

City of Rochester Planning Board
Monday, September 11, 2023
City Hall Council Chambers
31 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH 03867
(These minutes were approved on October 2, 2023)

Members Present

Mark Collopy, *Chair*
Alan Dews
Matthew Richardson
Dave Walker
Peter Bruckner
Don Hamann
Keith Fitts

Members Absent

Robert May, *Vice Chair, excused*
James Hayden, *excused*
Rick Healey, *excused*

Alternate Members Present

Alexander de Geofroy
Michael McQuade

Staff: Shanna B. Saunders, *Director of Planning & Development*

(These are the legal minutes of the meeting and are in the format of an overview of the meeting. A recording of the meeting will be on file in the City Clerk's office for reference purposes. They may be copied for a fee.)

I. Call to Order

Chair, Mark Collopy, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Planning Department Director, Shanna B. Saunders, conducted roll call.

III. Seating of Alternates

Mr. Collopy asked Mr. McQuade to vote in place of Mr. Hayden.

IV. Communications from the Chair

Mr. Collopy asked for a moment of silence in observance of September 11, 2001.

V. Approval of Minutes for

A. August 21, 2023

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to approve August 21, 2023, meeting minutes and seconded by Mr. Bruckner. The motion carried unanimously.

VI. Opening Discussion/Comments

A. Public Comment

Ray Wayman, 55 Ida Circle, expressed his appreciation to Ms. Saunders, the Mayor, and all others involved for their assistance in their parts to remedy concerns with developer and contractors for the Ida Circle development. Mr. Wayman stated that there are additional concerns for the development and requests a meeting with the Planning Department and the Department of Public Works to get answers to residents' questions.

Ms. Saunders stated that a meeting request was received by the City Mayor for the meeting that Mr. Wayman is requesting and that the meeting will be scheduled and take place soon.

B. Discussion of general planning issues

There were no general planning issues to discuss.

VII. New Applications

A. Robert Erickson and Robert Fickett, 40 & 50 Evans Road (by Prospect Mountain Survey) Lot Line Revision between 40 & 50 Evans Road. Case# 235 – 60&61 – A – 23 **Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION***

Robert Erickson, 40 Evans Road, presented the proposed Lot-Line Revision between 40 and 50 Evans Road. Mr. Erickson stated that the purpose is to preserve wetlands.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments from the public.

Ms. Saunders explained the proposed Lot-Line Revision and stated the requested Plan Modifications and Conditions recommended by staff. Ms. Saunders stated that staff recommends the project be accepted as complete and approved by the Planning Board.

Mr. Walker asked for further verification on the reshaping of the lots. Ms. Saunders stated that the application was not to combine lots, but rather to move the lot line between the lots to change the shape of each lot.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to approve the project with the conditions as stated and seconded by Mr. Richardson. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Mann Family Trust/Stuart & Kathi Mann, 149 & 153 Rochester Hill Road (by Norway Plains/Randy Tetreault) Lot-Line Revision between 149 & 153 Rochester Hill Road. Cas# 243 – 63&64 – OC – 23

Mr. Glenn Griswold, Norway Plains, presented the Lot-Line Revision application. Mr. Griswold stated that both lots are owned by the Mann Family Trust and that the plan calls for a change to make one of the lots smaller.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments from the public.

Ms. Saunders stated that there are no plan modifications requested for this project. Ms. Saunders stated that the recommended Condition for Lot Monumentation will be added to the Precedent Conditions on the Notice of Decision. Ms. Saunders stated that the staff recommended the application to be accepted as complete and approved by the Planning Board.

Mr. Dews asked if the shed on the lot would be removed. Mr. Griswold stated that that structure is not a shed, but a canvas structure and can be moved easily.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to approve the project with the conditions as stated and seconded by Mr. Hamann. The motion carried unanimously.

C. R. Bruce Wotton, 83 Eastern Avenue (by Norway Plains/Joel Runnals) 2-Lot Subdivision. Case# 117 – 49 – R2 – 23 **Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION***

Mr. Glenn Griswold, Norway Plains, presented the Lot-Line Revision application. Mr. Griswold stated that the purpose of the Lot-Line Revision is to create a single-family lot and that existing water and sewer is available. Mr. Griswold stated that wetlands setbacks are not affected due to the small lot size.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments from the public.

