

Town of Milford
Zoning Board of Adjustment
JULY 6, 2023
Public Hearings

Case #2023-02 689 North Main Street, LLC and Salt Creek Properties, LLC, VARIANCE
Case #2023-07 Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc., SPECIAL EXCEPTION

Present: Andrea Kokko Chappell, Chair
Joan Dargie, Vice Chair
Michael Thornton, Member
Tracy Steel, Member
Dan Sadkowski, Member
Rich Elliott, Alternate
Terrey Dolan, Director of Community Development
David Freel, BOS Representative

Recording Clerk: Jane Hesketh

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Public Hearing(s):
 - a. **Case #2023-02** 689 North Main Street, LLC and Salt Creek Properties, LLC. for the property located at Tax Map 43, Lot 20-2 are seeking a Variance from Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, Sections 6.01.3.B.7 to allow the retail sale of petroleum products in the Groundwater Protection District on a property located in the Commercial and Limited Commercial Zoning Districts (**new request for continuance to meeting of August 3, 2023**).
 - b. **Case #2023-07** Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc. is seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, Sections 6.02.6.A & B to disturb approximately 4,123 square feet of the site's (2007- approved) total wetland buffer area. The overall 5.94-acre site was developed as the "Perry Field Condominiums". The property is located at 96 Old Wilton Road, Tax Map 7, Lot 20. This developed site is within the Town of Milford's "ICI-2" (Integrated Commercial-Industrial-2) Zoning District, and presently consists of five (5) total adjoining units totally 12,084 square feet. The new ownership wishes to modify and reduce the total wetland buffer area in several locations on-site to expand and improve the vehicular access surrounding the building so larger trucks may safely travel around the building complex footprint.
3. Meeting Minutes: Review and Approve Meeting Minutes from May 18, 2023
4. Other Business: a. Board of Adjustment – Chair / Vice Chair Determination
5. Next Meeting(s): July 20, 2023 & August 3, 2023

1 **MINUTES OF THE ZBA MEETING JULY 6, 2023**

2
3
4 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

5
6 Chair Kokko Chappell opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and introducing herself. The Chair welcomed those
7 attending in person and electronically.

8
9 The Chair stated you may also attend this meeting in person at the Milford Town Hall, Board of Selectmen’s Meeting Room.

10
11 If you would like to participate in the public meeting, please call this number from home: +1 646-558-8656 and enter the
12 Meeting ID: 851 6407 7601 and Password: 269952 or log in via www.zoom.com using the Meeting ID and Password
13 previously stated.

14
15 A digital copy of the meeting materials can be found on the Town website at: [https://www.milford.nh.gov/zoning-board-](https://www.milford.nh.gov/zoning-board-adjustment/agenda/zba-agenda)
16 [adjustment/agenda/zba-agenda](https://www.milford.nh.gov/zoning-board-adjustment/agenda/zba-agenda). We will also be live streaming the meeting on Granite Town Media, Government Channel
17 21: <http://gtm.milford.nh.gov/CablecastPublicSite/watch/2?channel=2>

18
19 The Chair then went on to inform everyone about the procedures of the Board.

20
21 Chair Kokko Chappell started the meeting with a roll call attendance by asking each member to state their name: at Milford
22 Town Hall: M. Thornton present; J. Dargie present; R. Elliott present; D. Sadkowski present; T. Steel present; A. Kokko
23 Chappell present.

24
25 Chair Kokko Chappell continued by saying there are 2 cases to be heard, and explained the process of the case hearings for
26 the applicant and the public. The Chair said a full agenda may not allow all cases to be heard and that at 10:00 p.m. the
27 meeting will end. The Chair explained how the meeting would proceed for the cases that may not be heard in that they would
28 be continued or tabled to another agreed upon meeting and the public notification process for a continued case.

29
30 A. Kokko Chappell moved on to the cases to be heard.

31
32 **2. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

33
34
35 **a. Case #2023-02 (continued from July 20, 2023) 689 North Main Street, LLC and Salt Creek Properties, LLC. for**
36 **the property located at Tax Map 43, Lot 20-2** are seeking a Variance from Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI,
37 Sections 6.01.3.B.7 to allow the retail sale of petroleum products in the Groundwater Protection District on a property
38 located in the Commercial and Limited Commercial Zoning Districts (**new request for continuance to meeting of**
39 **August 3, 2023**).

