

**Official
As of 11/17/08**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, November 3, 2008**

CALLED TO ORDER

Vice-Chair J. McHugh called the meeting to order at 7:06pm

ATTENDANCE

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

Excused: Chairman J. Gryval.

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

D. Marshall will be voting tonight.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 10/20/08

P. Rueppel motioned to approve the minutes of 10/20/08. Seconded by D. Marshall. Vote unanimously in favor. D. Dreffs abstained.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

1. BROOKVIEW SR. HOUSING (07-29)

1631 Hooksett Road, Map 14, Lot 32

Revised residential site plan for a proposed 3-story residential structure, with parking underneath, which will contain 42 2-bedroom units of older person housing.

George Chadwick, Keach-Nordstrom: Attorney Buchanan is also here with me tonight. At the 9/15/08 Planning Board meeting I showed several concepts for this project. Based on your comments, I am presenting the plan to you tonight for a 42-unit structure with 2 bedrooms in each unit. I have updated and submitted plans to Stantec and the Town. I believe Stantec has completed their review. I have met with your staff also. The access into the site was made more gradual and the radius was lengthened. The lighting stayed the same. The landscaping only changed for the gazebo; it was moved to the front. The sewer and water remain the same; utilities are brought into project from Rte 3. There will be a booster station to help with flow. Drainage is collected and put into an infiltration basin; designed per Town regulations. Per the Board's request, we decreased the volume in a 50-year storm event. When this project is developed, there will be less water than

today. We have the State driveway site-specific permit in hand. For the sidewalk, NHDOT prefers no sidewalk within the NHDOT right-of-way. We will have a 15 ft wide sidewalk easement in the front of the property. We still need the 40 ft buffer waiver to Mr. Yee's lot; possibly we can act on this waiver tonight. For drainage, there is a treatment swale to a detention area; then it goes under Rte 3 to the Merrimack River. The rate and volume has decreased as the result of this project. I understand neighbors have concerns with water running off the hill. If neighbors are feeling there is an increase in rate/volume, I cannot promise that this project will not resolve all issues (i.e. water in their basements), but it will help water "surface" runoff.

P. Rueppel: Is your plan what the end product will look like?

G. Chadwick: Yes.

D. Hemeon: Who is the easement for the sidewalk going to be given to?

G. Chadwick: To the Town.

J. Duffy: For the Wal-Mart sidewalk, they needed a Letter of Credit (LOC). Is the Board just asking for an easement or also a LOC?

J. McHugh: In response to audience comment they cannot here the Board or speakers: there is no amplification system at this time, but we will check into this with the Town Administrator. For the sidewalk easement, don't you have to use it for something else for the State?

G. Chadwick: If the Town had additional sidewalks in the future, they could add onto this project's sidewalk. The NHDOT stated they would prefer not to have a sidewalk within a NHDOT right-of-way.

J. McHugh: I made the previous sidewalk inquiry. I was hoping there would be a sidewalk for people to access the Library and other areas.

J. Duffy: The State does not want a sidewalk within the NHDOT right-of-way. The developer is offering the Town a 15 ft easement. Are you also requiring a LOC to build the sidewalk?

R. Duhaime: Could the developer just build the sidewalk?

D. Marshall: They can only build the sidewalk on their site. If the other properties do not build sidewalks, this project would have a sidewalk to nowhere.

J. Duffy: The sidewalk was in place of a walking trail.

R. Duhaime: Part of their approval requires they have a trail; we could require a sidewalk.

J. McHugh: As a result of the age of the individuals in this building, a sidewalk “paved” would provide better footing than a natural walking trail.

G. Chadwick: We could have the sidewalk be a “dead end” at the billboard.

J. McHugh: As a condition of approval, we could have the money set aside for later use.

R. Duhaime: Moving gazebo, why?

G. Chadwick: It was too close to the dumpster. We are losing 30 ft of the building. This allowed us to dress-up the gazebo.

R. Duhaime: For drainage, only a 50 yr event decrease?

G. Chadwick: Decreased for all events up to 50 yrs, but not for 100 yr flood.

R. Duhaime: What is the elevation for the drainage?

M. Sorel: What are the Hooksett standards for stormwater runoff?

G. Chadwick: Finished grade to unfinished is approximately 13 ft.

R. Duhaime: What is the size of the outlet pipe?

G. Chadwick: 12” pipe.

D. Tatem: There is a regulation for the decrease in peak rate runoff. There is no regulation for a decrease in the volume of runoff. They have exceeded the regulation for this plan by including a decrease in the volume of runoff. Example: Wal-Mart site has made the Goonan Road residents much drier; less water. George Chadwick has met the design for up to 50 yrs decrease. You can still have uncommon storm events that cannot be measured.