Ms. Saunders listed the recommended conditions of approval, including the requirement for any new development to be connected to city water and sewer because the lot falls within connection requirements. Ms. Saunders stated that the wetland behind the lot is small and would not have a buffer, but that the wetland itself should be marked with tags to signify the property is a wetland for the property owner to prevent more cutting of the wetlands.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to approve the project with the conditions as stated and seconded by Mr. Hamann. The motion carried unanimously.

D. CEM3 Holdings II, LLC/Doug Morton, 146 Old Dover Road (by Berry Surveying & Engineering/Chris Berry & Kenneth Berry) Preliminary Design Review for 11-Lot Subdivision, roadway, and Open Space. Case# 140 – 72 – R1 – 23 **Public Hearing Only**

Mr. Chris Berry, Berry Surveying and Engineering, presented the Preliminary Design Review for an 11-Lot Subdivision with an open space. Mr. Berry explained that the property has been reviewed by the Planning Board before for a previous subdivision. Mr. Berry stated that the development would consist of 10 residential lots and an open space area, as well as new road construction. Mr. Berry stated that city water and sewer is not available on this lot, so lots will have their own wells and septic systems. Mr. Berry stated that the lot has been investigated for traffic and visibility concerns and road has been proposed to include requirements stated by the Rochester Police Department. Mr. Berry explained the proposed drainage plan for the new development. Mr. Berry stated that a

trail is proposed as an amenity for the development as amenities were requested by the Planning Department.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Michael Case, 4 Rockledge Road, stated that she was not an abutter, but is close to the proposed development. Ms. Case asked for the size of the proposed lots, what covenants will be in place, and what structures will be built on the lots.

Mr. Kenneth Lehman, 28 Quarry Drive, stated his concern with the size of the lots, as well as the proposed septic and well systems. Mr. Lehman listed proposed lots that he felt had the proposed well and septic too close to each other. Mr. Lehman stated his concern for the newly proposed septic to leach into the current wetlands nearby.

Ms. Saunders stated that there is no vote required of the Planning Board due to the application being a Preliminary Design Review.

Mr. Berry stated that the lots are a larger than the City's required 10,000 sqft. Mr. Berry stated that the homes that are proposed to be built on the lots range between 1,500 sqft and 2,000 sqft.

Mr. Collopy asked what the rough acreage was for each lot. Mr. Berry responded that the space is around $\frac{1}{4}$ of an acre.

Mr. Berry explained that the well and septic separation must be kept at 75 feet per the Effluent Disposable Area requirement and the plans meet the space requirement. Mr. Berry also stated that the well and septic plans would be reviewed and require approval by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES). Mr. Berry stated that septic systems are required to be 50 feet from wetlands areas and that future plans would include meeting this requirement.

Mr. Dews asked why there is no sidewalk proposed. Mr. Berry responded that there is no sidewalk on Lowell Street or within any of the abutting neighbors and the development is located within the sidewalk zone.

Mr. Dews asked is the new road would be designed as a city road. Mr. Berry stated that the road would be designed as a city road.

E. [Tuck Realty Corporation/EWST, LLC, 0 Autumn Street](#) (by Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc./Ian MacKinnon) 23-Lot Major Subdivision Case# 104 – 10 – R1 – 22 **Public Hearing/ ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION***

Mr. Ian MacKinnon of Jones and Beach Engineers presented the Major Subdivision application. Mr. MacKinnon stated that Mike Garrepy, the Project Manager for the applicant is also present to explain and answer questions. Mr. MacKinnon explained that the road development will have 2 access/exit points and contain a 5-foot sidewalk throughout. Mr. MacKinnon explained how the lots will receive city water and sewer. Mr. MacKinnon stated that the development will require an upgrade to the size of the watermain provided by the developer. Mr. MacKinnon explained the landscape plan of the proposed development. Mr. MacKinnon explained that the driveway for lot 9 would need to be re-designed. Mr. MacKinnon explained wetlands and drainage plans, as well as approvals that have been received and application applied for through NH Department of Environmental Services. Mr. MacKinnon explained the Conditional Use Permit application applied for and the Waiver Requests that have been submitted to the Planning Board for review.

