



**TOWN OF PITTSFIELD
PLANNING BOARD
TOWN HALL, 85 MAIN STREET
PITTSFIELD, NH 03263**

MEETING MINUTES OF Thursday, March 10, 2022

ITEM 1. - CALL TO ORDER

Call to order at 7:00 p.m. by Adam Gauthier, Chair of the Planning Board.

ITEM 2. – ROLL CALL

Adam Gauthier – Chair

Matt St. George – Vice Chair

Ray Ramsey

Randy Severance

Jim Adams – Selectman Alt Rep.

Ed Trzcinski - Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT

Carl Anderson – Selectman Rep.

OTHERS PRESENT

Bonnie Theriault – Office Assistant

ITEM 3. –PUBLIC INPUT

None.

ITEM 4. – APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 10, 2022 MEETING

Jim Adams left the meeting at 10:04 p.m. Adam Gauthier called Ed Trzcinski to the table.

Matt St. George: I make a motion to approve the February 10, 2022 meeting minutes as amended.

Randy Severance: Second.

Discussion: None.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George– yes, Ray Ramsey – yes, Randy Severance – yes, Ed Trzcinski – yes.

ITEM 5. – K & M DEVELOPERS, LLC MANNY SOUSA, JR., TO DISCUSS BAILEY PARK CLUSTER SUBDIVISION REVISION

Manny Sousa, Jr. of K&M Developers met with Board members to request consideration of allowing decks and attached garages to be added to 2-3 of the parcels in Bailey Park without

increasing the square footage of the homes.

Manny Sousa, Jr. stated that although K&M Developers were not the original developers of Bailey Park, they were trying to clean up some of their recently acquired developments around the state for salability before his father's retirement.

Adam Gauthier notified Mr. Sousa, Jr. that the discussion was non-binding and stated the Board members had heard back from the attorney on how to move forward in the process. Board members requested a letter from Manny Sousa, Jr. with the amendments to the current subdivision plan which includes a list of abutters and fees that go along with setting up advertisements and a public hearing.

Bonnie Theriault let Manny Sousa, Jr. know the letter would need to be received by the March 16, 2022 deadline for the request to be heard at the April 14, 2022, Planning Board meeting. Board members thanked Manny Sousa, Jr. for coming in.

ITEM 6. – NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING VERTEX TOWER ASSETS, LLC/DEMES INVESTMENTS, LLC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

Adam Gauthier read the following;

The Pittsfield Planning Board will hold a meeting under RSA 676:4, I, (c), (1), to determine whether a submitted application for Site Plan approval and Conditional Use Permit (if necessary) are complete according to the board's regulations. The time and place of the meeting are Thursday, March 10, 2022, at 7:00 P.M., at the Pittsfield Town Hall, 85 Main Street, Pittsfield, NH. The applicants' name and address are Vertex Tower Assets, LLC., 225 Dyer Street, Providence, RI 02903.

The proposal is a Major Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit (if necessary) to allow for the construction and operation of a Telecommunications Facility consisting of a 150' tall lattice style tower inside a 60' X 60' fenced-in compound, that will be located in the Light Ind./Commercial Zoning District (a portion of the subject property is in the Suburban Zoning District). The subject property is Tax Map R21 Lot 12, 1002 Upper City Road, owned by DEMES Investments, LLC., 49 Pilgrim Drive, Bedford, NH 03110.

The application for Site Plan Review is on file for public inspection at the Town Hall, 85 Main Street, Pittsfield, NH.

Notice of Hearing on the Merits of an Application for Site Plan Approval If the Pittsfield Planning Board determines that Vertex Tower Assets, LLC's, application for Major Site Plan approval and Conditional Use Permit (if necessary) are complete at the above-noticed meeting, then the board will hold a public hearing under RSA 676:4, I, (c), (1); RSA 676:4, I, (e); the Town of

Pittsfield Site Plan Review Regulations, section III; and the Town of Pittsfield Subdivision Regulations, article 5, section 1, (d), and article 5, section 4, (a) on the merits of the application immediately after the board's completeness determination. The board will not give additional notice of a continuance of the merits hearing to a later meeting.

Adam Gauthier opened the meeting and welcomed the applicants.

