

**Official  
As of 6/16/08**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MINUTE  
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
Monday, June 2, 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, D. Hemeon, Y. Nahikian, R. Sullivan, R. Duhaime, D. Dreffs, B. Ehlers, J. McHugh, J. Gryval, and Town Council Rep. P. Rueppel.

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 5/19/08**

*J. McHugh motioned to approve the minutes of 5/19/08 with the following edits by J. Gryval: pg 1 add J. Gryval to attendance, pg 6 “R. Duhaime motioned to grant extension of this application to June 16, 2008 as a last extension. Seconded by J. Gryval.” Seconded by P. Rueppel.*

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

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

- 1. 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

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

Stephen Kaneb (owner of property-Catamount Management Corp.): Provided an overview to the Board of the outcome of the Aesthetic Committee Meeting completed earlier tonight. This committee reviewed the revised plans for the building and sign.

Barry Brensinger, Lavallee Brensinger Architects: Presented an overview of the revised plans for the building and sign. We reduced the appearance of the size of the building and added architectural features. We increased proportions to the trim to minimize the building size. We changed the feature element of the main entrance to be an arched top vs. a gable end and complemented it with a horizontal canopy. The choice of materials is

lighter gray shakes, darker gray clapboards, white trim, and a darker gray roof. The back entrance is modest due to the elevation.

R. Duhaime: As a member of the Aesthetic Committee, I was happy with the changes.

D. Marshall: Could you put the sign design up for the Board to see?

Chris Tymula, MHF Design: Campbell Hill is incorporated in the arch of the design. The Aesthetic Committee would like to see a more prominent sign arch to match the building arch.

D. Marshall: The applicant is not using the full height allowed for the sign; therefore he has space to add a higher arch.

J. Duffy: Is it possible to enlarge the Campbell Hill lettering so it does not get lost?

J. McHugh: How is the overhang from the building attached?

B. Brensinger: brackets attach The overhang.

*Continued to June 16, 2008.*

### **SPECIAL EXCEPTION REQUEST**

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

J. Duffy: The applicant needed a special exception request due to the public utility. This request was sent to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). In May 2008, David Hess motioned for a rehearing and it was granted. The ZBA rehearing is next week. We need to send a letter to the ZBA that we approve the special exception.

D. Marshall: What is the pleasure of the Board?

Don Ware, Pennichuck Water Works: Nothing has changed since the last presentation to the Planning Board. The replacement of the booster station is in a Medium Density Residential (MDR) zone and thus requires a special exception. The relocation is just to the right of the existing station.

J. McHugh: There is no expansion?

D. Ware: The 50 gallons per minute will stay the same, however the station itself will be a bit larger to accommodate an emergency generator.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to send a letter to the ZBA that the Planning Board approves the special exception?

***R. Duhaime motioned to send a letter to the ZBA that the Planning Board approves the special exception. Seconded by D. Hemeon.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

*Continued to June 16, 2008.*

### **COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARING**

- 3. 1134 HOOKSETT ROAD LLC (08-18)**  
1134 Hooksett Road, Map 39, Lot 33-1  
Non-Residential Site Plan for Clock Tower and Walkway

Y. Nahikian: An Aesthetic Committee Meeting is scheduled for June 16, 2008 @ 6:00pm at the Hooksett Town Hall Chambers, 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH.

*Continued to June 16, 2008.*

### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 4. FRANK MAGDZIARZ (07-32)**  
25 Jacob Avenue, Map 48, Lot 47  
Lot Line Adjustment and one (1) Lot Subdivision

*Continued to June 16, 2008.*

- 5. BROOKVIEW SR. HOUSING (07-29)**  
1631 Hooksett Road, Map 14, lot 32  
Non-Residential Site Plan for 60 Unit 55+ Housing Development

J. Duffy: At the last Board meeting, staff recommended this application be denied. The Board wanted Mr. Yee to attend tonight's meeting. Mr. Yee is here and has had discussion with Mr. Russell, one of the DTR Properties LLC applicants.

Mr. Yee: We had a discussion this past week and explored a couple of different venues regarding the 40 ft buffer area. We discussed the applicant purchasing my property, but could not come up with suitable ground. This is a large size building even with trees and shrubs.

D. Marshall: Mr. Yee, are you opposed to this project?

Mr. Yee: Yes.

