

Official  
As of 7/14/08

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MINUTES  
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
Monday, June 16, 2008**

CALLED TO ORDER

Chairman D. Marshall called the meeting to order at 7:16pm

ATTENDANCE

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

Absent: R. Sullivan

Excused: D. Dreffs

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 6/02/08

*P. Rueppel motioned to approve the minutes of 6/02/08. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.*

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARING

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

George Chadwick, Keach-Nordstrom: I am representing 1134 Hooksett Road LLC. Presented an overview of the project to include outcome of the Aesthetic Committee Meeting on 6/16/08.

R. Duhaime: The Aesthetic Committee recommended minor changes for shrubs and for trees to be moved. Y. Nahikian recommended moving the clock back. The applicant made no presentation of a sign design. The sign design should tie into the building design. I am in favor of a conditional approval for final landscaping plan and sign design.

D. Tatem: The 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 R Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor. Opposed by P. Rueppel.***

**Open public hearing:**

G. Chadwick: This plan is the same plan presented at the last Planning Board Meeting. There is a single access lane in and out. The addition of the clock tower was originally away from the building, now we have been asked to move it closer to the building. We were asked to review lighting and we did. The lighting meets regulations. We revisited the landscaping. Per the recommendation of R. Duhaime, we will revise the plan to include a sign design. Stantec completed their review to include a sketch for future parking. We are requesting a total of 5 waivers.

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver #1 into the record for plan scale. Do we have a motion to grant waiver #1?

***R. Guay motioned to grant waiver #1. Seconded by J. McHugh.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Marshall: Received a read waiver #2 into the record for the Erosion Prevention Plan (EPP). Do we have a motion to grant waiver #2?

***R. Guay motioned to grant waiver #2. Seconded by R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver #3 into the record for drainage. Do we have a motion to grant waiver #3?

***R. Guay motioned to grant waiver #3. Seconded by P. Rueppel.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver #4 into the record for parking. Do we have a motion to grant waiver #4?

***P. Rueppel motioned to grant waiver #4 conditional that should the need arise, the owner must appear before the Planning Board to obtain approval for additional parking; condition to be noted on plan. Seconded by R. Guay.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Tatem: Since the clock tower has been raised, a waiver is now needed for the setback.

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver #5 into the record for the setback. Do we have a motion to grant waiver #5?

***P. Rueppel motioned to grant waiver #5. Seconded by R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Tatem: I have no issues with any of these waivers.

J. McHugh: This site is in the Performance Zone (PZ). I need J. Duffy and D. Tatem assurance the this project meets all of the PZ criteria.

D. Tatem: This is a different PZ situation. The applicant is only adding an entrance, not expanding the building.

J. McHugh: If this business site is successful and it expands, then what happens?

D. Tatem: A note is required on the plan "owner must appear before the Planning Board to obtain approval for additional parking". The owner would also have to appear before the Board for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

J. Duffy: I checked with DOT and they were fine with this project. They do not anticipate an increase in traffic or parking.

J. Gryval: This site now has 3 businesses vs. the old furniture store was one business. There is a lot of equipment in the back of this site.

Patrick Houghton, owner: There is a Tenant at Will with Faulkner Landscaping. They will have to vacate the space to accommodate this site's parking. The top floor of this building has Sherwin Williams Paint, Granite & Marble Company, and Garage and Overhead Door Company.

J. McHugh: For the future parking, how much more can you adopt?

G. Chadwick: We can adopt an additional 22-25 parking spaces.

P. Houghton: I have letters of intent from two different tenants. One tenant has high parking, and the other low parking. The low parking tenant will provide 15,000 sq ft of his total 20,000 sq ft to the high parking tenant.

J. Duffy: The parking is still retail; same use.

J. Gryval: The parking should be available if necessary.

D. Tatem: The plan to be signed and recorded will have future parking noted.

J. Duffy: The only thing the Board needs to approve is the sign and landscaping design. This can be a conditional approval.

R. Duhaime: What is the display area criteria in the PZ?

J. Duffy: Storage must be screened. PZ criteria for display areas is silent. I have addressed the display of granite with P. Houghton.

