. They would be reimbursed? Contract? Chief Arcieri and Christiansen said the details would have to be worked out. Chief Arcieri reiterated that the funds be provided by the school. Otherwise, it comes from the taxpayers. Hypothetically, you have runaway, that's a priority level and you have a motor vehicle accident, where are we going to go? Kennedy agreed but I wanted to clarify who is paying for this, who is employing these people; can they be a private security force? Chief Arcieri said if you have a crime occurring in Brentwood, that's the jurisdiction of the Town of Brentwood so they should be employed by the Town of Brentwood.

Cost of SRO's: Stevens commented we want to make it clear to the members of the Seacoast Learning Collaborative that no one in Brentwood is against the school but we do realize this is a requirement to running a successful, safe, school program. It's no different than a janitor, a teacher, a teacher's aide, these are all components of what makes a school program work. It's a cost; like hiring a teacher or special ed or a counselor of some kind. It's a cost that this town is not going to bear any part of. That (*cost*) needs to be borne by the school itself, if it's going to come to this Town, period. The remedy would be to go to Superior Court but you won't get an approval here from this Board in this Town until that requirement is satisfied.

SLC commented it's important to note that those 580 calls were over 17 years, we were in Brentwood for 17 year so that's an average of about 34 calls a year. Chief Arcieri replied we looked at 2001-2007.

Chief Arcieri said I welcome a meeting with Montero but I want it on record that I am adamantly opposed to the school coming in unless we have assurance that we will have funding for two (2) SRO's. Yes, we get the funding, then the funding dries up, then what do we do? Stevens said it would be a condition of this approval. If they don't have the funding, we could revoke their site plan approval, go to court and shut the school down. Steven's reiterated that an SRO is another component of any other staff member (teacher, cook, maintenance).

SLC stressed it's important when you say it's a part of the component of the school, which it has not been a component of the school for over 25 years that we've been in existence, that need hasn't necessarily been there so it's a topic of further discussion and to have a better understanding of what we do, how we do it and who are the kids that we service. Kennedy asked if they saw a need for one. SLC asked one (1) full time officer? No. We're owned by Board members of Superintendents for the area and none of our Board members, Portsmouth, Hampton, Exeter have the requirement for the amount of time that is being proposed. Kennedy said so you feel that the taxpayers of Brentwood should bear the burden of all those calls to

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

your facility. SLC replied we need to have a conversation with the Chief because we need to look at what those numbers really look like and what's required as a result of those numbers. We're saying that something may be needed but we need to talk about what's really needed. Stevens reiterated that we want to be very clear up front from the start about what the requirements will be.

Greenwood replied to the SLC representatives; I have now seen SLC being in both Brentwood and Kingston, where I'm also a circuit rider, it's disingenuous to hear you say that the Superintendents of Hampton and Exeter don't think that there is that need when it's their students they're sending to you and then those services, that are being provided to those students from other school districts, are getting paid for by the Towns of either Brentwood or Kingston or Gonic. That's just wrong. Hamilton asked why aren't they in a regular high school? If there wasn't a need for these officers, they would be in a regular high school. Greenwood added my concerns with the comments that were made is that the superintendent of Portsmouth, Hampton or Exeter are going to say they don't want to pony up any money. SLC corrected, that's not true. Looking at their enrollment and their census of thousands of kids, what their SRO requirements are, we're being asked for something more for a fraction of the maximum capacity of students. Portsmouth has an alternative school. Greenwood said aren't your clients those students that have needs greater than what that school can deal with, so they come to you? SLC replied some have educational needs. Greenwood continued so when you say Exeter High School has a resource officer, that resource officer can do their job because the most difficult students are taken out of that environment and sent to your school. SLC responded not all of them. Greenwood said that is part of your program. SLC said some are with youth centers or a continuum. We are the least restrictive on the scale. Greenwood said perhaps it's time that those other school districts understand that other towns have been footing the bill for their students. SLC reiterated we have our Board of Superintendents and we sit with them, we haven't said no to an SRO, it's the amount being requested that is excessive for what the need is. Hamilton asked so two (2) SRO's is excessive? SLC replied absolutely.

Chief Arcieri reviewed stats: With 11 assaults = interviews with all parties involved, witnesses, juveniles involved so you have to have the parents involved. You have juvenile petitions and you do the report; 2, 3 ,4 - four hours or more on one assault. Every situation is fluid and involving. To do it right, be thorough and provide the services you deserve, it would be me. I'm trying to do Chief duties and I have to go to the school to investigate a juvenile offense that will take me out of circulation for a day or two, as it stands right now. I'm asking that if this school comes, we have an assurance that it's going to be staffed with the appropriate amount of school resource officers to handle, with the stats that I have in front of me, adequately.

Christiansen spoke from the perspective of the Board of Selectmen; we would wait for your total input and doing the budget and doing the funding would create a problem for the school if we don't get sufficient funds. I could not approve something where he had to pay or I had to pay additional taxes for somebody who doesn't reside in our community.

