

Unofficial

HOOKSETT ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

Tuesday, March 20, 2012

HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
35 Main Street

CALL TO ORDER

C. Pearson called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm

Pledge of Allegiance

ATTENDANCE

Chair C. Pearson, R. Duhaime, R. Bairam, D. Pare, P. Denbow, and G. Hyde

Excused: M. Simoneau and J. Levesques, Council Rep.

Absent: G. Lee

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 14, 2012

***R. Bairam motioned to approve the minutes of Feb. 14, 2012. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor***

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

FALCON BROOK

49 Mammoth Road

Map 45 Lot 33

MDR

- A Variance from Article 8 Section E.9 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Conservation Subdivision on 17.12 acres where 20 acres is required.
- A Variance from Article 8 Section D.5 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a unit density of 21 units where 17 units are allowed.
- A Variance from Article 8 Section G.2 to permit the construction of a condominium development which is by definition a single lot, without having to adhere to the minimum frontage requirements of 50 feet as stated in the ordinance.
- A Variance from Article 8, Section G.6 to permit the construction of freestanding units with a minimum separation of 30 feet where 40 is required.

Emile Bussiere Jr, Attorney

Doug Maguire

E. Bussierre: We have been attempting to develop this parcel for a while. We spoke with a number of agencies about the concept. We presented attached units which were not received well. We changed to single units. We then got new direction on how to proceed. We did receive approval for a variance and then a rehearing was granted and the variance was reversed and new direction given on how to proceed.

The concept has not changed. This is still a condominium development on a single lot. We have the same wetland crossings which were approved and there is still significant effort to use back lot wetlands.

1. A Variance from Article 8 Section E.9 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Conservation Subdivision on 17.12 acres where 20 acres is required.

Read from the application.

The plan was increased by three (3) acres. There were two (2) fee simple lots proposed at the entrance of the parcel. We eliminated two (2) fee simple lots which were conditionally approved and pulled the cul-de-sac back and shortened it.

2. A Variance from Article 8 Section D.5 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a unit density of 21 units where 17 units are allowed.

Read from the application.

With the additional crossing we would only have three (3) units on that upland. It would not be economically feasible for only three (3) units.

3. A Variance from Article 8 Section G.2 to permit the construction of a condominium development which is by definition a single lot, without having to adhere to the minimum frontage requirements of 50 feet as stated in the ordinance.

Read from application

There is no strict frontage rule on lot lines. There is more than 50 feet per unit if you take the aggregate but if you drew imaginary line on the units it would not meet the 50 foot requirement.

4. A Variance from Article 8, Section G.6 to permit the construction of freestanding units with a minimum separation of 30 feet where 40 is required.

Read from application

It is our understanding that the requirement is for fire protection. The National Safety Code requires 30 feet. The Board should be aware the reason the ordinance requires 40 is because there is a 20 foot setback for lot lines therefore a 40 foot separation.

R. Duhaime: I understand you were directed to the Conservation Subdivision. The ordinance is to maintain the rural character. By putting the homes too close together, you lose that rural feel as well as the increase number of units.

E. Bussiere: As a matter of right, based on the density calculations, the additional lots will be at the eastern most end of the drive. If we were denied that variance, we would have the lots at the beginning. There will always be an aggregated area where they are massed together. That is due to the role of the ordinance to maintain open space. The units at the end are the units that are most separated.

R. Duhaime: If you took out two (2) units you could get the 40 feet between residences.

D. Maguire: The goal is to gain more open space and cluster homes closer together so that you are maximizing the open space. The open space calculations require 50% of the area be open space and we are proposing 75% open space. You can see we are meeting and exceeding that. If we space the units out, we are decreasing the open space.

P. Denbow: What buffer is there with the existing single family homes?

D. Maguire: I believe it is 25 feet. These are 30' x 50' units. This is conceptual.

C. Pearson: We are struggling with the condominium development on a Conservation Subdivision. On the calculations for open space; how much is usable and wetland?

D. Maguire: The Ordinance requires a percentage to be set aside and percentage of useable and unconstrained area. We are also meeting that. Fifty percent of the open space needs to be usable. That is conservatively taking out all the setbacks from the wetlands because that is not useable.

C. Pearson: Some units are 30 and some appear more than 30 feet of separation.

D. Maguire: We are showing units as 35 feet of separation. We would like to have the approval for 30 if there were a need.