Francis D. Parisi introduced himself as a representative for Vertex Tower Assets, LLC stating that at a previous Zoning Board meeting the variance application was denied for the tower to be placed in a suburban zone. Since that meeting, Vertex Tower Assets, LLC moved the tower further away into the commercial/light industrial zone so a variance would no longer be needed.

Mr. Parisi noted that a conditional use permit might be needed to install the tower on the large 9-acre lot behind the hardware store on RT 28 and several waivers were requested by Vertex Tower Assets, LLC which were discussed and listed below;

- a. Drainage waiver- due to the use of crushed gravel and a small foundation being used for installation with the setback now 800 feet from RT 28 leaving no impact on drainage issues.
- b. Landscaping waiver- the tower will be placed on a commercial lot in the middle of a field and will be hidden by the hardware store and tree lines along RT 28.
- c. Traffic Study waiver- due to the facility being unmanned leaving no traffic issues.
- d. Wetland waiver- due to engineers certifying no wetlands in the area.

Francis D. Parisi stated Vertex Tower Assets, LLC planned to submit the information from the engineers as well as submit the bond that will be provided at the conclusion of the process.

In addition to local regulations, Mr. Parisi said federal regulations will be satisfied with a NEPA report which includes a comprehensible environmental impact report that is site-specific. The report will be provided before application completion and was not included due to it involving contact with several government agencies and the changes already occurring with the application process, Vertex Tower Assets, LLC felt it would be better to wait until approval.

Francis D. Parisi said the Regional Planning Commission went through the application in extensive detail for clarification and suggested Vertex Tower Assets, LLC request waivers for things not applicable at this time.

Mr. Parisi provided statistics showing 75% of 911 calls are now made by cell phones, people are using mobile communications as the only source of a phone now, and due to more people seeking education and employment from home, the installation of the tower would upgrade the cell signals and provide better and more reliable telecommunication service to the rural

areas of Pittsfield.

Francis D. Parisi said the site plan, as presented, meets all requirements for site plan review criteria and asked the Board members for their input.

Adam Gauthier stated the Board would go over the potential conditions of approval and course of action provided by Matt Monahan of CNHRPC in a review letter dated March 1, 2022.

Adam Gauthier read the following;

Potential Conditions of Approval:

- *The security for removal of the equipment must fully in effect before the issuance of the building permit.
- *That the applicant executes, and records at the Merrimack Registry of Deeds, an agreement that allows for the maximum allowance of co-location upon the new structure before the issuance of the building permit.
- *Professional stamps and signatures as well as owner signatures need to be on the final plan.
- *All waivers granted and conditions of approval need to be on the final plan.
- *Notice of Decision to be recorded at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds.
- *Any other conditions sought by the Board.

Potential Course of Action:

- *Applicant's presentation.
- *Planner presents concerns in this memorandum.
- *Board makes the determination of regional impact.
- *Board acts on waivers.
- *Board acts on completeness.
- *Board opens the public hearing.
- *Board closes public hearing, deliberates, and votes

Adam Gauthier asked about the Police and Fire Department using the tower since communication is difficult in some of the areas of Pittsfield. Adam Gauthier also asked about a NAS box and added that Fire Chief Pete Pszonowsky had a concern with the propane tanks being within the 125% fall zone.

Francis D. Parisi stated they would be willing to work with both departments to ensure safety when it comes to communication technologies and that there were plans to install a NAS box. Mr. Parisi said there wasn't a concern with the propane tanks because they are under building and fire codes and allowed to be 200 feet away from any property lines.

Matt St. George said he had some concerns about the plan meeting the 25-foot setback to the

zoning line and referenced the Zoning Ordinance pages 24, 30, and 69.

Matt St. George read Article 18.7 Conditional Use Permits and Site Plan Review; Criteria; Construction and Performance Standards below;

D. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITIES These requirements shall supersede any less stringent applicable standards found elsewhere in this ordinance or any Town ordinance or regulation.

1. Setbacks and Separation.

- a. Towers shall be setback at least the distance equal to 125% of the height of the tower from the
property lines of the lot on which the tower is sited.
- b. Tower, guys, and accessory facilities shall comply with the minimum zoning district setback requirements.

Matt St. George then referenced page 30 of the Zoning Ordinance in the Table of Dimensional Requirements noting that under Light Industrial/Commercial the setback is 25 feet.

