

**ATKINSON PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, November 20, 2013**

**Members Present:**

Sue Killam, Chairperson  
Mike Turell  
John Wolters  
Vice Chairman Paul DiMaggio  
Tim Dziechowski

**Other's Present**

Julie LaBranche, Rockingham County Planning Commission  
Tim Lavelle, Lavelle Associates  
Henry Boyd, Millennium Engineering  
Aaron LaChance, Stantec Engineering  
Jim Kirsch, Code Enforcement  
Glen Boady, Atkinson Properties, LLC

**Correspondence:**

- Citizen Petition period has started and ends December 11, 2013
- Last Day to post and publish notice of first public hearing for warrant articles is December 27, 2013, last day to hold first public hearing is Tuesday, January 7, 2013.
- Newest edition of Town and City - winter edition
- Stantec Invoice for work on the Hamlet subdivision, consumed the initial estimate and request for additional escrow in the amount of \$1700 by the applicant
- Public hearing for a frontage waiver on North Ave and another on Fountain Ave.
- Chairperson Killam took comments and forwarded to Town Counsel

There is a meeting tomorrow night at 7:00 pm with the Department of Environmental Services at the Community Center to discuss the dioxane problem.

**Call to order:**

Chairperson Sue Killam called the regular meeting of the Atkinson Planning Board to order on Wednesday, November 20, 2013 at 7:40 PM.

Announcement: Meeting tomorrow night at the Community Center, 7:00 PM November 21, 2013 with The Environmental Protection Agency, Federal and the State Department of Environmental Services regarding dioxane in water.

**Public Hearing:**

1) Continued from August 21, 2013 and again from September and October, Application for Subdivision and Cluster Subdivision presented by Millennium Engineering for Gordon P. Brown Family Revocable Trust, for Subdivision of 15.58 Acre parcel to create a lot of 2 acres with the existing house, and to create an 8 Lot Scenic Cluster Subdivision of the remaining 13.58 acres, located at 129 Main Street, Map 13 Lot 21 in the RR2 Zone. Jurisdiction has been extended through November 20, 2013.

Abutters list: Norbert J. Gauren, Trustee of Gauren Realty Trust; Gordon P. Brown Revocable Trust, c/o Paige Brown - **PRESENT**, Kuldip and Pinderpal Baines; Kathleen Sedkowsky; Jesse Page Estates, Woody Wood, President, Lincoln Jackson; Robert and July Weaver; 138 Realty Trust, John Feuer, Trustee; West Environmental; Joseph Nowell; and Millennium Engineering, Inc. - **PRESENT**.

**Discussion:** Mr. Henry Boyd, Millennium Engineering has returned. He will recap the last meetings, the discussion was how to preserve the view since it is a scenic vista cluster subdivision. They have decided

to encumber the lot with a no build/view easement for the 2 acre lot that contains the house and the barn and will record it with the registry of deeds. Two members of the Board who gave him input are not here tonight. Essentially it is the westerly portion of the lot, that encompasses the view. Mr. Boyd turned to the third sheet. There is a stone wall on one end that supports the upper portion of the lot where the homestead is. That seems like a natural break for the easement. The homestead sits up very high. Chairperson Killam concurred that the Board was looking for protection of that section of the two acre lot.

Mr. Boyd worked with Aaron LaChance of Stantec, and requested that the Board look at sheet 5 which shows storm water drainage. There was concern that water was naturally making it from the crest on Main Street would not make it to the wetland area near the road on the northeasterly side on the left hand side. It is very thickly wooded. They have changed the roadway profile to add concrete pipes to keep the storm water in the watershed that is directed to the wetlands in that section of the property and will not add more drainage to the back of the lot.

Another change is the size of the sewer pipe went from 3 inches to 2 inches there , deep sumps have been added back into the cache basins. The permit is still 2 weeks away. In order to preserve the water quality, they have incorporated drip strips for the roofs,, the depth of the forebay has been increased from 2 feet to 4 feet; they have been asked to revise the level spreader which is the actual discharge and instead of grass they have required that they use stone. The plans have been sent back to AOT for more comment and Mr. LaChance has suggested that the area be wider.

