

**Official
As of 10/06/08**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, September 15, 2008**

CALLED TO ORDER

Chairman J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 7:03pm

ATTENDANCE

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 8/18/08

*J. McHugh motioned to approve the minutes of 8/18/08 with edits by J. McHugh and M. Sorel. Seconded by D. Jodoin.
Vote unanimously in favor. R. Guay abstained.*

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF 65-DAY DEADLINE

1. MANCHESTER SAND & GRAVEL - HEAD'S POND PROJECT

Dave Campbell, Attorney: I am representing Manchester, Sand & Gravel. We are working with Stantec to complete our review process. We should be appearing before the Board prior to Christmas this year. We are asking for a 120-day extension.

*R. Duhaime motioned to grant a 120-day extension from September 15, 2008.
Seconded by D. Dreffs.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

DISCUSSIONS

2. BEAVER BROOK DEVELOPMENT (06-18)

Bypass 28 and Jacob Avenue, Map 49, lots 49 and 58 and Map 48, lot 26
Phasing Plan for 87-Lot Residential Cluster Housing Subdivision

J. McHugh: I am stepping down from this application.

Scott Bussiere, applicant: This project was approved 4-5 months ago. I have a phasing plan for 88 lots off Bypass 28 to Jacob Avenue. Fire, Police, Dale at Highway, and Stantec have no issues with phasing. With the current economy, the bank will not give financing for the entire phase. My phase I = 7,000 ft of roadway and 28 lots. The ordinance states 24 lots are allowed.

J. Gryval: Your approval is for 87 lots not 88 lots.

R. Duhaime: What about bonding the rest of the road straight through to Jacob Avenue?

S. Bussiere: I can't get financing for the entire road; need phasing.

J. Duffy: The last phasing discussion between the Town Attorney and Steven Keach was to bond the first phase of this project. Then when phase I is complete, the bond would fall into the second phase. This never materialized. The Board stated the road had to be built all the way through to Jacob Avenue. In May 2008, voters approved phasing in the ordinance.

D. Marshall: If phased, what guarantee do we have that the road will ever get built?

J. Duffy: There is no guarantee. If the road doesn't get built, you have a 26-lot subdivision. How do off-site improvements for Smyth Road and Jacob Avenue come into play?

S. Bussiere: We will repave 3-4 driveways.

J. Duffy: When would off site improvements be completed or started?

D. Tatem: Site improvements would be tied into the first building permit in phase II.

D. Tatem: This is a no vote meeting; discussion item only. I recommend the Board takes a straw vote. If there is some type of bonding agreement approved by Town Counsel and the Board, will the Board allow the phasing? Have a reclamation bond to Jacob Avenue vs. all the way through to Smyth Road.

R. Duhaime: I would like to see letters from Fire and Police. Would the applicant consider flipping the bond from phase I to phase II; perhaps as a reclamation bond?

S. Bussiere: How is the Town going to address the new ordinance?

R. Duhaime: During design and review.

D. Marshall: Although we have passed a new phasing ordinance, there is nothing that states everything should be completed in phase I.

D. Jodoin: We need e-mails and correspondence from Police, Fire, and Dale.

J. Duffy: We have something in writing from Fire.

JR Ouellette, applicant: For the bond issue, we can't get building permits until the road is done. This includes the gravel base and infrastructure. Then, the bond can be rolled into phase II.

D. Hemeon: Send bonds to the Town Attorney for review and approval to assure the Town is protected.

JR Ouellette: Other Towns allow this.

D. Hemeon: How long before the second phase would be started?

S. Bussiere: We would sell 3-5 homes a year in today's market.

D. Hemeon: What about bond reductions?

D. Tatem: We need revised letters from Fire and Police that they are OK with a 3,800 ft roadway dead end.

J. Gryval: You will get the consensus of the Board after we have received the Fire and Police written input.

D. Dreffs: There is no road beyond the hammerhead?

JR Ouellette: Correct.