Mr. Collopy asked for further explanation on the Conditional Use Permits and Waiver Request. Mr. McKinnon explained the Conditional Use Permit that was presented and supported by the Conservation Commission. Mr. McKinnon explained the Waiver Requests including one for the sidewalk planter strip, 2 waivers regarding the Stormwater Chapter 218 regulations: the first for the groundwater recharge requirement and the second for pipe velocities. Mr. McKinnon explained why the proposed plans would require the requested waivers. Mr. McKinnon explained the third-party reviews that have been conducted and those that are to come in the near future.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Fred Leonard, 10 Sandina Drive, stated his concerns with the plans not being listed on the City's website for public to review. Mr. Leonard requested for the project to be postponed for review by the Planning Board, due to files not being made public. Mr. Leonard stated that he has many concerns with the project as an abutter but wishes to see the plans and corresponding information. Mr. Leonard stated his concerns for water build up and flooding on his property caused by the development. Mr. Leonard stated his concerns with the access to the development regarding car and foot traffic. Mr. Leonard stated his concerns on a previous plan to have sewage storage tanks placed in the new development. Mr. Leonard requested that Sandina drive be added to the sewage pump, rather than the current storage tanks that are placed, if a sewage pump is in the proposed plan of the new development. Mr. Leonard stated his concerned with the number of homes on the property.

Ms. Saunders stated that she was unsure about the plans being removed from the City Website but will investigate the concern.

Ms. Saunders reviewed the Staff Recommendation and explained the recommended conditions of approval. Ms. Saunders stated that the project has been reviewed by a third-party sewer capacity, water capacity, and stormwater engineer company. The Planning Department has received the Water and Sewer Capacity reviews but is still waiting for the Stormwater Review. Ms. Saunders stated that there is a listed condition to include future recommendations listed in the Stormwater review, once received. Ms. Saunders explained the request for applicants who request stormwater waivers, stating that staff requires that engineers go above and beyond in drainage reports in an effort to show they have prevented impacts to surrounding areas and residents. Ms. Saunders stated that the applicant has received support by the Conservation Commission for their Conditional Use Permit. Ms. Saunders read the recommended precedent and subsequent Conditions of Approval for the proposed project.

Mr. Collopy asked for clarification and regarding the Condition of Approval for a Homeowner's Association to take over drainage maintenance and how maintenance is funded. Ms. Saunders responded that funding was not required, but that the Homeowner's Association is required to be formed for the express purpose of maintaining the ponds and other drainage aspects of the development and that yearly reports must be sent to the Department of Public Works to monitor maintenance.

Mr. Walker asked for clarification regarding the traffic flow and barriers of the development. Ms. Saunders explained that traffic is expected to use the new roadway and not Sandina Drive. Ms. Saunders stated that a connecting passage between the development on Sandina Drive and the proposed development is recommending for neighbors to visit without having to use Autumn Street.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to accept the application as complete and seconded by Mr. Hamann. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Saunders reviewed the Conditional Use Permit.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to accept both Conditional Use Permits requested by the applicant and seconded by Mr. Hamann.

Mr. Dews asked for further clarification on each of the Conditional Use Permits. Ms. Saunders responded that the Conditional Use Permit for the Conservation Subdivision requires that the applicant provide yield plan to show how many lots can fit on the property and that the applicant is not able to exceed the lots, but that the lots can be made smaller and closer together to allow for more open space.

The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Saunders reviewed the three Stormwater Waiver Requests: one for Post-Development Volume, one for Groundwater recharge, and one for minimum pipe velocity. Ms. Saunders also reviewed the Waiver Request for the sidewalk planter strip.