Mr. Boyd has answers to Ms. LaBranche's questions about run off. In the two year and in the 10 year storm, there is a decrease in run off. In a 25 year storm, there is a 2% increase in run off. In a 50 year storm there is only a 4% increase in runoff from pre to post storm. The actual volume would, right now there is 184,000 cubic feet of water the increase is 8,000 cubic feet so run off would increase to 192,000 cubic feet with a 4% increase. Mr. LaChance pointed out that they are now using the revised Cornell rain fall depths that are significantly more.

At the last meeting Mr. Boyd informed the Board that they did a full widening lane width, a 20:1 taper and they had to redesign the driveway for Lot A. Mr. Boyd eliminated the driveway to the east, and the other driveway has been reshaped to come out more square to the highway. Right now it comes down at a 35% slope. The slope has been cut down substantially, the grades have been tied in and will run up to the front door. The stone wall will be moved slightly closer to the house. He now has a permit for the driveway. He is still waiting for a permit for a site specific permit, the common septic and subdivision approval. Other than what he has presented, he does not see any other significant changes. Mr. Dziechowski asked if Mr. Boyd had a site specific soils map. Mr. Boyd replied that he did and will get a map for the Planning Board.

Chairperson Killam commented that on the easement documents, the one for the drainage easement, just describes the constructed wetlands and access to it. On the DOT easement for widening the road and sight line; Mr. Stewart was concerned that it does not give full sight easement to Paiges Lane.

Chairperson Killam suggested some trees just inside the stone wall be cut down to preserved the line of sight. The trees are in the wet corner and grew up almost in the stone wall, and there are only 2 or 3. Mr. Boyd confirmed that the area is about 200 feet from the new road to Paiges Lane. Mr. Boyd agreed that as long as it does not require a wetlands permit, there should not be a problem. Chairperson Killam asked that an easement be granted to allow the Town access to maintain the area. Mr. Boyd agreed to change the easement.

Chairperson Killam also mentioned the scenic vista conservation easement, she has given it to the Town attorney and asked if it had to be a quit claim or could it be a warranty. Mr. Boyd explained the

difference between quit claim and warranty deeds. Ms. Killam read the second page regarding easement, section C, which she thinks is the same as the document for Cogswell Farm. There were some things listed that the Board is not comfortable with. She read the section. The board agrees that the language regarding protective well access, cisterns, temporary well access and monitoring to Section C iii, be removed because it was specific to Cogswell Farm. Mr. Boyd agreed that he would talk to Stantec.

The Board would like to add in Letter D "unless shown on the approved plan". The Board discussed what the property could be used for. Ms. LaBranche informed the committee that the answer would problem area.

On Page 3 it had been written to Number 7, that the open space is subject to a widening easement and a sight line easement. Chairperson Killam would like to add Number 8 with language for the drainage easement. Ms. Killam will get in touch with Scot's office tomorrow. Ms. LaBranche has a comment on the last page, drainage easements,. where it says to maintain .... drainage, it should say storm water infrastructure instead of drainage.

Mr. Wolters asked to discuss generator back up. Mr. Boyd replied that they plan to do what NH DES requires, which is above and beyond.

Ms. Killam asked where the plan was at with AOT. Mr. Boyd is not sure, but he is requesting conditional approval.

Julie LaBranche asked if deep sumps for the cache basin had been eliminated. Mr. Boyd explained that deeper cache basins were added. Ms. LaBranche then asked about volume control. She was looking at the question was is it a point discharge or is it a distributed discharge. Mr. Boyd explained that it is a point discharge. Mr. LaChance explained that by lengthening the level spreader it becomes less of a point discharge and is more evenly distributed. The volumetric numbers are not in the drainage manual. Mr. LaChance requested that Millennium send him the information on volume. The big question is how the volume may be impacting the next wetland or next stream. Julie LaBranche explains that it will flow down the vegetated slope before it hits the property line. It flows down the vegetated slope then it is channeled to run through the constructed wetland into a culvert. There is an increase in volume but not an increased rate of release. Mr. Boyd explained that the pavement in the cul de sac had been removed and water from the roofs has been diverted, reducing the volume for the site. Ms. LaBranche commented that her concern is the amount of water that flows out of the cache basin and into the culvert. Mr. Boyd explained that the water is not allowed to flow more quickly but there is more volume. Ms. LaBranche explained that her question is the volume of water at that one point before and after the development. Mr. Boyd said he would give her an answer. Mr. LaChance explained that the rate of flow over time is a bell curve. Each subdivision has its own curve or hydrograph. It is difficult to say if letting the water go without retaining or retaining it makes a difference. Mr. Boyd has reduced the flow for the 10 year storms, a slight increase for 25 year storms and held it at nearly the same for 50 and 100 year storms. The question is what is the concentrated flow at the corner of the property and will it affect development at that corner. Mr. Boyd informed the Board that that corner of the law abuts the Jesse Paige estates which is mostly all conservation land or open space and is not developable. Mr. LaChance explained that the water is dispersed over 25 feet which is the DES requirement and there should not be an erosion problem. The Board agreed that they would like to look at the table. The Board discussed if there should be a note on the plan summarizing the flows. Ms. LaBranche informed them that her concern is if there is a problem with it will become the Town's problem. Mr. Boyd agreed that it is possible to make that area longer.