Then on page 24, due to the plan being a split zone of Light Industrial/Commercial with Suburban, Matt St. George referenced and read the following;

2. District Boundary Interpretation Rules

Where the location of any district boundary as shown on the zoning-district map is uncertain, the following rules of interpretation shall apply:

- (a) Where the zoning-district map shows a district boundary as following a STREET or watercourse, the district boundary shall be construed to be the centerline of the STREET or watercourse.
- (b) Where the zoning-district map shows a district boundary as approximating a town boundary, the district boundary shall be construed to be the town boundary.
- (c) Where the zoning-district map shows a district boundary as less than 25 feet from a LOT LINE and does not show the district boundary as following a STREET or watercourse or approximating a town boundary, the district boundary shall be construed to be the LOT LINE.
- (d) Where the zoning-district map shows a district boundary as approximately parallel to a STREET, watercourse, or town boundary, the district boundary shall be construed to be parallel to the STREET, watercourse, or town boundary.
- (e) Where the zoning-district map shows a district boundary and does not dimension the

district boundary or show the district boundary according to paragraphs (a) through (c), the scale shown on the map shall determine the location of the district boundary.

Board members agreed to seek clarification on whether the setback referred to the district boundary or the property line due to the Zoning Ordinance specifications for telecommunications. Francis D. Parisi stated he respectfully disagreed with the interpretations but agreed to move forward with the site plan approval leaving this question as a condition until the town council could clarify the boundary lines being referred to in the Zoning Ordinance.

Adam Gauthier stated he had another concern after looking over the property and noticing standing water in an area. Adam Gauthier asked Francis D. Parisi if he would consider requesting a wetland scientist to certify there are no wetlands rather than submitting the wetlands waiver. Mr. Parisi agreed to the certification.

Adam Gauthier asked Francis D. Parisi if he could list the length of the driveway access on the plan. Mr. Parisi agreed to provide the information.

Adam Gauthier asked about the power and access road recorded easements. Francis D. Parisi stated there was a lease agreement between Vertex Tower Assets, LLC and the owner of the property that gives the company rights to bring in access and utilities without a recorded formal easement agreement.

Board members agreed to have the attorney take a look at the agreement since it is a 3rd part lease agreement that should be recorded as well as any other easements for other utility companies.

Adam Gauthier read the following Pittsfield Site Plan Regulation Requirements noted by CNHRPC;

1. It should be noted that the Site Plan Regulations, Section II.C.1.c defines any change of use within the use categories as a Major Site Plan. Given that the proposal is a new use on the lot it seems to be a Major Site Plan.
2. Site Plan Regulation Section IV.A.II.1 –Water bodies (wetlands) not shown and note 19 on the plans say none were observed. Was this observation made by a Certified Wetland Scientist? If not, site pictures of the site in the vicinity of the proposed tower could support note 19. This is a completeness issue.
3. Site Plan Regulation Section IV.B.7 – Property survey is not clearly addressed. The plans speak to a survey done on 6/25/21 and the plan notes indicate a “partial survey” was done. Further,

there are no dimensions shown for the property lines. Unless waived by the Board, a survey would need to be provided. This is a completeness issue.

Adam Gauthier requested the partial survey to show the dimensions of property lines. Francis D. Parisi agreed to provide the information.

Adam Gauthier then read the Zoning Ordinance Requirements:

4. Section 18.8.B.2 of the Zoning Ordinance stipulates that all applicants submit written proof that an evaluation has taken place which demonstrates that the use satisfies the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Such documentation was not found in the submittal package. The project narrative indicates that they believe that the NEPA will not be an issue but further documentation should be provided to answer whether or not it is required or if it has been granted. This is an issue for completeness.

5. Section 18.8.B.5 of the Zoning Ordinance requires that applicants for new towers shall execute an agreement that allows for the maximum allowance of co-location upon the new structure and such an agreement shall be executed and recorded as conditional approval. This should be a condition of approval.

6. A Conditional Use Permit will need to be obtained for this project to be permitted. Section 18.7 and 18.8.C will need to be reviewed by the Board to grant the permit. Elements of CUP are addressed in the Project Narrative, beginning on page five. The Board should review this portion of the narrative at the public hearing when considering the CUP. Elements in 18.8.C include:

- i. Height of proposed tower or other structure.
- ii. Proximity of the tower to residential development or zones.
- iii. Nature of uses on adjacent and nearby properties.
- iv. Surrounding topography. v. Surrounding tree coverage and foliage.
- vi. Design of the tower, with particular reference to design characteristics that have the effect of reducing or eliminating visual obtrusiveness.