40
41 Chair then read the letter received from the applicant’s representative Matthew Peterson. The letter requested a continuance
42 to August 3, 2023 in order for them to complete additional research for the variance.

43
44 Chair then stated she will be unable to attend the August 3, 2023 meeting. She has discussed this with staff and asked to
45 have the hearing on this case moved to August 17, 2023. Vice Chair Joan Dargie made a motion to **continue**
46 **Case #2023-02 to August 17, 2023** and Member T. Steel seconded. Chair asked for a vote and all were in favor.

47
48 Terrey Dolan then stated the Town Engineer, Nicole Crawford, has been in touch with the applicant as well as Matthew
49 Peterson. He continued by saying there needs to be a meeting with the applicant and the Office of Community
50 Development staff to address outstanding questions and issues. He noted he will contact the appropriate parties for this case
51 regarding the change to the meeting of August 17, 2023.

52
53 Chair moved to the next case on the agenda.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

b. Case #2023-07 Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc. (continued from July 20, 2023) is seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, Sections 6.02.6.A & B to disturb approximately 4,123 square feet of the site’s (2007- approved) total wetland buffer area. The overall 5.94-acre site was developed as the “Perry Field Condominiums”. The **property is located at 96 Old Wilton Road, Tax Map 7, Lot 20**. This developed site is within the Town of Milford’s “ICI-2” (Integrated Commercial-Industrial-2) Zoning District, and presently consists of five (5) total adjoining units totally 12,084 square feet. The new ownership wishes to modify and reduce the total wetland buffer area in several locations on-site to expand and improve the vehicular access surrounding the building so larger trucks may safely travel around the building complex footprint.

Director Dolan noted there is a change to the square footage of the wetland buffer impact. Subsequent to the site walk conducted on June 6, 2023, the square footage is now 4,830 feet of impact to the wetland buffer.

Earl Blatchford, Senior Project Manager from Hayner/Swanson stepped forward as the representative for the applicant. Hayner/Swanson is the Project Surveyor and Site Engineer for Hitchiner Manufacturing. He noted Anthony Rodrigues from Hitchiner Manufacturing was also present to answer questions. Mr. Blatchford continued his presentation by explaining the location as listed in the application as well as the history of the units in regards to the previous two owners and condominiums. Previous owners sold to Hitchiner and the Condominium has been dissolved.

Using the site map included in the application packet E. Blatchford pointed out the roads surrounding the building. He continued by saying there are 2 existing driveways into the lot with one on Perry Rd. and the other on Old Wilton Rd. The site has a conservation easement of 3.4 acres out of the total 5.9 acres (shown in magenta on the site map). There are other wetlands outside of the conservation easement as shown and pointed out on the site map by Mr. Blatchford. Also, shown is the setback line highlighted in gold.

E. Blatchford continued his presentation by providing additional facts about the site. The area outside of the easement area is approximately .53 acres. He further explained that the 25 ft. buffer is approximately 17,550 sq. ft. with half the buffer containing a paved driveway and the other half is a grass slope outside of the driveway. The site is served by natural gas, underground communications, town sewer and water. Proposed improvements are to take over the southerly three units in order to renovate them. This will streamline the current manufacturing by bringing in a part of the process that is currently out sourced. The northerly two units occupied by Stanford will remain and Stanford has the option of staying there up to 2 years. E. Blatchford outlined the proposed site improvements: new gas main to run the new kiln (existing smaller gas main for heat will remain the same), new underground power and communications, new dumpster enclosure, pavement widening to accommodate slightly larger box trucks (to stay out of the wetlands they are installing modular block retaining walls approximately 4 ft. tall. as pointed out by E. Blatchford), some existing pavement will be removed where it is not needed which will compensate for where pavement will be added. Mr. Blatchford added that except for the 4,830 feet that will impact the 25 ft. buffer, the total disturbed area will be approximately 10,000 sq. ft. which will be temporary once all construction is complete. He added that the increase in pavement will be 590 sq. ft.

