

**Official**  
**As of 5/19/08**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**MINUTES**  
**HOOKSETT MEMORIAL SCHOOL**  
**Monday, May 5, 2008**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

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

**ATTENDANCE**

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

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 4/21/08**

*J. McHugh motioned to approve the minutes of April 21, 2008 as submitted. Seconded by P. Rueppel.*

*Vote unanimously in favor. R. Sullivan abstained.*

**REVOCAION HEARING**

- 1. REVOCATION OF SUBDIVISION APPROVAL – UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS PHASE II ( RSA 676:4 - a (b),(c),(e) )**  
Hooksett Road, Map 14, Lots 1-9

J. Duffy: The issue is concerning payment to Stantec. There was \$80,518.33 in total invoices due with the oldest invoice dating back to August 2007. In February 2008, staff had a meeting with the applicant for collection of the money. On April 21, 2008, we received payment, however this was the same day the revocation of subdivision was being discussed with the Planning Board and we needed to wait for the checks to clear. Therefore, the Planning Board motioned to continue with the revocation hearing on May 5, 2008. The stipulation from the developer was to hold \$10,572.87 in disputed charges with Stantec for time spent representing the Library Trustees. We did go ahead with the remaining payment. On May 1, 2008, we met with the applicant and a settlement was reached between the developer, Town, and Stantec. There is \$10,000 set aside for future Stantec invoices. The site plan approval process will need reviews and inspections by Stantec. I have concerns with the applicant's payment of future Stantec invoices. I recommend no work done by Stantec unless the money has been paid in advance. I do not recommend revoking the subdivision approval. I recommend something in writing be given to the developer regarding Stantec future payments.

D. Jodoin: The funds have been released.

R. Sullivan: Is this the same process for all developers?

J. Duffy: Yes, same process for all developers.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to revoke the subdivision approval?

***D. Dreffs motioned to revoke the subdivision approval. Seconded by P. Rueppel.  
Vote unanimously in opposition; no revocation.***

### **CONTINUED DISCUSSION**

#### **2. RON LUCCI**

Merrimack Street, Map 9, Lots 67 and 68

Subdivision of Map 9, Lot 68 into two single-family lots and Map 9, Lot 67 into three lots; each having water frontage on the Merrimack River

J. Gryval: I attended the site walk. Property should be subdivided. There is just enough room for parking across the street.

R. Duhaime: I have existing safety issues for the first lot. The homeowners are already using the existing parking. Subdividing the property will not add more safety issues.

P. Holden: Provided overview of the site map.

R. Sullivan: I drove by the property. There really should be parking.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion for a letter to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) that the Planning Board identifies this property as unique and the homeowners should use the lots across the street for parking vs. parking on the road?

***R. Sullivan motioned for a letter to the ZBA that the Planning Board identifies this property as unique and the homeowners should use the lots across the street for parking vs. parking on the road. Seconded by J. McHugh.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

### **DISCUSSIONS**

#### **3. THE STABLE COMPANIES – UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS APARTMENTS** Hooksett Road, Map 14, Lot 14-1

Bobbie Hantz, Attorney: Presented an overview of the site plan to eliminate one 12 unit building and take these 12 units and add them to three of the 24 unit buildings. This would bring the total units of 28 vs. 24 per building. A zoning variance would be needed. The buildings would increase in height to 47' ½" tall; well under the regulation limit.

J. McHugh: Is there any age limit for these apartments?

B. Hantz: No age limit.

J. Gryval: Will this revised plan have a monetary savings on the site work?

B. Hantz: Yes there will be a monetary savings as well as adding more green space.

Y. Nahikian: How are 4 units being added to 3 buildings?

B. Hantz: Pointed to units on site plan.

R. Duhaime: There needs to be buffering for the elevations from DW Highway. The taller the building, the more visible it is from DW Highway. This plan has taller buildings than originally proposed.

R. Sullivan: We spent a lot of time in past discussions on the size of the buildings. Why should we set a variance for 24 to 28 units?

Shaun Malone, The Stabile Companies: Higher buildings will add more green space in the subdivision.

