

PRESENT: Fred Hawkins, Acting Chairman; Jack Dever; John Moyer; Jan Joslin, Alternate; Edney, Code Enforcement Officer; Harvey, Clerk

Dever moved, Joslin seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 24, 2005, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2667. **TOWN OF MEREDITH:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to allow construction of a building and related site development within the 150' buffer of a prime wetland and a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to allow off-street parking within the side setbacks, Tax Map No. U11, Lot Nos. 50 & 50A, located at 1 Circle Drive in the Central Business and Residential Districts. **CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY 24, 2005.**

This hearing was continued to this date because the letter from the Conservation Commission was not available at the previous hearing. Hawkins, Acting Chairman, read the Commission's letter into the record recommending that the request be approved. Hearing closed at 7:03 p.m.

2668. **ERIC A. ROSEEN LLS FOR DEAN R. AND BARBARA J. BEDINGFIELD:** (Rep. Eric Roseen) An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to allow construction of a driveway within the 100' buffer of designated wetlands, Tax Map No. S08, Lot No. 2, located on 183 Meredith Neck Road in the Meredith Neck District.

This is a 3-lot subdivision, Lot 3 being the balance of the property where their existing house is located and this application is for the purpose of crossing a buffer zone. Applicant proposes to cross a portion of the buffer with a driveway across Lot 1 for servicing both Lot 1 and Lot 2. The house locations will be on the high ground of each lot. This location is the best that can be accomplished as far as distance from the wetland and yet meet the NHDOT sight distance from the top of the hill. This is a minimum impact because it is only a driveway to serve two homes. Hearing closed at 7:10 p.m.

2669. **TIMOTHY PAGE FOR DAVID AND KATHLEEN WINSOR:** (Rep. Timothy Page) An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to allow construction of a driveway and installation of utilities across non-designated wetlands and a non-designated stream, Tax Map No. R25, Lot No. 14, located on Roxbury Road in the Forestry/Conservation District.

Applicant proposes to construct a driveway and installation of utilities across non-designated wetlands and a non-designated stream. Wetlands have been delineated by Kathleen Surowiec, Certified Soil Scientist, and the wetlands flagging was located during the process of preparing a septic system design. The proposed wetland impact area is 300 sq. ft. The location of the driveway and utilities crossing is an existing woods road so tree cutting will be kept to a minimum. Silt fencing will be in place during driveway construction. The proposed construction area is located at the narrowest part of the wetlands/seasonal stream area, thus reducing the impact area which is providing adequate access to a proposed barn. This project has been submitted to the NHDES and the Meredith Conservation Commission. The Conservation Commission has no objection to the granting of this request. Hearing closed at 7:18 p.m.

2670. **STEVEN HERING FOR HOWARD S. BROWER:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to allow construction of a driveway across a designated wetland and designated and non-designated streams to access a proposed single-family dwelling and utilities and a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a single-family dwelling, well, and leachbed within the 100' protective buffer of designated wetlands, Tax Map No. R31, Lot No. 12, located on Hermit Woods Road in the Forestry/Conservation District.

This is a pre-existing lot in an approved subdivision that dates back to the 1970's located on Hermit Woods Road. The 5.5 acre lot is located on the south side of Hermit Woods Road, east of a small marsh complex that flows southwesterly through a culvert under Hermit Woods Road. Construction of the driveway requires crossing an intermittent non-designated stream and Hermit Brook. After crossing Hermit Brook, the ground starts to slope up fairly quickly, leaving the only portion on the lot that is the truly buildable portion on the site. We are proposing to bring a driveway in on the northwesterly side of the lot, cross approximately 100' of poorly drained/some very poorly drained soils until we get to the first stream crossing where we would have two 24" culverts installed and then cross a portion of upland area until we get to Hermit Brook where we are now crossing 150' of poorly drained soils with some spots of very poorly drained soils. The Hermit Brook crossing will be constructed using two 48" culverts to the upland area. The house would be situated roughly 30' from poorly drained soils and approximately 2/3 of the leachfield would be outside of the leachfield buffer. The closest portion of the leachfield in this lower right-hand corner would be roughly 76' from poorly drained soils up on the back side of the lot. There were some concerns stated by the Conservation Commission regarding a potential damming effect of the