J. McHugh: Recently we have had storms more like 100 yr storms.

D. Tatem: The maximum flow “peak rate” is a lot of rain in a short period of time. With pavement, nothing infiltrates into the ground. Volume is determined over a complete storm.

D. Marshall: The site, as it exists today, with a 100 yr storm, flooding would occur to the neighbors across from this site.

D. Tatem: During construction, we cannot promise anything.

G. Chadwick: It all depends on the site manager.

Open Public Hearing

Tom Fischer, 3 Morgan Dr: All the water off this building seems like it is going right into Pleasant View Dr.

G. Chadwick: There is a closed drainage system with catch basins that collect the water and put into the wetland then into a 30" pipe under Rte 3. The catch basins put it into the infiltration system then back into the ground, so it doesn't run over the surface. Then under Rte 3 to the backyards of some on Pleasant View Dr. This decreases the rate and volume.

T. Fischer: Is this project for senior citizens, 55 and up? You will add 82 vehicles onto Rte 3. Do you know how many accidents there have been at this intersection in the last 10 years? Now the State has taken the road further, a 4-lane road into a 2-lane road. You are telling me an old person is going to be able to cross Rte 3?

Peter Farwell, 24 Grant Dr: The people here are affected by the water from this project. My wife and I walked around Sunday and handed out flyers on what is going on. Any more water, 50 yr or 100 yr flood, will put a major crimp on their properties and value. The water on our site will eventually get to Donati Field. We are not specialist. All we are saying is that the Town has to take an extra step or 2, however the drainage is designed, the Town has taken care of us and will not affect our properties. When the Beauchesne development was devised, a pipe was installed to get out the gray area.

Frank Lee, 3 Albert Ave: There are two 36" culverts. These drain into the Beauchesne area and stream into our cellars. What you are going to do is upset the water on the hill and more water will come into our basements. There is not guarantee you will not cause problems. This affects our properties. I have 5 sub-pumps I need to turn on during these rainstorms. Why would you have elderly housing on a hill? How will emergency vehicles get to them during a snowstorm?

Michelle West, 5 Morgan Dr: The stream is a rapid. Release water back into groundwater. Taking surface water off; whatever is going into the ground will come back up.

G. Chadwick: It is 6-8 ft down, not at basement level.

M. West: Most of us have split-levels and we have to take time off from work to pump out water.

Lisa Miller, 2 Morgan Dr: It is a safety issue with the water. This past year, they needed to let the kids out of school. I tried 2 different roads to get to my home via Main Street. I found out the kids were let out of school.

Robert Moore, 1627 Hooksett Rd: I recently had severe damage to my stone foundation due to the water issues. Elliot Construction accessed the road to the back and altered the water. I don't know how this will impact this development. Septic or sewer, homeowners get away with public sewers.

G. Chadwick: The sewer is extending to Rte 3, not to the North or South of this property.

R. Moore: South side; up past Granite Hill.

G. Chadwick: If it was not on our

Joanne DeSordo, 3 Albert Ave: The water from this development will come right at us. We had a culvert installed. We set our alarm every ½ hour during rainy nights to empty out the sub-pump. We don't sleep. I have to teach a class at 8:00am. I do not find this amusing. What if we try to sell our house?

D. Marshall: If this project is not improved, you will still have this problem. The volume and rate will decrease.

P. Farwell: The surface water will be less. If you put it into the ground, this affects our properties.

Alec Buchanan, Attorney for project: There will not be any more water, whether in the ground or surface into a swale. The only thing the project does is paving and building.

P. Farwell: If you move the vegetation and pave, the water will increase to my home. The ground has a natural absorption factor.

Jane Ferguson, 8 Short Ave. I have been at my home for 43 years. I had problems with water during recent storms. The building is disturbing what is going on underground to the aquifer. We need a better drainage study. It has nothing to do with surface water.

Mary Farwell, 24 Grant Dr: There was clear cutting in 2005. This is about when our problems got worse. We used to have Spring snow melt issues. 2005 is when problems got worse. Submitted and read letter from neighbors dated November 3, 2008 into the record.

Randy LeBlanc, 16 Grant Dr: I had 3-4 ft of water in my backyard. Dale has seen this mess. How much more of this will I see as the result of this project?