B. Hantz: This is a relatively minor 7 ft height adjustment.

D. Dreffs: We have a regulation and we should abide by it and not request a variance.

J. McHugh: Will the number of bedrooms stay the same?

B. Hantz: Yes, 1 & 2 bedrooms. There will be no studios.

D. Marshall: What are the Board's comments to the Zoning Board of Adjustment?

***Unanimous consensus by the Board: "Keep plan as is with 24 unit buildings vs. the proposed 28 unit buildings."***

**4. HOLDEN ENGINEERING - CHRIS MASTRIANO**  
Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 47

Peter Holden, Holden Engineering: The site presented tonight is next to Mr. Mastriano's existing Diesel Land Truck dealership. The site presently has a billboard on it. The site is proposed for a 4,500 sq ft building auto dealership with auto repair and customer parking in the front. There is an aquifer protection zone line on this site. At this time, we are only requesting comments from the Board.

R. Duhaime: This area is saturated with car lots. We previously asked that the back area of this site be cleaned-up. I would like to see this lot limited. It is in the performance zone district. Would Diesel Land get upgraded landscaping as part of this site condition?

D. Marshall: Does the Board have any other comments?

Board: No further comments at this time.

### **WAIVERS**

#### **5. LOG HOUSE ANTIQUE CENTER (08-19)**

1158 Hooksett Road, Map 39, Lot 39

Waiver Request for Outdoor Antique Market on Saturday Mornings from  
8:00am-10:00am

D. Marshall: The waiver requests were submitted and read into the record.

J. Duffy: The Ed Walter NH Auto Display has 12 cars approved to be at this site. Would the cars be allowed to stay here when the outdoor market is held?

B. Sullivan: Can this space be used for two different purposes?

Mike Donnell: My site has nothing to do with the abutting auto site.

J. Duffy: The proposed Rondeau Ed Walter auto site and this existing site as an annex?

Ed Walter: If I am approved for my application at 1118 Hooksett Road tonight, then I will relocate my autos from 1158 Hooksett Road to 1118 Hooksett Rd. I would withdraw the Planning Board approval for 1158 Hooksett Road (Plan File #06-02 approved 2-6-06).

B. Sullivan: What about a new applicant for 1158 Hooksett Road site?

D. Marshall: A new application for 1158 Hooksett Road would have to be submitted to the Planning Board.

J. Gryval: Will there be tents at the antique market? If yes, how long will these tents stay up?

M. Donnell: Some dealers have tables or sell out of the back of their truck. I would not be opposed for dealers to have small tents. There are no parking problems.

J. Gryval: The dealers are cleaned-up by 10:00am?

J. McHugh: There are traffic issues and potential parking alongside Hooksett Road.

M. Donnell: This antique market is just for dealers. It is not a flea market.

J. McHugh: I don't want to see auto accidents as a result of the antique market.

P. Rueppel: I am also concerned about the traffic.

J. Duffy: If this waiver is approved, the Board could make it conditional "If the outdoor antique market ever becomes a nuisance as defined by the Planning Board, the applicant will be called back to appear before the Board."

D. Marshall: How is the traffic by Meadowbrook Condominiums and Rte. 3?

J. Gryval: I live nearby and have not seen traffic issues.

R. Duhaime: I previously requested an island and landscaping to separate the auto sales from the Calico house. That was never provided.

M. Donnell: I have 58-68 parking spaces.

Y. Nahikian: What will the buffer be between the dealers at the outdoor antique market and general public shopping inside the building on Saturdays?

M. Donnell: The outdoor market will end prior to inside sales being open to the public.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the waiver conditional "If the outdoor antique market ever becomes a nuisance as defined by the Planning Board, the applicant will be called back to appear before the Board."?

***P. Rueppel motioned to grant waiver conditional "If the outdoor antique market ever becomes a nuisance as defined by the Planning Board, the applicant will be called back to appear before the Board." Seconded by J. Gryval.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

**6. BROOK RIDGE (08-20)**  
3 Mailhouse Road, Map 19, Lot 4-1  
Waiver Request for Construction of a Gazebo

Larry Cutting, Jensen's Construction Supervisor: Presented overview of gazebo plan.

D. Marshall: Do we have any comments from the Board?

Board: No comments.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the waiver for construction of a gazebo?

***R. Sullivan motioned to grant the waiver for construction of a gazebo. Seconded by P. Rueppel.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

**COMPLETENESS HEARINGS**

- 7. SOUTHERN NH UNIVERSITY (08-12)**  
North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67  
Non-Residential Site Plan for a Dining Facility

Jeff Kevan, TF Moran: Presented overview of site plan.