J. Gryval: Get issues with fire and police and bonding.

S. Bussiere: 3-5 years to estimate project completion and length is 3,800 ft.

3. BROOKVIEW SR. HOUSING (07-29)

1631 Hooksett Road, Map 14, lot 32

Non-Residential Site Plan for 40 Unit 55+ Housing Development

J. Gryval: Received and read a letter from Mary Farwell, abutter, into the record.

George Chadwick, Keach-Nordstrom: The Board asked me to come back. This proposed building lowers the site about 4 ft. I did hear the abutter's letter and will take this into consideration.

D. Dreffs: What is the rate of run off?

R. Duhaime: The structure showed in last plan vs. this plan is still 3-stories, however you have reduced the mass.

J. McHugh: How did you lower the structure?

G. Chadwick: The height is still the same. We just dropped the structure lower into the site.

J. McHugh: Are there garden style apartments on the first floor?

G. Chadwick: yes.

D. Hemeon: What is the roadway grade?

G. Chadwick: 6 ½ % grade.

D. Tatem: Does the cross-section show a raised berm?

G. Chadwick: The trees will be planted at 12 ft tall and will grow to 20 ft tall within 3 yrs.

Y. Nahikian: What is the difference between the middle section and the lower one?

G. Chadwick: I am showing the sections tonight after the 4 ft reduction.

J. Gryval: Has this new plan been reviewed by the Fire Dept. for the radius? For the buffer, how did you make out with that?

G. Chadwick: We increased the distance from Mr. Yee's property. A waiver is still needed, because of the driveway and Pleasant View Drive.

Mr. Yee, abutter: I would prefer this property be pushed back. I have concerns with the site view and traffic. I have small children. Also, I have water concerns.

M. Sorel: Are there any comments from the Aesthetic Committee?

R. Duhaime: He has not gone to the Aesthetic Committee with this proposal, but I feel he has met the majority of what we are looking for.

G. Chadwick: Do I need to go back to the Aesthetic Committee again? All we did is shorten the building.

J. Gryval: Meet with the Aesthetic Committee briefly before the next Planning Board meeting on October 6, 2008.

Y. Nahikian: What is the pitch of the roof?

G. Chadwick: About a 12 pitch roof.

D. Tatem: 12 pitch is in the regulations.

Y. Nahikian: Why are we keeping a 12-pitch roof on such a large building?

J. McHugh: Is the pitch required for snow to run off?

D. Tatem: It is for aesthetics only. If other than a 12 pitch, the applicant will need a waiver.

J. Gryval: The waiver for the buffer, how does the Board feel? The Board consensus is they are in favor of this waiver.

J. Duffy: A note on the plan needs to be changed for the 4 ft high chain link fence. It should read a "4 ft high black vinyl coated chain link fence".

4. HARMONY PLACE LLC (08-31)
1621 Hooksett Road, Map 14, Lot 27
63-unit older person housing development in three (3) buildings

Jenn McCourt, McCourt Engineering: The project is now called Harmony Place. 4 yrs ago, it was called Northview Condos. The site is just North of the Main Street "Y". The original approval was for 74 townhouse style units; now proposing 63 units. I met with the Aesthetic committee last Thursday night. We are very much into the conceptual phase of this plan. We want to bring you a project that meets the new regulations. This project is for older person housing with 2x 3-story 24-unit buildings, and 1x 15 unit building. The final design will look more pleasing than tonight's proposal. I am presenting 3 sections of the site with the roof pitch ranging from 6 to 12. Cindy Lewis, architect, will review the roof pitches. There are 30 ft tall existing trees, and the site was logged about 10 yrs ago. I propose plantings 8 ft in height that will have full growth at 30 ft high. There is an existing 20 ft gap in the tree line that we can fill in. This gap will have a 3 second window when you will see the buildings. For a 24-unit building, the regulations require a 10/12 pitch with a maximum height of 40 ft (referred to Zoning Ordinance Article 22 for definition of building height). I suggest going with a shorter roof and adding gables. If we can't get a waiver on the height, then we would need to add buildings to the site to meet the 63-units.