J. Duffy: If this project were reduced to 24 units, then a 30 ft buffer would be allowed. The larger building has more specific regulations. Currently this project has more than 24-units, therefore the 40 ft buffer is required. J. Duffy read the Town Planner comments into the record. Our regulations do not state we must approve waivers due to hardship. The RSA does specify a waiver should be granted due to hardship. I still say this is a self-imposed hardship and should not be approved.

P. Rueppel: The Town Planner comments have a list of items.

J. Duffy: The buffer waiver and retaining wall are the only outstanding items.

Alexander Buchanan, Attorney: I represent the developer. Mr. Yee's letter from February 2008 states he has a concern about the size of the structure to his property. We received a special exception from the ZBA that this project would not diminish Mr. Yee's property value. The materials for the structure are standard. The Fire Department would have full access. As far as the traffic concerns, the State DOT required the driveway entrance must be where it is proposed on the plan. The lighting needs Stantec approval. For the noise, the proposed improvement to the buffer to include berming, fencing, and vegetation are better than a 40 ft buffer that the Town regulations require. The drainage will be addressed through technical review. Ms. Duffy's only issue is the site of the driveway. The hardship the Planning Board needs to consider is different than a zoning hardship. The proposed use was reasonable for this site in April 2005. Nothing has changed other than reducing the number of units. The 40 ft buffer requirement is for the driveway. We are not building within the 30 ft buffer from Mr. Yee's property. This is just going to be the driveway. The berm, fence, and trees will minimize the visual and noise level. Your regulations indicate special conditions to the property (i.e. topography). Your regulations also state that a departure from these regulations can be made, so long as it is not detrimental to the ordinance. This waiver should be granted. We could build 24 units with driveway. According to the ordinance, he could live with 30 ft. We believe our buffer would be better with a 30 ft buffer and he would see less. We request that you reconsider the decision made by the Board in May 2007 and consider this project under prior regulations. I am submitting a letter to the Board for the record. What is 10 ft? The waiver should be granted or approve the project under the old ordinance. Negotiations have been made between my client and Mr. Yee. Mr. Yee requested \$685,000 for us to buy his property. The MSA value for this property is \$190,000-\$205,000.

Mr. Yee: My mother does not want to sell the property. That's why the amount of \$685,000 was presented.

J. Duffy: Mr. Buchanan, our regulations do not differentiate between a driveway vs. a building. Mr. Buchanan has not provided written hardship for building 24 units. A 40 ft buffer is required around the entire property.

R. Sullivan: I was one of the individuals who wanted the change to the 40 ft buffer for larger projects. However, we are talking about a driveway in a 30 ft buffer not a building.

J. Duffy: There are restrictions for more units to protect the abutter(s).

D. Hemeon: As I stated at a previous meeting, I do not have a problem with lining-up the driveway with the road. Did you check with DOT if they would agree?

A. Buchanan: We checked with DOT and they would not change.

George Chadwick, Keach-Nordstrom: They want crossing roads.

J. Duffy: I also checked with DOT and they said the same thing.

R. Sullivan: Instead of the access point where it is now, why can't it be moved to a different location on the site?

G. Chadwick: There are wetlands and the State will not budge. We would have to go through the wetlands for access.

A. Buchanan: Economic hardship does not have to be shown. We are being denied a reasonable use of our property. Building 24 units just won't make it. Article 7 amenities for older person housing requires community rooms and we also want to make this affordable housing.

Mr. Russell: \$200,000 or under is affordable housing.

R. Duhaime: I thought previously that the abutter was in agreement, however he is not. Did you try to compromise and have some common ground with the abutter?

A. Buchanan: Mr. Russell's representative approached Mr. Yee; I did not. I believe we even offered to place a buffer on Rte. 3 for the abutter, not a requirement of this project.

Mr. Russell: We offered to build the abutter a garage. We offered the mother a life estate. The abutter wants \$685,000 for his property. Mr. Chairman, his property is worth \$200,000 or less.

R. Duhaime: I also have property on Hooksett Road and \$685,000 is a dream. We would like to see this gentlemen put in a desirable development in this site.

J. McHugh: Somebody appraised the property on behalf of Mr. Russell. Mr. Yee, would you agree to have your property appraised by your own appraiser?

Mr. Yee: Well, my mother is not interested in selling the property. For sentimental reasons we are asking for \$685,000.