R. Duhaime: The driveways are matched up. If they were staggered it would be better.

D. Maguire: We have discussed utilizing different size homes so that it would diminish the cookie cutter feel. It is in our best interest to make it aesthetically appealing from a landscaping perspective.

E. Bussiere: There will be condo docs to prevent people from building sheds and pools and it will be enforced by the condo owners.

C. Pearson: Can you define the private road. Maurais is private?

D. Maguire: Maurais is now a private road. We have obtained conditional approval to upgrade that to a full town road and the road beyond the cul-de-sac will be a private road.

Application is on record and submitted.

Open Public:

Abutters:

George Porter, 40 Castle Drive: I thought this was supposed to go to the Planning Board first.

C. Pearson stated that the applicant must get all variance before going to Planning.

D. Blais, 34 Castle Drive: Looking back the original subdivision was Castle Estates and Maurais had a subdivision approved. Due to economic downturns, his plan became unfeasible. It is a difficult parcel. I do believe the Conservation Subdivision will allow the applicant to get units that would otherwise not be realized. What they are proposing is reasonable. Anyone that bought into the Castle Drive subdivision understood there was a possibility of another subdivision. I think they are being reasonable with that. Their response (#2) to the first variance states that the density would further restrict and then they say we want 21 units. We will be constrained but we want 21 units. It says it is the same plan that they got approval for before but it's not. This is the best way for them to develop the lot but I don't agree with the increase in density. They did the calculation and they don't have enough to meet the 20 acres and they should flow the mass of what is allowed. That is my thought.

The Conservation Subdivision; I agree that the goal is to preserve large tracks. I don't see any storm water treatment areas. I don't know if they will be part of the open space and will that change the calculations. I'm sure the abutters want to see where the storm water management will tie in. You need to see how they will deal with that.

The second wetland crossing; the representation to the town is that needs to be addressed. That is in previous minutes.

The capacity at the sewer pumps stations. At the TRC, there were comments relative to the pump station. I don't know if they need to buy more shares or not and we need to insure there is capacity. What will happen during power outages? The style and price point of the homes needs to be considered. They are asking for 35 foot setbacks. I'm not comfortable without seeing the number of bedrooms and style of the homes. Will that be compatible with the neighborhood? That is also going to affect the sewer pump station. Renderings would be good to see. The traffic; I think we are looking at adding 10 trips per day/house. I don't know if anyone has looked at that. I don't know if any traffic analysis has been done. Is there a site distance issue? The previous subdivision isn't recorded and therefore I don't know if taking lots out will affect that. Overall, I think I understand the Conservation Subdivision concept, and if the Board works with the application, they can find their way through the hardship and the ordinances has changed. I don't see the hardship for adding more units. I would like to see what the houses are and see if they can get that separation and get a more open feel. It looks like a cul-de-sac off a cul-de-sac. There is case law with the town that they can see their way through this. I agree with the way they're going but it needs more work.

C. Pearson: Many of your points are to be addressed by Planning. We can address storm water.

D. Maguire: On the older concepts, I made provision for drainage. This would all be flushed out at Planning. I'm confident we can deal with all this at Planning.

C. Pearson: What will that do to your open space calculations?

D. Maguire: If we created a wet pond that met State requirements for alterations of terrain, I don't see why that couldn't be included in the open space.

C. Pearson: The open space is usable space, whether it is pedestrian walkway, etc. When you take away, that's important.

D. Maguire: We have 75% overall and that leaves some portion available for drainage. We could recharge the roofs for their own systems and that would minimize the ponds. I didn't want to bring this all to this Board.

E. Bussiere stated that if the wetland crossing change, approvals would be require.

C. Pearson: This is city sewer?

D. Maguire: The pump station does have capacity and I have been before the Sewer Commission and presented the old design and it does have capacity and moving forward, we will utilize the same approach.

D. Blais: Some of their statements say one of the items is the houses are going to be the same as the surrounding community. Then we hear there is no number of bedrooms and style. They need to show that.

E. Bussiere: The Zoning Ordinance does not require it to be in kind with surrounding area. We can put quadplex and duplex and the neighbors did not receive that well. So we changed the concept and we got away from workforce housing and duplexes. The neighbors can't say you must build like units. I don't think different size or shape can have any affect on their homes.

Dana Langton, 28 Castle Drive: You said there is no run off on storm water?