The runoff from the roof tops will go back in for discharge. The issue is the runoff that hits the asphalt, and some of that will go to the grass swale, Mr. Boyd has made every effort to reduce the runoff from the asphalt.

Chairperson Killam asked if he had made a written waiver request for reducing the pavement. Mr. Boyd responded that he had given the board a written waiver request. The board looked at the map and reviewed the width of the road. It is 20 feet and with the cul de sac it is 22 feet. The Fire Chief had asked for a formal request for a waiver if the width of the road changed. The board discussed if a waiver had been granted previously. Mr. Boyd agreed to do a handwritten waiver request for the change in the width of the road. The waivers were added to the cover sheet this morning.

Vice Chairman DiMaggio asked Mr. LaChance for his comments. The most recent letter from Mr. LaChance is August 19, 2013. Mr. LaChance received the plans Friday and he has not had a chance to review the plans regarding storm water management. He will coincide the final review with DES. It is mostly technical comments. His only issue is the level of design for the pump station.

The RSA is 674:36 2n. Mr. Turell read the regulation. "...the basis for any waiver granted by the planning board and recorded into the minutes; the planning board can only grant a waiver if the board finds by majority vote that 1) that strict conformity would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and a waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations or that the specific circumstances relative to the subdivision or 2) conditions of the land indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations. It is the applicants responsibility to provide testimony to prove one or the other.

The written waiver request reads as follows: "We graciously request the following waivers: Road Specifications 410:8 pavement width 24 feet to 20 feet with 22 feet in the cul de sac area; and a typical section to allow 3:1 side slope in the swale instead of 4:1.

Ms. Killam read the 674:362n again. The applicant needs to request the waiver under that paragraph and subparagraph. Mr. Boyd explained his waiver requests.

Mr. Boyd agreed to write a formal request for a waiver. The pavement width specifically addresses the issue. Reduction of the pavement width will reduce the flow. Review of the side slopes, in the regulations they require that every foot of rise requires 4 feet of run. There are issues with site constraint so they have designed it to a 3:1 grading rather than a 4:1 grading. The swale is over 2 feet deep.

Ms. Killam requested a motion to act on the first waiver request to reduce the pavement from the town road specifications from 24 feet to 20 feet in the roadway to 22 feet in the cul de sac because either 1) that strict conformity would cause a hardship, or that 2) that the specific circumstances relative to the land the variance would conform to the spirit of the regulation.

**Vice Chairman Paul DiMaggio made a motion to allow the request to reduce the pavement from 24 feet to 20 feet in the roadway to 22 feet in the cul de sac because; 1) that strict conformity would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and a waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations or that the specific circumstances relative to the subdivision, and 2) that the conditions of the land indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations. Member Mike Turell seconded the motion. Vote 5/0.**

Chairperson Killam requested a motion on the second waiver request to allow 3:1 side slope in a swale rather than 4:1.

**Vice Chairman Paul DiMaggio made a motion to allow the request to allow 3:1 side slope in a swale rather than 4:1 because; 1) that strict conformity would cause a hardship to the applicant, and 2) that a waiver would conform to the spirit of the regulation. Member Mike Turell seconded the motion. Vote 5/0 in favor .**

**Discussion:** Julie LaBranche stated that Mr. Boyd did not mention that strict conformity would impose a hardship in his testimony. Mr. DiMaggio replied that the change is miniscule, the changes are being made to preserve the scenic vista, Mr. Dziechowski stated that there is no need to prove hardship. Mr. DiMaggio retracted the motion. Mr. Turell retracted his second.