Chair Kokko Chappell, to clarify, the 4,830 sq. ft. already has pavement in it. The request is to remove some of this pavement, move some things around and the addition to what is already being used in the buffer is less than 600 sq. ft. E. Blatchford responded this is correct and that is the net impact. Mr. Blatchford explained that after the site walk on June 6, 2023 some of the numbers changed and what was presented to the Conservation Commission on June 8, 2023 shows the correct numbers on the site plan. The memo from the Conservation Commission is based on the corrected numbers on the site plan. In order to quantify, he stated that 590 sq. ft. is about the size of a 45 ft. driveway. He emphasized there is no impact to any other surrounding wet land areas. He again stated the 590 sq. ft. will be the net impact after all the construction is done. E. Blatchford added, after the delay at the ZBA meeting of June 15, 2023, the project was allowed to be presented to the Planning Board on June 20, 2023 where conditional approval was received pending a hearing with the ZBA for the special exception. Using the site map, he pointed out additional facts about the site with the green highlighted area being the construction area. Mr. Blatchford then moved on the criteria.

Special Exception Criteria under 10.02.1:

- a. Criteria: proposed use is similar to those permitted in the district**
The existing industrial building is presently used as a warehouse and the proposed change of use from automotive repair to manufacturing is an allowed use in this zone.

1
2
3 **Special Exception Criteria under 10.02.1:**
4

5 **b. Criteria: specific site is in an appropriate location for the proposed use because**

6 The uses are allowed and similar to abutting properties.
7

8 **c. Criteria: the use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area because**

9 “The proposal is for site improvements and interior building renovations to support a change of use for a portion of
10 the existing industrial building (7200 sq. ft. of the 12000 sq. ft.). No building addition is proposed. The proposed
11 site improvements will be subject to Planning Board review and approval.”
12

13 **d. Criteria: no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians**

14 “The improvements will be designed in compliance with Town of Milford regulations. The design will incorporate
15 accepted design standards for vehicular and pedestrian circulation through the site.”
16

17 **e. Criteria: adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper operation of the proposed use**

18 “The improvements will be designed in compliance with Town of Milford regulations. The proposed
19 manufacturing operation will operate under the same NHDES and EPA regulations that govern Hitchiner’s other
20 manufacturing facilities in Milford.”
21

22 **Wetland and Wetland Buffer Criteria under 6.02.06.2:**
23

24 **1. The need for the proposed project.**

25 “The proposed improvements are essential to the growth of Hitchiner Manufacturing, Inc. in the Town of
26 Milford.” The manufacturing process, which was previously out sourced, will now be brought on site with this
27 project. This will create jobs and benefit the growth of Hitchiner.
28

29 **2. The plan is the least impact to the site.**

30 “The proposed improvements do not directly impact jurisdictional wetlands. The plan has been refined to
31 minimize the permanent and temporary impacts to the wetland buffer (4800 sq. ft.)”
32

33 **3. The impact on plants, fish and wildlife.**

34 “The proposed plan does not require any tree cutting within the wetland buffer, does not disturb jurisdictional
35 wetlands, and all work is within the existing approved development area of the site”.
36

37 **4. The impact on the quantity and quality of surface and ground water.**

38 “The proposed work has a net increase in impervious area of 600 +/- sf. This is considered negligible and should
39 have no adverse impacts on storm water runoff or ground water on the 5.94 acre parcel or adjacent wetlands.”
40

41 **5. The potential to cause or increase flooding, erosion or sedimentation.**

42 “As stated in #4, the increase in impervious area is negligible, and erosion control best management practices have
43 been incorporated into the site improvements design.”
44

45 **6. The cumulative impact if all parties abutting this wetland or buffer were permitted to make equivalent**
46 **alterations to the wetland and buffer proportional to the extent of their property rights.**

47 The on-site wet meadow is part of the Tucker Brook wetland complex which is large and involves dozens of
48 properties; many owned by the Town or within conservation easements. It seems reasonable that similar impacts
49 on the remaining properties wouldn’t have a measurable effect on such a large system.” Mr. Blatchford stated
50 again, 5.98 sq. ft. of impact on the total 5.94 acre parcel which is negligible.
51