D. Maguire: At this point, we will have to go to Planning Board which will include a site plan and show a reduction in storm water run-off.

D. Langton: There is no project there now and we have significant runoff now. I've been there since 1992 and without any roads or properties there is a lot of runoff. My concern is I will have a river behind my property.

C. Pearson: Your house is the first crossing and the water was level with your yard.

D. Langton: Over the last few years it has become a steady stream. With the runoff, it comes right up and dries out in the summer. I don't know if there is a brook or stream. That is a concern.

D. Maguire: We did go through a full engineering design with the multi-family. I modeled the water coming from Lamberts to our property. We will put a value to the existing brooks and will not increase beyond that.

Peter Madison, 34 Castle Drive: We all have concerns similar to Mr. Blais. We keep hearing that we have a right to do this and that. Our concern is nothing is conforming. Variances are required to do anything. The fact is that there was a detention pond on the previous plan right behind our house. On the new plan, there is no reference of any drainage and yet we will allow a variance for additional houses seems like putting the cart before the horse. We keep hearing give us the variance and then we will address the issues down the road. What is being proposed is not in

kind to the surrounding properties. There are a lot of issues that must be addressed before any variances are granted.

C. Pearson: I understand your concern. In the applicant's defense, this is his third time in front of us so they are trying to work within the guidelines.

Peter Madison: To say there were appraisals, there were only opinions. To say abutters can't say this will affect their property, I believe it is the applicant's responsibility to show they will not negatively affect the homes.

D. Blais: We as abutters cannot do the appraisal without knowing what kind of homes will be built.

Peter Madison: It looks like a trailer park. If we don't know what is going in, we can't assess the impact.

E. Bussiere: It is not a trailer park. We want flexibility for 2 or 3 bedroom units. The opinion of an appraiser was that multi-units would not negatively affect the neighborhood value than these single units would not affect that value. This will all be addressed at the Planning Board level. We are not asking for variance from the other ordinances other than presented.

C. Pearson: I appreciate the work you have done and I agree that Conservation Subdivision is the right direction. The property value is a reasonable request and therefore we need a concept on what they will look like.

D. Maguire: We have actively been looking at design and we can't be held to sketch so I don't see the value in that.

C. Pearson: If you present a concept and then at Planning they vary greatly, the abutters have some basis for argument.

D. Maguire: There is not going to be a drainage issue down the road. We will resolve that.

C. Pearson: I agree on the drainage but the diminishing property values must be addressed.

D. Pare: If you are going to build 21 units and you have a budget, what will they look like? Is it going to be trailers or is it going to be a one story shed roof?

D. Maguire: This will be an attractive unit that will fit into the current market. This will not be a tin roof situation. There have been a lot of unique compact houses that we have looked at. We are looking to do a mix of units. If you look at the surrounding house they are a mix of styles.

D. Pare: There must be a budget if you are going to build for example 21 units for half a million.

P. Denbow: There is a 55 and older community across the way which is really nice. These are stick built. In Manchester, across from Goldenrod, there are prefab homes that are not as attractive. It is fair for the abutters to want to see concepts.

C. Pearson: Do you have the square footage of the units?

D. Maguire: They will be 30' x 50' max which is 1500 square feet for one level. We plan on incorporating a garage. Our initial discussion is that is our max and maybe a 30' x 40'. We are looking at 2-story in the 1500 to 1800 square foot range including the garage.

E. Bussiere: We are targeting empty nesters and not families with children for these size units.

D. Maguire: We will have architectural renderings and landscape plans but we don't want to spend that money without approval.

C. Pearson: We do require a concept of what will be presented and that allows us to make a determination on diminishing property values.

D. Pare: Can they come along and put a manufactured park?

M. Labonte: No per Article 9.

C. Pearson: I'm glad to see you went with the Conservation Subdivision and I like the fact that you added in more acreage and pulled the cul-de-sac back. You can take the time to address the property value. Is that something you want to present before we move forward?

E. Bussiere: I cannot come here and give you what will be built. The pictures I submitted are a fair view of what is planned. They are suitable to empty nester type family. That is the market we are looking for. If you could put a condition that we are following that type of model then we would welcome that restriction.

R. Duhaime: This is a Conservation Subdivision. You are looking at this property and had one acre lot and you would have what the neighboring development has. Why the 4 extra units.