**Member Mike Turell made a motion to approve the change in side slope as proposed by the developer from 4:1 to 3:1 under 674:6n(ii) because the specific circumstances relative to the subdivisions and conditions of the land indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulation. Vice Chairman Paul DiMaggio seconded the motion.**

**Discussion:** Vice Chairman DiMaggio feels that the first waiver applies, Member Mike Turell , agreed but in his opinion the second waiver is easier to prove.

**The board voted all in favor to approve the change in side slope as proposed by the developer from 4:1 to 3:1 under 674:6n(ii) because the specific circumstances relative to the subdivisions and conditions of the land indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulation. Vote: 5/0.**

The board approved waivers to 1) the Specifications in 410:8 that pavement width can be changed from 24 feet to 20 feet with 22 feet in the cul de sac area; and 2) to allow 3:1 side slope in the swale instead of 4:1.

**Discussion:** The board questioned if Stantec should review the private pump station in the plan. Plans have been revised to include more detail. The board agreed that since it is a private pump station to be reviewed by DES and owned by the homeowners association, it should not be reviewed by Stantec. It should be reviewed by the subsurface bureau. The question is does the chamber have enough capacity in the event of a power failure. The Board agreed to wait for DES opinion. There was no vote.

Mr. Boyd had requested conditional approval. Chairperson Killam stated that she wanted one more review from the consultants. Mr. DiMaggio felt there should be another site walk to see how cutting trees would affect the property. The Board agreed to a site walk on Friday, November 22, 2013 at 10:00 am.

Chairperson Killam requested recommendations. Mr. LaChance, Stantec stated that a big issue is the alteration of terrain permit outstanding. Also AOT and subsurface applications are still pending. Other issues are technical. Ms. LaBranche pointed out that if any substantial changes are required, then the applicant needs to apply for a revision. Ms. Killam would feel more comfortable waiting for finalizing the scenic view easement on parcel A and the final edits to the easement documents. Chairperson Killam informed the applicant that choices were to accept, deny or extend the application. Mr. Boyd would like to wait until he has the permits from AOT and DES.

The board discussed sustentative changes; it would be changes to the lot line or the layout of the road or the grading. The two changes that were commented on earlier were that originally, the level spreader was grass, they wanted it stone, and they wanted the fore bay to be 2 feet deep instead of one.

Mr. Boyd requested an extension to December 18, 2013.

**Member Mike Turell made a motion at the request of the applicant to extend jurisdiction of the Application for Subdivision and Cluster Subdivision presented by Millennium Engineering for Gordon P. Brown Family Revocable Trust, for Subdivision of 15.58 Acre parcel to create a lot of 2 acres with the existing house, and to create an 8 Lot Scenic Cluster Subdivision of the remaining 13.58 acres, located at 129 Main Street, Map 13 Lot 21 in the RR2 Zone to December 18, 2013. Vice Chairman Paul DiMaggio seconded the motion. There was no more discussion. Vote: 5/0 .**

The hearing is continued to December 18, 2013.

Barbara asked to change the site walk to Monday at 1:00 PM. The board agreed to look at the site individually and speak to the Road Agent.

2) New: Application for Amendment to the site plan submitted by Lavelle Associates for Clinton Teague on property located at 6 Industrial Way, Map 16 Lot 53 in the Commercial/Industrial Zone.

Ms. Killam handed out copies of the previously approved site plan. The board has been working with the property owner to clear up some infractions with permitted use in the industrial zone. The use infractions had caused a lawsuit which reached a consent decree. Ms. Killam read the consent decree which states in part that the parties agree that entry into the consent decree without further litigation is appropriate resolution of the claims and the parties consent to terms as follows: the defendant owns map 16 lot 53, 6 Industrial Way; the defendant is permanently enjoined from any activity which violates Town of Atkinson zoning ordinance or is inconsistent with the town approved site plan or certificate of occupation. The defendant is prohibited from non conforming, uses to include: cement building debris crushing operations and stockpiling cement building debris. Defendant shall conform to the requirements of Paragraph 2, in or within 90 days from the signing of this decree by all parties including but not limited to the removal of all crushing stockpiles unless permitted by the Zoning or Planning Board. The defendant also agrees to submit an amended site plan for allowed uses of the property within 120 days of the signing of the decree. The defendant owes the town for attorney fees and fines for the time that the suit has taken to go forward.