Mr. Dews asked why the sidewalks do not come out on either side at the road to ease future sidewalk connection. Mr. McKinnon stated that the applicant limited the sidewalk within the property that is controlled by the development. Mr. McKinnon explained concerns for pedestrian traffic encouragement to an unsafe area. Mr. Dews stated that he felt that a landing at the end of the sidewalk would provide a space for students to stand while waiting for bus pickup. Mr. McKinnon stated that the development on Sandina Drive has a similar setup of sidewalks as the proposed development.

Mr. Dews asked if there was a reason for wires to be brought over and across Autumn Street, rather than buried underground. Mr. McKinnon stated that the plan calls for the line to be brought over and across Autumn Street, then buried when brought through the development. Mr. Dews asked if possibility of wires being brought under Autumn Street has been investigated by the applicant. Mr. McKinnon stated that underground wires would require a greater impact to Autumn Drive.

Mr. McQuade asked how many Public Hearings have been opened for this project. Mr. Saunders stated that this is the first time that the project has been brought before the Planning Board.

Mr. McKinnon responded to concerns stated by Mr. Leonard. Mr. McKinnon explained the drainage plan for the proposed development regarding the brook, drainage swales, and collection ponds. Mr. McKinnon explained that the previous plan called for a sewer pump station, but the current proposed plan calls for individual pump systems and homeowners will be responsible for their individual sewer pump. Mr. McKinnon stated that the proposed open space size exceeds requirements.

Mr. Collopy asked if there were plans for home designs. Mr. McKinnon stated that the homes will have smaller footprints on the lots and that there is a standard house layout for utilities.

Mr. Collopy stated his concerns about buyer retention systems in place for this development due to drainage and flooding concerns.

Mr. Dews asked if there was a storage plan for power-outage emergencies for the personal sewer pump stations and if other products for blackouts have been reviewed by the developer. Mr. McKinnon responded that there are other similar products, but they differ in size. Mr. McKinnon stated the concerns of the developer were to regulate the rate of the sewer pumps burning out in the event of a blackout.

Mr. Dews stated his concerns of administering a waiver request before receiving the Third-Party Stormwater Review. Ms. Saunders stated that the review has not yet been received and that, given the concern of the plans not being posted publicly, though not a requirement, public plans hold a benefit. Ms. Saunders stated that if the Planning Board continued the application to the next

meeting, that the Stormwater review will be received by the meeting. Mr. Dews stated his support in postponing until the review is received due to increasing stormwater issues.

Mr. McKinnon stated that the Stormwater review is being performed to create a flood map and study and that the Salmon Falls River has been surveyed and shown to not have reached peak rates. Mr. McKinnon stated that based on the cubic feet per second of waterflow per event, the developer is 0.01% of the flow entering the river. Mr. McKinnon continued to explain the proposed development's expected water contribution to the river by the developer's engineer's report.

A motion was made by Mr. Dews to continue the application to the October 2, 2023 Planning Board Meeting to give time for the receipt of the Third-Party Stormwater Review and seconded by Mr. Bruckner. The motion carried unanimously.

F. New England Gaming and Consulting LLC, 7 Milton Road (by Altus Engineering/Norway Plains/DMAC Architecture) Site Plan to construct Charitable Gaming Facility Case# 222 – 94 – HC – 23 **Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION***

Mr. John Bosen, Attorney for New England Gaming and Consulting, LLC, introduced other representatives, engineers, and architects of the proposed project, including Greg Carlin, Principal of New England Gaming Consulting, Mr. Dwayne MacEwen of DMAC Architecture, Mr. Eric Saari of Altus Engineering, and Ms. Vicky Martel of Woodburn & Company Landscape Architecture. Mr. Bosen explained Mr. Carlin's experience regarding operating Charitable Gaming Facilities. Mr. Bosen shared information on statistical benefits of the proposed project. Mr. Bosen thanked City of Rochester staff for their efforts in reviewing the plans for the proposed facility.

Mr. Eric Saari, Altus Engineering, introduced himself and gave an overview of the project. Mr. Saari explained the current status and concerns of the location of the proposed facility. Mr. Saari explained the plans and proposed upgrades regarding the renovation of the parking lot and pedestrian areas to the proposed facility. Mr. Saari explained the placement of landscape and lighting within the proposed parking lot, as well as plans for traffic flows.