D. Marshall: Any further comments from the Board?

J. Gryval: I have a concern with someone wanting to get as much as they can for this property.

D. Dreffs: 10 ft should not be an issue.

D. Jodoin: I just have a question; what is the abutter's acreage?

Mr. Yee: Less than an acre.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to approve the waiver for the 40 ft buffer per the subdivision regulations?

***R. Sullivan motioned to approve the waiver for the 40 ft buffer per the subdivision regulations. Seconded by D. Dreffs.***

***Vote = approved by 3 members; opposed by 5 members.***

***R. Sullivan motioned to deny the waiver for the 40 ft buffer per the subdivision regulations. I withdraw this waiver motion.***

A. Buchanan: I ask the Board to hold-off on the vote to deny the waiver so the applicant can revise their plans and come back with 40 units vs. the existing 50 units.

P. Rueppel: Would you consider taking one floor off of the project?

A. Buchanan: If we can do it, we will.

R. Sullivan: Let's go forward and reject the waiver. It is a bad idea to take a floor off. We can't play with the regulations like that.

J. Duffy: The zoning has changed. If the plan gets denied tonight, the applicant must reapply and follow the new regulations.

R. Guay: When did you start contacting Mr. Yee?

Mr. Russell: I called Mr. Yee at his old phone # after the last Planning Board Meeting. Recently I asked Ms. Duffy for Mr. Yee's phone number and she denied. Finally, I contacted him on Thursday and Friday last week. From the start, we purchased the property from Mr. Yee's cousin, Edward Yee. We were told that this project would not be a problem. We have been working on this project for 3 years, since May 2005. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) wanted the road across. We want to provide affordable elderly housing. If we didn't think the Board or Town would want it, we would not have started this project.

R. Guay: It doesn't seem like there has been a whole lot of back and forth discussions with the abutter.

Mr. Russell: His property is worth \$200,000 and we would give him \$300,000 today.

J. Duffy: I got Mr. Yee's work & cell phone numbers and did not feel appropriate to give these numbers to Mr. Russell. I requested Mr. Yee contact Mr. Russell. There is nothing in this application indicating affordable housing. The applicant has known a waiver would be needed since February 2008.

A. Buchanan: We contacted Mr. Yee in February 2008.

***J. Gryval motioned to deny the waiver for the 40 ft buffer per the subdivision regulations due to the Board not denying the applicant reasonable use of this property. Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

***Vote = approved by 6 members; opposed by 2 members. R. Guay abstained. The waiver is denied.***

D. Marshall: You can deny the application or give the applicant a second shot with another plan.

J. Duffy: If the application were denied, the applicant would need to reapply and meet the new regulations. If the application is approved, the applicant will still need a waiver for the 40 ft buffer. If the applicant reduces the project to 24 units, then they would not need a waiver. The applicant could come back with a different plan. The 65-day deadline will expire on June 16, 2008.

R. Duhaime: At the last meeting we stated not to go past June 16<sup>th</sup>. Can the applicant get new plans for this date?

J. McHugh: With 40 units the applicant still needs the 40 ft buffer?

D. Marshall: Does the applicant agree to a 90-day extension?

A. Buchanan: Yes.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to extend the application for 90 days?

***P. Rueppel motioned to extend the application for 90 days. Seconded by R. Sullivan. Vote unanimously in favor. Opposed by J. Gryval and J. Jodoin.***

D. Tatem: I recommend the applicant confer with staff for Technical Review Committee (TRC) and Aesthetic Committee Meetings.

Y. Nahikian: As an architect, there are many ways to come up with a total of 40 units and have the bulk of the building go away.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

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

J. Duffy: This is the first hearing before the Board on all three SNHU projects. The applicant is aware there are Stantec comments to meet.

D. Marshall: This is an informational meeting tonight.

Jeff Kevan, TF Moran: We reworked the project for an amended approval for a (1) dining facility and (2) an additional parking lot proposed for 151 cars. The third project for an Academic Building is by Opechee Construction Corp.

R. Sullivan: For the parking lot, is this for general admission students and then they would have to walk along the road?

J. Kevan: The parking lot is for the dormitory students.

R. Sullivan: The By-pass road is indicated on the plan. This is a phantom structure. It is still too far from where it is proposed.

J. Kevan: Waivers are needed for the dining facility.

D. Marshall: Read the waivers for the SNHU dining facility into the record.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the SNHU dining facility waivers?