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

Stevens reiterated if the school's going to be here, there will be two (2) SRO's, paid for by the school. All your contributing communities can pay for it. If you want to come to Brentwood, that's a requirement, right up front. If you don't wish to participate then I'd advise you to seek another town perhaps to place your school in, period.

A resident asked what town's do these kids come from? SLC replied Southern NH, all along the seacoast and up through Lakes Region. All bussed in.

Chief Arcieri in response to West's question about SRO's being pulled off the school for a car accident for example commented they would be members of the Brentwood Police force, officers assigned as SRO's in the school season to service the school. Whatever funding would be during the time that they are at the school and that can be worked out. Kennedy said they would be employees of the Town of Brentwood. Chief Arcieri said Exeter, Stratham, they have an SRO during school season and in the summer, they're back on the Police Department because they're full time employees. Regarding West's questions about emergencies; the Chief could not guarantee that they would not be pulled from the school in the case of an emergency. Stevens said their purpose of their being hired is for the school.

A resident asked about school time, SRO's paid for by the school but when school's not in session, it would be taxpayers paying their payroll. Chief Arcieri said we'd have to see how Exeter and Stratham do it and be equitable and fair. The school has to provide some funding for those positions. I'm asking for additional full-time officers. I don't have the staffing to even put an SRO over there, even part-time. Some agencies work something out with an additional officer where the Town comes up with some money and the school pays the rest.

Montero suggested treat it like an impact fee. Stevens said no, we are very clear. This has nothing to do with impact fees. Montero said so you hire two full-time employees their going to work for the town doing other shifts? Stevens replied we haven't decided that yet. That's a discussion that you will have with the Chief and bring the information back to the Board. We are 100% behind the Chief and her recommendations, we want two (2) SRO's when that school is operating, if it's operated in Brentwood. The details of that can be worked out with the Chief. This is going to be done professionally and the Board relies on professional engineers and the professionalism of the police department.

Hamilton asked for the Gonic stats again from Chief Arcieri.

Residents asked how many runaways; ages of the kids and any concerns with being on 125 with the traffic? Chief Arcieri replied 12 reported runaways and school ages are 6 – 21 years old. SLC commented that they've been on 125 before in Kingston. The runaways typically were in the woods at the Castles or down on 27. We had a memorandum of understanding which Chief Robinson had developed when we first moved in and part of the agreement was that we notify the police. Stevens replied that memorandum is no longer in effect. We also have the Kingston select board's minutes here and they expressed some big concerns and Kingston hasn't opened

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

their arms to the school coming to Kingston. You can read the minutes. Those are our requirements. If you want to proceed, please do and we'll take the next step.

Montero confirmed they would be at the next meeting (*July 18<sup>th</sup>*) and talk about traffic etc.

Motion made by Christensen, 2<sup>nd</sup> by West, to continue the meeting to July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at 7 p.m. All were in favor. Motion carried.

**7:00 p.m. – Continued Hearing:** Amendment to a previously approved site plan: Bob Bent (ECS) tax map 209.011. Extensions requested 2-21-19; 3-7-19; 4-4-19; 5-2-19; 5-16-19; 6-20-19. *This proposal is to add a steel building 100'x 50' to the existing site at 326 Route 125.*

Present: Owner, Bob Bent of ECS, 326 Route 125; Rick Lundborn Civil Engineer from Fuss & O'Neill; Abutter, Tucker Jacobson of Fremont.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by West, to invoke jurisdiction and accept the application. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Rick Lundborn summarized: There was a site walk that took place (*January 2019*). The house on Route 125 is currently used as an office. There's an existing metal frame building where materials are stored; a paved driveway coming in off 125. The gravel area has been there, when the trucking operation was in business. Another driveway out into the back that ECS has been clearing and expanding and that's one of the items on the site walk. The culvert under the driveway was there before ECS bought the property and we're in the process of getting that permitted by NHDES. There's a wetland area so we're also getting an AOT permit for this gravel area back here with a change in coverage = a change in runoff. We were initially retained to do the site permitting for the building and address the septic but the Board had requested after the site walk that the topographic survey be updated. Jones and Beach, the original surveyors on record, went out and did that. To one of Glenn's comments about the plans to be recorded; the registry here only allows surveyors to stamp and record so we'll work with Jones and Beach to get the site plans recorded. Jones and Beach will have to put a stamp and signature block on the plan saying it's not a subdivision, it's just for purposes of recording. We'll see how the registry treats it.

Grading and erosion control plan: The existing building and paved area is here and we'll pave a little extra once the new metal building goes in. One of the concerns was that runoff from the existing gravel area and the paved driveway, it was a gravel driveway until 2012, isn't being collected and treated. We're putting in a diversionary berm, a detention basin/infiltration basin on the back edge to slow that water and that should handle that stormwater coming off that section of the lot. In the rear, we have proposed a shallow swale and a basin preceded by a sediment forebay and spillway. This will operate as a detention basin. There's a stone wall near stump and loam piles and the water comes to a low spot. We'll berm that off and re-direct so it will infiltrate into the ground and in higher flow conditions, will flow over a stone spillway. The

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

stormwater issues that were perceived with the clearing of this area have been addressed by adding the two (2) detention basins and the infiltration basin.