Ms. Vicky Martel, Woodburn & Company Landscape Architecture, gave an overview of the Landscape Plan of the proposed project in the parking lots and entryway.

Mr. Dwayne MacEwen, DMAC Architecture gave an overview of the interior plan of the proposed project. Mr. MacEwen explained current design concerns and the upgrades of the external and interior designs. Mr. MacEwen explained interior layout plans.

Mr. Bosen stated that he felt that the project would bring great benefit to the City of Rochester and welcomed questions and comments from the public and the Planning Board members.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Comment.

Mr. Derek Peters, President of Roger Allen Park Association, stated his support of the Charitable Gaming Facility and gave statistical information regarding the number of people that use the Roger Allen Park and how much maintenance and activities costs for the property. Mr. Peters gave an overview of planning upgrades with the park and again stated his support of the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility.

Mr. Danny Woodman, President of the Farmington 500 Organization, gave an overview of his organization and offered his personal history of the City of Rochester. Mr. Woodman stated his

support in the construction of the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility to help organizations that are within and support the City of Rochester.

Mr. Jerry Rainville, Chairman of the Sharefund, gave an overview of what the Sharefund does and stated his support of the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility and their support of Non-Profit organizations, such as the Sharefund.

Ms. Lisa Gibson, representative of the Rochester Opera House and RPAC (Rochester Performing Arts Center), stated her duties of fundraising in the City of Rochester and offered her personal history and experiences. Ms. Gibson stated her support for the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility.

Mr. Bill LeDuc, current and long-time resident of Rochester and Board Member of Rochester Youth Hockey, stated his support for the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility and the funds that will be contributed from the facility to benefit Rochester Organizations, such as youth sports.

Mr. Scott Marrow, Executive Director of Pope Memorial Humane Society, gave an overview of the statistical data of the Pope Memorial Humane Society and stated his support for the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility and the funds that are derived from these types of organizations to help non-profits organizations, such as the Pope Memorial Humane Society.

Ms. Pat Rainboth, Executive Director of Victims, Inc., gave a history of Victims, Inc. and what services and assistance they provide. Ms. Rainboth gave examples of cases that they have been apart of. Ms. Rainboth explained that the funds from the Bingo Hall will continue to help and support Victims, Inc. and stated her support of the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility.

Chris Dooley, 10 Davis Blvd, Vice President of Rochester Boys Youth Basketball Association, expressed his support for the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility and the funds that will be contributed from the facility to benefit Rochester Organizations, such as youth sports. Mr. Dooley explained the importance of youth sports and that there is a steady decrease in players due to financial strain to families.

Mr. Peter Bloomfield, representing several Non-Profit Organizations, explained the benefits of Charitable Gaming Facilities and their funds shared with Non-Profit Organizations. Mr. Bloomfield stated his support the construction of the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility.

Ms. Stacy Corris, Board member of the Home for Now Homeless Shelter, recommended that Rochester-based organizations charities have the benefit of 10 days of funds from the Charitable Gaming Facility. Ms. Corris is in support of the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility.

Ms. Saunders stated that there were multiple letters received from businesses and organizations in support of the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility including Cornerstone VNA, The Lions Club International, a representative of Nursing Home in the area, Epping American Legion Post 51, and Vouchers for Veterans.

Ms. Saunders also listed the individual senders of letters in support of the Charitable Gaming Facility including Joyce Pagnotta, P. Sukduang, Jason Taylor, Suzanne Langlais, Natasha Galarneau, and Wanda Pelkey.

Mr. MacEwen showed a short video clip to the Planning Board as a visual representation of the exterior plans to the proposed facility.

Mr. Collopy thanked all of the presenters and public members that represented their organizations in support of the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility.