R. Duhaime: Is there a limit on the height of displays?

Y. Nahikian: Does this site have sprinklers? Is there paint stored?

P. Houghton: Yes.

J. Duffy: The Fire Dept. comments were that this site have sprinklers and emergency lighting.

J. McHugh: Will all three (3) tenants have the same sign?

P. Houghton: Yes, a 10x10 monument sign.

D. Marshall: Will the old pylon sign come down?

P. Houghton: Yes.

R. Duhaime: Screening with trees out front would hide the existing sign.

**Public Comments:**

*None.*

**Close Public Hearing.**

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion for a conditional approval

***J. McHugh motioned to approve the site plan with the following conditions:***

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies, and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction
- Design of landscaping and monument sign is submitted and addressed to the Planning Board/Aesthetic Committee's satisfaction
- Applicant agrees to a preconstruction meeting and site plan compliance monitoring
- All waivers noted on plan
- Note on plan "Approval of this plan shall expire three (3) years from the date of the Planning Board approval, as recorded in the Planning Board Minutes, unless the right to develop has vested pursuant to RSA 674:39."

***Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

***Vote Unanimously in favor.***

***Continued to July 14, 2008 for design of landscaping and monument sign.***

**DISCUSSION**

**2. AMBROSE REALTY, LLC (07-43)**

1399 Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 13

CUP for site improvements associated with the creation of a display area and a gravel equipment storage area within wetland impacts

Peter Holden, Holden Engineering: This site is for paving equipment and it abuts G & M cooperative. We want to pave this area, however it is in a stormwater treatment area and we need a wetland permit. Kathy Sullivan, Lawyer for G & M, recommends the Board not approve this plan until the use of Gary Avenue is resolved. The Cooperative uses Gary Avenue for their access road. The property line goes down the middle of Gary Avenue. It has been suggested to block-off driveways on Gary Avenue or continue negotiations with the Cooperative. We are asking for the Board's suggestion on how to proceed with the plan's technical aspect and proceed with Gary Avenue traffic. Trucks drive down Gary Avenue to access the back of the Ambrose site. We request conditional approval. Tonight, we just want to know how to proceed. Zoning changes will affect the use of this property.

D. Marshall: We can proceed on all technical aspects and only have the outstanding issue of the use of Gary Avenue. Is it the intent to only use access from Rte. 3 until there is resolution for Gary Avenue with the Cooperative? Should the resolution be in favor of the abutters, can this site function without usage of Gary Avenue?

P. Holden: Yes the site can still function. The applicant could access Rte. 3 until resolved.

D. Marshall: You are presenting a plan with the property line down the middle of Gary Avenue. The only way the abutters could protest, is if they have a different survey showing otherwise.

P. Holden: It is not a question on the surveyed location. The issue is the use of Gary Avenue.

J. McHugh: What has this Board done in the past? Give a date certain for resolution or the plan would be continually extended.

D. Marshall: I don't think anyone is contesting the property line of Gary Avenue. It is just the use. This is not something the Board would address.

D. Tatem: I recommended the applicant appear before the Board tonight. I recommended having a second access off Rte 3.

D. Marshall: They would have to seek another driveway permit from the State.

P. Holden: The State will not approve 3 total driveways with the site size. The thought is to temporarily have the Gary Avenue driveway as an emergency entrance only until the use of Gary Avenue is resolved with the abutters.

R. Duhaime: Can you move the existing driveway? Do you have room to make it an exit only? If you move the entrance and landscaping, vehicles exiting the Ambrose site from the Western entrance would stay within the property line.

D. Marshall: Close the Eastern driveway.

J. Duffy: Would this require another driveway permit from the State?

D. Tatem: No, this would just be an alteration.

P. Holden: I will revise plans for the Board's July 14, 2008 meeting to include moving the entrance and landscaping.

*Continued to July 14, 2008.*

### **COMPLETENESS**

#### **3. FAULKNER LANDSCAPING & NURSERY (08-23)**

1348 Hooksett Road, Map 25, Lots 4 & 5

- Lot Consolidation
- Non-Residential Site Plan for a Proposed 2,792 sq ft Building and Use of Existing 1,816 sq ft Building for Storage/Sales & Display

*Continued to July14, 2008.*

### **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP)**

#### **4. FAULKNER LANDSCAPING & NURSERY (08-23)**

1348 Hooksett Road, Map 25, Lots 4 & 5

Conditional Use Permit to store landscaping and nursery supplies within a 40 ft wetland buffer

*Continued to August 18, 2008.*

### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **5. FRANK MAGDZIARZ (07-32)**

25 Jacob Avenue, Map 48, Lot 47

Lot Line Adjustment and one (1) Lot Subdivision

*Continued to July 14, 2008.*

**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 and Sign

D. Tatem: There are only two outstanding item; a letter from Hooksett Sewer Commission and a letter from Central Water Precinct stating they have capacity and approve this project.

