

PLANNING BOARD

Monday, July 24, 2006
Belmont Corner Meeting House
Belmont, New Hampshire

Members Present: Chairman P. Harris; J. Pike, G. Flack, W. Peterson, C. Patten, J. Marden and R. Caldwell.
Alternates Absent: C. Shibles.
Staff: C. Daigle and R. Ball.

The chairman opened the meeting at 7p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

PUBLIC HEARING - Sunset Rock LLC: Request for Site Plan approval to install bituminous asphalt plant. Property is located at 396 Depot Street, Tax Lots 235-038 & 235-039 in the "I" Zone. PB #2905.

Mr. Hall and Mr. Stephenson of Brox Industries and Mr. Wright of Continental Placer were present for this application. They were here about a year ago for application acceptance. At that time the Board requested a consultant's review of the aquifer issues. Since that time the applicant has been working with the consultant, Mr. Tarr and with staff. Some revisions were made to the proposal in response to those comments. The revisions were not major in relation to the looks of the site plan and related primarily to the stormwater management plan. Mr. Hall reviewed the plan for those present. He noted Brox previously had an asphalt plant on the site for a relatively short period of time in the 1980s. Since that time the site has been used as a contractor's yard by Virgin Construction. Since Mr. Virgin's purchase and development of the adjacent property his use of this site has been limited. He does use the garage on site for vehicle repairs and storage.

Mr. Hall indicated the location of the proposed asphalt plant and fuel tanks containing liquid asphalt which is a solid at ambient temperature. Any leak in those tanks essentially plugs itself. There is also a 20,000 gal fuel tank to fuel the asphalt plant. Separate aggregate storage bins segregate the different sized materials. Materials are loaded into bins which feed directly into the batch plant. The driveway will be narrowed significantly to no more than 50' at the ROW line and has been moved away from the driveway to Mr. Virgin's abutting lot. This creates a separation between the two access points and eliminates the need for cross easements with Mr. Virgin. The entrance will also be regraded to make sure that all runoff goes into the new retention basin being constructed as part of this proposal. The use of the existing garage which was installed as part of the original asphalt plant will be for storage and maintenance of different plant components including the service/welding truck. Any major equipment repairs will be done offsite. This will not be a repair garage or place to service equipment from off site. He asked if members had any questions.

J. Marden asked about the monitoring wells. Mr. Hall pointed out the location of the four they are proposing. He said his consultant was in disagreement with Mr. Tarr's opinion as to how many wells should be installed initially and the sampling schedule. They would like to put in four wells to start. One of the main items of interest is which way does the water flow? That's an important point of information. It could be flowing towards the brook on the

other side of the industrial park. A small spill could also still flow between their proposed four or Mr. Tarr's proposed eight wells. They do use a lot of Best Management Practices (BMPs). With the designed containment areas and double walled pipes they're banking on not having a spill to begin with. But it would be better to find out in what direction the water is flowing and at that time they can submit a report and propose to put in more wells if necessary. If it's already flowing directly at one of their wells maybe they won't need to.

J. Marden also asked about the tanks. Mr. Hall noted there are two asphalt tanks for the two different types of liquid asphalt required by the State and one fuel tank. As required by the State, the concrete containment tank will contain 110% of the largest tank, not the total of both tanks. J. Marden asked about sensors on the double walled pipes. Mr. Stephenson noted that there are sensors and explained the design of a similar plant just permitted in Rochester.

J. Pike asked about the soap rack. Mr. Hall noted the industry used to apply diesel fuel to truck beds prior to loading with asphalt to eliminate sticking. Because of contamination concerns that practice has been stopped. Brox does not use it and will not allow it to be used on their site by other contractors. In place of the banned practice they provide a soap rack where biodegradable soap, similar to dish soap but in a much diluted concentration, is lightly applied to truck beds to avoid asphalt sticking to the truck bed. Because the soap is applied in a very light spray very little, if any, goes anywhere but on the truck. If any does runoff the site grading directs it into the on-site retention area. P. Harris noted that there will be periodic inspections of the site to assure compliance with all necessary safety measures. He also noted that the owners have to be aware of what the environmental penalties are for noncompliance. R. Ball noted that given the information provided, staff did not have a concern on the soap application. Mr. Hall noted there will be two employees on site. The garage will be used for repairing plant components and for parking the repair vehicle. The garage previously had floor drains but they were closed some time ago and the required report submitted to NH DES.