Cindy Lewis, Architect: The height to the eave is 29 ft. I am proposing gables with a different pitch roof. Also, I will have building bump-outs and textures as discussed at the Aesthetic Committee meeting. We are asking for vinyl siding with cedar impressions vs. the wood requirement.

R. Duhaime: There are benefits to having less buildings on the site. The older site plan had 14 buildings, now this plan has 3 buildings. You have moved the site up the hill and

that is why we asked for the site lines. The 24-unit buildings are on the flattest part of the property. Brookview Sr. Housing you will see from the roadway. This site you will see less from the roadway. I didn't embellish on the landscape for this site, because it is 500 ft back from the roadway.

Y. Nahikian: We discussed middle 24-unit building to step ½ down.

J. McCourt: I can hide parking a lot easier than buildings. We are trying to get input from the Board.

J. Gryval: Yervant, what is your opinion on the pitch of the roof?

Y. Nahikian: For the pitch, I disagree with Dan on a 10/12 pitch. You don't want to add to the bulk of the building. A 10/12 pitch depends on the architecture. A 10/12 pitch is unreasonable for this building. For the siding, exclude vinyl siding and use fiber cement siding. Use different materials on the exterior.

J. McHugh: I was at the TRC meeting. As Northview Condos, there was a concern about getting out of this location onto Rte 3. There is no left-hand turn lane. Will there be sidewalks on Rte. 3?

J. McCourt: Correct, there is no left-hand turn lane. The original design had sidewalks all the way up. What is the requirement for a trail?

J. Gryval: For elderly housing, a sidewalk is a good idea.

D. Hemeon: There were major drainage problems on the Northview plan. The subdivisions across the street cannot take any more water.

J. McCourt: Now that I have more room, I propose an above ground drainage system.

D. Tatem: There needs to be a reduction in the peak rate and volume.

J. McCourt: 8 inch pipes between catch basins is not a good thing. For every 4 units, ADA requires a parking space.

J. Gryval: For the elderly, we want to assure there is enough ADA parking.

J. McCourt: We are required to have 16 ADA spaces. I propose disbursing them along the parking lot vs. clumping them together.

J. Gryval: If you are looking for less ADA spaces, then you will need a waiver. How many waivers will you be looking for (building height, sidewalks vs. nature trails)?

J. Duffy: Dale, if there are sidewalks along Hooksett Road, are you responsible to maintain them?

D. Hemeon: Yes.

J. Duffy: For the nature trails per the regulations, if you prefer sidewalks, where will they go?

J. Gryval: For an elderly person walking, sidewalks are better than a nature trail.

J. McCourt: For enclosed parking, we would use carports. Therefore, we would prefer a waiver for this.

D. Jodoin: What is the Fire Dept. opinion on this?

D. Hemeon: Per BJ Branch's Village Water letter, there is no water available. This needs to be further researched with Village Water.

J. Gryval: Enclosed parking?

J. Duffy: Mike Hoisington, Fire Dept., does not want carports.

J. McHugh: What is another alternative to carports, open parking?

R. Guay: Elderly units without covered parking won't sell.

R. Duhaime: Does Fire think the carports are attached to the building?

J. McHugh: J. Duffy should make the inquiry to the Fire Dept. why carports are not favored.

J. McCourt: We can request a partial waiver, so that not all parking has to be under carports.

D. Dreffs: What is the purpose of the regulation?

R. Guay: One covered space per unit to sell.

J. Gryval: Any other comments?

D. Tatem: The side buffers on the revised plan need to be vegetated.

J. Gryval: Was there a traffic study on this site?

J. McCourt: Yes, in 2005.

D. Tatem: We will ask that the traffic study be updated.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 5. RK ASSOCIATES – K-Mart Plaza (07-30)**
1271 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 2
- Site Improvement – Parking Lot & Drainage
 - Drainage Easement (Book 1166, Page 019)

Open Public Hearing

David Baker, RK Associates: The Board asked us to note on the site plan the repair of the 36” culvert. We have no problem with this condition for approval.