Jim Kirsch, Code Enforcement, informed the board that the debris was gone as of the day before the meeting. Some of the equipment is there, specifically the big pay loader. He will take pictures and consult with the town attorney

Ms. Killam read the abutters list.

Abutters: North End Blvd. Corp., South Cove Realty Trust, Clinton Teague, William Hogue, Rent Due One LLC, John Calimaris, Lavelle Associates - **PRESENT**.

There was a large pile of concrete debris on the site. Chairperson Killam informed the board that the issue was deciding whether the board could take jurisdiction, she has a letter from Stantec explaining that he has not had time to review thoroughly. The board needs to collect an escrow amount from the applicant of \$1,100 but first the board needs to decide to take jurisdiction.

The site plan is being amended. Member Mike Turell asked if there is anything on the plan explaining the intent of the plan.

The plan Chairperson Killam received in terms of the application is a document entitled existing conditions plan. She called the applicant and got a new plan stating it is an amended site plan. She has a letter from the owner authorizing James Lavelle Associates to represent him before the board. Existing use is to rent out space for Atkinson Screen Printing, he has offices for his construction company and

another construction company. Mr. Lavelle is waiting for input from the board before he makes changes to the plan.

Chairperson Killam asked the parties if they would like the board to take it under jurisdiction.

Tim Lavelle requested that the board take it under jurisdiction.

**Member Mike Turell made a motion to take the application for amendment to the site plan submitted by Lavelle Associates for Clinton Teague on property located at 6 Industrial Way, Map 16 Lot 53 in the Commercial/Industrial Zone under jurisdiction and Member Tim Dziechowski seconded the motion.**

**Discussion:** the original plan was for a proposed warehouse building, so everything on the original plan such as densities, fire permits, etc. was based on a plan for a warehouse building. Now it is basically offices. Tim Lavelle has an office on one end, and there is light manufacturing, it is commercial industrial zone.

Chairperson Killam asked if there is a statement of intent. Vice Chairman Paul DiMaggio informed the applicant that the board cannot take the plan under jurisdiction without a statement of intent. Jim Kirsch, Code enforcement informed the board that there were complaints about crushing stone, it is very noisy, he was stockpiling the stone and selling it as a base for roads. It is specifically prohibited by Atkinson zoning ordinances. Also the lot was supposed to be loamed and seeded and it is not. It is all gravel and there are multiple cars. Some of the issues have been corrected. Material has been removed. Mr. Lavelle said the applicant would like the lot to remain as gravel because he parks cars. Mr. Kirsch added that there are 40-50 dumpsters.

Chairperson Killam asked the board for a vote on the motion to take the proposed plan under jurisdiction.

**The board voted all opposed to take the application for amendment to the site plan submitted by Lavelle Associates for Clinton Teague on property located at 6 Industrial Way, Map 16 Lot 53 in the Commercial/Industrial Zone under jurisdiction. Vote: 0/5.**

**Discussion:** There is no statement of intent. The site plan needs to show a parking plan, dumpsters.

**Member Mike Turell made a motion to continue hearing on the Application for Amendment to the site plan submitted by Lavelle Associates for Clinton Teague on property located at 6 Industrial Way, Map 16 Lot 53 in the Commercial/Industrial Zone to December 18, 2013. Member Tim Dziechowski seconded the motion. All in favor. Vote: 5/0.**

**Discussion:** Aaron LaChance, Stantec Engineering asked about drainage calculations if the surface of the lot is changed from loam to gravel or pervious pavement.

3) New: Application for Amendment to Site Plan submitted by Lavelle Associates for Ruby Holdings, LLC (Robert Allen) on property located at 16 Industrial Way, Map 16 Lot 59 in the Commercial/Industrial Zone.

This is another code enforcement situation generated from the Town to the property owner. Chairperson Killam gave the Board a copy of the last site plan. The last recorded site plan was done by Beaver Brook in 1997. The notice of violation is included in the hand out. This was also just recently seen by Stantec, Based on cost it is \$1,500 for review, it will be collected and escrowed for Stantec to conduct the review.

Chairperson Killam asked Mr. Lavelle if it had a letter authorizing the him to represent the applicant before the board. Mr. Lavelle has submitted the amendment to the site plan.

ABUTTERS: Keith and Michelle Wolters, Atkinson Properties, LLC - PRESENT, Positive Start Realty, Inc., Ruby Holdings, LLC, Chelly Suno, LCC and Norris Lemay.