The chairman asked Jim Tarr of CEA, the Town's consultant to speak on the proposal. Mr. Tarr noted the location of the property by using a USGS map. He showed the Gardners Grove aquifer which also supplies water to neighboring towns. There are three public water supply wells which fall within close proximity of the proposed plant. The wells have protection zones around them, well-head protection zones. All three zones overlap this particular property. The darker shades on the aquifer map relate to higher transmissivity of the aquifer. The saturated thickness of the aquifer in this location is in excess of 100'.

Mr. Tarr explained that the Town asked him to analyze the science of what has been proposed. Mr. Tarr referred to the June 16th letter from CPI showing the proposed well locations. He noted the well locations are also located quite far away from the possible contaminant locations including salt storage, the lab and fueling sites. He agreed that the Town needs to know in what direction the water flows and how quickly contaminants will travel. He also felt that once a year sampling was not sufficient. It boils down to risk management. You want to know as soon as possible and he recommends sampling be done three times a year, similar to what the State does on several of their sites. It's early warning in the unlikely event of a release.

Mr. Tarr explained that there are different types of releases. A release can be all at once or be an accumulation of small drips over time. Brox does use BMPs and that's a good thing. But he feels they need additional wells and more frequent testing. It should give the Town and the applicant a higher comfort level. Mr. Tarr went over the list of items that will be on site that can be potential contaminants. It's not the aggregates or the coated aggregates that are of concern, it's the sources listed in his document dated 7/20/06.

It's also extremely important for the applicant to perform hydro geological testing on the aquifer to create critical base line data. He outlined the specific chemical analysis that should be done at the time of testing. The monitoring should be effective. J. Marden asked about the four extra wells. Mr. Tarr pointed out the location of his

recommended additional four wells.

Mr. Tarr asked Mr. Hall to provide additional information on the soaping as he felt the members might not have understood that part of the presentation. Mr. Hall pointed out it is not a degreaser, it just reduces sticking.

P. Harris asked if there were any tests done on the site to identify any contamination from the previous uses. Mr. Hall stated not yet, but they would run one round of tests before the proposed plant went into operation. P. Harris also pointed out contamination could come from the adjacent state highway – salt, oil and other contaminants. When asked, Mr. Tarr explained that the monitoring wells would be 15' to 20' in depth and would be drilled wells. W. Peterson asked about the Pike plant and if there are monitoring wells. J. Tarr said there are several wells, but he does not know if they are still being monitored. If they were placed in response to high levels of contaminants, the State may have allowed them to stop monitoring once the levels fell. In this situation the wells are being used for risk management, an early warning tool, not to monitor existing contamination.

The members wondered why Tilton had not required monitoring at the Pike site. Mr. Tarr noted this is a sensitive environmental area, but the Towns' understanding of the issue has evolved over the last few years and maybe the dynamics today are significantly different now than only 5 years ago. R. Caldwell noted that the Northfield well was put in with no notice to Belmont that it could affect the development of sites in Belmont's Industrial Zone. G. Flack asked about the State's requirements for monitoring. Mr. Tarr noted he believes the applicant has met with State's requirements because, again, the State would monitor once contamination is found. The monitoring he is recommending for Brox is within the Town's own regulations and in response to the specific aquifer concerns and will allow the Town to monitor the use at an early stage. Mr. Tarr estimated that it would \$5,000-\$6,000 total to install the 8 wells and \$6,000 to \$8,000 per year to sample. He stated it did not seem to be an unreasonable request on the Town's part to protect the Town's water.

Mr. Hall noted they feel the cost will be \$500 per round of samples per well or \$1,500 per year per well for sampling. He felt that the sampling should be specific to the well. If a well is found to be upgradient then once they've done an initial sampling and determined the flow direction he feels sampling of that well could be limited. He suggested the decision on sampling should come after the initial round of sampling.

Mr. Wright of CPI noted he was in agreement with Mr. Tarr about the aquifer. Looking at the Town's regulations they need to qualify what they're sitting on. They recommended three or four wells because they feel it will give them the base information they need. Without contamination Mr. Tarr's recommendation is too many wells and too much testing. That level is only required by the State once there is contamination. The wells aren't going to stop a spill. That's going to be done by using BMPs. He noted that the USGS log shows a clay layer which will hold the contamination high in the aquifer. He feels one sample at the beginning, another after startup and then if there's a spill they go to DES and put in more wells.