Deborah LeBlanc, 16 Grant Dr: Showed pictures from the 2006 and 2007 rainstorms.

R. LeBlanc: I had to call 911; the floodgates opened up.

Vincent Lembo, Jr., 56 Main St: Will all the water go into the catch basin?

G. Chadwick: Wetlands, yes.

V. Lembo: What happens when this overflows?

G. Chadwick: Goes into 36" pipes.

D. Hemeon: Thibeault is doing construction North of this site. The hay bails with the silk fence broke loose and flooded the culvert. This even flooded Main Street. You will get water even with this project. There is also the Granite Hills site. I upgraded Morgan Dr. There was a 24 " pipe to 12" pipe to a 24" pipe. I upgraded all to 24" pipes. I cannot answer if it will fill into ground.

V. Lembo: Could you place a Bond for 10-15 years?

D. Hemeon: We need to slow water down; at least 50%.

V Lembo: How long can a Bond be to fix substantial damage?

D. Hemeon: The Town Planner would have to inquire with the Town Attorney. A Bond is used when building the site; not for private subdivisions.

D. Tatem: Private subdivisions can still be bonded.

Richard Sullivan, 7 Morgan Dr.: My understanding is that the road exiting and entering is directly opposite of Pleasant View Dr. I would hope there is another means of exiting this project. These residents will go straight down Pleasant View and not turn onto Hooksett Road/Rte 3.

G. Chadwick: The Board asked us if we could offset the entrance/exit from Pleasant View Dr. The NHDOT stated the best way is the intersection.

Debra Young, 21 Grant Dr: They had talked to me earlier about closing down the entrance to Pleasant View Drive. That would stop people going in and out and stop traffic. Another road across from Pleasant View will rush water. I videotaped the rain events. If we can do anything to stop this, we need to do it. It was heart breaking. I was calling people at work telling them the issues.

Lynn Dee Carey, 6 Please View Dr: To Dale, The hay bails, they had excavators . . . the ground and the water tables, you didn't know about the road not on your site. You need to go out of your perimeters to see how the abutting projects are affecting us and now this project. Thibeault should have put up a Bond. The Town should have gone after Thibeault to repair our lawns.

Frank Lee, 3 Albert Ave: There must be another area in Hooksett this project can go. There are issues with runoff and traffic with this site.

M. Farwell: My understanding is there is another elderly housing project just Southerly to this project. We could all be back here again. I would like to know how the Board will address extending studies for surface water, groundwater, and traffic. How will this affect our property values?

J. McHugh: The Board has been looking at this project for about four (4) years. It is not that the Board has not requested the project be looked at for traffic and water studies.

M. Farwell: Many of us were not aware of this project, because we are not direct abutters. I don't know how you can get neighbors to be notified of this project downstream.

T. Fischer: I have lived in my house for 34 years. The road has always been a cut through. With the connector road, this helped our traffic flow. Now you are putting a project across the street that will increase our traffic.

Sherry Bergeron, 14 Pleasant View Dr: I am an abutter where the water issue is going to happen. Showed on plan where her home is located. I am concerned with the water and traffic; accidents from Pleasant View onto Rte 3. I do agree more studies are needed.

Rob Moore: Has there been any further studies since Granite Hill has been completed up top? I know there are several small streams.

R. Duhaime: Granite Hill has been completed for years. Granite Heights is still under construction.

R. Moore: Something went wrong up there. I think there should be further studies.

Terry C., 4 Beachesne Dr: 30" pipe under Rte 3?

G. Chadwick: This will go into the backyard of some of you folks. We have decreased rate and volume through the pipe. I can't fix all your problems tonight. After this project is built, according to our calculations, you will receive less water. At the South end, we are not discharging to this side. Everything flows to our property from the South side.

Terry C.: Where is water dumping?

D. Hemeon: State put a pipe in years ago, behind the Gagnons to the top of the street to Main Street to Donati Park to the Merrimack River. On a normal day there is not a problem. 50-100 yr storms are impacting your properties. State said they can put their water through this pipe. I am more worried about the next project.

M. West: You are saying with the existing pipes, the water will be released into the ground.

D. Hemeon: With this project, water will never get to Albert Ave.

M. West: The surface water is being released somewhere.

D. Hemeon: Morgan and Albert, flooding is coming from the South project; Granite Hill site.

M. West: Tell us the tests will be done and our basements will not be affected.

D. Hemeon: We are not solving the problem. We are just going to slow it down. Part of the water goes into the ground, and the other part into the wetland. Now you are getting 100% of the water, we are trying to decrease by at least 50%.