Mr. Kirsch explained that the large structure erected on the property is not permitted in the Commercial Industrial Zone. Mr. Kelman said the applicant would have to get site plan approval and a building permit for the structure. It is 28 x 61. A few years ago, the planning board looked at a cartoon like amendment to the plan which only indicated changes in parking. It was not recorded. Mr. Lavelle informed the Board that there is a retention pond on the approved plan. He would like to alter the retention pond to increase it.

Mr. Lavelle says the main issue is proposed use which is office and warehouse space. Ms. Killam said that was for the existing building, there is nothing for the new building. She believes it is to store heavy equipment. Mr. Lavelle replied that he will give the board the proposed uses. Also, all the sites have large trucks. Ms. Killam stated that if large trucks were going to be parked it had to be spelled out as well as the parking for office and warehouse use. Mr. Kirsch asked if additional storage should be on the plan. There are 3 or 4 of them. The board looked at the existing plan and Mr. Lavelle pointed out where the new building, and parking were added. The only thing the same is the big concrete pad and the water tank.

Mr. Dziechowski informed the board that there is a wetland on adjacent property. Mr. Lavelle stated that the original plan shows a wetland, it is a 547b, There is a big wetland setback but there is no wetland on the property.

Chairperson Killam requested a vote for jurisdiction. The board agreed that there were too many questions. Ms. Killam requested comments from the audience.

Glen Boady, Atkinson Properties, LLC had 3 points to make. Mr. Allen has filled in his property, which is south of the property on 6 Industrial Way, creating a wetland. He has a plan, some photos, a plan done by Henry Boyd, Millennium Engineering to show the encroachment on his property by Mr. Allen. The other abutters have put up retaining walls and Mr. Body stated that Mr. Allen just decided to fill in the land. Mr. Boady requested that Mr. Boyd survey the property and put in stakes, Mr. Boyd put in stakes and they were gone two weeks later. Mr. Boady also stated that Mr. Allen, the owner of the property on 6 Industrial Way has been filling in the retention pond on the property located there. Mr. Boady has photos of the retention pond. He stated that all the run off flows into Mr. Boady's property creating a wetland. Ms. Killam informed Mr. Boady that he would need an attorney for the encroachment issues. She requested that Mr. Boady give the board a copy of the plan and his photos. Mr. Lavelle also requested copies of the plan and the photos. Mr. Boady stated that the applicant put a shallow pond on the northern corner of 6 Industrial way, and run a pipe under the bottom of his property and diverted the runoff from his property onto Mr. Boady's property. The pipe runs parallel to Mr. Boady's property and then changes direction. There is another pipe at a 90 degree angle to the first property. Mr. Boady requested that the board look at his pictures of the retention pond. He pointed out where the pond has been filled in and where the lines had been changed.

**Member Mike Turell made a motion to take the Application for Amendment to Site Plan submitted by Lavelle Associates for Ruby Holdings, LLC (Robert Allen) on property located at 16 Industrial Way, Map 16 Lot 59 in the Commercial/Industrial Zone under jurisdiction, Vice Chairman Paul DiMaggio seconded the motion. Discussion: all opposed. Vote 0/5.**

**Chairperson Killam asked if the applicant would like continuance to December 18, 2013. The applicant agreed.**

**Member Mike Turell made a motion to continue Application for Amendment to Site Plan submitted by Lavelle Associates for Ruby Holdings, LLC (Robert Allen) on property located at 16 Industrial Way, Map 16 Lot 59 in the Commercial/Industrial Zone to December 18, 2013. Vice Chairman Paul DiMaggio seconded the motion. Vote: 5/0 in favor.**

**Discussion:** Julie LaBranche informed the board that for industrial development and a large building and if there is a question of usage, some towns approve the site, then approve tenants individually. Chairperson Killam added that tenants change frequently. The fire department inspects yearly and identifies new tenants, collects sheets. If the building use has not changed, the building inspector is not involved. The town does not have a procedure. Ms. LaBranche informed the board that other towns require the applicant to inform the board if there are changes in tenants and if the new use conforms.

Chairperson Killam asked if there was more discussion. There was none.

The next Planning Board meeting will be a workshop meeting on December 4, 2013.

**Member Tim Dziechowski made a motion to adjourn. Member Mike Turell seconded the motion. Vote: 4/0. The November 20, 2013 meeting of the Atkinson Planning Board was adjourned at 10:15 PM.**