Ms. Saunders reviewed the staff report by the Planning Department. Ms. Saunders stated that a waiver request has been submitted for Chapter 218, but that the project does not fall under the jurisdiction of requiring the waiver, so there will be no vote on the waiver request. Ms. Saunders reviewed the required Plan Modifications and Conditions of Approval for the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility. Ms. Saunders explained the recommended traffic upgrades recommended by the Third-Party Traffic Engineer. Ms. Saunders explained that at least 50% of the interior and exterior work must be started within 24 months and completed within 5 years in order for the project to be vested in perpetuity. Ms. Saunders explained that future Public Art will be reviewed by the Planning Board. Ms. Saunders stated that staff recommend the application to be accepted as complete and approved by the Planning Board.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to accept the application as complete and seconded by Mr. Hamann. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Dews asked for clarification on what part of the mall will be occupied by the Charitable Gaming facility. Mr. Greg Carlin explained that the applicant is leasing a portion of the building, but an affiliate of the applicant owns the mall.

Mr. Dews stated his support of the new façade and asked if the visual would be continued throughout the building. Mr. Carlin stated that there would be exterior improvements made to make the front of the building look consistent.

Mr. Collopy asked for clarification on the first, smaller entrance into the Lilac Mall. Mr. Saari explained the upgrades that are proposed, such as a stop sign and stop bar. Mr. Saari stated that there are possible future changes to that area with more development. Mr. Saari stated that long-term plans called for the movement of the dumpster enclosure.

Mr. Collopy stated his concerns with the current sidewalks in the area and recommended the continuance of sidewalks from the railroad tracks to the facility. Mr. Saari stated that the concern may affect the current stormwater drainage, and that the sidewalks will be investigated, but may be outside the scope of this current project.

Mr. Collopy asked if the Arts & Culture Commission has been involved with the plans for Public Art. Mr. Carlin stated that the Arts & Culture Commission has been involved and that they will be further engaged as the project requires placement of Public Art.

Mr. Collopy asked for further explanation of the signage for the facility and lumens that are shown. Mr. Saari explained that the existing sign will stay, but parts will be replaced.

Mr. Collopy stated his concern that there is no gate at the railroad crossing. Mr. Saari stated that a barrier is not within the scope of the project and that the railroad company would be responsible for the installation of a gate at the location.

Mr. Dews asked for the hours of operation of the facility. Mr. Carlin stated that the hours have not been finalized.

Mr. Dews expressed his concerns for the emptying of the parking lot at later hours.

Mr. de Geofroy asked for elaboration on items that are not being addressed in the traffic study. Ms. Saunders explained that the remainder of the conditions that came back, were regarding the roadway and the Chestnut Hill Road and Wakefield intersection. Ms. Saunders stated that there was not a good delineation of how the traffic would be impacted at that intersection. Ms. Saunders reviewed the cost of the road upgrades and stated that there are future planned upgrades for the lot and that it was not correct to burden the applicant with the extreme upgrade expenditure. Ms.

Saunders stated that the Department of Public Works have already been looking to upgrade the signals in the area. Ms. Saunders stated that the full traffic report can be provided. Mr. de Geofroy asked for a copy of the full report.

Mr. de Geofroy asked about the requirement of electric vehicle parking stations required for this project. Ms. Saunders stated that the developer is over-supplying the requirement at 4 EV charging stations. Ms. Saunders reported the total of parking spaces with the numbers of EV charging stations. Mr. Saari stated that there should be one additional EV space, which will be added to the plans.

Mr. Hamann stated that there is a dedicated space for police for any issues that may arise. Mr. Carlin stated that the plan shows the space available in the back-of-house office area.

Mr. Collopy asked for clarification of security for the proposed facility. Mr. Carlin stated that there will be on-site security and surveillance indoors and into the parking lot. Mr. Carlin also stated that there will be AED emergency devices throughout the facility. Ms. Saunders explained that the applicant was required to submit a security plan, the applicant has submitted, and the plan has been reviewed and approved by the Police and Fire Departments.

Mr. de Geofroy asked if Seacoast Gymnastics would be staying at the Lilac Mall and how access will be for the gymnastics studio. Mr. Saari explained that the studio will still be entered from the rear of the building and that the Charitable Gaming Facility and its patrons will not have access to the studio from any other entrances.