The survey shows the tree line hasn't really gone over the town line, so Bob's agreed to let that revert and that will fill in. There's no development in the Fremont section in this proposal. We're addressing the original proposal of adding the building and updating the septic system and addressing the concerns of the gravel area out back and the drainage.

Greenwood commented the setback is from the property line. Bent said the land in Fremont is zoned residential/agricultural.

West asked about the site: Bent said there's vehicles, trailers, construction equipment, pipe, leftover items and stuff going to projects. Abutter Jacobson asked about a large generator noise. Bent replied we bought a Brock and did some training. It's a piece of demo equipment.

Lundborn said the setbacks from the abutter's, town line, is about 150'. Stevens said abutters were concerned with the amount of demo debris, stuff, broken concrete etc. The whole site won't be littered with that? Bent replied no. There's not a lot presently there. We'll clean that up and there won't be anything there. We'll use it for storage for our equipment; for materials in and out.

Hamilton asked Bob what ECS does. Bent replied we're an industrial construction company; Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Schiller, etc. We built the biomass facility in Town for the county and for the State of NH in Concord. Industrial and heavy manufacturing; Foss, Anheuser-Busch, Gypsum plants over on the river.

Abutter Tucker Jacobson asked are these fixes to the area done with how it is now or how it would have been suggested in its pre-existing condition? Lundborn replied it's done to what is there now being treated as if it wasn't. We designed the improvements to the site with 2012 as the baseline. In 2012, the gravel area was this little thing. We treated this as the existing and then we designed the treatment and infiltration stormwater controls to make it fit.

Lundborn reiterated what is needed:

1. AOT permit
2. Amendment of the driveway permit and DOT needs to know what's going on. No physical change to the driveway.
3. The after the fact permit for the culvert.

Lundborn continued with all the work they do, it's intricate pipe-work so to do some of this pipe-fitting work and not freeze, they need the additional building to do assembly. Bent said the goal is to build a better office and have the back portion be the shop. We use the current building as the shop that's down back but really the operation stays the same. We'll take the existing building that we have and have that be cold storage. All the parking would be out

## Brentwood Planning Board

### Minutes

June 20, 2019

front. We do from time to time, send the guys out so their vehicles may be out back for a week or so while they're traveling.

Bond: Stevens asked Lundborn to submit an estimate for a bond for what those improvements will cost to Steve Cummings, Town Engineer, to review.

Keep site clean: Stevens reiterated that Bent keep the site as neat as possible for the sake of the abutters; be a good neighbor. Bent reiterated that's my intent. I told you I'd clean up and not make another mess. Stevens said we'll take you for your word.

Hours of Operation: Lundborn said I can have my hours of operation match Jones & Beach's hours of operation from the industrial approval on their plan. Hours are 6 a.m. to 8 p.m., 7-days. Abutter Tucker Jacobson asked that hours of operation on Sunday be changed to 9 a.m. Bent said we don't work on Sundays and there was confusion at the last meeting with the landscaping business next door. Stevens said this approval runs with the property, someone else doing similar work can go in so to safeguard against early Sunday morning activity on the site can you agree to 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Sunday. Bent said I already agreed to a 9 a.m. start on Sunday. Stevens said please include that on the notes; 90-days to accomplish this? This extension to run through our second October meeting, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

#### Conditions of approval:

1. Applicant will also cover and address any and all remaining concerns of the Town Planner and the Town Engineer.
2. NHDES AOT permit
3. NHDOT driveway permit
4. NHDOT culvert
5. Submit a Bond
6. Add note to the plan to change hours to 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Sunday.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Johnston, to grant ECS/Bob Bent a 90-day conditional approval of the project noting the conditions above and satisfying any and all remaining concerns of the Town Planner and the Town Engineer. All were in favor. Motion carried. (*CA expires 10-17-19*).

**Zoning Proposals** – Board decided to table this discussion and have this work session at the next meeting on July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

#### **Board Business**

##### Signed Manifest

- Farmer's market (once a week) proposed at former Everyday's a Sundae location; 178 Rte. 125. Paul and Sandra Kutty owners/QTbusiness LLC have approved. See attached letter from Debi Lyons. (*This was on the original site plan, farmer's market, crafts*

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**June 20, 2019**

*allowed*). Stevens said they are advising us that they are going to make use of this. Letter on file.

**Approval of Minutes:**

- May 16th, 2019 minutes (No June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting)

Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by West, to approve the minutes of May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2019 as presented. All were in favor with Johnston abstaining as he was not present. Motion carried.

There is no meeting on July 4<sup>th</sup>. The next scheduled PB meeting is July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Johnston, to adjourn at approximately 8:45. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Bickum  
Administrative Assistant,  
Brentwood Planning Board