J. McHugh: We are still taking comments from the public. Then we will have discussion from the Board how to address comments.

Rita Dinwoodie, 3 Ray Dr: For 45 years, we had no water problems. Recently, we have a lot of problems. I don't think it is too much to ask the Board for a study.

Richard Sullivan, 7 Morgan Dr: Dale is a resident expert. You put new piping; 2 pipes.

D. Hemeon: The pipe behind The Vanuddens old house to Rte 3 water to a swale to a 12" pipe to a catch basin to a short 24" pipe to a 12" pipe to Crossing Rd. I updated all pipes to 24". Some surface water, but most water is coming from Granite Hill.

R. Sullivan: Pool of water at Grant Dr.

J. McHugh: Submitted and read letter from resident, Lee Ann Moynihan, Short Ave., into the record.

P. Rueppel: We are fortunate to have three (3) engineers here tonight: Dick Marshall, Dan Tatem, and George Chadwick. I would like to hear from each of these engineers.

D. Marshall: A solution to the current problem, this Board does not have the power to solve. If people are asking us to grant them iron clad assurance that construction of this project will have no impact or decrease, the Board can either accept the results of studies already done or expand the scope of the study which would be a watershed.

D. Tatem: From what we have seen and studies provided in this Town and many other Towns we work in, I have not seen a groundwater study for this flooding issue. For this type of study, you would have to include the top of Granite Hill down to the Merrimack River. It does not seem to be a reasonable solution. Surface runoff appears to be the issue. Was there water in the basement before trees were cleared in 2005 for this project? And for the construction of Granite Hill?

P. Rueppel: Granite Hill construction was in 2006.

D. Tatem: 15 acres were not clear-cut. It was selectively cut. I don't see how the cuts done could affect this neighborhood. I think it is a bigger issue with other developments.

J. McHugh: Possibility the water is coming from Granite Hill. I think the neighbors believe the water is coming from this project. I am not sure we know where the water is coming from.

D. Tatem: The work above this site most likely caused your issues, not this project. I don't think another study would prove something different.

G. Chadwick: Result of us clear cutting would not have resulted in the water to these neighbors. The developer has decreased the rate and volume with the control.

J. McHugh: What is the Pleasure of the Board?

M. Sorel: Is the rate of runoff created by this development? The snow storage is noted on the plan; where is the melt off going?

G. Chadwick: If disposed properly, it will go into the wetland area.

M. Sorel: I am not comfortable with the 50 yr storm. I would be comfortable with a 100 yr storm study. Most of these neighbors had dry cellars prior to these recent rainstorms. Accommodate the site and runoff.

G. Chadwick: 100 yr storm; decrease in rate of runoff = pre 144 psf, and 115 psf post. We are detaining for a 100 yr storm.

R. Duhaime: I have not been aware of wet basements in the Beauchesne development.

A. Buchanan: May 2005 went to ZBA, December 2005 went to Planning Board – drainage has been studied to the extent of what it can be. There may be problems with water on the hill of Rte 3. This site is not causing the problems. It is not this Board's authority to conduct studies, when it has not been proven to cause problems. It should not be at my client's expense.

R. Duhaime: Did you not hear the same comments/concerns from the neighbors tonight that I have?

A. Buchanan: Ms. Rueppel stated the water issues are concurrent with work from Granite Hill.

M. Sorel: I don't think I heard that this project is causing their problems, I hear that it may add to it.

A. Buchanan: It will lessen the rate and the peak and will reduce water to their properties.

R. Duhaime: The size of the building on this site is the maximum use on this property. It has been a concern of mine since the start.

J. McHugh: The watershed study?

D. Marshall: Granite Hills all the way to the River.

J. McHugh: Is the applicant to fair the costs or is the study independent by the Town?

D. Marshall: I don't think a watershed study on the developer's shoulders is reasonable. If other developments (i.e. Granite Heights & 3A Development) contributed to this water issue, the Town should fair the study.

R. Duhaime: Should we ask a Hydro-Geologists if the study is worth it?

D. Marshall: How can the Hydro-Geologists advise us "blind" without a study?

R. Duhaime: Look at a GIS map to determine if the study is needed.

J. McHugh: The water issues were before this development.

D. Hemeon: Water is from 3A Development, and Granite Hill. Until everything is built, we are going to have problems. All these projects have phases.