E. Bussiere: It is because of the second crossing and the economic feasibility of that. The hardship criteria has changed and it must say that there is not fair and substantial...by achieving the extra units you get the four (4) units at the end of the property and it is in the spirit of the ordinance to cluster units.

C. Pearson: If you were not going to have 4 units, where would you remove them?

D. Maguire: I don't know we would have to weigh that out and probably shorten the road.

Close Public

R. Duhaime: If you look at the houses, in the old plan you could come up with a plan for 17 houses as is allowed in the old plan. The conservation Subdivision, I don't see the reason for more units. We don't make decisions based on the economics.

1. A Variance from Article 8 Section E.9 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Conservation Subdivision on 17.12 acres where 20 acres is required.

The proposed use would not diminish surrounding property values:

C. Pearson: I like the Conservation concept with the open space on a 17 acre lot. There is no other acreage available to get to 20 acres. If we deny, they cannot go to Conservation Subdivision.

Granting the variance would be of benefit to the public interest:

C. Pearson: The Conservation Subdivision is in best interest of the public.

Granting the variance would do substantial justice:

C. Pearson: The property owner is trying to work in the spirit of the Town proposing the Conservation Subdivision.

The use is not contrary to the spirit of the ordinance:

C. Pearson: They are trying to maximize the open space on 17 acres.

An unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

C. Pearson: We have steered them to the Conservation Subdivision.

R. Duhaime motioned to grant a Variance from Article 8 Section E.9 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Conservation Subdivision on 17.12 acres where 20 acres is required. Seconded by R. Bairam.

Vote 4:1 motion carries

2. A Variance from Article 8 Section D.5 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a unit density of 21 units where 17 units are allowed.

The proposed use would not diminish surrounding property values:

R. Duhaime: If this was approved 20 years ago you would be allowed 17 and that it is not unreasonable to only have 17. I don't see the need for 21.

G. Hyde: If we limit them to 17, they will dump the units in the back. So if we will keep the units in the front, we will not achieve the goal.

R. Duhaime: That would be worked out with Planning. We don't take economics into account.

C. Pearson: Relative to property value, I don't think the ones in the back will affect the property value as much as the cluster in the front.

G. Hyde: The style of the structure will have more affect than the number.

C. Pearson: Does the Board feel they need more information?

D. Pare: I would like to see what they are building.

R. Duhaime: I would like to see 17 bigger houses than 21 smaller houses.

C. Pearson: We can ask the applicant to come back with more conceptual plans of the units and we could require them to stay within the aesthetics proposed.

The Chairman requested more information be provided by the applicant including dimensions for the proposed buildings as well as design and style.

C. Pearson: We would like to limit square footage and homes will have this design. When we vote on this we will recommend those ranges.

E. Bussierre: I can understand the square foot limitation but I don't know how we will adhere to a specific design.

C. Pearson: If you came to us with an idea, a ranch style or colonial style, I'm sure you have a concept of what it will look like. You can come with a concept so we can provide that information to the abutters.

P. Denbow: When someone does multiple structures, you have an idea of what will be built. We now are looking at a block of squares and have no idea what it will look like.

C. Pearson: This is a rural subdivision; we need to see what it will look like.

**R. Duhaime motioned to table Variance to allow 21 units where 17 are allowed to April 10, 2012. Seconded by R. Bairam.
Vote 4:1 motion carries**

Information will be available by April 2nd at noon.

3. A Variance from Article 8 Section G.2 to permit the construction of a condominium development which is by definition a single lot, without having to adhere to the minimum frontage requirements of 50 feet as stated in the ordinance.

The proposed use would not diminish surrounding property values:

Granting the variance would be of benefit to the public interest:

Granting the variance would do substantial justice:

C. Pearson: It is a condominium project with a unique property. This will preserve more of the wetlands and will have condominium bylaws which will preserve the area.

The use is not contrary to the spirit of the ordinance:

C. Pearson: It is good idea as one lot.

An unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

C. Pearson: Yes it would result in a road with a bigger impact.

**G. Hyde motioned to grant the variance from Article 8 Section G.2 to permit the construction of a condominium development which is by definition a single lot, without having to adhere to the minimum frontage requirements of 50 feet as stated in the ordinance. Seconded R. Duhaime.
Vote 4:1 motion carries**

4. A Variance from Article 8, Section G.6 to permit the construction of freestanding units with a minimum separation of 30 feet where 40 is required.