driveway which was addressed by the wetland scientist. His comment was that it may or may not occur. Joslin – On the Conservation Commission report, they question whether the driveway is going to be paved or gravel. Hering – The intent is to have the driveway remain gravel, but there is no guarantee that it will not be paved sometime in the future. Joslin – Also raised was that there may be continuing filling of the wetlands with gravel as the driveway would deteriorate during the seasons. Hering – Hermit Woods Road also is a gravel road, although the Town does a lot of maintenance along that road, but it does receive a lot of traffic. Relatively speaking, this is going to be a driveway and will not see a heavy amount of traffic. Joslin – I think the concern is more the wetlands will be continually assaulted by being filled in repairing the driveway. It does raise that possibility. Hering – Yes, that is a possibility, again it is an approved lot, it's in an approved subdivision, I think it's the best solution we can come up with. The buildable portion is towards the rear. Hering – We would entertain a requirement that it be paved too, if that is preferable. Because of the driveway length, this does come under the erosion and sedimentation control. Prior to construction, it will require Planning Board approval for the project before they can start work. Hawkins read the Conservation Commission's letter into the record and the Commission does not recommend approval. Hering - Although a lot of it is within the protective buffer, roughly 250' of the 700' of driveway is actually what is crossing wetlands and brooks. Hawkins read Ann Higgins Kynast's letter into the record expressing concerns about the project. James & Ann Freeman submitted a letter which was read into the record in opposition to the project. Sheldon Cooperman – Abutter downstream on Hermit Brook - Where do you propose to dump the soil that comes out of these excavations? Hering – Most likely it will have to be hauled off site. As you know, Hermit Brook is a major conduit of water and no matter what you do, it's going to lead mud and silt downstream. How do you propose to take care of that? Hering – The only thing I can refer you to is the Functional Assessment from the Wetland Scientist. Cooperman – Beaver dams. Those culverts get blocked by beavers in that area and cause flooding. How do you propose to deal with that? Hering – I was not aware of this being an issue with the culvert under Hermit Woods Road. Vadney – That's a maintenance issue. Joslin – Is there any way to monitor that? Edney – It's obvious when it happens because there's a lot of water. There's a lot of wetlands and a lot of water there. Headwalls are proposed to keep the erosion down so sediments and so on don't continually effect the brook and the water stream. A lot of that is taken care of in the design stage of the types of culverts and the design of those culverts to ensure that we're not eroding high water situations. If the project does go forward, the culvert designs will be

submitted for review as part of the building permit submittal. Hering – There is riprap being installed downstream, as it comes through the culvert for 50 feet. Dan Duquette – As far as the setbacks go, to me it appears that virtually every setback has to be adjusted for this project, i.e., setbacks from boundaries, crossing brooks, etc. I recently built a house in this neighborhood, I had more land and was forced to build in one particular spot because we had higher setbacks in our area, 125' from a brook, 50 from undesignated wetland areas. These setbacks don't even come close. I can see a special exception for a small area, this is a large area and instead of the driveway being 50' away from the wetlands, it's actually going through the wetland and also crossing Hermit Brook which is a major brook in the area. All of us in this area have had to conform to the rules that are set for our conservation area. We try to keep everything pristine out there and try to blend in. I think this is going to have a major effect on the area, so I'm opposed to it. Bob LeCount – Most of the Conservation Commission's concerns occurred because they read the engineer's report and the ponding problem was brought up in the engineer's report. We feel that the ponding would be on the abutting property because the road runs right across the estimated property line. We had very great concerns over the filling of the wetlands to build a road. The only mention of fill in the whole program is on that engineering report and it says "excess fill to be removed from the wetlands". How much fill is going to be over the top of the two 48" culverts to maintain structural integrity? How much fill is going to be required to bring the road level up out of the water. Most of that is poorly drained soil, very poorly drained soil, so we have very strong concerns over the road. Basically, all of these concerns came out of the engineering report. If the Board approves this project, there are a lot of things the engineering report says should be done post construction, such as swales to maintain proper movement of the water through the property. Are these going to be adhered to? What about the continuing fill? We've had problems in that area where residents in that area have complained that they can hardly get through because of the mud. Is this property owner going to continuously fill to bring the road up to standards during the wet season. I was glad to hear Bill say that engineering of the culverts, the design of the culverts will be required by the Town. That was one of our concerns whether these culverts would be built to specifications. They are very expensive, two 48" culverts 50' long is not a small project. They will probably have to dig deep into the ground to build a base for those two 48" pipes and then you're going to have to build up the road over the top. Most of the concerns of the Conservation Commission dealt with the road and the construction of the road and the post construction, what is going to happen to the land after the road is in. Will it be maintained? No mention

of the width of the road is in the engineering report, no width of how much is going to be cleared, how much ground is going to be cleared. It says in the report "as practical", we question the statement of how much is practical? So there are a lot of questions during construction and post construction. We do not think it's the best place to put a road directly through poorly drained and very poorly drained soils in an area which is designated wetland and a medium to high resource area. Hering – Again, regarding this particular lot, it's probably the best place that the driveway can be placed if a driveway's going to be placed. The Town has another review of the erosion and sedimentation plans. Steve Smart – There's a tremendous amount of water that comes out of that pond. Although the existing culvert is smaller than the proposed, I've seen it up to the road on many occasions. Why not a bridge? Would that be less impact? I'm not in favor of this application. Carol Maguire - Is the owner of the property the abutter on both sides? Hering - Yes. The property with the small cabin does not appear to be a tidy lot and when I checked in the assessor's office, they showed two applications for septic that had both lapsed. I think what it said in the papers is that the property next to this one doesn't have a good septic system on it. It has some kind of a holding tank. If this lot gets approved for building even though it has problems with wetlands, I'm assuming that he's going to apply for a special permit for properties on both sides of this one and that will be 3 exceptions in one spot on a real low spot on Hermit Woods Road. Hering – Again, the lot that we're talking to here with the house close to the road, he was not the resident of that house he had a contract for deed on that property. I think regarding any potential septic issues there, probably any efforts to improve that would improve the septic situation and any potential pollution happening. My understanding is that Lot 5 is a much drier lot and I'm not sure what may be happening there and what would be required for special exceptions for that lot. Edney – In any of the discussions you've had with this fellow, have you ever discussed the notion of sharing a driveway and coming in from a highland side where all you're doing is crossing rather than disturbing this mass amount of wetlands. Hering – I did have that conversation with him the other day, but to go further upstream to the two brooks, we are still going to be crossing wet areas. We don't feel that should be forced upon him. Jackie Kiesel – I came in here thinking this would not be good for our neighborhood. I have listened to all the questions and answers and I feel a lot more strongly than when I came in. I don't think it should be approved. Ron Kiesel – This gentleman talks about this being upland area. This area is so wet that the tree roots are standing up on stilts. Anybody that's familiar with wetlands can tell you that when you see trees where the root structure is above ground, the reason why is because it is severely wet. As an example, there was a

partial driveway cut in on this lot, not as far as the first brook is, last summer that area never dried. There's an existing beaver dam that forms a semi-circle and also goes over onto abutting Lot #13. That beaver dam was abandoned the year before last, but last spring there was a tremendous amount of runoff and the water coming down off the hill, in addition to Hermit Brook, carried debris from that dormant beaver dam and plugged this culvert. The Town was out there twice and the water level had gotten to a point where it was up to road level ready to wash over the road. The Town has the equipment to clean out these culverts relatively easy. What is a private landowner going to have available to him on short notice when the beavers plug this up and it starts to overrun the road and carry away all the fill that was put in there? There are 700+ feet of driveway. We get ice out there quite often because we're in a higher elevation than Meredith Village. What's going to happen when this future landowner decides to salt/sand his driveway. Where is the salt going to go except down Hermit Brook under the culvert through the Cooperman's land and into the Hermit Woods Town Forest. I monitor this area. As a private individual, I don't even put salt on my driveway because conscientiously I don't want to have any salt end up in Hermit Woods marsh. I am adamantly against this proposal. Bob LeCount – Steve made a statement about 200' of wetlands to be crossed, but the engineering report says that 9,300 feet of wetlands will be impacted, which represents about 4% of the 5 ½ acres. Bob Maguire – We bought our house because we felt we would be protected by the many restrictions at the time it was built. If this particular project is allowed, it's negating all of the restrictions and will have a very negative impact on what we believe was that area. Hearing closed at 7:58 p.m.

2671. **RUSTY BERTHOLET FOR HERBERT & LINDA JOHNSON:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to create off street parking within side setbacks and an appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to allow an additional free standing sign, Tax Map No. U06, Lot No. 144, located at 8 Maple Street in the Central Business District.

This is the former Harley-Davidson building. The site plan for this project was reviewed and conditionally approved by the Planning Board last month. The lower parking lot needs to be reworked so it meets Town specs. To make the parking lot work and get as many spaces as we can, it needs to go approximately 1' into the setback area. The total parking area will be paved and striped. A landscape plan has been submitted for the project. The section of property on the lower corner of the building is all asphalt and is going to be ripped out and landscaped with a sidewalk system going from the lower parking lot upstairs to the top parking lot. To