D. Dreffs: I am stepping down from the Board on this application.

D. Tatem: Plan is complete.

J. Duffy: 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. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***Public hearing on June 2, 2008.***

- 8. SOUTHERN NH UNIVERSITY (08-13)**  
North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67  
Non-Residential Site Plan for a Parking Lot

Jeff Kevan, TF Moran: Presented overview of site plan.

D. Dreffs: I am stepping down from the Board on this application.

J. McHugh: How close is this site to the Underhill School?

J. Kevan: Pointed out site on plan.

D. Tatem: Plan is complete.

J. Duffy: 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 J. Gryval.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***Public hearing on June 2, 2008.***

- 9. SOUTHERN NH UNIVERSITY (08-14)**  
North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67  
Non-Residential Site Plan for an Academic Building

Steve Long, Opechee Construction Corp.: Presented overview of site plan.

D. Dreffs: I am stepping down from the Board on this application.

D. Tatem: Plan is complete.

J. Duffy: Plan is complete.

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

*J. Gryval motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by P. Rueppel.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

*Public hearing on June 2, 2008.*

#### **COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 10. 1134 HOOKSETT ROAD LLC (08-18)**  
1134 Hooksett Road, Map 39, Lot 33-1  
Non-Residential Site Plan for Clock Tower and Walkway

*Continued to May 19, 2008.*

- 11. RONDEAU – ED WALTERS (08-03)**  
1118 Hooksett Road, Map 41, Lot 92  
Site Improvement – parking delineation for vehicle displays

D. Marshall: The completeness checklist waiver requests were submitted and read into the record (date April 30, 2008 items A-M). This site is to continue operation as a commercial establishment for the sale of motor vehicles.

R. Duhaime: This site is in the performance zone. Are we granting waivers under existing conditions?

D. Marshall: Waivers A-M are non-negotiable.

D. Tatem: Waivers A-M are for completeness checklist only.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant waivers A-M?

*J. Gryval motioned to grant waivers A-M. Seconded by D. Jodoin.  
Vote unanimously in favor. Opposed by R. Duhaime.*

D. Marshall: The waiver request for a) existing topographic contours, b) soils analysis, c) drainage analysis, and d) various studies (wildlife, etc.) was submitted and read into the record.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant waivers A-D?

***D. Dreffs motioned to grant waiver request for a) existing topographic contours, b) soils analysis, c) drainage analysis, and d) various studies (wildlife, etc.) were submitted and read into the record. Seconded by D. Jodoin.  
Vote unanimously in favor. Opposed by R. Duhaime.***

D. Marshall: The waiver request for plan scale 1" = 20' was submitted and read into the record.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant waiver for plan scale?

***J. Gryval motioned to grant waiver request for plan scale 1" = 20'. Seconded by D. Jodoin.  
Vote unanimously in favor. Opposed by R. Duhaime.***

D. Marshall: The waiver request for Section 10-A, Article F access from local roads was submitted and read into the record.

J. McHugh: Will Rte. 3 be widened in the future?

Robert Shiffman, The Civil Engineers, Inc.: The slope is steep from Leonard and Cushing.

J. Gryval: The retaining structure keeps the parking lot elevated from Leonard Ave.

R. Duhaime: How many other properties are accessible from Cushing Ave? This is a Town road.

Gary Rondeau: There is limited access to this site.