D. Baker: There has been a camera study of the beaver dam.

D. Hemeon: How are you going to repair this?

D. Baker: The easement provided by Atty. John Sokul.

D. Hemeon: The water will leave RK site retention pond and go into 2x 36” pipes. What is NHDOT’s plan to repair?

D. Baker: We meet with DOT tomorrow and will ask them questions.

D. Marshall: Benton Road can handle anything you send them. How is it going to get there? If drainage across Merchant’s property was granted to K-Mart, you can send anything you want. Who responsibility is it to handle water from the West side of Rte. 3 to Benton Road?

D. Baker: It is the flow of Dalton Brook, not just RK Associates water. I agree with you, the issue is capacity. We need the 6 x 10 or 6 x 12 culvert replacement by FEMA. I would like to get the approval and work with abutters and State agencies.

D. Marshall: Let’s say you are meeting everything on your site. If we give our approval, we are saying you can send anything to Merchants.

D. Hemeon: I believe Merchants thinks their pipes are adequate.

John Sokul, Attorney: I am representing Merchants. We do not have an issue with RK’s plan tonight. The State DOT has indicated they do not want to have the roadways updated, unless drainage issues are resolved. With that said, I don’t think you should oppose this plan.

J. McHugh: I would do a disservice to you to approve this plan. I would suggest you go to this meeting tomorrow with NHDOT and have all parties resolve this.

R. Duhaime: Lou, there are drainage pipes on the Merchants auto site that drain across into the K-Mart property.

D. Baker: When we first realized this required a global project, we decided to look at what we can do for our site. We can't sit back and wait for everyone to be on the same timeline. We can do enhancements to our site now.

J. McHugh: If you had implemented your plan, would this last storm have caused this flooding?

D. Baker: I don't believe we would have had the flooding from a couple of weekends ago.

D. Marshall: NHDOT, they propose the start of construction at the end of 2009 and drainage in 2010.

D. Baker: We are willing to take the risk for the approval of this project.

J. Duffy: Cross easements are required for any improvements.

D. Baker: DOT is showing raised median. Cross easements will be needed from Merchants property, Applebee's, and the Chinese restaurant to the RK property. Section E of the regulations state cross easements needed "unless deemed undesirable by the Planning Board".

D. Marshall: Was it my understanding that U-turns will be allowed?

D. Baker: U-turns are not a requirement of DOT.

D. Marshall: DOT is not going to prohibit.

J. Duffy: I disagree. In the Performance Zone we want access behind Hooksett Road to get to multiple sites. The DOT, at their presentation, stated U-turns OK for cars only. The boundary or blockage between Merchants Retail and the Applebee's site is to omit traffic crossing through. RK Associates to provide draft documents for cross easements per Article 10-A, G.1.(e); prior to the plan being signed.

D. Marshall: I can agree to some extent. There is a building(s) in the way that prohibits adequate circulation.

J. Duffy: You could pull in behind Applebee's and around to other side.

D. Marshall: We would be looking for a route through, without taking parking spaces from Applebee's or RK Associates. Before the Board Chairman can sign the plans, you would need this easement agreement reviewed and approved by the Town Attorney.

J. Duffy: Maybe you could have a condition as part of the Rte. 3 roadway improvements.

J. Gryval: I thought tonight's continued public hearing is for the drainage issue.

R. Duhaime: For the redevelopment of the Merchants retail site, a cross easement would be beneficial.

J. Duffy: RK Associates would have to give the easement.

R. Guay: It is impractical to request an easement.

Close Public Hearing

J. Gryval: Do we have a motion to approve this plan?

R. Guay motioned to approve plan conditional:

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- \$25.00 LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to Planning Dept.
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies, and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction (see letter dated July 11, 2008 from Stantec)
- Conditional Use Permit is approved to expand the existing on-site drainage basin
- Letter from Hooksett Central Water Precinct stating they approve this project
- All outstanding Federal, State, and local permits are obtained and submitted to the Town and Stantec
- Applicant agrees to attend a required pre-construction meeting after (a) all bonds are submitted and approved, (b) site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place and the Inspection Funding Agreement is signed and submitted and (3) 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. Jodoin.