make the parking lot work and get as many spaces as we can. A second free-standing sign is being requested which would be located on the corner of Mill Street and Maple Street and would include a directory of the businesses in the building. On the top of the dormers over the entryways, instead of putting up signs with 32 sq. ft. per business, a 12 sq. ft. sign will be placed inside the dormers to try and control the signage on the building. When someone moves in there, that's the sign they have so their message has to go on that sign. This property is unique as it actually fronts on three highways, Route 3, Mill Street and Maple Street so I feel the best way to utilize that is to put a sign structure down below so when people are driving around, they are not driving around the building trying to find something or see what's there. Moyer – Is the black and white area of the sign going to be moving sign? Bertholet – No, it will just be a removable read-a-board sign with plastic letters. It's not an electronic sign. Joslin – What about the big signage there that you see from the bridge on Route 3? Any plans for that? Bertholet – I'm currently working on beautifying it. I need the sign there because the top part of the sign advertises the train station and we have an agreement for parking. The Planning Board knows about it and it's going to be noted on the plan so I'm working with them to see what we can do to make it not look like a telephone pole sign, maybe take the poles and either paint them black or green so they kind of blend in and not look like telephone poles. The Ben Franklin sign that's there now will be repainted and we'll probably change the design to say "The Shops at Meredith Place" with an arrow so that people know. If you drive over there, it is down underneath a bridge so at some point we will be beautifying that sign to make it look like the rest of the property. Edney – I have a comment on the first portion of the application when we talk about the parking. It's actually from John Edgar and Planning Board's traffic flow concerns that drove that additional footage into the setback. Hearing closed at 8:12 p.m.

DELIBERATIONS

2667. TOWN OF MEREDITH:

Dever moved, Moyer seconded, IN CASE #2667, TOWN OF MEREDITH, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING AND RELATED SITE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE 150' BUFFER OF A PRIME WETLAND, AS IT MEETS THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Dever moved, Moyer seconded, IN CASE #2667, TOWN OF MEREDITH, I MOVE WE GRANT THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ALLOW OFF-STREET PARKING WITHIN THE SIDE SETBACKS AS IT MEETS THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

2668. ERIC A. ROSEEN LLS FOR DEAN R. & BARBARA J. BEDINGFIELD:

Joslin moved, Dever seconded, IN CASE #2668, ERIC A. ROSEEN LLS FOR DEAN R. AND BARBARA J. BEDINGFIELD, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT THE APPEAL FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A DRIVEWAY WITHIN THE 100' BUFFER OF DESIGNATED WETLANDS AS IT MEETS THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

2669. TIMOTHY PAGE FOR DAVID AND KATHLEEN WINSOR:

Dever moved, Joslin seconded, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A DRIVEWAY AND INSTALLATION OF UTILITIES ACROSS NON-DESIGNATED WETLANDS AND A NON-DESIGNATED STREAM AS IT MEETS ALL THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION AND HAS RECEIVED THE BLESSING OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

2670. STEVEN HERING FOR HOWARD S. BROWER:

Dever – At the end of the wetlands report, it states that if proper temporary erosion control measures are implemented prior to construction, there should be no adverse affect to the wetlands and streams. Permanent stabilization of the construction area will ensure that there are no future impacts to the existing wetland system and limiting the removal of existing vegetation in the buffer areas will preserve the visual aesthetics of the site. Site alteration activity should result in no long term adverse impacts to the functions and values supported by the wetland system. That's a lot of stuff to take into consideration. There is a way to make that all work, but it will be expensive. By virtue of the fact that the Conservation Commission has some serious concerns and the rest of the Board members have concerns as I do, we do have to give the property owner and the wetland scientist the benefit of the doubt. If they could hire an engineering firm to monitor this construction throughout the construction process and also the permanent stabilization of the area after it's all done so that it's not a burden that's going to fall on the Code Enforcement Officer, that's about