R. Duhaime: Is there commercial land behind this site?

R. Shiffman: It is in the performance zone.

D. Marshall: Mr. Duhaime, are you suggesting subdividing the back lot?

R. Duhaime: There are two accesses from Rte. 3; no access from Leonard or Cushing.

D. Marshall: The subdivision suggested by Mr. Duhaime would take out 20% usage from site. This is an existing business.

R. Duhaime: This is the one time to improve this site.

R. Sullivan: Has the Town Planner reviewed this plan in depth? Sheet 2 shows a 6-lane road?

D. Tatem: There are 2 lanes in each direction with a center turn lane.

R. Sullivan: The setback for Leonard and Cushing Avenues does not appear correct with the parked cars.

R. Shiffman: The EP (edge of pavement) and property line is grass. The DOT designates the paved shoulder.

D. Dreffs: Has the applicant contacted the Fire Dept. for input?

G. Rondeau: Is the question, can the Fire Dept. get around the building?

J. Duffy: The existing site is open. The new site will have curbing in the center and it will improve the frontage.

J. Gryval: Right now cars are parked up to Leonard Avenue.

D. Marshall: What will be in the 15 ft wide strips in front of Cushing and Leonard Avenues?

G. Rondeau: The strips will have planting.

Y. Nahikian: Are there any plans showing the grading?

R. Duhaime: Is the parking lot designed as it is?

G. Rondeau: We purchased the property back in the 1970s.

D. Marshall: It is an existing lot.

J. McHugh: What are the Town Planner and Stantec comments for this access waiver?

D. Tatem: Review sheet 2 and then look at sheet 1. Cushing and Leonard Avenues are 18-20 ft wide and not realistic for access roads; too narrow. Can the Fire Dept. access these roads? Look at this site as a whole. The landscaping should be enhanced.. Last week, the applicant only had a 4 ft wide island. He has since revised his plan to propose an 8 ft wide island. The waivers requested are checklist items. I recommend the lighting should not be waived. This revised site plan is an improvement from the initial version.

J. Duffy: This site was approved back in 1989 for a similar business. The last approved site plan for a Dunkin Donuts was revoked at the Planning Board Meeting on April 21, 2008.

R. Duhaime: There are no topographies for the roadways.

D. Tatem: Topographies is not an issue. The issue is the narrowness of Leonard and Cushing roadways.

J. Duffy: The plan submitted tonight is much better than the initial plan. A lot of work has been put into this revised plan.

R. Duhaime: Is the driveway access to the performance zone?

D. Tatem: If Fire Dept. agrees, I am in support of 33 ft in and out from Rte. 3 and one way out onto Cushing Avenue.

R. Sullivan: The performance zoning is to improve a lot and better the Town. This plan is an improvement.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant waiver for access from local roads?

***J. Gryval motioned to grant the waiver request for Section 10-A, Article F access from local roads. Seconded by R. Sullivan.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Marshall: The waiver request for front landscape area and tree strip was submitted and read into the record.

D. Jodoin: Would the applicant point out the landscape site on the map?

R. Shiffman: Pointed out landscape site on the map.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the waiver for the front landscape area and tree strip?

***R. Sullivan motioned to grant the waiver for the front landscape area and tree strip. Seconded by D. Dreffs.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Marshall: Is the plan complete?

D. Tatem: 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 J. Gryval  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**Open public hearing:**

J. Duffy: The sign proposed for the business is on the lower left corner of the sheet presented.

D. Tatem: The sign meets the technical components.

D. Marshall: The applicant is only changing the panel to the existing sign.

D. Tatem: We should discuss the landscaping plan. I recommend this plan have conditional approval:

- 2 Mylars, 11 paper copies and 1 digital
- Location and direction of site lighting and utilities are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction
- Applicant agrees to preconstruction monitoring and site plan compliance monitoring
- All waivers noted on plan

R. Shiffman: The original proposal was for a full strip of trees. In my new plan I am presenting, I recommend not having trees all along the fenced area. I propose to replace the existing fence with a 4 ft stockade fence and to extend it to Rte. 3.

G. Rondeau: It is hard to clean around the landscaping. How long will trees survive along Rte. 3?

P. Rueppel: Does Mr. Duhaime have comment on potting landscaping?

R. Duhaime: I have no further comments on the landscaping.

Y. Nahikian: Two curb cuts are not needed on Rte. 3.

**Close Public Hearing:**

**No public comments.**

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to approve the landscaping plan?

*R. Duhaime motioned to approve the landscaping plan. Seconded by R. Sullivan.  
Vote unanimously in favor. Opposed by P. Rueppel.*

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to approve the site plan conditional per D. Tatem bullets above?

***D. Dreffs motioned to approve plan conditional:***

- **2 Mylars, 11 paper copies and 1 digital**
- **Location and direction of site lighting and utilities are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction**
- **Applicant agrees to preconstruction monitoring and site plan compliance monitoring**
- **All waivers noted on plan**

***Seconded by J. Gryval.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**12. 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 and sign(s)

R. Sullivan: I am stepping down from the Board on this application.

J. Duffy: If this plan is not approved tonight, an extension will be needed; expires on May 7, 2008.

D. Tatem: Need letter from the sewer and water departments regarding capacity.

Chris Tymula, MHF Designs: I met with R. Duhaime and Ms. Fitzpatrick. We can incorporate R. Duhaime's suggestions for landscaping. We have revised our plans per Stantec's comments. The existing Campbell Hill Estates sign will be used for the new office building.

