Official As of 4/21/08

HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING Monday, April 7, 2008

CALLED TO ORDER

Chairman D. Marshall called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm

ATTENDANCE

Chairman D. Marshall, Vice-Chair R. Guay, Town Administrator D. Jodoin, R. Sullivan, D. Hemeon, R. Duhaime, D. Dreffs, B. Ehlers, J. Gryval and Town Council Rep. P. Rueppel.

Excused: J. McHugh

Absent: Y. Nahikian

D. Tatem, Stantec Engineer, and Jo Ann Duffy, Town Planner, representing the Town of Hooksett

<u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 3/17/08 & 3/24/08</u>

P. Rueppel motioned to approve the minutes of March 17, 2008 as submitted. Seconded by R. Guay.

Correction: Page 6 bullet #4 and page 8 "a street sweeper will be donated <u>to</u> the Town Highway Dept."

Vote unanimously in favor. J. Gryval abstained.

P. Rueppel motioned to approve the minutes of March 24, 2008 as submitted. Seconded by R. Guay.

Correction: J. Gryval attended meeting.

Vote unanimously in favor. D. Jodoin abstained.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION – RSA 91-A:3 II (d)

D. Marshall stated non-public session moved to end of tonight's agenda.

WAIVER

1. MANCHESTER SAND & GRAVEL

Hooksett Road, Map 3, Lots 1 through 11, 17, 19 through 24, 26 Map 14, Lots 2, 3, 4, 5

Waiver requests for design speed limit, intersection sight distance for driveways, driveway grading, driveway radii and width, and minimum buildable area requirements.

Continued to April 21, 2008 Planning Board Meeting.

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. NANCY LANE (08-07)

15, 17, & 19 Nancy Lane, Map 25, Lots 21-1, 21-2, and 21-3 Lot Line Adjustment.

J. Duffy: This is a 5 Lot subdivision at the end of Nancy Lane with a gated access to Berry Hill. Applicant is reconfiguring lots; 2 lots smaller and 1 lot larger. What is the intension of this project? Is there any consideration for future elderly housing?

Don Duval (Duval Survey, Inc.): Applicant has discussed with me the possibility of future elderly housing. I am aware that I would need to obtain ZBA prior approval for elderly housing. Tonight's presentation is only for a lot line adjustment. If the ZBA does not approve elderly housing in the future, then the applicant will have a large lot.

- R. Duhaime: Any water and sewer on this site?
- D. Duval: At the end of the new cul-de-sac, there is water available.
- D. Hemeon: Central Water Precinct did not approve water to this site.
- D. Marshall: Is there municipal sewer and water to this site?
- D. Duval: Yes.
- J. Duffy: The applicant came with a revised site plan to accommodate water and sewer with frontage adjustments. I will need to review previous revisions to this plan for water and sewer availability. This plan is complete.
- J. Gryval: Note # 6 is repeated by note #8 on the plan presented.
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to find the plan complete?

R. Duhaime motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by R. Guay. Vote unanimously in favor.

- D. Marshall: Waiver request submitted and read into the record.
- R. Duhaime: If this site becomes a retirement community, can we get closer to the existing Berry Hill entrance at 25-1-3 vs. 25-1-1 for traffic flow?
- R. Sullivan: The road runs the entire length of the development; not sure how traffic flow would work with 25-1-3. There is a larger turn radius into the cul-de-sac. Could this configuration be adjusted?
- D. Duval: The current configuration of the road is what the applicant requested.

- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the waivers tonight and address the reconfiguration of the road at a later date?
- R. Sullivan motioned to grant the waivers tonight and address the reconfiguration of the road at a later date. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.
- D. Marshall: There will be no public hearing at this time.

Continued public hearing to May 5, 2008 and abutters will be renotified.

3. BOUCHARD/COREY (08-08)

115 & 117 Mammoth Road, Map 39, Lot 24 & 25 Lot Line Adjustment

- D. Duval: This project is the outcome of Estate planning.
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to find the plan complete?
- J. Gryval motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.

Open public hearing:

Will any parcels be built on the back of the property?

- D. Duval: No.
- D. Tatem: How many acres are on this site?
- D. Duval: 4.17 acres are on this site.

Close public hearing.

- D. Marshall: Waiver request submitted and read into the record.
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the waivers?
- J. Gryval motioned to grant the waivers. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.
- J. Duffy: This plan is complete with the following conditions:
 - ➤ All review fees are paid-in-full
 - > 2 Mylars, 11 paper copies and 1 digital copy
 - ➤ All waivers noted on plan

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to approve the plan with J. Duffy conditions?

J. Gryval motioned to approve the plan with J. Duffy conditions. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Vote unanimously in favor.

4. 4 JOHNS DRIVE (08-09)

4A & 4B Johns Drive, Map 48, Lot 16 2 Unit Condo Conversion

J. Duffy: This plan is complete.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to find the plan complete?

P. Rueppel motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by R. Guay. Vote unanimously in favor.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

- D. Marshall: Waiver request submitted and read into the record.
- R. Duhaime: Are there any other duplexes in this area? What is the dotted line?
- D. Duval: No other duplexes. The dotted line is the limited common area. This is not a site change, just a condo conversion.
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the waivers?

R. Sullivan motioned to grant the waivers. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.

- J. Duffy: The plan is complete with the following conditions:
 - ➤ All review fees are paid-in-full
 - ➤ 2 Mylars, 11 paper copies
 - Town attorney review and approve condominium declarations
 - ➤ All waivers noted on plan
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to approve the plan with J. Duffy conditions?

R. Duhaime motioned to approve the plan with J. Duffy conditions. Seconded by D. Dreffs.

Vote unanimously in favor.

5. 2 ROCKFOREST DRIVE CONDOMINIUM (08-11)

2A Rockforest Drive, Map 42, Lot 25-2 Condo Conversion

- J. Duffy: This plan is complete.
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to find the plan complete?

R. Sullivan motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by R. Guay. Vote unanimously in favor.

Open public hearing:

Is this a change in ownership only?

D. Duval: Yes.

Close public hearing.

- D. Marshall: Waiver request submitted and read into the record.
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the waivers?

R. Sullivan motioned to grant the waivers. Seconded by D. Dreffs. Vote unanimously in favor.

- D. Duval: I could not find a State approved septic system document. Therefore, I am working with the State for the septic approval.
- J. Duffy: The plan is complete with the following conditions:
 - ➤ All review fees are paid-in-full
 - ➤ 2 Mylars, 11 paper copies
 - > State approval of septic system
 - Town attorney review and approve condominium declarations
 - ➤ All waivers noted on plan
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to approve the plan with J. Duffy conditions?

R. Guay motioned to approve the plan with J. Duffy conditions. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Vote unanimously in favor.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

6. CATAMOUNT MANAGEMENT (07-38)

5 Lindsay Road, Map 25, Lot 18-3B Non-Residential Site Plan for a 2-story, 11,450 sq ft office building

Chris Tymula (Senior Project Engineer, MHF Design Consultants, Inc): Presented plan to the Planning Board.

- J. Duffy: Stantec has completed their second review. There is a question about the water pressure to the site. The engineer states the pressure is adequate. There is a landscaping plan with 25 ft buffers for the frontage. What are the size of the matured Ash and Maple Trees? What is the landscaping for facing the existing elderly apartments. The Planning Board will also need to approve the signage on Hooksett Road.
- R. Duhaime: I can provide options for landscaping to the applicant.
- D. Tatem: I recommend a cross-section plan abutting the residential projects. The Planning Board needs to approve the signage.
- C. Tymula: The intent for signage is to use the existing sign "Campbell Hill Estates". We could maintain the existing sign. Once the tenants are in the building, then the sign would be changed.
- D. Marshall: The Planning Board will need to receive and review the dimensions and look of the new sign.
- R. Sullivan: Why are you using the existing sign? With most developments in Hooksett, the association is responsible for their community sign.

Stephen Kaneb (owner of property-Catamount Management Corp.): I own the existing Campbell Hill Estates sign and it is on my property.

- D. Tatem: There is a retaining wall to the rear of the site. The Geo Technical Engineer stated this does not affect the wetlands "no disturb area".
- R. Sullivan: I recommend a larger meeting location (i.e. Library) for a public hearing on the sign.
- R. Guay: It is common for developers to install signs. Since the residents at Campbell Hill do not own the sign, the applicant has the right to change it.
- D. Tatem: There are steeper than 3:1 slopes on the site.

Open public hearing:

Donna Fitzpatrick: Where will the water source come from?