the only way I would be in favor of this. Like I say, it's not going to be cheap and it all depends on how badly somebody wants to build there, but we do have to protect the wetlands. Even though it is a lot of record and I know people do have rights when you have a lot of record, there are a number of lots of record that were approved that would certainly not be approved today, so I think we would have to find a balance if we possibly can. Joslin – He's saying permanent stabilization of the construction area, does that mean during the construction? Dever – No, it's after the construction area's done. It's like loaming and seeding and things of that nature to stop erosion and everything else. Joslin – Do you feel that's a fair statement to make that they can achieve permanent stabilization? Dever – I feel we're looking at a certified soil scientist that has a license and is certified by the State of New Hampshire and he's putting his certification on the line by making these statements. Moyer – Mr. Chairman, in reference to the fact that we have to look towards the owner of the property, I sat here tonight and listened to so many objections to the surrounding neighbors and I think that plus the fact it's disturbing the wetlands, we have to consider the public's view on this too. Dever – I don't disagree with that, but we have to protect the property owner just like they would like to be protected themselves. It is a very bad situation and those lots are all bad out there. Joslin – In looking over the lot, I don't see that there's a better alternative or any alternative that might create less problems for the wetlands. Dever – If we should decide to approve it, that we approve it with the stipulation that they jump through all the hoops their wetland scientist said they should jump through. Joslin – Can I have some clarification, for the sake of discussion say we approve this and grant the special exception, what happens then? What comes into play to monitor, protect, make sure that all of this goes along as it should? What's the process. Dever – The normal process would be that we approve it subject to a firm being hired to monitor this and that a bond would be put in place with the Town so that the engineering firm could be paid and then the firm would monitor it throughout the whole process and report to the Code Enforcement Officer who will be issuing the Building Permit and the Certificate of Occupancy. If these stipulations are not met, he doesn't issue a C.O., and they don't move in. Joslin – And the engineering company is the one that says OK? Joslin – People raised concerns about beaver dams and I realize there's no control over them, but is there any monitoring possible, does the landowner then...? Who says five years down the road that what we've worked to make sure has been protected, that he's still protecting this wetland? Edney – First of all, he's the first to be impacted by that kind of situation. The very first and then if there are impacts, if it's something that isn't taken care of, then the neighborhood... Dever – Then the road gets impacted. If he doesn't

have the equipment or the means to deal with it himself, there are certainly people for hire locally. I agree with you Jan, they've done everything they possibly can to minimize the effects on a lot that is a terrible lot and the ordinance does say that is what they are required to do. Edney – I would like to reiterate what Jack had touched on earlier. As difficult as this lot is, it is a legal lot of record. They've done their very best to minimize those impacts and do not have an alternative. A denial is basically a legal taking of the property and there are a whole bunch of legal ramifications to that. The decision has to be that (1) is it a probability that something can be done under tight supervision, you can put those kinds of restrictions on your approval. There is no alternative for that piece of property. The only alternative as I suggested is the notion that maybe do something off site, but we can't enforce that. Dever – Every one of these lots that's been built on over the past few years has had some action by the Board. The people that have built out there have done a good job. Joslin – That also speaks to the people that are here raising the concerns, all showing their conservation concerns.

Dever moved, Joslin seconded, I MOVE THAT THE APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION IN CASE #2670 BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THAT AN ENGINEERED EROSION CONTROL PLAN BE PROVIDED;
- (2) THAT ALL OF THE TEMPORARY MEASURES AND PERMANENT STABILIZATION MEASURES OUTLINED IN THE CIVIL ENGINEER'S REPORT BE IMPLEMENTED;
- (3) THAT AN ENGINEERING FIRM BE ENGAGED TO OVERSEE CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCING OF THE DRIVEWAY INSTALLATION;
- (4) THAT CULVERT DESIGNS BE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO INSTALLATION;
- (5) ALL EXCAVATED MATERIAL BE DISPOSED OF OFF-SITE; AND
- (6) THAT A BOND BE PLACED WITH THE TOWN OF MEREDITH FOR THE COST OF THE ENGINEERING FIRM AND THAT NO PORTIONS OF THE BOND BE RELEASED WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER AND THAT A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY WILL NOT BE ISSUED UNTIL ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET.

I FEEL THIS IS THE BEST WAY THAT THE ZBA CAN ENSURE THE CONTINUED SURVIVAL OF THOS WETLANDS AND THEY HAVE DONE ALL THEY CAN DO TO LESSEN THE IMPACTS THAT ARE POSSIBLE WITH A VERY, VERY BAD LOT. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Joslin moved, Dever seconded, IN CASE #2670, AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, WELL AND LEACHBED WITHIN THE 100' PROTECTIVE BUFFER OF DESIGNATED WETLANDS, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SPECIAL EXCETPION AS IT MEETS THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE AND AS WE LOOK AT THE SITE, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THIS IS PERHAPS THE ONLY PLACE THAT THIS HOUSE COULD BE LOCATED. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

2671. RUSTY BERTHOLET FOR HERBERT & LINDA JOHNSON:

Moyer moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE #2671, RUSTY BERTHOLET FOR HERBERT & LINDA JOHNSON, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CREATE OFF-STREET PARKING WITHIN THE SIDE SETBACKS BE GRANTED BECAUSE IT MEETS THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Moyer moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE #2671, RUSTY BERTHOLET FOR HERBERT & LINDA JOHNSON, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT THE APPEAL FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ALLOW AN ADDITIONAL FREE-STANDING SIGN ON TAX MAP U06, LOT 144, LOCATED AT 8 MAPLE STREET IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey
Administrative Assistant
Planning/Zoning Department

The above minutes were reviewed and approved at regular meeting of the Board held on _____.

John Mack, Chairman