D. Marshall: Is RK willing to give an easement?

D. Baker: We are not opposed to traffic flowing through our property, however I think this is premature to ask for an easement now.

L. Caron: Issues are with controlling the traffic to get to Merchants Plaza by skipping the traffic light. Traffic issues could go both ways.

Vote unanimously in favor.

6. **Application continued to October 6, 2008**
CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF HOOKSETT (08-26)
5 Veterans Drive, Map 9, Lot 35
Non-Residential Site Plan for a Parking Lot

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

7. **GEORGE LAWRENCE (former Granite Plaza) (08-32)**
1778 Hooksett Road, Map 6, Lot 23
Non-Residential Site Plan for Building Addition, Parking Lot, and Related
Improvements to Support a 60-Seat Restaurant

George Lawrence, applicant: I was originally approved April 2007. Now I am taking the building down. I am replacing the site with a 2,400 sq ft building. This new plan will have an exit only onto Hooksett Road. I have spoken to the Pellerins and other neighbors. I will install an 8ft high vinyl white fence.

D. Tatem: Because this is a revised plan to the one originally approved, it was not reasonable to bring the application to the full checklist criteria. We recommend you waive the two items requested (1) scale of plan, and (2) off-site information.

J. Duffy: These two waivers are checklist items.

J. Gryval: Do we have a motion to find the plan complete?

***D. Hemeon motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by Joanne McHugh.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Gryval: Received and read the waivers into the record. Do we have a motion to grant two waivers above?

***R. Guay motioned to grant the two waivers. Seconded by D. Hemeon.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Open Public Hearing

Donald Carrier, abutter: concerned policing about process that occupancy is not allowed until fence is put up.

Close Public Hearing

D. Tatem: I have 14 comments. The impervious are increased to 6%. We want to see that the existing drainage system can handle this. The lighting plan needs to be revised. You need documentation from sewer and water that they approve capacity for a 60-seat restaurant. The 12 ft wide access drive is 5 ft from the building; we recommend a couple of bollards or a raised sidewalk so that cars will not hit the building. You also need a letter from Mike Hoisington, Fire Dept., that he has access to the building.

J. McHugh: Where are the entrances and exits?

G. Lawrence: In and out on Granite Street; out only on Rte. 3/Hooksett Road.

J. Gryval: Do we have a motion to approve the plan?

R. Guay motioned to approve the plan conditional:

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- \$25.00 LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to Planning Dept.
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies, and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction (see letter dated September 15, 2008 from Stantec)
- Letter from Hooksett Village Water Precinct stating they approve this project
- Letter from Hooksett Sewer Commission stating they have capacity and approve this project
- Letter from Hooksett Fire Department stating they approve this project
- All outstanding Federal, State, and local permits are obtained and submitted to the Town and Stantec
- Applicant agrees to attend a required pre-construction meeting after (a) all bonds are submitted and approved, (b) site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place and the Inspection Funding Agreement is signed and submitted, and (3) 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. J. McHugh abstained.

- 8. SANDRA NOLET (08-33)**
30 Morrill Road, Map 40, Lots 2 & 3
Consolidate Lots 2 & 3 and Then Subdivide into Two Lots

J. McHugh: I am stepping down from this application.

D. Marshall: I am taking J. McHugh's place for voting.

J. Duffy: This plan is complete.

J. Gryval: Do we have a motion to find the plan complete?

***D. Marshall motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by D. Hemeon.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Don Duval, applicant: I originally went to the ZBA for a variance. I then appeared before the ZBA again to show the appropriate wetlands on the plan and received another variance. This is a 2-lot subdivision and I am asking for several waivers (see waiver request letter dated August 26, 2008).

D. Hemeon: I have received numerous calls from the Autumn Run residents. I don't know how much water this site is going to create.