- vii. Proposed ingress and egress to the site.
- viii. Availability of suitable existing towers or other structures.
- ix. Visual impacts on viewsheds, ridgelines, and other impacts by means of tower location, tree and foliage clearing and placement of incidental structures.
- x. Availability of alternative tower structures and alternative siting locations.

Adam Gauthier asked about the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) condition for approval. Francis D. Parisi stated providing a condition upon approval shouldn't be a problem based on his past experiences.

Adam Gauthier went over the DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT below;

7. In accordance with RSA 36:56, the Board shall determine if the proposal is a development of regional impact:

"A local land use board, as defined in RSA 672:7, upon receipt of an application for development, shall review it promptly and determine whether or not the development, if approved, reasonably could be construed as having the potential for regional impact." That said, the proposal does appear to have a regional impact as RSA 12-K:7 requires that all communities within 20 miles must be noticed

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion that the proposed project has development regional impact.
Ray Ramsey: Second.

Discussion: Francis D. Parisi agreed the State bylaw says the towers do have regional impact and Vertex Tower Assets, LLC has notified the towns within 20 miles and provided the details to the Board.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Adam Gauthier then moved the Board meeting to approve or deny the applicant waivers below;

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion to approve the Traffic Study waiver.

Matt St. George: Second.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion to approve no Water/Sewer Facility for this project.

Ray Ramsey: Second.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion to approve a no Landscape Plan for this project.

Ray Ramsey: Second.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion for a Partial-Survey for this project.

Ray Ramsey: Second.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion to approve a Drainage Report waiver contingent upon a no wetlands study on the scope of work.

Randy Severance: Second.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion to approve a waiver for the recording of a Mylar.

Matt St. George: Second.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion to approve the application as complete.

Ray Ramsey: Second.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Adam Gauthier called a recess at 8:44 p.m. and resumed the public hearing at 8:48 p.m. rereading the following public notice;

The Pittsfield Planning Board will hold a meeting under RSA 676:4, I, (c), (1), to determine whether a submitted application for Site Plan approval and Conditional Use Permit (if necessary) are complete according to the board's regulations. The time and place of the meeting are Thursday, March 10, 2022, at 7:00 P.M., at the Pittsfield Town Hall, 85 Main Street, Pittsfield, NH. The applicants' name and address are Vertex Tower Assets, LLC., 225 Dyer Street, Providence, RI 02903.

The proposal is a Major Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit (if necessary) to allow for the construction and operation of a Telecommunications Facility consisting of a 150' tall lattice style tower inside a 60' X 60' fenced-in compound, that will be located in the Light Ind./Commercial Zoning District (a portion of the subject property is in the Suburban Zoning District). The subject property is Tax Map R21 Lot 12, 1002 Upper City Road, owned by DEMES Investments, LLC., 49 Pilgrim Drive, Bedford, NH 03110.

The application for Site Plan Review is on file for public inspection at the Town Hall, 85 Main Street, Pittsfield, NH.

Notice of Hearing on the Merits of an Application for Site Plan Approval If the Pittsfield Planning Board determines that Vertex Tower Assets, LLC's, application for Major Site Plan approval and Conditional Use Permit (if necessary) are complete at the above-noticed meeting, then the board will hold a public hearing under RSA 676:4, I, (c), (1); RSA 676:4, I, (e); the Town of Pittsfield Site Plan Review Regulations, section III; and the Town of Pittsfield Subdivision Regulations, article 5, section 1, (d), and article 5, section 4, (a) on the merits of the application immediately after the board's completeness determination. The board will not give additional notice of a continuance of the merits hearing to a later meeting.

Adam Gauthier opened for public input at 8:50 p.m.