The proposed use would not diminish surrounding property values:

C. Pearson: I don't feel 10 feet will impact property values

Granting the variance would be of benefit to the public interest:

C. Pearson: Fire has approved the 30 feet.

Granting the variance would do substantial justice:

R. Duhaime: I have a problem with this. I don't see that putting units closer will do substantial justice. Maybe houses should be 50 feet together.

C. Pearson: I do think that the cluster is to preserve the open space and not expand this out.

G. Hyde: We have already granted the Conservation Subdivision so it does do justice.

The use is not contrary to the spirit of the ordinance:

C. Pearson: It is fire and safety and it meets that.

R. Duhaime: I don't mind a condo subdivision but I think it should look like a Conservation Subdivision with more separation.

An unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

C. Pearson: The hardship is pushing out more into the open space.

R. Bairam: I think it is the best use of the land he has. If you start moving the houses around, it makes it worse.

R. Duhaime: If you limit the uses, I don't think it is a hardship to space them 40 feet.

***G. Hyde motioned to grant a Variance from Article 8, Section G.6 to permit the construction of freestanding units with a minimum separation of 30 feet where 40 is required. Seconded by R. Bairam
Vote 3:2 motion carries***

MANCHESTER ANIMAL HOSPITAL

1129 Hooksett Road

Map 41 Lot 11

Performance Zone

A Variance from Article 10-A:E of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a residential use within the Performance Zone for an apartment to be located in the basement of the property to be occupied by an employee of Manchester Animal Hospital.

R. Ball, owner of Manchester Animal Hospital

A variance is being requested to build an apartment to be occupied solely by an employee of Manchester Animal Hospital.

C. Pearson: I would like you to qualify that.

R. Ball: This is to allow 24 hour care which is standard for Veterinary Hospitals. Currently we have to transfer animals to overnight care or a doctor goes back for overnight care. Initially, I will be occupying the apartment. When I retire, the intent is for a technician to live there.

C. Pearson: Will this be every day?

R. Ball: Yes, every day. This will be my primary residents while I build a home in Tuftonboro.

M. Labonte: The word transient would be more appropriate and not a primary residents. We thought this would be more intermittent.

C. Pearson: I thought this was for rotating staff to provide a place to sleep. I didn't see this as permanent residents. When you leave this could be rented?

R. Ball: This is standard in animal hospitals for overnight care for a technician. It is usually a benefit for a technician to be hired with a place to stay.

I will not provide 24 hour care. There are animals that need to be cared for around the clock. It is the standard in veterinary medicine.

R. Ball read the application into record.

This is a one bedroom with a kitchen (minus the break room) with storage for the apartment and the hospital. Parking is outside (19 spaces) and city water and sewer is provided. The basement is unfinished. This was designed by the architect who designed the building knowing at some point we may put this in. There is plumbing already in the floor.

D. Pare: Is there a large demand for 24 hour care?

R. Ball: The National Standard of care requires this. It is a necessity for overnight animals.

D. Pare: Why wasn't this incorporated when this was first built? Should the person staying there be awake?

R. Ball: It doesn't require that someone be awake. They require that someone be on site. Currently I go back and forth from Manchester. This would only be an employee's apartment after I leave. I have no desire to rent it out to anyone other than an employee.

C. Pearson: How do you monitor who rents the apartment and it is in the Performance Zone which is governed by the Planning Board.

R. Ball: It is almost a necessity. The practice has grown and I have three (3) associates so there are always animals at night.

The Board would like to get Planning Board input on the residential use in the Performance Zone.

Open Public
Close Public

R. Bairam motioned to continue to April 10th and attain information from Planning Board. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.

**CADORETTE/MCFARLAND
455 West River Road
Map 8 Lot 48-1
URD**

A Special Exception from Article 5-A:B to allow a two-family dwelling within the Urban Residential District for the addition of a basement apartment within a single family unit.

Nathanial Cadorette and Lindsay McFarland
N. Cadorette read from application

N. Cadorette: We purchased the house and there was an existing tenant from the previous owner. We transferred the lease to our name. It was sold as a two family. The tenant had to move and we put an ad and another couple moved in and they were only staying a short time. They broke their lease and called Code Enforcement for basis to break the lease. Once Code Enforcement saw the site, it was identified as not meeting code requirements.