R. Duhaime: Something has changed the water table.

J. McHugh: Inquire from the Attorney if we can have a study completed?

M. Sorel: With do courtesy to the engineers present, there are no Hydro-Geologists. We need to be concerned that this project, as proposed, will not cause more problems to these neighbors. We need professional advice. We need a water study on this project.

J. Duffy: Stantec has a Hydro-Geologist on staff.

M. Sorel motioned for a professional Hydro-Geologist to appear before the Board and advise this Board on this parcel only to determine if this project will add to the problem of the water table and if further studies should be completed. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

P. Rueppel: Can we get these other projects, 3A Development and Granite Heights, to contribute to this study?

J. McHugh: I asked D. Jodoin if we can use the bonding for this study and he said no.

J. Duffy: We would need more money in the escrow account for this project, if the developer pays for the study.

D. Tatem: 6 inches, 46,590 gallons could fit in this room 2x. I don't know if a Hydro-Geologist can make a determination just on this site.

D. Marshall: What data is to be looked at?

D. Tatem: A professional engineer will not make a decision without data. The data you need to get to your answer will far exceed your needs.

Vote in favor. D. Jodoin opposed.

D. Marshall: I request this Hydro-Geologist appear at a separate meeting from the regularly scheduled Planning Board meetings.

J. McHugh: Dan will speak to Stantec's Hydro-Geologist.

D. Tatem: I recommend you move on the 40 ft buffer.

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver for the 40 ft buffer. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Marshall motioned to continue to November 24, 2008 for Hydro-Geologist to appear before the Board and to continue the public hearing (no other agenda items). Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.

Continued to November 24, 2008.

COMPLETENESS

- 2. PSNH - Public Service Company of NH (08-39)**
1250 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 96
Non-residential site plan for construction of a 2-story warehouse (lower level 9,220 sq ft, upper level 11,445 sq ft, and mezzanine 2,775 sq ft) for relocation of existing company assets on-site.

J. Duffy: The plan is complete.

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

J. Duffy: The public hearing was scheduled for December 1, 2008, however the applicant has requested to have the hearing on November 17, 2008. We will need to renotify the abutters. The applicant will need to provide the abutters information by November 5, 2008.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 3. LEO & IRENE DOYON (08-41)**
67 Chester Turnpike, Map 15, Lot 43
Two-lot subdivision.

J. Duffy: This plan is complete.

***R. Guay motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by D. Jodoin.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Don Duval, Duval Survey: Representing Leo & Irene Doyon. We received a variance for the frontage from the ZBA. We applied to the water supply for the subdivision approval. We are requesting 2 waivers. We received comments from Dan on the existing driveway. Owners in the future may build on the newly created lot. Until that happens, the existing driveway will be left as an easement. If built, the existing driveway will be used to access the new lot and break-up. Jo Ann's comments, it is a temporary driveway access, not an easement. This discrepancy has been taken care of. Dan's comments are for the proposed driveway for site distance and typical driveway profile. The only thing I haven't shown is the proposed utility access to the lots.

D. Marshall: 200 ft on 1 ½ acres on this site, the ZBA decision has caused a substandard lot again. I wanted to bring this to the attention of the Board that we cannot create substandard lots.

J. McHugh: Who from our Board goes to the ZBA meetings? These comments should be given to the Board.

J. Duffy: I had a conversation with the Building Inspector. His position, even if the ZBA grants the variance, it should not be a reason for this Board to approve the subdivision. In other words, the ZBA is not looking at Planning Board requirements.

D. Marshall: The Board has not seen these comments.

M. Sorel: Attorney Buckley from our workshop a few months ago, stated that courts have rules. If it is reasonable use of property, then it is OK. Is it consistent with the neighborhood to have substandard lots?

D. Marshall: The other half of Attorney Buckley's reply, the Planning Board does not have to agree with the ZBA.

M. Sorel: I am addressing the comment “ZBA approved ‘not good’ lots”.

D. Marshall: I stated “substandard” lots doesn’t meet our regulations.

J. McHugh: We need to work more with the ZBA.

R. Duhaime: I do get to discuss comments with the ZBA. They are a judiciary Board. People are looking for relief that they can’t get through the Planning Board. The ZBA looks at 5 criteria.

D. Marshall: Explain to the ZBA that all 5 criteria must be met, not just one or two.

Y. Nahikian: What is the minimum distance for the driveways?

D. Tatem: 50 ft.

D. Duval: Intent of owner, existing driveway that services 15-43 will serve 15-43-1 and construct a new one for the existing 15-43.