P. Rueppel: On the proposed sign, who is Tenant A & B?

C. Tymula: The Tenants of the office building A – floor 1, B – floor 2. They are not known at this time.

P. Rueppel: I do not like the sign.

Y. Nahikian: The scale of the building does not go with the residential neighborhood.

McHugh: How many tenants will there be?

C. Tymula: One tenant on each floor.

D. Dreffs: Is the applicant willing to discuss options for the sign with the Board?

D. Marshall: The use of this plan is allowed by the ordinance.

Y. Nahikian: I recommend an Aesthetic Meeting regarding the building design and sign.

**Open public hearing:**

D. Marshall: This is a commercial site and something is going on this property. If the public is opposed to this application, provide the ordinances that are not being met. Merely not liking the application for this site plan is not grounds to oppose.

Mr. Rob Spencer (Stirling Ave. resident): Why weren't the residents in this community informed earlier how we feel about a business so close to a residential neighborhood?

D. Marshall: I appreciate the community wanting to protect their residential neighborhood, however this property is zoned commercial. The law only requires that abutters be notified. The residents at Campbell Hill recently received a courtesy notice only.

Mr. Spencer: How many vehicles are anticipated for traffic?

R. Duhaime: Traffic study is 1 trip every 3 minutes during weekday peak hours.

Unknown Resident: The traffic light needs to be retimed; long wait periods.

D. Marshall: The DOT may warrant a signal retiming.

Ms. Margaret Roach: I have safety concerns with our children walking down Lindsay Road and crossing Hooksett Road to get to the school bus. There are no sidewalks.

D. Marshall: The Planning Board approval for the Lindsay Road residential development was for grass panels. Residents would lose 6-7 ft of lawn if there were sidewalks.

Ms. Roach: How much of this proposed building will be visible from Lindsay Road? Are trees coming out?

R. Duhaime: There are setbacks for wetlands.

D. Marshall: There is a crash gate off of Nancy Lane for emergency use only.

C. Tymula: Deputy Chief Hoisington from the Fire Dept. is all set with our plans.

Ms. Roach: Are there any restrictions on business tenants?

Mr. Glen Williamson (Lenox Street resident): It is difficult to generate peak traffic studies when the tenants are not known. There is no ability to turn right going up. There are no sidewalks. There are no markings on the roadway. There are no improvements to Rte. 3 to accommodate this facility. This is an incompatible use of this site for a residential neighborhood.

D. Marshall: This property is zoned for commercial use.

D. Tatem: I am a hired consultant by the Town. From a technical standpoint, this parcel was left for commercial use by the original subdivision. It has been in the performance zone for several years.

Mr. Williamson: I understand the landowner has every right to develop his property, however everyone in the residential neighborhood is being harmed.

D. Marshall: We have a community to live, work and play. This plan is a good mix for this community and is a compatible use.

J. McHugh: Would the applicant include sidewalks from this site plan to the bottom of Lindsay Road for the safety of the children to access the bus stop?

Y. Nahikian: I understand the concerns of the neighbors. The architecture of this building needs to be revised to fit better into this neighborhood.

Ms. Patricia Spencer: Why can't this building be closer to Rte. 3.?

C. Tymula: The majority of this site is wetlands. The site plan as presented already has the Westview Terrace building as a buffer to the residential neighborhood.

Mr. Rui Furtado (Lindsay Road resident): Could this building be accessed from Hooksett Road?

D. Marshall: No, there are wetlands.

Ms. Roach: What is the anticipated traffic for the construction phase?

D. Marshall: This plan would be conditional for a preconstruction meeting to identify the traffic plan. We also require bonds to protect the existing roadway from the construction vehicles.

Mr. Albert: Is there additional buildable land on this site? There are safety issues before and after the buses arrive. Parents are parked along the side of Lindsay Road.

Mr. Jim Duffin (39 Virginia Court resident): Ice build-up is a safety issue in this area in Winter.

Donna Fitzpatrick: Will there be a second sign at the entrance to the site driveway?

C. Tymula: No, only one sign will be at the bottom of the hill on Rte. 3.

J. Duffy: Totally eliminating Campbell Hill sign, applicant willing to provide another sign for Campbell Hill.

D. Tatem: A 10 ft sign is allowed; there is room to add "Campbell Hill Estates".

R. Sullivan: In the past, the corner of Rte. 3 and Lindsay Road has been saturated with staked For Sale Signs and cars parked in this area marked “for sale”. Would the applicant provide the Town the authority to eliminate these signs/parking?

Stephen Kaneb, property owner: I am aware of the sensitivity of the sign to the neighborhood, however I am limited for sign space on Rte. 3. Perhaps we could consider another placement for a neighborhood sign or design a new sign.

D. Marshall: A 10 ft. sign is allowed in the performance zone.

D. Marshall: The applicant needs to provide a redesign of the sign and a redesign of the building to include sidewalks from this site to Rte. 3.

D. Fitzpatrick: Would the applicant consider as part of their landscape maintenance to their site to maintain the white fenced area leading to the corner of Lindsay Road and Rte. 3?

R. Sullivan: Could the Manchester High School buses enter Campbell Hill vs. the children accessing these buses from Rte. 3?

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant an extension of this application for 60 days?

***R. Duhaime motioned to grant an extension of this application for 60 days. Seconded by P. Rueppel  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***Continued to June 2, 2008.***

**13. NANCY LANE (08-07)**  
15, 17, & 19 Nancy Lane, Map 25, Lots 21-1, 21-2, and 21-3  
Lot Line Adjustment

J. Duffy: Application is for a lot line adjustment and a potential proposal before the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). I recommend the applicant should go to the ZBA first, then apply to the Planning Board for the lot line adjustment. The previous plan approved includes an emergency access gate that needs to be noted in this plan as “36’ long battery operated barrier arm with card type access control panel HTG 320 DC or Equal. Gate is to remain locked at all times except for emergencies and maintenance and is not to be kept open for long periods of time and is not to be used as a thorough way for traffic.” Previously the applicant did not need to hook-up to water due to the Berry Hill Road site. This new plan reduces the lot line frontage to include the need for both water and sewer. The Sewer Dept. has the capacity for this plan. We still need a letter from the water precinct that they have the capacity.

D. Marshall: If it is the intention of the applicant to propose elderly housing, then you should go to ZBA first.

D. Tatem: The two new lots need sewer and water.

Don Duval, Duval Surveying, Inc.: The 3-lot subdivision was approved.

J. Duffy: The revised site plan is to expand the frontage to 175 ft each.

D. Tatem: We need letter from sewer and water departments that they have capacity for the new plan.

J. Duffy: Originally this was a 5-lot sub division, now left hand side changes. The note on the plan was for a 1,000 ft structure restriction; anything after that did not meet Fire Dept. regulations. Yes, the Sewer Dept. has capacity. We still need a letter from the water precinct that they have capacity. This application is not for elderly housing, now just for 3 house lots. I do not believe there is capacity for sewer and perhaps even water for elderly housing.

JR Ouellette, property owner: We modified the frontage for septic and well. I already have a permit for water.

J. Duffy: Plan approved back in 2006 for single-family homes with private wells per Article 5 of Hooksett Zoning Ordinance. I do not have anything from the water precinct on this plan's capacity.

JR Ouellette: The fire hydrant is activated.

D. Jodoin: The applicant is here for a lot line adjustment.

J. Duffy: The Realtor should make the landowners aware of a potential elderly housing.

### **Close Public Hearing.**

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to approve the plan conditional?

#### ***D. Jodoin motioned to approve plan conditional:***

- 2 Mylars, 11 paper copies, and 1 digital
- All waiver noted on plan
- Letter from water precinct stating they have capacity
- Note on plan " 36' long battery operated barrier arm with card type access control panel HTG 320 DC or Equal. Gate is to remain locked at all times except for emergencies and maintenance and is not to be kept open for long periods of time and is not to be used as a thorough way for traffic."

***Seconded by J. McHugh.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 14. TONY ACORACE – PENNICHUCK EAST UTILITY (08-15)**  
16 Springer Road, Map 5, Lot 116  
WESCO Booster Station Replacement

*Continued to May 19, 2008.*

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman D. Marshall declared the meeting adjourned at 10:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick  
Planning Coordinator