- D. Tatem: This project will be on the Oak Hill water booster not the Campbell Hill water booster.
- D. Fitzpatrick: Is the access road on Lindsay Road? Is it possible access behind the muffler shop on Hooksett Road?
- C. Tymula: Access road is on Lindsay Road. It is not an option to access behind the muffler shop due to wetland area.
- D. Hemeon: It should be noted on the plan for 50-75 ft repave for the water supply via the Oak Hill booster station.

Michael Sorel: At the next public hearing, will there be more information on the water being tapped, etc.?

J. Gryval: What is the purpose of a 5 yr. moratorium?

Continued public hearing to May 5, 2008 Planning Board Meeting at the Hooksett Public Library.

7. WEBSTER WOODS PHASE II (07-37)

Hooksett Road, Map 6, Lot 114 Site Plan for 46 Duplex Units and 7 Single Units, 55 & Older Person Housing

- D. Marshall: Bernice and Otterson roadways are gated for emergency use only.
- J. Duffy: Yes, Bernice and Otterson are gated for emergency use only, however Stantec has determined that left hand turns exiting at peak hours are too dangerous. The site plan cannot have a condition "no left turn at peak hours". There needs to be another way to exit the site for left hand turns onto Rte 3 Hooksett Road.
- D. Marshall: Who is going to enforce no left hand turns onto Rte 3? Bernice and Otterson roadways will remain gated for emergency use only.
- J. Duffy: The conditions to this plan include:
 - ➤ Conservation "trail committee" to maintain the existing easement
 - Condominium declarations to be reviewed and approved by the Town attorney for the total of 93 units phase I 40 units and phase II 53 units (condominium declarations are in existence for the present 40 units in phase I)
 - ➤ Wetland setbacks need to be clear on the plan along with the seal and signature of the wetland scientist
 - ➤ March 12, 2008 was the 65 day deadline on this plan, therefore plan needs to be extended

- D. Tatem: The 2nd revision to the site plan should be noted on the plan.
- D. Tatem: Left hand turns exiting this site are unsafe. I need the traffic comments from Michael Gospodarek, P.E. Edward N. Herbert Assoc, Inc.
- D. Marshall: How many units for phase II?

Peter Godzak: There are 40 units for phase I and 53 units for phase II for a total of 93 homes.

- M. Gospodarek: The topographic is 6-8 ft lower. There cannot be a road from Rte 3 because of the steep elevation.
- D. Tatem: The magnitude of volume on Rte 3 results in unsafe left turn exiting for both phase I and phase II.
- D. Marshall: If the gated Bernice and Otterson roadways opened as accesses, this would not resolve the unsafe left hand turns.
- D. Tatem: The Post and Granite roadways may warrant better access.

Stephen Pernaw, Traffic Study: Presented a flip chart presentation of the traffic study. The weekday higher volume vs. weekend is typical. During the week, the Rte 3 highest volume is in the pm. There were manual observations completed for Ash Street from 7-8am (southbound) and 4:45-5:45pm (northbound). The traffic study included normal growth rate and vacancies in phase I. I have included the 2019 projections on the Rte 3 corridor. The 55+ communities have less traffic than single-family homes. The projection includes 23 am and 26 pm trips. The manual traffic count for the left hand turn volume was 6 trips within 60 minutes. The biggest impact in the study was traffic turning south onto Rte 3, not north onto Rte 3. The right turns into the development had the highest volume of 11 cars at peak hours. There is no need to provide a left turn lane, widen the shoulder or add traffic signals with these low volumes. The Bernice and Otterson roadways should remain gated for emergency use only. Pavement markers should be added to the existing roadway.

D. Hemeon: What is the traffic study based on?

Stephen P.: Traffic study based on manual traffic study, projection for new units and State DOT September 2007 data. The manual study is # of trips, not vehicles, in and out over a 60 minute period of time.

- D. Hemeon: How many units are now built?
- J. Duffy: 28 units are now built.