Teresa Doyle-Creamer, abutter: I have large concerns about water and the culvert the Town put in 1989. It is very wet and there is an intermittent stream.

D. Hemeon: This water comes down through your property?

T. Creamer: My foundation cracked from the hydraulic pressure in the ground.

D. Duval: For the construction off Morrill Road, I think anything would be absorbed within 500-600 ft of any site development.

D. Tatem: This is a 2-lot subdivision. This will cause minor flow to this abutter.

J. Gryval: A drainage study should be completed.

D. Tatem: There are options for the applicant such as a gravel driveway vs. paved, and infiltrate the rooftops with gutters.

R. Duhaime: A zero runoff is needed.

J. Gryval: Prove you can complete this without increasing the water flow.

D. Duval: This is a buildable lot for a starter home.

J. Duffy: The regulations state 75 x 100 ft for both lots. The applicant is asking for a waiver for the existing home lot. Stantec disagrees with this waiver. The applicant should be able to provide the buildable area, if this home would be taken down.

J. Gryval: How does the Board feel about this?

D. Tatem: If you take the existing lot and split it in half and jam the setbacks to make the other lot buildable at 75 x 100, then the existing house lot would not be a buildable lot.

J. Duffy: When putting in new lot lines, the building set back should not go through the building. Otherwise I think the applicant would need a variance.

D. Duval: The regulations allow 20 ft on one side and 30 ft on the other. Based on Dan's comments, we have taken care of this issue.

D. Marshall: They got a variance.

J. Duffy: A side-note on the frontage, the ZBA is allowing substandard lots. CEO reply was that the ZBA is not looking at whether the subdivision OK, they are just looking at the frontage. They are promoting an applicant to move forward. I think we need some communication between the ZBA and Planning Board on this. Referred to note #8 signed plans and note #10 the existing house has an existing childcare business. It should be noted on the plan who approved the daycare and the date.

D. Duval: I will submit Ken Andrews' letter.

R. Guay: Where is your septic going?

D. Duval: The State does not require septic on the plan on a 5-acre lot.

D. Tatem: The Town regulations require soil data. There is nothing that states he can't build a lot in the back.

D. Duval: A lot of these regulations are for larger subdivisions.

D. Tatem: If they don't grant the waiver, I do not have a problem. Other applicants have brought in an aerial map. The house backs to Autumn Run; maybe there is an issue.

Neil Patel, builder: There is nothing concrete for what will be built. The sloped area in front will be filled 75 ft from the road for the building. We are taking away the drainage problem by filling.

J. Gryval: Because of the drainage issue in this area, we should request a drainage report.

R. Guay: The property immediately to the West, are they on well or public water?

D. Hemeon: Water but no sewer.

Sandra Nolet, owner: Regarding the water issue, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Apple and Mr. Sorel walked my property approximately 17 yrs ago. My husband granted an easement to the Town. I think the water is coming through this easement pipe from the road onto my property.

Waiver #1 2.01-16 septic areas within 100' of project J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

***D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #1. Seconded by R. Guay.
Vote 1 in favor, 8 opposed = not granted.***

Waiver #2 2.01-17 specimen preservable trees (1) foot or more in diameter J. Gryval received and read the waiver into the record.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #2. Seconded by R. Guay.
Vote 4 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 abstained = not granted.*

Waiver #3 2.01-29 design of driveway D. Duval, waiver not needed.

Waiver #4 2.02-1-1 temporary and permanent erosion and sediment best management practices D. Duval, waiver not needed.

Waiver #5 location of buildings within 200' of parcel J. Gryval received and read the waiver into the record.

*R. Duhaime motioned to grant waiver #5. Seconded by D. Marshall.
Vote 5 in favor, 1 opposed, 3 abstained = granted.*

Waiver #6 location of septics within 200' of parcel J. Gryval received and read the waiver into the record.