D. Tatem: That should be noted on the plan.

J. Duffy: Signature block, should have date of approval and date of signature.

***D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver for topographic map of site. Seconded by D. Hemeon.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver for site specific soil survey. Seconded by D. Hemeon.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Open Public Hearing

No comments.

Close Public Hearing

R. Duhaime: Approximate septic?

D. Duval: Yes.

D. Hemeon: Jo Ann, are you OK with this plan?

J. Duffy: Yes, conditional to include:

- Driveway grading
- Underground utilities for new lot
- State subdivision approval
- Benchmark for bounds
- Buildable area calculation to include setbacks and wetlands to be excluded
- Driveway access vs. easement
- Showing 2 driveways on plan
- Signature block on plan

R. Duhaime motioned to approve plan per conditional:

- All review fees paid-in-full
- \$25.00 LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to the Planning Dept.
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction
- J. Duffy conditions above
- All waivers are 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."

Seconded by D. Hemeon.

Vote unanimously in favor.

4. AV HOOKSETT (08-40)

Hooksett Road, Map 25, Lot 19

Amended site plan to the original non-residential site plan application to include the parking lot expansion.

J. Duffy: This plan is complete.

D. Marshall motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by D. Jodoin.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Brad Jones, Jones & Beach Engineering: This is an amended site plan. We appeared before this Board last month to expand the parking lot on Southern section of the site.

D. Tatem: Regulations don't allow for overhead utilities. It would be difficult to put underground, but not impossible. Not an engineering requirement, more aesthetic. Culvert new parking lot across existing entrance does not quite get to 3 ft. Bunch of catch basins at the Westerly end of parking lot at the flat slope. We looked into tying into other catch basins. Can't change the grade of parking lot.

D. Hemeon: Pipe?

B. Jones: 12" plastic pipe with 2.7 ft of cover.

D. Tatem: Better off concrete.

D. Hemeon: Pitched to drain.

D. Tatem: Design requirements for adds OK.

R. Duhaime: Elevations already work against this property. Placing a pole is not aesthetically pleasing.

D. Dreffs: Why would PSNH request overhead?

B. Jones: Underground zigzag through pipes and catch basins.

R. Duhaime: The other sites all have underground utilities.

B. Jones: Stub pole required even if we put our utilities underground. Looks better to separate out, not a cluttered pole.

R. Duhaime: Your entrance and landscaping draw your eye up the road.

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver for checklist – scale is one inch per forty feet. Seconded by R. Guay. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver for 11.16(1) for underground utilities. Seconded by R. Guay. Vote in favor. Opposed by R. Duhaime.

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver for culvert 3 ft cover. Seconded by D. Hemeon. Vote unanimously in favor.

B. Jones: 52 parking spaces, 9x18 employee parking. This site has 50% patient parking of the 115 employee parking. The slope is in front of parking lot. The back ledge faced the wall and the slope rip rapped behind the building.

D. Hemeon: You are going to build out now?

A. Vailas: Build out now so we are not blasting for the future.

D. Hemeon: Future dig out loam.

B. Jones: Loam and seed, install curb to keep drainage.

R. Duhaime: Landscape addressed when loam and seeded.

B. Jones: The slope completed in Spring, not rip rapped.

J. Duffy: It seems excessive to have 50% parking for employees. 10x20 space size is designated for patients. They are trying to get the smaller parking spaces by stating "employee parking" vs. patient parking.

A. Vailas: 10x18, 9x20; very unusual to see 10x20.

D. Marshall: 50% of what?

J. Duffy: 50% for employees and 50% for patients. New parking lot for employees as well as both the sides of the proposed parking lot next to the building.

D. Tatem: Ask for waiver.

B. Jones: 9x18 employees, 10x20 patients.

D. Marshall: For employee parking, you will have to mark "employee parking only".

A. Vailas: What you recommend, we will consider.

D. Marshall: At the time of actual construction of this parking lot, all spaces should be realigned?

D. Tatem: Isolated parking lot for patients?

Y. Nahikian: How do you determine patients vs. employees?

R. Guay: If we granted 10x18 parking vs. 10x20 you would have to change your isle width.

D. Marshall: At time of construction for the additional parking lot, you have to show the Board how you will reconfigure the parking lot.

D. Tatem: It should be done now.

A. Vailas: We are happy with 9x18.

J. McHugh: In the same token, you don't want your car dented either. Larger parking was needed in our regulations for larger vehicles and opening car doors.

B. Jones: A medical office building has more one-to-one parking vs. retail business.

A. Vailas: We have our tenants. Medical use one-to-one is not extraordinary.

B. Jones: For the 2nd phase, 10 ft wide spaces, then as long as we can go with the 18 ft length.

***R. Guay motioned to grant waiver for 10x20 patient parking space sizes and accept 10x18 spaces. Seconded by D. Marshall.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Duffy: Was this new parking lot in the condo docs?

A. Vailas: We need to change our condo docs and submit to the Planning Dept. for Town Attorney review.

D. Tatem: What is the timeline to complete this amended parking lot?

J. Duffy: Active and substantial development in 12 months, then vested. Bond for site work and keep a portion for the parking lot.

J. McHugh: Say they do it in 10 yrs, what is the mechanism?

A. Vailas: Reclamation Bond.

D. Tatem: Bond for 30% of gravels and pavement to make sure you eventually complete the parking lot. In regulations, any undone site work is Bonded.

A. Vailas: If we do landscaping and everything else except gravel, pavements and lighting, who determines we need more parking?

D. Tatem: CEO.

A. Vailas: On the original approval, who was going to determine if this site needed the additional parking built?

D. Hemeon: It isn't feasible to build the whole thing at one time?

A. Vailas: We don't think there is an immediate need for extra parking. A lot depends. Londonderry ratios without additional parking is functioning fine.

Y. Nahikian: Parking completed for phase I.

A. Vailas: Phase II is the additional parking which is based on need.

D. Tatem: Something should be in place for the developer to tell the CEO or someone else that they are starting to truck gravel on site and pave.

Y. Nahikian: Phase II permit of building to tie into additional parking.

A. Vailas: Phase II permit of building, bond it or pave additional parking.

M. Sorel: Mr. Marshall, have you seen this in your years of experience? Can they build a parking lot without a permit?

J. Duffy: No permit, right Peter.

P. Rowell: Not that I have seen in my 4 months here.

Open Public Hearing

No comments

Close Public Hearing

D. Tatem: Did you look at the landscaping?

R. Duhaime: When did we start doing "OR" landscaping on plans? Something to fill in hill.

J. Duffy: Central water may have issues.

B. Jones: This afternoon Janet Levy was all set.

J. Duffy: I recommend conditional approval:

- Updated condo docs to include new parking area and to be reviewed and approved by Town Attorney
- Additional work be bonded 1/3 of costs of site work for parking lot
- When pulling permit for phase II of building, either bond or pave for additional parking on Southerly corner

R. Duhaime motioned to approve plan conditional:

- All review fees paid-in-full
- \$50.00 LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to the Planning Dept.
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction
- J. Duffy conditions above
- All waivers are 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."

Seconded by D. Dreffs.

Vote unanimously in favor.

*P. Rueppel motioned to extend meeting past 10:00pm. Seconded by R. Guay.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

PUBLIC HEARING

5. STEPHEN FAULKNER, Faulkner Landscaping & Nursery (08-28)

1380 Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 47

- CUP (Conditional Use Permit) for construction of storm water treatment in a 40 ft buffer and to remove some pavement out of the buffer
- Non-residential site plan to construct a 1,800 sq ft building, 400 sq ft greenhouse, and 616 sq ft storage shed. Additionally, there may be a future 750 sq ft building expansion for an ice cream stand/restaurant.

D. Tatem: Comment #4, the Board should discuss. Project needs CUP. Removing pavement from 40 ft buffer. What are they proposing to do in the 40 ft buffer? Temporary vehicle maintenance on the Rte 3 pad, just used during construction? TRC landscaping proposal – waiver for some landscaping requirements for this type of business. Walkways are not lit. Gates put up not to allow public in these unlit areas at night.

J. Duffy: CUP - Conservation Commission needs to reply to the permit to this Board in writing. I looked at their minutes, and there was a motion to approve from September 2008. I have not seen anything in writing from them yet.

P. Holden: We went to ConCom and they approved the CUP with condition they wanted to see the final plan. We are on the next ConCom Meeting Agenda.

J. Duffy: Flow for sprinkler and hydrant?

P. Holden: I have memo from Janet Levy to OK for fire and domestic. She wanted specific flow. The only thing we are using water is for domestic use. We have onsite well to irrigate plants. In talking to Janet today, she did not have a problem with that and is writing a letter to state such.