Mr. de Geofroy verified that there will be future plans of lighting at the rear of the facility. Ms. Saunders answered yes. Mr. Saari stated that there is lighting now, but fixtures are broken and will be prepared.

A motion was made by Mr. Dews to approve the proposed Charitable Gaming Facility with all conditions stated and added by Planning Board discussion and seconded by Mr. Hamann. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Sig Sauer, 7 Amarosa Drive (by Allen & Major Assoc./Brian Jones) Phase II Site plan to add multiple building additions, update utility connections, enhance stormwater design & treatment, and tie into the municipal sewer system for the existing Sig Sauer facility
Public Hearing Only

Ms. Saunders explained that the purpose of the meeting is to only allow for Public Hearing and Planning Board discussion, there will not be a vote for the facility at this time due to third party review. Ms. Saunders stated that continuance to 9/18/2023 Planning Board Workshop Session is recommended.

Mr. Brian Jones, Allen & Major Associates, Inc., gave an overview of the proposed Phase II of Sig Sauer upgrades and construction. Mr. Jones briefly explained the Phase I submittal and plans that were approved by the Planning Board. Mr. Jones stated that the Phase II plan calls for reconstruct existing pavement areas to expand to expand parking in the front of the facility, to add landscaping that was previously presented, and to allow lighting, fencing, and stormwater improvements to be completed. Mr. Jones explained the current buildings that are remaining in Phase II. Mr. Jones stated that the Stormwater review is ongoing, and the Planning Department is awaiting receipt.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. George Homes, 4 Cross Road, stated that he is an abutter to the Sig Sauer facility and stated his concerns of an 8-foot chain-link fence with barbed-wire at the top along his property line. Mr. Holmes stated his concerns for mitigation of noise coming from the facility and stated that he filed a complaint with the City of Rochester Code Enforcement department because of a vacuum system that is loud. Mr. Holmes stated that the noise varies through the day and that the noise is continuous. Mr. Holmes stated his frustration of the noise and stated concerns for screening parking and lighting of the facility. Mr. Holmes explained the history of the lot pertaining to a previous purchases and requirements for a buffer between zones. Mr. Holmes also stated his concern of a planned snow dump area between building 125 and the rear of his property. Mr. Holmes read information from the proposed plans stating "clear and grub" the buffer and stated his concern. Mr. Holmes stated his frustration with the noise and that he felt as if abutters are not considered. Mr. Holmes stated that abutters received offers of selling their homes by Sig Sauer.

Mr. Collopy reiterated that the Third-Party review has not yet been received and that the Planning Board will not be voting on the proposed Sig Sauer plan tonight.

Ms. Saunders stated that the Stormwater Report and Staff Recommendation will be available by the upcoming workshop meeting on September 18, 2023.

Mr. Dews asked if the buffer concern could be reviewed. Ms. Saunders stated that the buffer concern would be investigated further.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to continue the application to September 18, 2023, and seconded by Mr. Dews. The motion carried unanimously.

VIII. Continued Applications

A. [42 Front Street, LLC, 42 Front Street](#) (by Norway Plains Assoc./Ashley Rowe) 2-Lot subdivision. Case# 102 – 41 – R2 – 23 **CONTINUANCE to October 2, 2023 Meeting**

Ms. Saunders stated that the application has been continued 4 times and the Planning Department reached out to the applicant to let them know that unless there was a submittal of funding for third-party review, she was going to recommend the continuance be denied. Ms. Saunders stated that the funds have been received and recommended that only one more continuance be approved for the review to be received.

A motion was made by Mr. Hamann to continue the project to the October 2, 2023, Planning Board meeting and seconded by Mr. Walker. The motion carried unanimously.

IX. Other Business

A. Planning Update

Ms. Saunders explained that there has been a change in the DPW memo that was provided to the Planning Board members in their packets and that further information will be presented at a future meeting. There will be no presentation tonight.

B. Other

There was no other business to be discussed.

X. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to adjourn the meeting at 9:04pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaclyn Millard,
Administrative Assistant II

and

Shanna B. Saunders,
Director of Planning & Development