Chris Tymula, MHF Design: This is the same plan as presented at the last Board meeting. We expanded the sign about 8 inches.

R. Duhaime: Is there a landscape design for the sign?

C. Tymula: No, it is not on the plan. It will be consistent with the building landscape.

C. Tymula: I spoke to Janet Levy, Engineer, regarding water, gas and drainage and I was told the applicant may have to add a booster pump. We are asking for a conditional approval.

J. Gryval: I am not happy with conditional approvals.

J. McHugh: We make rules and then we abandon them by granting conditional approvals.

J. Duffy: When you approve conditionally, it allows the applicant to proceed with their financing. If we hold the project until all conditions are met, the project takes longer to get started. We are very careful about checking if conditions are met. If there is something not met, it would have to go back before the Board.

D. Tatem: If there were multiple conditions, I would not recommend conditional approval. This site only has a couple of conditions.

P. Rueppel: Why does approval for sewer and water take longer?

D. Tatem: They are not committed to a review time.

D. Marshall: Conditional approvals are case-by-case, not blanket to all applicants.

J. McHugh: I want people to know this Board is fair.

D. Hemeon: Have you been to the sewer and water contacts?

C. Tymula: Sewer stated there is adequate capacity. Water stated the applicant may need a booster station.

D. Hemeon: We have been fair, case-by-case, not to hold up developers.

**Close Public Hearing.**

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion for a conditional approval?

***R. Guay motioned to approve the site plan with the following conditions:***

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies, and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction (see letter dated April 30, 2008 from Stantec)
- All outstanding Federal, State, and local permits are obtained and submitted to the Town and Stantec
- Letter from Hooksett Central Water Precinct stating they have capacity and approve this project
- Letter from Hooksett Sewer Commission stating they have capacity and approve this project
- Applicant agrees to attend a required preconstruction meeting after all bonds are submitted and approved, site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place and the plans are signed and recorded
- Applicant agrees to site plan compliance monitoring
- All waivers noted on plan
- Note on plan "Approval of this plan shall expire three (3) years from the date of the Planning Board approval, as recorded in the Planning Board Minutes, unless the right to develop has vested pursuant to RSA 674:39."

***Seconded by D. Hemeon.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

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

J. Duffy: The site plan review before the Board was a few weeks ago. Then someone filed a motion for a rehearing with ZBA. ZBA completed their rehearing and approved.

**Open Public Hearing:**

**Public Comments:**

***None.***

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver for soils into the record. Do we have a motion to grant the waiver for soils?



***R. Guay motioned to grant the waiver for soils. Seconded by J. Gryval.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Duffy: Stantec completed a fourth review back in April 2008. Basically, Stantec we are recommending a conditional approval that all outstanding comments from Stantec's April 30<sup>th</sup> letter be addressed.

D. Tatem: We still need the approval letter from Hooksett Village Water.

D. Ware: I have a letter from Hooksett Village water with their approval of the plans.

R. Duhaime: This property and the property behind could be subdivided with a buffer.

D. Hemeon: I would like to inspect the site for the Highway Dept.

**Closed Public Hearing.**

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion for a conditional approval?

***R. Duhaime motioned to approve the site plan with the following conditions:***

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies, and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction (see letter dated April 30, 2008 from Stantec)
- All outstanding Federal, State, and local permits are obtained and submitted to the Town and Stantec
- Letter from Hooksett Village Water Precinct stating they have capacity and approve this project
- Applicant agrees to site inspection by D. Hemeon at the Highway Department for the road opening permit
- Applicant agrees to attend a required preconstruction meeting after all bonds are submitted and approved, site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place and the plans are signed and recorded
- Applicant agrees to site plan compliance monitoring
- All waivers noted on plan
- Note on plan "Approval of this plan shall expire three (3) years from the date of the Planning Board approval, as recorded in the Planning Board Minutes, unless the right to develop has vested pursuant to RSA 674:39."