Robert Perkins (1010 Upper City Road): Mr. Perkins expressed several concerns with Board members about approving the tower installation with Vertex Tower Assets, LLC. as noted below;

1. The field is overflooded with water on a regular basis and needs to be checked for wetlands.
2. The tower will be less than 500 feet from Perry Brook.
3. 1010 Upper City Road is zoned as a commercial, agriculture, and residential area so there are questions about allowing a 150-foot tower in a light industrial/commercial zone.
4. The tower is going to be installed under a no-fly zone area that is extremely close to a restricted government airway.
5. The tower will be viewable from Robert Perkins' front door and back door of his residence.
6. The tower will come right up to his property line wall where he has grown vegetables for years.
7. Robert Perkins doesn't like the idea of himself, his grandchildren, and the younger kids in town working under the tower and has concerns about its safety in such close proximity.
8. Robert Perkins stated there were already 2 towers in Pittsfield, (Nuts Hill and Catamount) so questioned the need for an additional tower.
9. Robert Perkins believes the tower installation will bring his property value down if he ever decides to sell and feels that someone should be responsible for paying the difference when that happens.

Robert Perkins thanked the Board members for allowing him to speak and requested Board members to consider them before a final decision is made on the tower.

Matt St. George addressed one of Robert Perkins' concerns stating the citizens in Pittsfield voted in the past to allow 150-foot towers in the light industrial/commercial zones per the Zoning Ordinance.

Randy Severance stated a contingency is in place for a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) report which will include a comprehensible environmental study for environmental impact on the area before the waiver is approved.

Adam Gauthier stated Article 18.1 on page 66 of the Zoning Ordinance vaguely touches on the restricted flight concern and read the following;

Article 18. Telecommunications Equipment and Facilities

18.1 Findings and Intent

D. The purposes of this article are as follows:

2. To reduce adverse impacts such facilities may create, including, but not limited to, impacts on aesthetics, environmentally sensitive areas, historically significant locations, flight corridors, health and safety by injurious accidents to person and property, and prosperity through protection of property values.

Adam Gauthier pointed out one of the biggest events in Pittsfield is the Hot Air Balloon Rally which occurs only one week a year, but there was a concern about the flight track. Adam Gauthier stated there are around 16-20 hot air balloons that attend the rally and approximately 90% of the balloons land in the area along Upper City Road. During the rest of the year, there are 2-3 local balloons that fly regularly and will sometimes launch from Upper City Road as well so the flight corridor would be greatly affected.

Francis D. Parisi stated they have produced a multi-stage report researching flight navigation databases and the analysis was no impact on air flight navigation. With the tower being only 150 feet from the ground, Mr. Parisi didn't see an issue with the balloons flying overhead but had never had to deal with the consideration of hot air balloon flight paths in the past.

Francis D. Parisi said they are limited with where they can go for the telecommunications towers due to topography, terrain, zoning districts, curb cuts, and where the telecommunications signal is required to be. Mr. Parisi stated the tower does meet the zoning laws.

Adam Gauthier said a hot air balloon has a right, just like an airplane, to land anywhere when needed without permission and when studying the flight paths of air balloons from past rallies, the spot where the tower will be placed is one of the most used landing spots. Adam Gauthier stated there are other areas in Pittsfield that could be used instead and that all acceptable locations should be looked into.

Ed Trzcinski agreed with Adam Gauthier that 90% of hot air balloons land in the area where the tower will be installed and questioned why Vertex Tower Assets, LLC didn't consider the balloon rally recorded flight patterns in their study.

Matt St. George said he felt the tower would take up other spaces, which in some cases would require the removal of trees, and in turn, would affect a new area. Matt St. George agreed it was a concern but the balloons also needed a license to fly and asked Mr. Parisi if there were shorter towers that could be installed.

Francis D. Parisi stated the towers are multi-tenant where antennas are separated along the tower height. If the tower is shorter, they run into needing additional tower installations and a taller tower of 190-200 feet is the threshold where they run into FAA issues. The 150 feet is the minimum necessary for a multi telecommunications installation.

Betsy Cadbury (1310 Upper City Road) wanted to know if the tower made any noise or sound.

Francis D. Parisi stated the towers weren't designed to make noise and the electronics at the base of the towers are getting smaller and smaller. Mr. Parisi said if any noise were to be detected, they would be able to tighten it up.

Ed Trzcinski asked if there would be light or illumination from the tower.

Francis D. Parisi answered no.

Adam Gauthier asked if Mr. Parisi could explain the details of radiofrequency and the maximum allowances or impact.

Francis D. Parisi stated the towers are considered a low power facility at just 100 watts that are designed to signal over a 1-2 miles radius for two-way communication. By comparison, a radio broadcast out of Boston would be 50,000 watts because it is trying to broadcast the signal as far as possible. Mr. Parisi said frequency and power output are heavily regulated by the FCC and are routinely found to broadcast out less than the 1% FCC limits.