52 **7. The impact of the proposed project on the values and functions of the total wetland or wetland complex.**

53 “The jurisdictional wetland is not being disturbed, no tree cutting is proposed, and the net increase in impervious is
54 600 +/- sq. ft. This should not affect the function and values of the adjacent wet meadow and the larger wetland
55 complex.”
56

57 **8. Has a comment from the Milford Conservation Commission been solicited?**

58 Yes; a site walk was conducted on June 6, 2023 and a meeting attended on June 8, 2023.
59

60 E. Blatchford ended the presentation by asking if there were comments or questions. Chair also asked for questions.
61

MINUTES OF THE ZBA MEETING JULY 6, 2023

1
2
3 There were no questions from the board. Chair Kokko Chappell opened the public portion of the meeting. There was
4 nobody in attendance or online. Hearing no further questions or comments, Chair Kokko Chappell closed the public portion
5 of the meeting.
6

7 Chair Kokko Chappell noted the following email communications were received and will be labeled as Exhibit A and B.
8 These emails will be made available for the public to view.
9

10 **Exhibit A**

11 Email received from Susan Fournier on Friday, June 9, 2023 with attachments A, B, C, D
12

13 **Exhibit B**

14 Email received from Susan Fournier on Thursday, June 15, 2023 with attachment from DES dated 6/13/2023
15

16 Chair Kokko Chappell asked the board if they wished to discuss the emails. Member Dargie stated that essentially the
17 emails expressed concerns about impacting the wetlands. She noted none of the wetlands are being impacted only a small
18 portion of the wetland buffer. J. Dargie added that basically there is no bearing on the conservation concern which is what
19 Susan Fournier wrote about in her emails.
20

21 Director Dolan added that Ms. Fournier may have misunderstood that the Hitchiner parcel was part of a conservation
22 easement or had a concern that buffers should also be part of a protected zone. He then went in to detail explaining this.
23

24 Chair Kokko Chappell then re-opened the public portion of the meeting to allow Susan Fournier (who just joined the
25 meeting via Zoom) to speak.
26

27 Susan Fournier acknowledged that what Director Dolan said was basically correct, however, there is a part missing from his
28 statements. DES presented a mitigation agreement to include the wetland buffers. She went on to explain the mitigation
29 plan from DES. Her emphasis was on the importance of the wetland buffer and the agreement established by the DES.
30

31 Chair asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, Chair closed the public portion of the meeting.
32

33 Member Mike Thornton then asked to confirm the actual impact being 590 sq. ft. T. Dolan acknowledged that is correct.
34 M. Thornton went on to add his feelings by saying that while all buffers are important, this is a very negligible impact, and
35 there will be barriers to prevent runoff from the trucks.
36

37 **Deliberations:**

38
39 Chair Kokko Chappell then moved onto deliberations for the Special Exception criteria.
40

41 **Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:**

42
43 **a. Criteria: proposed use is similar to those permitted in the district**

44 T. Steel: it is similar because it is allowed by special exception to impact the buffer

45 M. Thornton: yes

46 D. Sadkowski: the change of use for the manufacturing is allowed in this district

47 J. Dargie: the buffer has already been impacted and this request is just an addition to the impact

48 A. Kokko Chappell: in order to clarify, she stated the change of use is part of the Planning Board's decision. The
49 Zoning Board, for this case, is looking at the disturbance to the wetland buffer. The buffer has already been
50 impacted and it is allowed with a special exception.
51

52 **b. Criteria: specific site is in an appropriate location for the proposed use**

53 M. Thornton: it is necessary to provide vehicular flow

54 T. Steel: agrees with M. Thornton; the space is needed for the trucks

55 J. Dargie: agrees

56 D. Sadkowski: agrees

57 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees
58
59
60

1
2 **Deliberations:**
3

4 **Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:**
5

6 **c. Criteria: the use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area**

7 J. Dargie: the building will remain the same; it is the driveway that will be made larger

8 D. Sadkowski: with a special exception this is allowed; no change to the building

9 M. Thornton: feels the amount of change is not significant

10 T. Steel: feels the increased square footage is not that large

11 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees with all the comments and the additional 550 sq. ft. is negligible, therefore, not
12 affecting the area. In addition, the drainage will be managed correctly.

13
14 **d. Criteria: no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians due to the proposed use**

15 M. Thornton: it is not a pedestrian zone, it is private property and it is not a public roadway

16 D. Sadkowski: agrees with Member Thornton

17 T. Steel: agrees with what has been said

18 J. Dargie: the roadway will be improved for the trucks which will make the flow better and safer for workers

19 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees with what has been said then added this building is already in use with traffic coming
20 and going.

21
22 **e. Criteria: adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper operation of the proposed use**

23 J. Dargie: in looking at the impact to the wetland buffer, the drainage plans will be appropriate to the site

24 D. Sadkowski: design will be in compliance with the town and the EPA

25 T. Steel: minimal impact to the buffer; should not cause flooding or erosion with plans for drainage; already an
26 existing driveway

27 M. Thornton: the change will be negligible (3.14% change)

28 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees with comments made and the changes are improvements to the roadway as well as
29 drainage

30
31 **Wetland and Wetland Buffer Criteria under 6.02.06:**
32

33 **1. The need for the proposed project been addressed.**

34 D. Sadkowski: yes

35 T. Steel: yes

36 J. Dargie: they need to extend the buffer for the trucks to get around for the new manufacturing

37 M. Thornton: better to extend the buffer for adequate truck flow than to have a truck accidentally drive into the
38 wetland buffer

39 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees with all remarks and the need has been adequately addressed
40

41 **2. The plan is the least impact to the site (wetlands, surface waters and associated buffers).**

42 M. Thornton: believes it has been addressed and will have the least impact to the buffer area.

43 T. Steel: agrees; the plan has been designed to make sure it will have the least impact to the buffer with just an
44 addition to the already existing driveway.

45 J. Dargie: agrees for all the reasons stated

46 D. Sadkowski: agrees

47 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees with all the comments made.
48

49 **3. The impact on plants, fish and wildlife been addressed.**

50 J. Dargie: there is no impact to plants, fish or wildlife as shown in the presentation by Earl Blatchford

51 T. Steel: there will be no removal of trees

52 M. Thornton: the Conservation Commission did not have any findings in this area

53 D. Sadkowski: agrees in view of what the Conservation Commission has stated

54 A. Kokko Chappell: the Conservation Commission was consulted and they acknowledged no trees will be
55 removed which will minimize impact to wildlife and the winding driveway will eliminate any impact to the
56 wetlands.
57

1
2 **Deliberations:**

3
4 **Wetland and Wetland Buffer Criteria under 6.02.06:**

5
6 **4. The impact on the quantity and quality of surface and ground water been addressed.**

7 D. Sadkowski: agrees

8 T. Steel: yes this was addressed with the addition of the roof drains which will divert any runoff as well as oil from
9 the trucks

10 M. Thornton: in addition, there will be the removal of an impervious surface to allow water to go back into the
11 ground to offset the small addition to the driveway

12 J. Dargie: she agrees this has been addressed

13 A. Kokko Chappell: also agrees and this was addressed by the Conservation Commission

14
15 **5. The potential to cause or increase flooding, erosion or sedimentation been addressed.**

16 D. Sadkowski: yes; the Conservation Commission addressed this and the Planning Board approved this contingent
17 upon the ZBA approval.

18 T. Steel: agrees

19 J. Dargie: the 4 foot retaining walls will prevent flooding

20 M. Thornton: has been addressed and the change is negligible

21 A. Kokko Chappell: there will only be an additional change of 550 sq. ft. that should not cause flooding, erosion or
22 sedimentation.

23
24 **6. The cumulative impact if all parties abutting this wetland or buffer were permitted to make equivalent
25 alterations to the wetland and buffer proportional to the extent of their property rights.**

26 T. Steel: yes it has been addressed; it should have no impact even if the neighboring properties should adjust the
27 wetland buffer.

28 M. Thornton: the impact should be cumulatively negligible if neighboring properties make alterations to the
29 wetland buffer

30 J. Dargie: agrees

31 D. Sadkowski: agrees

32 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees

33
34 **7. The impact of the proposed project on the values and functions of the total wetland or wetland complex.**

35 J. Dargie: this has been addressed and will not affect the wetland; only the wetland buffer

36 D. Sadkowski: the 4 foot retaining walls will protect the wetlands and the buffer

37 T. Steel: agrees it has been addressed; minimal change to the buffer and it will still function as a wetland

38 M. Thornton: the value has not changed only the small additional impact to the buffer

39 A. Kokko Chappell: Conservation Commission reported the impact will be minimal and it will not affect the
40 landscape in regards to wildlife or plants

41
42 **8. Has a report from the Milford Conservation Commission been solicited.**

43 Yes; by all.

44
45 **Voting:**

46
47 **Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:**

48
49 **a. Criteria: proposed use is similar to those permitted in the district**

50 D. Sadkowski yes; M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; Chair votes yes.

51
52 **b. Criteria: specific site is in an appropriate location for the proposed use**

53 M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadkowski yes; Chair votes yes.

54
55 **c. Criteria: the use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area**

56 T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadkowski yes; M. Thornton yes; Chair votes yes.

57
58 **d. Criteria: no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians due to the proposed use**

59 M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadkowski yes; Chair votes yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

Voting:

Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:

e. Criteria: adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper operation of the proposed use
D. Sadowski yes; M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; Chair votes yes.

Wetland and Wetland Buffer Criteria under 6.02.06:

1. The need for the proposed project.

M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadowski yes; Chair votes yes.

2. The plan is the least impact to the site (wetlands, surface waters and associated buffers).

T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadowski yes; M. Thornton yes; Chair votes yes.

3. The impact on plants, fish and wildlife.

J. Dargie yes; D. Sadowski yes; M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; Chair votes yes.

4. The impact on the quantity and quality of surface and ground water.

D. Sadowski yes; M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; Chair votes yes.

5. The potential to cause or increase flooding, erosion or sedimentation.

M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadowski yes; Chair votes yes.

6. The cumulative impact if all parties abutting this wetland or buffer were permitted to make equivalent alterations to the wetland and buffer proportional to the extent of their property rights.

M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadowski yes; Chair votes yes.

7. The impact of the proposed project on the values and functions of the total wetland or wetland complex.

T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadowski yes; M. Thornton yes; Chair votes yes.

Is the Special Exception allowed by the Ordinance?

J. Dargie yes; D. Sadowski yes; M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; Chair votes yes.

Are all the specified conditions present under which the Special Exception may be granted?

D. Sadowski yes; M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; Chair votes yes.

A. Kokko Chappell the criteria for the Special Exception have been satisfied:

M. Thornton yes; T. Steel yes; J. Dargie yes; D. Sadowski yes; Chair votes yes.

A. Kokko Chappell asked if there is a motion to approve **Case #2023-07 Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc.**

J. Dargie made a motion to approve **Case #2023-07** and it was seconded by T. Steel.

Chair Kokko Chappell stated a motion was made to approve **Case #2023-07**. Chair Kokko Chappell asked for a vote; all were in favor and the application approved. There is a 30 day appeal period that can be filed with the Zoning

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3. MEETING MINUTES

Director Dolan advised that the 5/18/2023 minutes will be reviewed at the 7/20/2023 meeting along with the minutes from the meeting of 6/15/2023.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

J. Dargie proposed the meetings start earlier at 6:00 or 6:30 p.m. T. Steel expressed conflict with her work schedule and M. Thornton expressed his conflict with another committee he attends that starts at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday's. J. Dargie asked if M. Thornton's Energy Committee time could be changed or moved to a different day. This was discussed and suggested this topic should be addressed at the next meeting after M. Thornton is able to resolve his conflict.

Chair Dolan advised the committee on the upcoming cases for the meeting of July 20, 2023 and cases for the meeting of July 3, 2023.

Motion to Adjourn

Chair Kokko Chappell asked for a motion to adjourn. J. Dargie made a motion to adjourn and M. Thornton seconded. All Board Members were in agreement. Meeting adjourned.

Motion to Approve: _____
Seconded: _____
Signed _____
Date: _____