P. Harris asked about the protocol if a spill occurs. Mr. Hall explained that there is a Best Management plan. If there is a spill in the containment tank it's pumped right out. If it occurs in another location it's reported to Brox and remediated. It would be immediately treated and then reported to the state and the fire department and the town. None of the plant is below ground. The plant, tanks and piping are all above ground, easily monitored. They have a SPCC plan. Each person on site is trained on how to maintain the site and recognize and respond to spills. Each day the facility manager keeps a log of activity, maintenance and on-site materials.

Mr. Tarr noted that there is no clay layer showing in the USGS log. The reason the Town is proposing to require sampling is due to the aquifer and water supply wells. The level of effort is in response to the location. Monitoring it is the best viable way to protect the Town. P. Harris asked Mr. Tarr if there were examples of where sampling has

been done and how many wells are used. Mr. Tarr said filling stations on very small lots in Laconia have four plus wells. This is a nine acre site. The proposal for eight wells is not excessive. After the initial baseline, he agrees some of the upgradient wells can be put on a reduced sampling schedule.

J. Pike asked whether there were any wells on site or if any testing had already occurred. Mr. Hall noted there is a drinking water well but it hasn't been tested. J. Pike suggested it would have been prudent to test before they decided to move forward with this proposal, to see whether there was an existing problem. J. Pike noted he felt there should be eight wells, but agreed maybe all won't have to be tested each time. But there should be an initial base line test first. He also agrees the road salt is used very heavily along Rte 140 in that location. There's also a State salt shed basically across the road.

P. Harris noted that the site will be tested once they get their approval. If contamination is found the State will determine what needs to be done. R. Caldwell noted that if they don't go ahead and then do the testing, the Town won't know if there is existing contamination. Mr. Hall noted that if they put in the wells before they do the main site grading the wells will be disturbed and have to be replaced. So it made sense to do the grading and then put in the wells. He agreed the wells would go in and be tested before any activity of the plant occurred.

J. Marden asked about determining the flow through the use of wells. Mr. Stephenson explained that the elevations from several wells allow them to triangulate and they also do some pumping and transmissivity testing.

Mr. Elson Moody asked about the testing. Mr. Wright gave the list of items they will be testing for. R. Caldwell asked about eight versus four wells. Mr. Hall wants to do four and then talk about one or two more wells if necessary, based on the test results. He does not want to end up putting a lot of wells upgradient. He agreed to secure the cost of additional wells as a condition of approval. He suggested allowing staff to direct the consultants based on test results. But he wanted to proceed in a way that makes sense. J. Marden clarified that Brox does want to finish grade before the wells are installed. Mr. Hall said yes, they understand that it would be done at their own risk. He explained that experience has found that the main contaminant found at sites used for years is diesel. Also years ago a pretty nasty substance was used to complete extraction tests. Extraction tests are required by the State to measure the amount of asphalt in a batch. A weighed sample of the asphalt is mixed with a chemical which separates the asphalt from the aggregate. The aggregate is then weighed separately determining the amount of asphalt in the mix. Years ago the waste chemical was dumped on the ground. But that chemical, and that practice was stopped 30 or 40 years ago. Long before the previous plant was located on this site. Now extraction testing is done with a citrus extract that does the same thing. This chemical is much more benign, but it is flammable, so all extraction sampling is done in the lab and the material is then disposed of in a sealed containment fixture. A total of 30 or 40 gallons is used per year and the sealed container is disposed of in an appropriate manner. Mr. Hall repeated that they will install wells and undertake testing. They just want to grade first so wells aren't disturbed and then do the initial round of testing prior to staff making a final determination of the total number of wells and sampling schedule based on the initial results. The plant will not be operated prior to the initial round of tests and the determination on additional well locations and sampling schedule.

P. Harris wanted to know if there was a way to prioritize the eight wells recommended by Mr. Tarr. Mr. Tarr stated he can live with some array between four and eight and agreed it doesn't make sense to put in the wells prior to grading as long as the approval requires them to put in four wells properly positioned along with a couple more in areas where he feels wells should be included. He's flexible about the number of wells and amount of testing. It's a matter of the comfort level the Town wants to achieve.