*R. Duhaime motioned to grant waiver #6. Seconded by D. Marshall.
Vote 1 in favor, 5 opposed, 3 abstained = not granted.*

Waiver #7 site soil survey J. Gryval received and read the waiver into the record.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #7. Seconded by D. Jodoin.
Vote 5 in favor, 1 opposed, 3 abstained = granted.*

Waiver #8 current zoning within 1,000 feet of site D. Duval, waiver not needed.

Waiver #9 roads and drives within 200 ft of site J. Gryval received and read the waiver into the record.

*R. Guay motioned to grant waiver #9. Seconded by D. Marshall.
Vote 8 in favor, 1 opposed = granted.*

Waiver #10 section i.11.03 bound along r.o.w. designated as benchmark D. Duval, waiver not needed. J. Duffy, this will be made a condition of approval "benchmark on bound when set".

Waiver #11 75' x 100' buildable area for lot #2 J. Gryval received and read the waiver into the record.

R. Guay motioned to grant waiver #11 conditional that if existing building is to have an add on to the back, the applicant must appear before the Board for approval. Seconded by D. Marshall.

Vote 7 in favor, 2 opposed = granted conditional.

J. Duffy: Applicant needs to correct notes 8 & 10 on the plan.

D. Tatem: Lot #2, the 4K area is required by the State. The Town ordinance is not met.

D. Duval: Note #19, the minimum setback is 25 ft to meet the regulations. I can meet your regulations, but not the State 4K.

J. Gryval: Note #19, what is the Board's consensus?

R. Duhaime: They are running a daycare business here.

S. Nolet: The 1989 septic system has the capacity for 50 children in my daycare.

D. Tatem: 75 ft from the end of the culvert, slide this Southeast and widen out.

D. Duval: The soils are poorly drained.

J. Gryval: It is in the regulations.

D. Marshall: Our regulations do not require a 4K area.

D. Tatem: Per the Town regulations, no septic components within 25 feet. Therefore he cannot show the State 4K requirement to design the septic system.

D. Hemeon: Who digs the test pit?

D. Duval: I dug both test pits.

M. Sorel: Just for the record, I did not walk this site.

Waiver #12 State 4K requirement to design septic system

D. Hemeon motioned to grant waiver #12. Seconded by D. Jodoin.

Vote unanimously opposed = not granted.

M. Sorel: How does the applicant get around the State regulations?

D. Marshall: We are more stringent than the State. The State allows within 10 ft, our regulations are 25 ft away.

J. Gryval: There will be no action on this plan tonight. Is there a motion to continue?

M. Sorel motioned to continue applicant to October 20, 2008. Seconded by D. Jodoin. Vote unanimously in favor.

Continued to October 20, 2008.

OTHER BUSINESS

CIP Committee

J. Duffy: The Board needs to appoint individuals by September 30, 2008 and notify the Finance Director of these appointments. Meetings will start in late October/early November.

R. Duhaime and M. Sorel volunteered to be appointed to the CIP Committee.

J. Duffy: Departments are meeting with the Town Administrator October 6-13, 2008. We need to work on having three (3) other people join this committee. Last year, we had the committee meetings @ 6:00pm on the same night as the Planning Board Meetings. Should we ask for a rep from the School Board, and Budget Committee? What about Mark Bourque?

Inspection Funding Agreement

J. Duffy: The Board adopted this agreement in June 2008. The Building Department will revise this document to have the CEO (vs. Planning Board Chair) and developer sign at the pre-construction meeting.

CTAP

J. Duffy: CTAP will provide the Board training on one of the 18 subjects from the choices I have read to you tonight. What is the consensus of the Board? The Board has chosen the subject of Economic Development. I will notify CTAP and a training will be scheduled in the near future.

NHARPC Fall Planning & Zoning Conference @ Loon Mountain

R. Duhaime and M. Sorel will attend the conference on Saturday, October 25, 2008 8:00am-3:30pm.

R. Duhaime motioned to adjourn at 9:55pm, seconded by D. Hemeon. Vote unanimously in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 9:55 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 6, 2008 at 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH Town Hall Chambers (room 105).

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator