

ALSTEAD PLANNING BOARD MEETING
POB 60, Alstead, New Hampshire 03602
Phone/Fax 603-835-2986

MEETING MINUTES
June 27, 2022

Note: These minutes are furnished for public inspection in accordance with RSA 91-A:2 and are unapproved until offered for disposition by the Board at a regular meeting. **Subject to approval.**

PB Members Peter Rhoades/Chairman, David Konesko, Gordon Kemp and Justin Falango.

At 7:15pm P. Rhoades/Chairman opened the CKB Properties, LLC/Beam Site Plan Review Hearing #1/2022. The property is located on 59 Library Avenue, Alstead, Tax Map 12 Lot #24. Members present reviewed the Application. A Motion (Kemp/Falango) was made to accept the Application as complete. Motion passed.

The Hearing was opened. Katie Beam/owner and Randy Rhoades/M&W Soils Engineering, Inc were present. It was noted that the ZBA granted a Special Exception for up to 150 storage units. Beam explained that she was only seeking approval for 50 units at this point in time to see how rentals would go. R. Rhoades provided a brief overview of this proposal, stating that there would be a crushed gravel driving surface, the area would be graded higher than the surrounding property, that there would be a security fence, 4 parking spaces, and retention pits built up from the 10-year flood expectancy level. R. Rhoades also explained that test pits had been conducted.

R. Rhoades continued, stating that there would potentially be a Phase II and III if rentals went well; and with the 50 units being proposed, it was projected that an increase in travel trips per day on Library Avenue would increase by 3-4 cars per day (as compared to the estimated 10 travel trips per day per the average house).

R. Rhoades stated that there would be no sewer to the site, but an electric source would be onsite to provide for the proposed down lighting (no pole mounted lights were being proposed). R. Rhoades explained that the lights would face each other and be mounted on the buildings. He explained that the rental storage units would be in a gated area, accessible by a keypad. He stated this was a low-impact use of the property.

Beam added that she was seeking access to the units 7 days a week, with the hours of 6am-10pm, which are the result of a feasibility study conducted. Beam inquired if the Board wanted to weigh in on color choices of the storage units. They did not.

P. Rhoades/Chairman began the review of Section V Submission Requirements of the Site Plan Review Regulations. (Two Plans had been submitted with the Application – one from DiBernardo Associates/Surveyor; the other from M&W Soils Engineering, Inc.).

Under A. Existing Data and Information -

6) *The shape, height, size and location of existing structures located on the site and within 200' of the site, also the location of wells and of sewage disposal systems within 200' of the site — the location of off-site buildings and septic systems was waived;*

9) *The size and location of all existing public facilities and all existing landscaping. This shall include the location and size of existent utilities within 100' of site, and any off-site utilities with which a connection is planned -* Member Konesko noticed symbols for 2 septic tanks that were not noted in the Legend – it was determined that was not relevant to this Site Plan Review.

Under B. Proposed Development -

- 5) *The location, type and size of all proposed landscaping and screening including fences and walls* - there was a fence shown, and it was noted that the natural buffer will stay, and if additional wood chips are removed from the property they will be added to the natural berm;
- 10) *Provisions for control of erosion and sedimentation for both permanent and temporary (during construction)* - the storage units are being built in bowl-shaped area, and will only be affected during construction. Rhoades stated they plan to use best management practices, and a water truck may be needed during construction to keep dust down;
- 12) *The phasing of project construction, if staged* – if they decide to add more than these 50 units, they understand that they need to go through the Site Plan Review process again;
- 13) *Provisions for fire safety, provisions and control* – The Fire Department will need access to the property (there will be a Knox box system in place);
- 14) *Storm water drainage plan showing: a), b), c), d)* – all shown on DiBernardo survey plans.

In Section VI Performance Bonds - it was determined that none were needed.

In Section VII Inspection, Approval and Acceptance of Improvements, Installations or Facilities - it was determined that the Select Board, or their designee, would determine that to be complete. *P. Rhoades asked that Beam notify the Planning Board when the work is complete, and that the Zoning Officer, or whomever is appointed, will inspect for compliance with the approved Plan. P. Rhoades stated that it is the Town's policy/practice that as long as a Plan has a stamped engineer label, it is assumed to be okay. Konesko stated that the Zoning Officer or the Planning Board should do a site visit/walk.

At 8pm, a Motion (Kemp/Falango) was made to close the Public Hearing; the Deliberations were opened. Kemp pointed out that no Abutters or interested parties were present – reflecting that it appears they no longer have any significant concerns. Kemp asked if any major changes have occurred since the ZBA approval – R. Rhoades stated only the proposal to initially install less units. P. Rhoades wanted to discuss the hours of operation. R. Rhoades stated the more hours the storage units are open, the less traffic impact will occur. P. Rhoades commented that the proposed hours mirror the residential traffic patterns in the area. It was noted that there is no Certificate of Compliance with the Site Plan Review process (as noted in Section VII) – but that *a site visit will be conducted.

Conditions were discussed:

#1 The hours of operation will be 6am-10pm, 7 days a week (Motion made (Kemp/Falango) and passed);

#2 Only wall mounted down lighting will be used and the structure will only be one story (Motion made (Falango/Konesko) and passed);

#3 Any future cameras shall be inwardly focused and not be able to see any abutting properties (Motion made (Falango/Kemp) and passed).

At 8:12pm a Motion (Kemp/Falango) was made to close the Deliberations. Motion passed. A Motion (Falango/Kemp) was made to accept the Site Plan Review Application with the 3 aforementioned conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

A Motion (Kemp/Falango) was made to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 8:30pm. **REMINDER – there is no meeting in July (7/11/22) due to there being no quorum. There is no new business known at this time. **

Melanie Marsden/Administrative Assistant