The chairman asked for public comment. Mr. Douglas Stone represented BPS Realty who owns the building where FedEx is located and that abuts this property, stated he would never have expected an asphalt plant to be proposed in

the industrial zone on the abutting lot. He stated he feels that an asphalt plant as an abutter will downgrade the value of his property. There are other vacant lots in the industrial park and he feels that other people won't want to move in either. Asphalt plants give off an odor. The Pike plant further down the road in Tilton does. FedEx has 25 or 30 people that come and go on their site. He thinks they're down wind of the proposed plant. He feels it will devalue their property. He feels there should only be clean industry in an industrial park. Fresh asphalt can be potent for a while. P. Harris asked if he also had an issue with the tree buffer. Mr. Stone said he was all set on that. P. Harris noted that the use is an allowed use in the zone. Mr. Stone asked about the silos and stack height. Mr. Hall noted the silos may be 80' high. The stack height will be determined by DES. Mr. Hall noted that it's generally steam coming out of the stack. Mr. Hall noted that he thinks Yellow Fright operated on the BPS lot for several years prior to FedEx and may have been there while the Brox plant was active. He doesn't think there were any complaints. Mr. Stone noted they built the original building FedEx is in and he doesn't think the plant was active at that time. Mr. Moody noted the Town's water supply comes from Pout Pond and he wanted the Board to have another meeting without all the projects. Mr. Moody commented on the taxes. P. Harris noted that an industrial use has less impact on the tax rate than residential development.

Mr. Hall will provide full cutoff light fixtures. J. Marden asked about bathroom facilities. There will be toilets in the control building, office building and lab building. They are not proposing any sewer connection or water to the garage. P. Harris asked about increasing the containment height. R. Ball noted Brox is doing what the State requires and with the viscosity of the asphalt mixture additional containment should not be necessary. W. Peterson asked how close together the monitoring wells had to be to determine water flow. Mr. Tarr noted a minimum of 3 points allows an accurate direction of flow. Our best guess now, based on the USGS regional flow is that it goes across the site towards 140 but there can be actual flow differences on the site and there can also be seasonal flow changes especially given the adjacent extensive wetlands.

P. Harris noted that the combination of the previous and proposed uses requires a unique situation for monitoring. Mr. Hall noted it will be the water that will tell you, not necessarily the disturbed ground. They'll agree to put in four wells with Mr. Tarr's opinion of location and then they'll put in one or two more as needed. J. Pike stated up to eight may be necessary as determined by staff based on the testing and other reports.

Mr. Hall asked about not providing building plans until the building permits are requested and about the proposed closure security. Staff agreed that building plans could be part of the building permit process and that closure security would be used to stabilize the site if abandoned.

There being no further comment or question the chairman closed the public hearing.

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

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

1. Submission of final plans (6 paper copies) including:
 - a. All pins to be set and so certified on final plan.
 - b. Note on plan to merge 2 lots into 1 using tax lot #39.
 - c. Full cut off lights.
2. The total number of monitoring wells to be installed (up to eight) and the type and frequency of

sampling shall be determined by staff who will consider information and recommendations from the first round of sampling and the applicant's and the Town's consultants. The site shall be graded, then the wells installed (a minimum of four – location to be approved by staff), and the first round of sampling shall occur with the results submitted to the Town prior to the installation of the plant. Any additional wells determined necessary by staff shall be installed as part of the final construction of the site and an initial sampling schedule shall be determined by staff. Adjustments to the sampling schedule may occur based on subsequent sampling results.

3. Other permits – Town Sewer (proposed & existing buildings), Town Building, NHDES Air Permit.
4. Submission of building plans, approved by Building Inspector & Fire Department shall occur prior to the issuance of building permits. Shall comply with all applicable building, fire, health, and life safety codes.
5. Payment of decision recording fee.
6. Establish escrow account for closure in case of abandonment, inspections/review if necessary.
7. Applicant shall sign and follow Inspection Schedule prepared by Planning staff.
8. Compliance hearing shall be held by Board as necessary.

Construction conditions to be complied with once plan has been signed and decision recorded:

9. Register ASTs, EPA Gen Permit.
10. Existing building requires Certificate of Use from Building Official.
11. Construction shall be monitored and certified by a consultant appointed by the Board at the applicant's expense if any.
12. Property owner shall install all required traffic control and fire and life safety facilities and systems required by the Board and/or by other applicable Codes and Regulations.
13. As-built plans required prior to occupancy/use.

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

14. Landscaping shall be maintained, shall be kept in a sightly manner and not allowed to deteriorate.
15. All exterior lighting shall be shielded from abutters and traffic.
16. Permits must be obtained for all signage, and signs for inactive, closed or abandoned uses shall be removed within 30 days.
17. No changes shall be made to the approved plans unless application is made in writing to the Town.
18. The Planning Board shall have the power to modify or amend its approval upon its own motion to do so.
19. Approval is subject to expiration, revocation and changes in the Ordinances.

The motion was seconded by C. Patten and carried unanimously. (7-0)

PUBLIC HEARING – Johngis Realty LLC: Request for Subdivision approval to create a 43-lot open space subdivision. Property is located on Middle Route & Province Road, Tax Lot 215-007 in the “R” Zone. PB #3605.

J. Pike stepped down as an abutter. Mr. David Johnston, owner, and Mr. Danny Gendrick and Mr. Jason Hale of Bedford Design were present for this application. Mr. Gendrick went over the general site information. This is a 43 lot cluster subdivision. Using the Town's density calculation they could have up to 46 lots. The road network has a separated entrance/outlet. They would all be single family residences with their own on site septic/well. A lot of the staff comments will be resolved by offering the open space to the Conservation Commission whose major concern when the applicant met with them was maintaining the quality of the river corridor. The Association will not

maintain any control over or say in what happens on the open space. The fire cistern was approved by the Fire Department. It will be similar to the Leavitt Road installation, but will be 50,000 gallons instead of 30,000. Street lighting is not proposed, but they will have a residential post lamp at the end of every driveway entrance to provide more subdued lighting for the site and the adjacent sidewalk. The post office has not determined whether delivery will be to each house or to a central location. The calculations have been updated in response to staff comments. The draft response comments provided tonight will be completed over the next few days.

J. Marden asked about providing open space passive recreation. There will be a lot of houses and a lot of kids. He suggested a spot for organized sports (level open area, etc.). Mr. Gendrick noted that there are areas that could be used, but that would be up to the Conservation Commission whose major concern was to preserve the open space. W. Peterson agreed there should be a recreation area. P. Harris also suggested more lighting. Mr. Gendrick noted that there will be post lights. W. Peterson noted the same type of lighting was required of a previous application (BBE) along with a widened-pavement sidewalk.

The chairman asked for public comment.

In response to questions from Mr. Richard Houle, an abutter, Mr. Gendrick noted the only access will be from Rte 107, there will be 43 houses total and NH DOT is ok with the access location, but wants some minor brush clearing for line of sight. Mr. Houle also stated that he has had a large increase in water running onto his property from this lot since it was clear cut. How will this development affect that? Mr. Gendrick noted that all the water is detained on site and then released and then goes back to cross at the original culvert location. It's all treated and detained on site. That will significantly reduce the amount of water that's running onto Mr. Houle's property today and actually be a decrease in what ran onto his property prior to the clear cut. Probably right not it's just sheet draining across the cut property and onto Mr. Houle's property. The on-site drainage will be a closed system. It is intended to break the natural flow of water.

Jason Hale of Bedford Design explained that they did a full stormwater management design which has already been reviewed and approved by the Town's consultant, Gerry Lang and NH DES. There are three detention ponds on the site which he located on the plan. They collect the drainage from the site. They are decreasing the flow across Rte 107 because they are detaining it on site. They have designed the detention for the 2, 10 and 25 year storms with spot checks beyond that to make sure no failure would occur. Mr. Hale explained the method of designing an effective stormwater design.

Mr. Gendrick stated that NH DOT has said they'll have the permit in hand by next week. For stormwater they do a full scale drainage model. They also take into consideration anything that's coming onto the site from offsite. Because the vegetation was cleared the water is just sheeting off the site now. What they propose after the development will be less than prior to the cut. J. Marden noted that the open space on Rte 107 side is smaller than the original plan. Mr. Gendrick stated that's because they added the cul-de-sac.

Mr. John Grant on Hoadley Road asked where the Hoadley Road frontage is. R. Caldwell noted its location for Mr. Grant. Mr. Pike noted the site was basically clearcut. His pond has stayed full from the water running off the site. He questioned their stormwater design and feels the road access sight distance is questionable. He suggested a light at the bus stop and feels the entrance is close to his property line. He is concerned that the kids, if not given an alternative will use his field for activities. He is also concerned that kids trespassing on his property will end up in the 18' deep fire pond. He feels the site has been clearcut, leaving no vegetative buffer and that the owner is depending on the abutters to maintain their vegetation giving the new lots a "rural" atmosphere. He recommends an on-site recreation area be provided. He agrees that the groundwater situation has changed significantly for abutters since the lot was clearcut.

Jim Coviello, abutter, is concerned that providing a playground area will result in creating an attractive nuisance unless the Town has control and policing of it. His experience was that the kids turn into a junk hole. Any area like that should be owned and controlled by the Town. Park areas have to be controlled. He asked if there will be an Association. Mr. Gendrick stated there will be covenants and an Association, but their concerns would be those within the development like the cistern, the bus stop, the rec area if any. John Rich, an abutter, questioned how much of the open area is wetland. C. Daigle noted that at least 50% of the open area has to be buildable. Mr. Rich asked if lot 24 was too small. R. Ball confirmed that it was. All have to meet the minimum lot size.

Mr. Rich recommended the residents should have some area to play. He asked if the applicant would be willing to contribute something to the ConCom to build and maintain the facility. Mr. Gendrick stated they'd have to talk to the ConCom to see what they'd like to see and whether they'd be interested. W. Peterson suggested that determining if there will be a rec area and the specifics of same are issues between the Board and the applicant, not the ConCom. The open space would be the jurisdiction of the ConCom. J. Marden asked about putting one of the lots to a rec use. Mr. Johnston said he is more than willing to provide a rec area, but needs more guidance from the Board. He agreed it would probably have to be owned, controlled and maintained by the Association. J. Marden suggested an open activity area, maybe horse shoe pits, a gathering area. P. Harris noted our reports indicate we can anticipate an average of one-half child per household so the rec area should be able to accommodate 20 children. R. Caldwell suggested an area for adults also. Mr. Rich also suggested picnic tables, lights, and a sitting area. R. Caldwell suggested a basketball hoop. Kathy LaRoche, an abutter, has an issue with the lighting. She doesn't want to look out and see PSNH lights. She wants to be able to see the night sky. She would also like to see that the rec area is put in as far away from all abutters as it can be so the kids aren't tempted to move onto abutting properties.

J. Pike agrees about not requiring excessive lighting. Mr. Coviello stated they cut all the trees to their line. He wants to know how that happened. C. Daigle noted they had a valid timber permit before the subdivision was proposed. G. Flack wanted to know where the rec area will be placed. It should be central and not require street side parking or parking on other people's lots. Mr. Gendrick stated they'd like an opportunity to take the plan back along with the Board's comments and locate the best spot. P. Harris asked about designing to the 25 year storm. Mr. Gendrick noted they design to the 25, but also spot check beyond that. P. Harris noted we've certainly seen unusual water table circumstances everywhere the last few years so Mr. Houle might have experienced some natural increase in runoff onto his property.

P. Harris asked if there were any further concerns from the applicant on the list of items generated by the staff. Mr. Johnston asked about the post-approval items and was assured they need to be addressed only post-approval. J. Marden asked about improvements to Brown Hill/Rte 106. C. Daigle explained that Mr. Pernaw's traffic report to the Board on proposed area subdivisions indicated that some improvements at the Rte 106/Brown Hill Rd location should be considered. The applicant should review that report and respond accordingly. J. Marden agrees that it is a rural area and too much lighting would result in unnecessary light pollution. The post lights will be less intrusive. J. Marden suggested having them switched to each house instead of on auto cells.

There being no further comment or question the chairman closed the public hearing.

MOTION: On a motion by C. Patten seconded by J. Marden it was voted unanimously to table the public hearing to the August 28th meeting to allow staff to use the information submitted at this public hearing and by the applicant prior to the that closing date to generate a list of recommended conditions. (6-0-1 w/Jon Pike abstaining)

OTHER BUSINESS:

J. Pike rejoined the Board.

1. Minutes:

J. Marden asked that the following be added to the 7/10/06 minutes on the CIP; J. Marden thought you had to be a resident of Belmont to be a voting member of the CIP Committee.

MOTION: On a motion by C. Patten seconded by R. Caldwell it was voted unanimously to approve the minutes of 7/10/06 as amended. (7-0)

2. Canterbury Development of Regional Impact: Belmont has received notice that Canterbury has voted that the proposal of Ralph M and Irene B Boles for a 3 lot subdivision and a 61 unit manufactured housing park on Rte 106 is a development of regional impact. R. Ball gave info on an earlier version of the proposal. The Board discussed that the impacts to Belmont appear to be as follows:

- a. Increased enrollment/costs in the joint Shaker Regional School District facilities;
- b. Possible increased fire and police mutual aid calls/costs.

3. Fall Lecture Series: The Board received the application form for the upcoming Fall Law Lectures.

4. The Source: The Board received copies of the summer, 2006 newsletter from NH DES, The Source.

Adjournment:

MOTION: On a motion C. Patten by seconded by R. Caldwell it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 9:50p.m. (7-0)

Respectfully submitted:

Candace L. Daigle, Town Planner