Francis D. Parisi said that if there were taller buildings around Pittsfield, they would have tried to connect to a building with an antenna. Mr. Parisi said that he currently attends a church where an antenna was attached to the steeple with a playground underneath and his children currently attend a high school that shares a parking lot with the fire station in town where a tower is located and the school children park under the tower with no issues. Mr. Parisi stated some of the other projects he has worked on involved installing antennas in public housing and VA hospitals with no issues and that the FCC's research found on the government website has more information on how safe and low-powered these antennas are.

Betsy Cadbury (1310 Upper City Road) stated that she has sold real estate for years and has experienced trying to get a client to purchase a house by a power line. Most people do not want to buy a house that has an enormous tower in view and, whether rational or not, express concerns about noise, radioactivity, or having their children around the area. Betsy Cadbury said Mr. Perkins is correct in that the tower will significantly devalue his property.

Adam Gauthier asked if there were any more concerns before closing public input at 9:19 p.m.

Adam Gauthier asked Mr. Parisi if he would be open to a balloon test where a balloon is floated at the height of the proposed tower to check visibility.

Francis D. Parisi said the tower would be visible along RT 28 and although he is willing to do a balloon test, he doesn't know if it would be beneficial.

Adam Gauthier asked if Mr. Parisi would be open to painting the tower a neutral color instead of the galvanized steel.

Francis D. Parisi stated the galvanized steel used is designed to be non-reflective and although he would be open to painting the tower, maintenance could become an issue with flaking paint. Mr. Parisi said that he has never had a request to paint a tower and felt putting paint on the tower would only draw more attention to it. Mr. Parisi stated he has used the utility towers that look like a tree in the past and in his opinion, they look out of place and worse than the steel towers.

Ed Trzcinski noted there wasn't a generator on the plan and asked if one would be permanently installed and how large it would be.

Francis D. Parisi said Vertex Tower Assets, LLC owns the tower and will lease it out to utility companies who might install a generator for backup power. In most cases, backup batteries will last for 12-24 hours before a generator needs to kick on. Mr. Parisi said he isn't sure when or who will install a generator but the utility company would be responsible for pulling a building permit for installation.

Board members were in agreement that the utility company will need to request a building permit and that it should be noted in the conditions of the application. Board members went into deliberation and discussed many of the concerns with the application and agreed to table the discussion until they could seek council on some of their questions.

Matt St. George: I make a motion to table the decision and continue the meeting to April 14, 2022, pending council review of Board member questions.

Adam Gauthier: Second.

Discussion: Matt St. George noted that when the Board members receive answers to their questions from council, they will notify Francis D. Parisi.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey – yes, Randy Severance – yes, Jim Adams – yes.

Board members thanked the applicants and abutters for coming in.

ITEM 7.- REVIEW MEETING DATES FOR THE REMAINDER OF 2022-APRIL 2023

Adam Gauthier: I make a motion to approve the Planning Board meeting dates and application deadline dates for the remainder of 2022-April 2023.

Ray Ramsey: Second.

Discussion: None.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Ed Trzcinski – yes.

ITEM 8. – MEMBERS' CONCERNS

Randy Severance wanted clarification on visiting ongoing application sites. Board members agreed that they were allowed to visit sites as long as they are not representing the Board or themselves as a Board member, and do not speak to applicants about the merits of an application. Board members also discussed visiting application sites as a group in a working capacity and agreed to look into the laws to make sure they are being followed.

Board members also briefly discussed past applicants meeting the conditions set forth by the Board and agreed to send a letter as a reminder.

Randy Severance: I motion for the Planning Board to send a signed reminder letter to Over the Moon Meadery requesting updated site plans with all conditions met in order to be legally open or move forward with other plans.

Ed Trzcinski: Second.

Discussion: None.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Ed Trzcinski – yes.

ITEM 9. – ADJOURNMENT

Matt St. George: I make a motion to adjourn at 10:24 p.m.

Ray Ramsey: Second.

Discussion: None.

Motion carried 5-0-0. Adam Gauthier – yes, Matt St. George – yes, Ray Ramsey– yes, Randy Severance – yes, Ed Trzcinski – yes.

Approved.


Adam Gauthier, Chair

4.28.22
Date