***Seconded by R. Guay.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

8. **RK ASSOCIATES – K-Mart Plaza (07-30)**  
1271 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 2  
Site Improvement –Parking Lot & Drainage

**Open Public Hearing:**

D. Tatem: There are four (4) waivers.

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver #1 for section F, G, and H into the record. Do we have a motion to grant the waiver #1?

D. Tatem: For waiver#1, we agreed on 10x20 larger parking spaces, but this compromised the number of spaces. We asked if the tenants could eliminate spaces to conform. As for the landscaping, R. Duhaime has been working with the applicant and he supports this waiver.

R. Duhaime: This plan is a large improvement to the existing landscaping.

J. McHugh: Parking in this area has been a concern and I am glad the spaces are larger. Will there be parking in the old photo booth area?

David Baker, RK Associates: Yes, this area will have parking.

J. McHugh: I know Applebee's is not part of RK Plaza, however I still have concerns with their parking.

D. Baker: We have considered the Board's previous recommendations.

J. McHugh: In the Winter months, this site is bad for parking. I encourage the K-Mart entrance way to be open for traffic.

D. Baker: This site plan is a drastic improvement.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant waiver #1?

***J. Gryval motioned to grant waiver #1. Seconded by J. McHugh.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver #2 for scale for plan lighting into the record. Do we have a motion to grant waiver #2?

D. Tatem: I recommend granting this waiver.

***J. McHugh motioned to grant waiver #2. Seconded by R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver #3 for drainage design criteria paragraph 2, subparagraphs 3,4,5,6,9,10,19,24,33,34,35,37 and paragraph 3 into the record. Do we have a motion to grant waiver #3?

D. Tatem: I recommend granting this waiver.

**Public Comments:**

John Sokul, Attorney for the Singer Family: May I speak to waiver #3 request? We are concerned with the potential impact to the Merchants' site based on what the applicant wants to do. Section 3 requires pre and post drainage models. We are opposed to waiving this condition. Drainage and flooding is an issue in this area.

D. Tatem: We have been going back and forth with Lou Caron, Engineer, and he recommends section 3, paragraph 2, subparagraph 3 should be stricken from this waiver.

J. Sokul: Depending on what the pre and post show, certain requirements may be needed. I would hate to have this waiver request approved.

D. Tatem: Analysis has shown and addressed other issues on waiver #3.

J. McHugh: Mr. Caron, when you came in earlier, wasn't there only a limited amount you could do for RK Plaza and that you needed assistance from Merchants?

L. Caron: I have the 2 yr. event for pre and post. Beyond 5 yrs I cannot project because water would be overflowing Rte. 3. 10 yrs and higher would be one big bathtub.

D. Marshall: If nothing is done to this site, what is the worst possible case?

D. Tatem: A river would be flowing above and under By-pass 28 to two (2) culverts under Rte. 3 (under Merchants Motors).

L. Caron: I tripled the detention pond on the site to decrease the flow to two (2) pipes at Merchants.

D. Marshall: If we approved all improvements for RK Associates, this will not drastically decrease the flooding.

J. McHugh: If we are not able to get Merchants or FEMA assistance, RK's improvements will minimize the situation but not solve the problem.

D. Tatem: RK Associates' upgrades cannot solve this areas flooding problems alone.

D. Baker: We are going to focus on RK Plaza improvements, because this is what we can control. We have demonstrated pre and post improvements. After a 5 yr. storm plan, we are under water. We understand our improvements won't solve the flooding problem, but we still want to improve our site. Tonight's waiver requests are for the RK Plaza site only. We recognize the Dalton Brook flooding, however we can't change our existing building. The existing road is out of our control.

D. Marshall: Water cannot get to the Benton Road culvert and Merchants fast enough. We need to replace the entire drainage system, not just the RK Plaza site. You will continue to get flooded at RK Plaza and I don't see how your plan will solve your problems.