R. Sullivan: Is the southern west portion of your site buildable? Will SNHU expand into this portion in the future?

J. Kevan: There could be an expansion in the future.

D. Hemeon: Anything that is not wet is buildable.

R. Duhaime: This is a walking pedestrian campus. Downsizing the dining facility is an improvement.

***P. Rueppel motioned to grant the SNHU dining facility waivers. Seconded by R. Guay. Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Kevan: The total sq ft of the dining facility is reduced. There is 10,000 sq ft on the second floor. The second floor is about ½ of the first floor size.

D. Tatem: I recommend adding a note to the plan that parking is restricted to employees and the handicapped. Another note is that the parking lot will be built and completed prior to the building being completed so there is not a parking issue.

J. Kevan: The parking regulations require 2,050 total spaces. We are proposing 2,089 total spaces. Dropping the barrier will allow access for fire and emergency vehicles.

D. Tatem: How will the snow be plowed?

J. Kevan: Snow plowing will be completed by dropping the barrier.

Y. Nahikian: Does the dining facility have a cafeteria only?

J. Kevan: Yes. Previously we also had a student center. Now this plan is only for a cafeteria. This plan is more economical. The house on the site will either be raised or relocated. We are working on Stantec comments for the drainage system.

J. McHugh: For this building and the existing building parking, has there been a traffic study?

D. Marshall: Are the dark black lines on the plan the walking trails?

D. Tatem: At the TRC meeting, the Police Chief had safety concerns about additional students crossing the road. In winter cars stop going up hill for the cross walk, but then cannot get traction to restart. During the winter months school hours, this area needs to be maintained better.

J. McHugh: Dale, I remember when Mr. Bourque did not like crosswalk bumps. There was a lot of discussion on the best option.

R. Sullivan: What is being proposed?

J. Kevan: We are proposing a raised crosswalk with a timed push button to active the crosswalk light.

R. Sullivan: We are proposing a traffic light at this site?

J. Kevan: It is not a traffic light, just a pedestrian signal.

Kim Hazarvartian, TEPP, LLC: In 2003 we completed a campus traffic study for the master plan. We looked at enrollment: 1,670 students by 2003, 2,200 students by 2013, and 2,400 students by 2023. There are currently 1,900 students in 2008. We are on track with the estimated enrollment for site distances and pedestrian crossing locations. With the existing traffic on North River Road, we recommend a raised crosswalk for visibility and to slow people down. A painted crosswalk is not as visible and drivers don't need to slow down. A raised bump does not impact plowing; it just slows down traffic. Signaling

the crosswalk has no draw back. Basically, signaling provides a dedicated time for vehicles and pedestrians. During lunch hour, if there were no signal, students could just start crossing without waiting. The signal helps both vehicles and pedestrians. I understand the signal may be an issue in the wintertime. If the road could be treated really well, then the signal should not be an issue.

R. Duhaime: How long is the elevation?

Kim Hazarvartian: The elevation is 20 ft. This is wider than the current narrow crosswalk and smaller than the current larger one.

R. Duhaime: Is the proposed crosswalk textured like the other ones? Do you have the road elevations with you?

J. Kevan: I do have a profile in the plans originally submitted. The uphill side is relatively flat and the downhill side is about 6%.

Y. Nahikian: Is this the only pedestrian crossing?

J. Kevan: There are multiple crossings.

J. McHugh: In addition to this traffic study for SNHU, should the Town include traffic impacts with the new plaza?

R. Sullivan: North River Road is growing beyond what it can handle. It is a dangerous road no matter what time of day. The road bisects the university. The plan is to use more area on the other side of the road; now needing more crosswalks. This is a public road. From the Town's perspective, we should start looking into a back entrance, overpass, etc.

J. Kevan: There is a 12-14 ft grade change in some areas for stairs. This is a walking campus. We are trying to make it safe for all.

R. Sullivan: For the scale, we need to effectively find methods to raise this area (i.e. walkway with stairwell having 90-degree breaks.

J. Kevan: If students have to climb 30 ft from the parking lot, they will choose to walk across the street.

Kim Hazarvartian: The volumes and speeds don't warrant a grade separation. The solution is something at grade level. If raised walkway with stairs by necessity, the student travel time will be excessive and they will avoid this type of walkway.

D. Hemeon: I cannot give this road area any more Town attention. It is a bad hill in storms. I am against raised crosswalks. We just repaved the entire road to tie into the existing bumps.

R. Sullivan: The hill adds to a driver's ability to slow down.

D. Hemeon: If you know bumps are there, you would want to slow down.

J. Gryval: What is the height of the raise?

J. Kevan: The height of the raise is 3 inches.

R. Sullivan: You don't have to drive that fast to launch off the raised crosswalks.

J. Kevan: The Town can decide on a raised or unraised crosswalk. We are strongly in favor of a signal.

D. Marshall: If no raised crosswalk will there be some other texture?

R. Sullivan: A light with a stamped crosswalk?

Bob Vachon, SNHU Facilities Director: Wasn't this facility approved last time?

J. McHugh: For Dale's comment, yes this roadway needs to be maintained better in winter. However, the maintenance responsibility should not be on Dale's shoulder alone.

J. Kevan: SNHU will assist with treating the roadway.

J. McHugh: This roadway should not be the responsibility of the Town.

R. Sullivan: SNHU has done a fair job of limiting the snow impact and maintaining the property.

D. Marshall: D. Jodoin, B. Vachon, and D. Hemeon are to workout the roadway maintenance. Are there any other comments for the dining facility site and its use?

J. Kevan: Do you want a raised crosswalk?

D. Marshall: No raised crosswalk. I like the slotted/stamped/textured look.

J. Kevan: Is a signal reasonable?

D. Marshall: There needs to be an opportunity for a break in the traffic.

J. Kevan: Does the traffic consultant need to come to the next meeting?

D. Marshall: Will students use a signal appropriately?

D. Hemeon: In the last agreement with the traffic signals, it was not the Town's responsibility. SNHU owns the signals not the Town. If something happens to the signals, SNHU has to repair them.

R. Duhaime: Do you prefer a raised crosswalk?

Kim Hazarvartian: The flat crosswalk meets standard of care, however I prefer a raised one.

D. Tatem: Does SNHU currently assist to maintain the road?

B. Vachon: We contract a salter.

D. Marshall: D. Hemeon would maintain the roadway as is and SNHU would contract to assist.

D. Tatem: The Chief of Police has an issue with students crossing this roadway.

*Continued to June 16, 2008.*

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

J. Kevan: Presented an overview of the site plan. The site is at the end of Eastside Drive. There are two sets of dorms on each side. There is an open field area. There are 151 parking spaces. There is a water sheet off, and another area remains grass. A swale is being added to the site. The lights are running down the middle of the parking lot. An overflow parking area is being addressed.

D. Marshall: Read the waivers for the SNHU parking lot into the record.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the SNHU parking lot waivers?

D. Tatem: What type of landscaping?

D. Marshall: I thought we addressed the landscaping and to leave space open for students.

R. Duhaime: Student parking has a high turn over of vehicles. This is difficult to maintain. I recommend keeping this space open.

D. Tatem: This is not a typical landscaping site.

***J. Gryval motioned to grant the SNHU parking lot waivers. Seconded by R. Sullivan. Vote unanimously in favor.***

*Continued to June 16, 2008.*

**8. SOUTHERN NH UNIVERSITY (08-12)**  
North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67  
Non-Residential Site Plan for an Academic Building

D. Marshall: Read the waivers for the SNHU academic building into the record.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant the SNHU academic building waivers?

***R. Guay motioned to grant the SNHU academic building waivers. Seconded by D. Jodoin.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

Steve Long, Opechee Construction: Provided an overview of the site plan. This is a new 33,500 sq ft academic building. Part of the building will hold the Community and Economic Development. The glass and metal ties into the existing buildings silver-gray color.

J. McHugh: This plan is more contemporary. Why doesn't mirror the rest of the buildings.

S. Long: SNHU wanted a more modern building on campus. The other brick buildings may look too old. SNHU wanted to reflect the style of the university.

J. McHugh: I liked the brick buildings built 5-6 yrs ago. They have a more pleasing look.

R. Sullivan: This looks more like an office building vs. a university.

S. Long: We tried to go in the direction of the new look with materials used in the existing buildings.

R. Sullivan: What existing buildings have gray?

S. Long: A lot of the new buildings have a gray roof.

Y. Nahikian: Architecturally, each building within a private university can bring a different style. I approve of what they have done.

R. Duhaime: As a walking campus, you don't think students will take short cuts?

S. Long: Pointed out the wetlands on the plan. We will continue a sidewalk up along North River Road. Rather than create difficult areas, we want to channel the students into paths.

R. Duhaime: What is the type of sidewalk? Is it wider than the existing ones? Is it anticipated for more walkways?

S. Long: We are proposing 4 ft walkways.

D. Marshall: Any other comments?

S. Long: We have received comments from Stantec and have replied.

*Continued to June 16, 2008.*

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

- 9. AMBROSE REALTY, LLC**  
1399 Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 13  
Non-Residential Site Plan Amendment for the layout and site improvements  
associated with the creation of a display area and a gravel equipment storage area  
**EXTENSION REQUEST**

J. Duffy: The applicant has surveyed ownership to the center of Gary Avenue. The applicant requests an extension of the 65-day deadline to July 14, 2008.

*R. Guay motioned to extend the application to July 14, 2008. Seconded by D. Hemeon. Vote unanimously in favor.*

*Continued to June 16, 2008.*

### **10. DEVELOPER MEETING**

D. Marshall: I have asked J. Duffy to schedule a meeting with developers to get their input on our Town and where there are areas for improvement.

D. Tatem: When a site gets built, there is a lot of infrastructure that only gets half done. If the applicant walks away from the project, it now becomes a bank issue.

D. Hemeon: Banks are obligating the applicant to put more money up front for Bonds and Letters of Credit.

R. Sullivan: There is a huge change in the industry.

D. Tatem: Zyacorp Phase II for an additional parking lot is an example. There is no bond and we cannot enforce them to finish. No one wants his bond pulled.

D. Marshall: We should look at how much money to require for bonds. This Board needs to hear the developer's issues.

J. McHugh: For traffic studies, the applicant should give the money to the Town and the Town hires a traffic study person.

J. Duffy: For the AV Hooksett pre-construction meeting, are we still asking for 1/3 bond?

D. Marshall: Yes, that is what is in the regulations for bonds.

**J. Duffy: The meeting with the developers is scheduled for June 23, 2008 @ 7:00pm, Hooksett Town Hall Chambers, 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH (the former Village School).**

D. Hemeon: The meeting with the developers should be taped.

## 11. INSPECTION FUNDING AGREEMENT

J. Duffy: our Town Attorney created This agreement. The applicant would be asked to sign this agreement. It lays out the steps for the initial deposit and what happens when money is due to run out for escrow accounts. There are a certain number of days to get the money into us or steps would be taken and work is stopped. If more time went by and money was not received, the application could go before the Board for revocation. Stantec, D. Jodoin, and D. Hemeon have reviewed the agreement. I recommend the Board adopt this agreement.

J. Gryval: I am questioning wording sections (c) developer must provide funding, and (d) developer wishes to enter into this agreement.

D. Marshall: The developer, by signing the agreement, is stating they wish to enter into this agreement.

R. Sullivan: We should reword “wishes”. We as a Town are telling the applicant to agree or not to agree; “wishes” should not be there.

D. Marshall: We need to send this agreement back to the Town Attorney to change the word “wishes” to “agree”.

R. Sullivan: I can see J. Gryval’s point-of-view on changing this word.

J. Gryval: For the failure of the applicant to replenish funds, it should be reworded that the Board is “to revoke the subdivision” vs. “revoking the subdivision”.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to adopt the Inspection Funding Agreement?

***R. Guay motioned to adopt the Inspection Funding Agreement. Seconded by R. Sullivan.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

## 11. AESTHETIC COMMITTEE

Y. Nahikian: The Aesthetic Committee used to meet at the TRC meeting. Then there was a big gap in time this did not happen. Now that I am on the Planning Board, as Chair of the Aesthetic Committee I can see what is coming before the Board. The Aesthetic Committee

Meetings are aside from the TRC. The committee has no control on the building permits or the final approval of the as built plans. The Building Inspector or whoever is giving the permits should consider the Aesthetic Committee recommendations for building and landscaping. R. Duhaime and I are on the Aesthetic Committee.

D. Marshall: What is presented and approved before the Planning Board is what should be built. The building architecture and landscaping needs to be included in the final approved plans.

*P. Rueppel motioned to adjourn at 9:40pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman D. Marshall declared the meeting adjourned at 9:40 PM. Next meeting scheduled for Monday, June 16, 2008 at 35 Main Street (former Village School), Hooksett, NH Town Hall Chambers Room 105.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick  
Planning Coordinator