- D. Hemeon: Granite Street is an example of vehicles being rear-ended heading North on Rte 3. Is there a way to gather information on past accidents in this area? How much pavement would be needed to head northbound turning left into Webster Woods?
- Stephen P.: No left hand turn lane is needed based on my traffic study. Ash Street had no accidents between 2003-2005.
- R. Duhaime: Vehicles at Birch and Granite Streets heading northbound are exiting at the same time.
- Stephen P.: There are approximately 1,171 vehicles heading North on Rte 3 in an hour.
- R. Duhaime: Approximately 20 cars per minute are heading North on Rte 3. Therefore every 4 minutes, a vehicle would be turning left into Webster Woods and stopping traffic heading North on Rte if there is oncoming southbound traffic.
- D. Tatem: There are 17 vehicles proposed to take left hand turns; 330 southbound oncoming vehicles. The State warrant does not have studies for 1,171 vehicles in an hour. Therefore, it is recommended to have a left turn lane vs. stopping traffic on Rte 3 northbound. There is not enough shoulder for traffic to go around a turning vehicle.
- R. Duhaime: Why is there no recommendation for a shoulder widening?
- Stephen P.: A left turn lane or shoulder widening is not warranted due low volumes in traffic study.
- R. Duhaime: The manual count traffic study does not project the other developments proposed for the near future (i.e. 400 homes at Head's Pond). The new connector road has caused increased speed and the need for another traffic light on Rte 3.
- D. Marshall: The Brookview and Northview projects left turn lanes were not recommended by the State DOT, however the Planning Board required it. A left turn lane is needed for Webster Woods phase II. The applicant should go back to the State DOT and revise the plans.
- R. Sullivan: What traffic issues will there be on Rte. 3 in 2019?
- D. Marshall: If the gated Bernice and Otterson roadways opened as accesses, this would not resolve the unsafe left hand turns. Cannot enforce no left turns, therefore do not make as a condition or recommendation.
- D. Stantec: The grading plan at the cul-de-sac top 3 units left side, the rear decks are 4-5ft of very steep drop-off. Recommendation to have these areas flattened for owner access to unit decks.

J. Duffy: There needs to be access for the Kuwanis to maintain the conservation hiking trail.

Stephen P.: Yes, I agree to access to the hiking trail. This detention area will have grass and natural vegetation.

Open public hearing:

Gary Ouellette: I am a resident at 11 Dogwood Drive and did not receive notification of Webster Woods phase II project.

J Duffy: For the first 40 units there is a condo association, however there is no wording when the residents would form the board and how. Therefore, the abutter notice went to Miacomet Development.

- D. Marshall: When all units are sold, who is the association? Phase II must have an established association with the language approved by the Town Attorney.
- P. Rueppel: Doesn't the State have requirements for an association?
- R. Guay: The State Attorney General's Office requires details in the condo docs for an association when over 12 units.
- J. Duffy: The phase II condo docs will need to be reviewed by the Town Attorney.
- G. Ouellette: The Blakes area has high traffic in the Summer months. Is there a potential for a future traffic light at Granite Street?
- G. Ouellette: Why are Bernice and Otterson gated accesses?
- D. Marshall: These are emergency accesses only and not for public use. If these are open, then anyone can access these roadways.
- G. Ouellette: Is there a recreational green area?
- D. Marshall: There is only a conservation trail now, no other recreational green area.
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to extend the expired 65 day deadline for another 60 days?

R. Guay motioned to extend the expired 65 day deadline for another 60 days. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Duffy: Abutters will be renotified once a date is established for presentation at a future Planning Board Meeting.

8. FRANK MADZIARZ (07-32)

25 Jacob Avenue, Map 48, Lot 47 Lot Line Adjustment and one (1) Lot Subdivision

Continued to April 21, 2008 Planning Board Meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Jo Ann Duffy:

- A) The 10 yr plan drafted in January 2008 to be amended to note the Hooksett (a) Cabela's 3A & turnpike ramp reconstruction and (b) Benton Road project.
- B) Grant by State There are upcoming grant funds Fall 2008 to update the master plan (\$20,000 for 2 yrs). I spoke with David Preece, SNHPC, and I recommend the Town Planner apply now for the Fall.
- C) I spoke with Steve Couture, Conservation Commission, and David Campbell, MSG the April 21, 2008 MSG waiver discussion to include land to Town, plus fee to maintain conservation easements and longterm management plan; potential to save the Town \$20,000 in future.
- D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to end the public session and go into a non-public session?

R Sullivan motioned to end the public session and go into a non-public session. Seconded by D. Jodoin.

Vote unanimously in favor.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION - RSA 91-A:3 II (d)

P. Rueppel motioned to seal non-public session meeting minutes and not to divulge. Seconded by R. Sullivan.

Vote unanimously in favor.

- P. Rueppel motioned to come out of non-public session. Seconded by R. Sullivan. Vote unanimously in favor.
- P. Rueppel motioned to adjourn meeting. Seconded by R. Sullivan. Vote unanimously in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman D. Marshall declared the meeting adjourned at 10:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick Planning Coordinator