J. Sokul: RK Plaza is prepared to take care of pipes on their property. In 1973, then owner of Merchants, granted an easement to RK Plaza to install pipes to assist their site. The Singers will not upgrade these pipes to benefit RK Plaza. It appears the Town of Hooksett was granted an easement for pipes on the Merchants' property. The Singers will not pay for pipe upgrades when it does not benefit the Merchants' site. We are hoping the Benton Road box culvert will resolve the issue.

D. Marshall: The culvert will not resolve the problem. The water can't get through the Merchants' area fast enough to get to the Benton Road culvert.

J. McHugh: Not only was RK Plaza impacted by the Mother's Day flood a couple of years ago, Merchants was impacted and school buses could not pass.

D. Baker: We have contacted FEMA for federal money for our private site. They said no, because the Town already can get these funds. DOT already has a project for Rte. 3. I am only here for RK Associates site improvements. We would like the Board to approve our improvements. We can demonstrate pre and post with less flooding.

R. Duhaime: For the landscape review, pipes should flow down DW Highway and not across RK Plaza. I don't understand Merchants' statements. Some approval by the Board in the past gave building rights to improve the Merchants' property. Yet RK wants to improve their site and Merchants does not want to assist? We should be looking for solutions to the problem.

J. McHugh: Wouldn't it be cheaper if everyone took a piece of the price?

D. Marshall: It will be at least 2010 before we see improvements from the State DOT project they anticipate starting in 2009.

D. Hemeon: The State DOT has two (2) problems, Benton Road and Merchants.

J. McHugh: I encourage parties to have discussions.

J. Solkel: The Singer family will pay on a fair share basis to resolve this problem. RK knows pipes were an easement from Merchants in 1973.

D. Baker: We have had discussions with Merchants, DOT and the Town for proposed cost sharing. All I can do is permit for my property. I do not have control over other sites. A river flows through pipes that are too small. We will continue to have discussions. The Army Corps of Engineers, FEMA, and State DOT cannot give money to

private property owners. I believe Merchants' position is to wait for the outcome of the Benton Road culvert improvements.

J. Sokul: I am against waiving the pre and post models. We would like their drainage report to review.

D. Baker: It is not relevant to study 10 yrs. and greater, since this would be a flood.

J. McHugh: Could Attorney Sokul provide the easement for the Highway Dept. to further research?

J. Sokul: I will provide the easement to the Board.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to grant waiver #3?

***R. Duhaime motioned to grant waiver #3. Seconded by R. Guay.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Marshall: Received and read waiver #4 for plan scale into the record. Do we have a motion to grant waiver #4?

D. Tatem: I recommend granting this waiver.

***R. Duhaime motioned to grant waiver #4. Seconded by J. Gryval.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Duffy: A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) should be handled as a separate item and the abutters notified for the Planning Board Meeting on July 14, 2008. The applicant will need to present the CUP to the Conservation Commission.

L. Caron: Have already appeared before the Conservation Commission as part of the wetland permit.

J. Duffy: The applicant will need an extension.

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion to extend the application for 60 days?

***J. McHugh motioned to extend application for 60 days. Seconded by R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***Continued to July 14, 2008.***

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

Jeff Kevan, TF Moran: I represent the SNHU Dining Facility and Parking Lot. Opechee Construction represents the SNHU Academic Building.

D. Tatem: Stantec has 35 comments/conditions for the applicant to address.

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

D. Tatem: Stantec has 13 comments/conditions, technical in nature, for the applicant to address.

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

D. Tatem: Stantec has 24 comments/conditions for the applicant to address.

D. Marshall: For all three (3) SNHU projects (#9 above - dining facility, #10 above - parking lot, and #11 above - Academic Building) there are too many outstanding items for this Board to conditionally approve. The applicants need to update their plans per Stantec comments prior to the July 14, 2008 Board meeting.

J. Duffy: Are Impact Fees per student? There is not a category for Impact Fees based on a University. An office Impact Fee is .52cents per sq ft, and a recreations site is .75cents per sq ft.

D. Marshall: Does an academic building qualify as an office? Every new building gets charged impact fees.

D. Marshall: For Impact fees, what happens to the existing dining facility that will be converted to office space? The applicants need to work out the Impact Fees with J. Duffy prior to July 14, 2008.

