

Present: Chairman Roger Barham, Vice Chair Jack Karcz; Members; Jack Downing; Brett Hunter; Andy Kohlhofer, Selectman Leon Holmes Sr., RPC Circuit Rider Planner Jenn Rowden and Building Official Bob Meade.

Also attending: Tom O'Brien; James & Jamey Watkins, Arleigh Greene, Kevin Baum, Donald Miller, Doug Andrew, Amy Bean, Dan Tatem, John & Andy Galloway, Dennis Quintal, Attila Zsiros, Randy & Cindy Grasso, Mark Pitkin, Rose MacDougall, Judi Blumenthal, Kathy Braun, Travis Baum, Karen & Glenn Easson, Rob Janvrin, Nancy Fiske, Eve Holt, James & Sara Cloutier, John & Renee King and Casey Wolfe

This meeting was live broadcast on FCTV channel 22.

This meeting was called to order at 7:15 pm at the Fremont Public Library by Chairman Roger Barham.

I. CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

7:15 pm Public Hearing continuation – Galloway / Seacoast Farms Site at parcel 05-035 located on Shirkin Road

Stantec Consulting Engineering Report for review
Response from Applicant(s) and their consultants with updated plans
Letter submitted by Attorney (Kevin) Baum for abutter Hard Rock Development

Mr. Barham opened the meeting addressing the Galloway application and explaining why we were meeting at the library. He stated that we would be using a PowerPoint presentation and explained how the meeting would be conducted. Then went to introductions, asked that all had signed in and a basic timeline. He also said that the status of the application had gone from minor to major.

Where the PowerPoint presentation was so much of this part of the meeting, a copy of that presentation shall be part of the minutes.

At this point Mr. Quintal got up and went over the latest updated site plan. Sheet one has new measurements added, new benchmark, additional piles noted. That Seacoast Farms needs to move or remove piles (it was mentioned that the tailing piles are in excess of what is allowed). Mr. Meade asked where the tailing piles would be moved and was told that was Mr. Kelly's problem. He mentioned that some work needed to be done at the ledge near the road. He went over grading and swales, elevation (almost six feet above wetlands/pond), addressed storm water and would add a stone/wood chip berm. The remainder should be the same as the last revision.

The second page had berm/swale details, some notes changed and measurements (addressed town engineer's written comments) of the Shirkin Road & Beede Hill Road intersection (visibility, grade and width).

Mr. Barham stated that we would be discussing the waivers and went over waiver protocol and that we would go over each one individually (named seven waivers requested).

The first waiver – Test Pits. After reading the waiver, the town engineer’s comments and having Mr. Quintal explain why they wanted the waiver, Mr. Barham wanted comments from the public. A motion was made by Mr. Holmes Sr. to open for public comment, seconded by Mr. Hunter with all in favor. Mr. Zsiros expressed concerns about petroleum and monitoring water. Mr. Holt asked about test pits. There was some discussion about test pits. Mr. Tatem (Town Engineer) stated that he was changing his opinion and would like to see test pits. Mr. Quintal went over map elevations. It was discovered that although the operation was six feet above the Seacoast Farms end, it was much closer in elevation to the wetlands on the other side near the entrance. Mr. Pitkin spoke about seasonal high water and the differences in and out of the aquifer and felt test pits should be dug. Mr. Karcz spoke of a historical reference point. Mrs. Grasso was concerned about the operation and asked “Why not” do test pits. Mr. (Kevin) Baum (Hardrock’s attorney) spoke about meeting the requirements of this new major site plan.

Mr. Holmes made a motion to close the public input with Mr. Hunter seconding and all in favor.

Mr. Holmes Sr. made a motion to require test pits and deny the waiver. Mr. Karcz seconded with all in favor.

Waiver #2 Road access – this was read along with the town engineer’s comments which did not recommend accepting this waiver. Ms. Rowden brought up the possibility of partially accepting contents within the waiver. Mr. Quintal went over the request, where workers/operators would park, trailer and machinery locations. Mr. (Andy) Galloway spoke about employees now vs. the new use. Mr. Tatem asked about details for access and paving a parking area. Mr. (John) Galloway and Mr. Meade discussed road travel, site distance and going from 16 to 40 trucks (approval in 2012 was for sixteen trucks, approvals in 1989 rounded up to sixteen trucks). Discussion followed on upgrading the road. Mr. Barham stated we were concerned with the significant increase in trucking. Mr. Tatem spoke about upgrading and widening Shirkin Road (he felt we may not get 24’ but felt we could get 22’). It was mentioned that we had already spoken with NHDES about this. Ms. Rowden stated we would still need to obtain wetlands permits. Mr. (Kevin) Baum stated it was the applicant’s burden to show why the waiver should be granted.

A motion was made to open this for public input by Mr. Kohlhofer, seconded by Mr. Holmes Sr. with all in favor. Mr. Pitkin spoke about a truck that had slipped off Shirkin Road approximately two years ago. Mr. Holt wanted to know how feasible it was to be pulling over and waiting time at the entrance of this gravel road. Mr. Grasso asked us to consider Seacoast Farms trucks. Mr. Tatem questioned whether Mr. Galloway’s trucks were 40 or in addition to the 16 trucks already spelled out. Mr. (John) Galloway stated 56 trucks (his 16 plus the 40). Mr. O’Brien brought up trucks waiting at the end of the road and the potential for leaks in this sensitive area let alone dust kicked up. Mr. Zsiros wanted to clarify that the road thins out after the entrance. Mr. (Travis) Baum asked with more trucks, how do we monitor and who keeps track. Mr. Tatem spoke about travel logs and road counters. Mr. Pitkin suggested that the road be bonded. Mr. (Kevin) Baum spoke about road burden and to prove no need to improve. Mr. Grasso stated that the road is not adequate. Mr. Pitkin suggested bonding Beede Hill Road.

Mr. Karcz made a motion to close to the public, Mr. Holmes Sr. seconded with all in agreement which brought us to final discussion. Mr. Kohlhofer asked about hours of operation and then stated it would be something like 5.6 trucks an hour. Mr. Barham stated that he would like to see Shirkin Road improved (24’ wide). Mr. Quintal said he would speak with Mr. Tatem

to see about taking measures to work with him to move forward. He would also look at the turning radius at the intersection (Shirkin & Beede Hill Roads).

Mr. Holmes made a motion to deny the waiver, Mr. Karcz seconded with all but Mr. Kohlhofer agreeing with the motion.

Waiver #3 Architectural Renderings – Mr. Barham read the waiver and Mr. Tatem’s comments. There was no discussion and Mr. Kohlhofer made a motion to open it up to the public with Mr. Hunter seconding and all in favor. There were no comments from the public and Mr. Hunter made a motion to close the public portion with Mr. Kohlhofer seconding with all agreeing. Mr. Karcz made a motion to accept the waiver with Mr. Downing seconding with all in agreement.

Waiver #4 Parking Design – Mr. Barham read the waiver and Mr. Tatem's comments. Mr. Quintal spoke of two or three operators with no one parking vehicles overnight (except machinery). Mr. Kohlhofer asked where the equipment is parked. Mr. Meade questioned the radii of the road access. Ms. Rowden would like to see a designated parking area. Mr. Tatem asked about a refueling area. Mr. Meade questioned whether refueling would be portable or stationary. Mr. (Andy) Galloway stated that it would be portable refueling. Mr. Quintal spoke about the equipment area (middle of operation) and the employee parking area (near trailer).

Mr. Holmes Sr. made a motion to open the discussion to the public, Mr. Hunter seconded with all in favor. Mrs. Grasso asked about parking and if there would be more out there than the current use. Mr. Meade stated he was also looking to see if the operation would require more people. Mr. O’Brien also asked about more operators and more vehicles. Mr. (John) Galloway said no, it would be the same. Mr. O’Brien asked about fueling, stationary or portable (concerns about spills and containment). Mr. (John) Galloway stated this had already been gone over and that it would be portable.

Mr. Kohlhofer made a motion to close the public input with Mr. Holmes Sr. seconding and all in agreement. Mr. Kohlhofer made a motion to approve the waiver provided the area where the employee’s park and the equipment sits is shown with Mr. Holmes Sr. seconding and all agreeing. Mrs. King asked about where the refueling would take place? Several stated that it would be from portable means. There was more discussion on fueling. Mr. Holmes Sr. said we had discussed refueling in the center of the operation. Mr. Tatem thought it would be a good idea to be as far away from the wetland setbacks as practical (middle of operation). Mr. Barham stated that fueling is more environmental than parking for a portable refueling truck and should be discussed later.

Waiver #5 Landscaping - Mr. Barham read the waiver and Mr. Tatem’s comments. Ms. Rowden recommended the existing tree line be maintained and a note added to the plan. Mr. Quintal pointed out where the tree line is (buffer). Mr. (John) Galloway said in the past there was talk about removing that hill on Shirkin Road at the edge of his property. He said that later Planning Boards wanted him to stay away from that hill. Mr. Meade asked why not remove the hill and which would improve that section of the road. Mr. Quintal and Mr. Tatem will discuss this (perhaps take out the hill and replant after).

Mr. Kohlhofer made a motion to open this to the public with Mr. Holmes Sr. seconding and all in favor.

Mr. Zsiros asked if the retention piles would be staying. Mr. Barham defined landscaping. Ms. Rowden stated that Mr. Galloway would have no more than 30,000 cubic yards of material on site (for this use).

Mr. Karcz made a motion to close this to the public with Mr. Holmes Sr. seconding and all in agreement. There was no further conversation and Mr. Karcz made a motion to accept the waiver and Mr. Downing seconded with all in agreement.

Waiver #6 Storm Water Drainage Analysis - Mr. Barham read the waiver and Mr. Tatem's comments. Mr. Tatem said that there never was one done for this site and moving forward there should be (and that state law would require it). He said that he spoke with Mr. (Rich) Mock about an alteration of terrain permit. Mr. Quintal stated that he too had spoken with Mr. Mock and would do this for the state and share it with the town of Fremont. Mr. Tatem said he would like to review this after the state of NH. A discussion followed on general waivers vs. specific waivers.

Mr. Hunter made a motion to open this up for public comment with Mr. Kohlhofer Seconding with all in favor. Mr. O'Brien asked about expansion of use, new operation and change of use. Mr. King asked if Seacoast Farms was being reviewed as well. Mrs. King asked about drainage from Seacoast Farms. Mr. Tatem said the state looks at the owner for all uses (disturbances as a whole). Mr. Zsiros would like to see an analysis for all uses out there so close to wetlands. Mr. (Kevin) Baum asked if his letter(s) were in the record and that it address run off.

Mr. Kohlhofer made a motion to close input from the public with Mr. Hunter seconding and all in agreement. There was no more discussion and Mr. Karcz made a motion to deny with Mr. Hunter seconding and all in favor.

Waiver#7 Traffic Analysis - Mr. Barham read the waiver and Mr. Tatem's comments. Mr. Tatem asked to deny and then look at all aspects (some not applicable). He also spoke about a deceleration lane and traffic study. Mr. Barham was concerned with impact on Beede Hill Road. Mr. Tatem stated that we can only ask the applicant for so much (percentage) of offsite improvements and to involve the Board of Selectmen (and Road Agent), he also felt that the applicant should come to the board with a proposal for offsite improvements. Mr. Barham stated that Galloway's trucking is indeed only a percentage of trucking beating up that road. Mr. Tatem said we need to see what Beede Hill Road is made of. Mr. (John) Galloway said that there is 1190 feet of that road going north out of Fremont and that he paved it around 1984. Mr. Holmes thought the road was done some 32 years ago with a life expectancy of 20 years – Beede Hill Road needs work. Mr. Barham spoke about the intent of improving Beede Hill Road for the increased traffic of his trucks. Mr. Quintal spoke about traffic/service on this road and asked that we see his notes on conditions before and after. That this will not have continuous use (periods of inactivity). He said that he would work with Mr. Tatem to come up with a scope of work.

Mr. Hunter made a motion to open this up to the public with Mr. Downing seconding and all in agreement. Mrs. Grasso addressed noise and pollution and how this fits in. Mr. Tatem said that he would take the question back to his office. There was a discussion of Jake/Engine braking. Mr. Tatem stated that if a sign did go up Mr. Meade would have to go out and issue tickets (not true, it would be the police department enforcing this). Ms. Rowden said noise from trucks on the road was not part of this (noise onsite would be). Mrs. Braun brought up North Road is not for through trucking and if this would be part of the study. Mr. (John) Galloway stated that his trucks do not go down North road. Mr. Tatem asked for a statement as to which

direction Galloway trucks would go out of Shirkin. Mr. (John) Galloway was reluctant, stating he may have jobs in Fremont or that direction. Most of the time he would turn North, sometimes he may need to go south. Mr. Tatem asked to clarify what percentage it would be in either direction and stated that downtown Fremont would have trouble handling that many (56) trucks. Mrs. Braun said (other) trucks do use North Road. Mrs. McDougall was concerned with traffic out the other side (paved) Shirkin Road. Mr. Barham thought the applicant should define trafficking. Mr. Zsiros questioned additional vehicles and that it was important to do first part of analysis as all traffic increases. Mr. O'Brien asked how they would be sure to comply with site plan. Mr. (John) Galloway suggested having radar out on Beede Hill Road. Mrs. McDougall asked about the study and how we ensure we get what we need. Mr. King said where this is not constant, how do we know what the impact really is and how to come up with calculations. Mr. Quintal and Mr. Barham said we would account for peak times/worse case. Mr. Quintal also stated that he would work that out with the town engineer. Mrs. King asked just what is the study based on. Mr. (John) Galloway mentioned that he had spoken with the police chief and that there had not been any instances out there. Mr. Tatem explained the traffic study may include using a counter and would like to see a daily limit. He also stated that although 56 trucks seemed like a lot and was significant to that road, 56 trucks was a drop in the bucket as far as traffic studies were concerned. Ms. Rowden and Mr. Barham stated the trucks are counted as trips per day. Mr. Grasso stated that he has seen traffic jams with trucks backed up in Beede Hill Road (a couple times). Mr. Meade stated that he had seen this once himself with Seacoast Farms trucks and that the matter was turned over to the police. Mr. Zsiros asked where Mr. Barham lives and the concerns of those who live there and experiencing all this. Mrs. McDougall pointed out that there were two sides of Shirkin Road. Mr. Cloutier stated that there were times where traffic from Seacoast Soccer were using all these roads (missing the first turn). Mr. Grasso stated all the more reason for a study. Mr. Zsiros mentioned that lost drivers were constantly turning around on Shirkin Road.

Mr. Karcz made a motion to close the public input with Mr. Downing seconding and all in favor.

With no further discussion, Mr. Karcz made a motion to deny the waiver with Mr. Downing seconding and all in favor.

This brought us to a new waiver dated March 2nd 2016 Site plan regulations require location and exact dimensions of all property lines. Mr. Quintal went over the waiver and stated that it was in response to the town engineer's comment. The request states that the existing pit is about 7.8 acres in the middle of a 52 acre site. The active area is not anywhere near the abutting lot lines. (See actual letter on file). Mr. Barham explained intent.

Mr. Holmes Sr. made a motion to address this waiver and open it to the public with Mr. Kohlhofer seconding and all in agreement. Mr. (Kevin) Baum had no issue with the waiver but asked that items be sent with adequate notice and time to review. Mrs. Grasso asked for Mr. Tatem's opinion. Mr. Tatem questioned the accuracy of current property lines. Mr. Quintal stated they were from a survey that the Lavelle's had done and that he had established points along the road. Mr. King felt where this commercial property abuts residential property that they should reestablish property lines and noted that her property abuts this. Mr. Barham stated that this is not anywhere near where the machinery would be located. Mrs. King asked about abutting residents, discussion followed. Mr. (John) Galloway stated that there was a stone wall between their properties. Mr. Pitkin asked where residential use ended and Corporate Commercial started.

Mr. Downing made a motion to close the public input with Mr. Karcz seconding and all in favor. With no further discussion Mr. Karcz made a motion to accept the waiver with Mr. Downing seconding and all in agreement.

Mr. Barham stated that this was the end of all the waivers and whether we had a complete application. Where we did not accept all the waivers he felt that we could not accept jurisdiction as the application was therefore not complete. Mr. Quintal stated that he would need time to address all the waivers to get this ready for the town to take jurisdiction. Mr. Barham said as far as timing, he would need everything done two weeks before the next public meeting. Mr. Quintal had no objections. Mr. Barham asked to give thought to a timeline and it was decided to continue this public hearing until the meeting on May 4th 2016 and to let us know if they could not make that meeting. Mrs. King asked if the public could be notified of a continuance. Mr. Barham stated that he would discuss this with the Town Administrator (and perhaps bulletin it on the town web site). This meeting is planned to be at the library again and open at 7:15.

At this point Ms. (Casey) Wolfe was introduced as the new land use person and that she would be taking minutes at the next meeting.

Mr. Karcz made a motion to continue this application to that meeting Wednesday May 4th at 7:15 at the library with Mr. Downing seconding with all in favor.

Mr. (Kevin) Baum (attorney representing Hardrock) asked if we had gotten his letter about the use of this site. Mr. Barham stated that we had and that it is the town's opinion that it is a permitted use. It was getting close to ten o'clock when this ended and people started to leave.

The board asked for and was granted a five minute break.

At this time Mr. O'Brien joined the board as a voting member.

II. MINUTES - Approve the minutes of the February 17, 2016 meeting Mr. Holmes Sr. made a motion to accept the minutes with Mr. Hunter Seconding and all in favor.

III. NEW APPLICATIONS – *None -Upcoming*

Gravel Renewal / Darlene Olson (02-151.002) scheduled for 7:00 pm on Wednesday March 16, 2016

Informational / Bill Gregsak (also 02-151.002) scheduled for 7:15 pm on Wednesday March 16, 2016

IV. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN (CIP) – It was decided that this could wait until the next scheduled meeting

V. BUILDING INSPECTOR'S REPORT – Mr. Meade was brief and stated that we had a better February than last year and would give details at the next meeting.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

1. The Town Report is available on the Town's website and print copies are at the Town Hall, Library and Safety Complex for pickup.
2. **MASTER PLAN** - Energy Chapter reviewed by the Energy Committee, will go over this next time.
3. **ZONING ORDINANCE RECODIFICATION** – Updates and review of information, will go over this next time
4. **SIGN ORDINANCE** - revision work to get underway. A Sign Sub-Committee meeting will be held at 2:00 pm on Tuesday March 15, 2016 at the Town Hall, Basement Meeting Room, will go over this next time

VI. INCOMING CORRESPONDENCE

1. Updated letter from Southeast Regional Planning regarding Raymond SPR for Pinard Waste Systems. All felt that this should not affect us.
2. Another letter from Hardrock's attorney.

VII. OTHER IMPORTANT MEETINGS UPCOMING: Town and School District Elections are Tuesday March 8, 2016 at Ellis School with polls open 7:00 am to 8:00 pm.

And any other business which may come before the Board - We are finalizing the hiring of Casey Wolfe as our new Land use Administrative Assistant. More information to follow. Casey spoke to the board (another introduction). We all hoped tonight's meeting would not scare her away...

Next regular meeting: March 16, 2016

With no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Hunter made the motion to adjourn at 10:04 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Downing with unanimous favorable vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Bob Meade
Building Inspector / Code Enforcement Officer

ACTION ITEMS

Zoning Ordinance Recodification
Sign Ordinance

Town of Fremont Galloway Public Hearing Continuation

Wednesday March 2nd, 2016
19:15 at the Town Library

AGENDA

- * Introductions & Public Sign In
- * Status of the Application
- * Next Steps on Application
- * Handling New Information

Introductions

- * Will all members of the public ensure they sign-in on the Sign in Sheet

Status of the Application

- * Site Plan Application Submitted (Major)
 - * Updated Site Plans
 - * List of Waiver Requests
- * Public Site Walks
- * Review of Application by Town Engineer
 - * Comments received from Hard Rock Development
- * **Update by Applicant**

Next Steps on Application

- * Jurisdiction of the Application
 - * Vote on Waiver Requests (with Public comment)
 - * Determine if Application is Complete
 - * Vote to take Jurisdiction or Continue
- * Discussions (with Public comment)
- * Vote on Application

Waiver Requests

- * 1.13.H Test pits
- * 1.13.L Road access
- * 1.13.M Architectural Renderings
- * 1.13.N Parking Design
- * 1.13.O Landscaping
- * 1.13.P Stormwater Drainage Analysis
- * 1.13.R Traffic Analysis

Waiver Request Protocol

- * Review each Waiver INDIVIDUALLY
 - * Define Waiver Request
 - * Town Engineer's and/or Circuit Rider's Comments
- * Board Discussion
- * **Public Comment**
- * Board Discussion (if necessary)
- * Board Vote on Waiver

Waiver #1

1.13.H Test pits

Provide location and results of each test pit and percolation results shall be submitted to the Planning Board. Information summary with respect to soil conditions capable of supporting on-site water and waste disposal for each lot will be supplied. Test reference markers shall be put in place and maintained during the review process.

We take no exception to the waiver request to not perform test pits, because no road or septic construction is proposed. However, if a drainage design is required by the Board, test pits may have to be performed to verify the estimated seasonal high water table and infiltration rates of the insitu soils

Waiver #2

1.13.L Road access

Provide complete plans and profiles for all streets to include:

- Curve data, horizontal and vertical at the street center lines.
- Street data at fifty foot (50') intervals, to include cross sections.
- Intersection, turn-around and/or cul-de-sac radii.
- All Storm Drainage design.
- Design of any bridges or culverts.
- Proposed finished grades of streets and adjacent roadsides within the right of way.

Waiver #2 1.13.L Road access

Considering the proposed expansion of the existing use, we do not recommend that the Board grant the two waiver requests to not adhere to the access way and parking area design criteria. In addition, it should be noted that the existing site plan does not specify any parking areas, nor are there any paved parking spaces on the site. Considering the existing and proposed use, a paved parking area would likely reduce the risk of contaminants leaching into the soils and water table.

Waiver #3 1.13.M Architectural Renderings

Provide an architectural rendering showing all elevation views of all proposed buildings and their exterior design. Provide plans reflecting shape, size, height and location of existing structures located on the site and within two hundred feet (200') of the site.

With the condition that the Board approves the proposed office trailer, we would take no exception to the waiver request to not provide architectural renderings of the trailer.

Waiver #4 1.13.N Parking Design

Provide a parking areas and access plan sufficient for review to insure compliance to applicable standards as set forth in this document.

1. The location, size, direction of travel and, if appropriate, curbing, paving, and radii of existing and proposed streets, driveways, access ways and sidewalks within the site and its relationship to the off-site system.
2. The size, location and layout of all on-site parking, loading facilities and snow storage areas. The methods and actuals used to provide for directing of traffic patterns and parking.

Waiver #4 1.13.N Parking Design

Considering the proposed expansion of the existing use, we do not recommend that the Board grant the two waiver requests to not adhere to the access way and parking area design criteria. In addition, it should be noted that the existing site plan does not specify any parking areas, nor are there any paved parking spaces on the site. Considering the existing and proposed use, a paved parking area would likely reduce the risk of contaminants leaching into the soils and water table.

Waiver #5 1.13.O Landscaping

Provide a landscaping plan sufficient for review to insure compliance to applicable standards as set forth in this document. The location, type and size of all proposed landscaping and screening as well as a plan for the retention of existing and significant natural features on the site.

Considering the remote location of the site and the fact that the current operation has no landscaping, we take no exception to the waiver request to not provide a proposed landscaping plan as part of this application.

Waiver #6 1.13.P Stormwater Drainage Analysis

Provide a storm drainage plan, performed by a registered professional engineer, including a plan for the detention and slow release of storm water where necessary, together with supporting calculations. Reference section 1.16.

We do not recommend that the Board grant the waiver request to not provide a Stormwater Drainage Analysis.

Waiver #7 1.13.R Traffic Analysis

Provide Traffic Impact Analysis

All proposed site plans shall be reviewed by the Planning Board to ascertain that adequate provisions have been made by the owner/agent for traffic safety and congestion. To facilitate this review, the Planning Board may require the developer to provide a full traffic impact analysis when deemed necessary by the Board due to the size, location or traffic-generating characteristics of the proposal.

Waiver #7 1.13.R Traffic Analysis

Traffic impact analysis shall address each of the following:

- Traffic circulation and access, including adequacy of adjacent street and intersections, entrances and exits, traffic flow, sight distances, accident statistics, curb cuts, turning lanes and existing or recommended traffic signals.
- Pedestrian safety and access.
- Off-street parking and loading.
- Emergency vehicle access.
- Snow removal adequacy.

No site plan shall be approved without a traffic impact study and analyses unless a written waiver is applied for and approved by the Planning Board.

Waiver #7 1.13.R Traffic Analysis

Considering the proposed increase in trucking traffic, we do not recommend that the Board grant the waiver request to not provide a traffic analysis.

March 2, 2016

Waiver Request for Site Plan Application
Galloway Pit, Shirkin Road, Fremont

I hereby request a waiver from the following Regulation.

Site Plan Regulations: Section 1.13.S.5.

Requires location and exact dimensions of all property lines.

The archive area of this existing pit area is about 8.7 acres in the middle of the 52 acre site. The active area is not anywhere near the abutting lot lines and therefore exact dimensions are not essential.

John Galloway