M. Labonte: It does not meet emergency escape provisions. It can probably work as a two bedroom apartment and is currently set up as a three bedroom. It has a walk out in the rear.

N. Cadorette: Parking is in the rear of the house.

R. Duhaime: I always thought this was a 2 family.

M. Labonte: It was never approved or received a Special Exception.

Site walk is scheduled for Monday, March 26 Monday at 5:30 pm at 455 West River Road.

**PALAZZI CORP/RITCHIE BROS.
39 Hackett Hill Road & 350 West River Road
Map 13 Lot 51**

A variance from Article 19:D.9 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow washing and perform cosmetic repairs to equipment in conjunction with an on-site auction operation within the Groundwater Resource Conservation District.

Nick Golan, TFM & Ben Swanson, Ritchie Bros.

A Variance is requested for equipment wash and repair for the auction facility.

Ben Swanson: We've been looking for an existing site to replace a site in Connecticut. This site was excellent and had a consistent use. There are different components for an auction site. The previous auction companies lease for a short time. We want a longer term lease with an option to purchase the property. Before that we look for certain components. The auction site and the second is the equipment wash on site. We get equipment ready for sale.

C. Pearson: This is washing and painting. Is there any mechanical work done?

B. Swanson: It is washing and cosmetic repair like glass. It is not intensive but rather cosmetic.

N. Golan: The intent is a two phased project of 22 acres and equipment display, parking and storm water management. Phase II is added equipment display and washing. We are asking for a slab on grad with a wash structure and a canopy recycling structure with the use of an environmentally friendly system.

B. Swanson: The location is on the southeast corner. The northern two-thirds is phase I and the wash is in the southeast corner. The handouts explain the basic concept with a slab on grade and have a canopy roof to prevent rainwater from entering. The equipment comes in and is all contained on the concrete service and the solids and mud. They then get power washed and everything is sloped towards the weir area. Pictures were distributed of recently built sites. There are three (3) weirs which capture the material. The water is then pumped through a recycling system. This is a closed loop system. It goes through electro coagulation. Then the water goes back in to the pressure washer. The mud is dried and tested to determine if there are containments and how to dispose of the material

N. Golan: We met with the Conservation Commission to make sure they were on board. A recommendation letter was provided. We met with Town staff as well.

C. Pearson: Do you keep records of the solids and where they are moved to?

B. Swanson: Once they are into the mud staging area and tested and if there are contaminants, there are records but if not, I don't know if there are records. We have a standard process for these and a lot comes down to the requirements of the jurisdiction.

N. Golan: There is some oversight at the State level and we must be consistent with State laws.

Nick read application into the record.

Open Public

Steve Korzynowski, 329 W. River Road: The first pictures showed a retention pond. The previous pictures show 2 ponds?

N. Golan: The storm water systems would be for storm water related ponds not this system.

Steve Korzynowski, 329 W. River Road: Why those area for the retention ponds.

N. Golan: It is difficult to answer with the site plan for the property incomplete. This variance is just for the equipment wash. During site plan review all the questions for site, drainage and signage will meet the requirements of the site review.

R. Duhaime: Are there plans for a second washing locations and what is the size?

B. Swanson: No just one and there are several sizes. It is usually 100 feet by 50 feet wide.

C. Person: Is it manual?

B. Swanson: Yes someone is actually washing the equipment.
This equipment is currently used on sites in Northeast Maryland and outside Columbus Ohio.

P. Denbow: Do you have any DES permits?

N. Golan: Preliminary only. No formal applications have been filed and if favorable will look at preparing site plans.

C. Pearson: Condition that this is a close loop system and solids are properly disposed.

R. Duhaime: Will the equipment be dried on pavement?

B. Swanson: We try but because most of the equipment is tractor equipment which will chew up the concrete it is difficult.

***R. Bairam motioned to approve variance from Article 19:D.9 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow washing and perform cosmetic repairs to equipment in conjunction with an on-site auction operation within the Groundwater Resource Conservation District provided a closed loop zero discharge system is used with best management practices and all resulting solids from the washing process be disposed off site to an approved landfill. Seconded by D. Pare.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

OTHER BUSINESS

Meeting start time will change to 6:30 starting in May 2012.

ADJOURNMENT

***R. Duhaime motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 pm. Seconded by P. Denbow.
Vote unanimously in favor***