D. Tatem: You could attach the Impact Fee to the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) and have it resolved prior to issuing the CO.

Dan Adams, Opechee Construction: In terms of timeframes, Stantec has seven (7) days to reply to the applicant for plans including D. Tatem's comments.

***Continued to July 14, 2008 for all three (3) SNHU projects above.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**12. Martin's Ferry:**

D. Tatem: When Coastal Partners was approved, a By-pass lane was designed. The 66 ft. shown on the plan is really 50 ft. When the contractor staked out the road, the abutters were upset. Michael DiGuiseppe, redesigned the plan. From SNHU to McDonald's, the plan was to take the land on the right side. Now the new plan has a land taken from the left side where there is a right-of-way for the Town.

D. Hemeon: Looking at the turn lane, we can only stack 3 cars. I don't think this will help traffic flow.

D. Tatem: The current \$47,000 budgeted plan can't be built. The plan that can be built will be a lot more money.

D. Marshall: We could add Impact Fees to the \$47,000 budgeted to make up the difference.

D. Jodoin: The applicant donated \$15,000 for Benton Road from the Wal-Greens' site.

D. Tatem: The issue is taking land from abutters to complete the roadway project.

D. Marshall: Do we agree that something needs to be done to the intersection of Benton Road & Martin's Ferry? Once all tenants are in Hooksett Landing, we will have the funds to complete the job right (if this site is included in the Rte. 3 corridor).

D. Tatem: We need to get the Town Attorney's legal opinion on what Impact Fees can be used for?

J. Duffy: Impact Fee documents are separated by zone.

J. Duffy: Is the \$47,000 for off site improvements?

D. Hemeon: The applicant has not paid the \$47,000. He is waiting for this Board's recommendation.

D. Tatem: Intersection improvements are not a condition of the CO.

D. Hemeon: Was there a bond estimate?

D. Tatem: We take State DOT standard lists of prices for bond estimates, however they are not realistic.

D. Marshall: Get DiGuiseppe to pay the \$47,000 he budgeted for and then add Impact Fees as a condition prior to the COs being released.

**13. Stantec Invoices – Berry Hill**

J. Duffy: The applicant has an issue with an invoice from Stantec. Stantec is billing for researching disputed invoices. This is the second developer with this same issue. I am sure you will hear about this at the June 23, 2008 Developer Meeting. I am presenting the applicant's letter to the Board.

D. Tatem: If there is an invoice error, Stantec will reimburse the developer for time spent researching. The developers don't see other items that Stantec is not billing. We would like the Board's vote tonight on this invoice billing.

D. Hemeon: That is why we need to have a written master contract with Stantec.

D. Marshall: We need a boiler plate contract and review it periodically for rates.

J. Duffy: I think we will hear a lot of complaints from the developers on Stantec billing. Would it be better to wait for a vote on this until the June 23, 2008 Developer Meeting?

D. Marshall: Do we have a motion for Stantec to continue billing for researching disputed invoices?

***D. Hemeon motioned to approved Stantec to continue billing for researching disputed invoices. Seconded by R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Tatem: Stantec will continue to bill for researching disputed invoices.

***Continued to July 14, 2008, pending comments from the June 23, 2008 Developer Meeting.***

**14. Developers Meeting, June 23, 2008, 7:00-9:00pm**

J. Duffy: Only developers were invited.

D. Marshall: We should also invite Hooksett Central Water Precinct, Village Water Precinct, and the Sewer Commission. We need to listen to the developers' concerns and comments.

**15. Land Use Attorney Workshop, June 19, 2008, 7:00-9:00pm**

D. Marshall: I encourage Board members to attend as this is a great opportunity for Questions & Answers for Planning Board and ZBA issues.

**16. SAU – High School Site Committee**

D. Marshall: The School Board would like to form a committee for a proposed High School site. They would like a member of the Planning Board to be on this committee. I think we should wait to choose a Board rep, after the Town Council determines the make-up of the Board for July 1, 2008.



*P. Rueppel motioned to adjourn at 10:15pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman D. Marshall declared the meeting adjourned at 10:15 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 14, 2008 at our new location, 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH Town Hall Chambers (the old Village School).

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick  
Planning Coordinator