J. Duffy: You also need the signature block on the plan.

P. Holden: CUP removing pavement within wetland setback area. A lot of pavement is in the buffer and we are trying to preserve the pavement.

Open Public Hearing

No comments.

Close Public Hearing

D. Marshall motioned to approve the Conditional Use Permit conditional:

- Conservation Commission to submit written approval of CUP to Planning Board

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

Peter Holden, Holden Engineering: The temporary pad will be used when a vehicle is being fueled or worked on for construction purposes. It has crushed stone. When the site is done, the pad will be removed.

D. Tatem: There are areas not proposed to be lit.

P. Holden: Identified areas in marker “not lit”. These areas include storage for bark mulch and stone, and the truck dock.

D. Tatem: Gate will be closed after dark for unlit areas?

Stephen Faulkner: Yes gate will be closed. Can I get rid of some lighting?

D. Tatem: There is nothing in the regulations that state if you gate it, you don’t have to light it. It seems like a reasonable request. Chain gates with reflectors and signs is proposed. I think you would need to give him a waiver for this.

P. Holden: #38 in Stantec’s comments, 310,000 sq ft of drainage area. 43,000 sq ft of pavement today, when done, 17,000 sq ft. 600 sq ft not in a pavement area without tearing up existing pavement.

D. Tatem: #38, reasonable approach and an improvement to the site.

P. Holden: Landscaping plan, we propose moveable landscaping “feature of the month – crab apple trees”. Road frontage, buffer between car dealership and us. Flexibility to move landscape to advertise nursery products. In back, a landscape display area for patio and stair materials.

D. Tatem: I rely on Rob for the landscaping.

R. Duhaime: At the Aesthetic Committee Meeting, we recommended separating yourself from the Dieselland site, and showing your products.

J. Duffy: 15 ft buffer along Hooksett Road.

P. Holden: Yes.

M. Sorel motioned to grant 6 waivers:

- trails
- landscape
- water wells
- unique features
- cross sections & profiles

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

***D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver for lighting. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Open Public Hearing

No comments.

Close Public Hearing

D. Marshall motioned to approve plan conditional:

- All review fees paid-in-full
- \$25.00 LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to the Planning Dept.
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction
- Signature blocks
- Traffic count
- Additional escrow funds
- Note on plan pad to be removed when construction completed
- Need further details as to actual square footage of each use prior to determining exact impact fees
- All waivers are 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."

***Seconded by D. Jodoin.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***P. Rueppel motioned to extend meeting past 11:00pm. Seconded by R. Guay.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

6. CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF HOOKSETT (08-26)

5 Veterans Drive, Map 9, Lot 35

Non-residential site plan for a parking lot

D. Marshall & R. Duhaime: We are stepping down from this application.

P. Holden: Presented an overview of the existing parking lot shape with 35 spaces. We want to add parking, because people are parking along the road. We had a layout for a parking lot and the Board and neighbors made some comments. We had 3 or 4 versions of the parking lot. Organized parking and proposing to add pavement. For the abutter, we will construct a 6 ft high vinyl simulated board fence. On the abutter's fence side, we will fill in with landscaping (arborvitaes, lilac, rhodies). We are planting 140 trees and shrubs on this site; 80 of them along the abutting property. 5 trees and 1 bush are being removed; others remaining. We are now leaving trees and adding more buffer.

J. Duffy: 6 ft high fence, can you make sure the line gets extended to end at the 3rd parking space?

P. Holden: Stantec has not seen this plan, because of issue with the pavement. 250' shoreland setback requirement by DES as of July 2008; we need a permit. Within first 50 ft, cannot cut anything more than 3 inches. Next 50 ft inventory all trees, cut 50%, etc. within 0-150 cover with impervious material by 30% (i.e. pavement, gravel). We went to the State, we are at 80%. If we don't do it, we can ask for a variance. Referred to letter from Arlene Allen to Jason Hill @ Holden. The State suggested permeable pavement over the 30%, we will give the permit. We don't have any water running into the River. We are in an aquifer zone, we have 100% infiltration.

J. McHugh: How good is this permeable pavement when plowing?

P. Holden: Use for airports so planes would not hydroplane. We tried this along time ago on Rte 3A, but wasn't as good a mixture as what Brox makes today. I think there is some on Rte 106 by Red Roof.

J. Duffy: Since this is in the groundwater district, you don't want car drippings into this pavement. UNH and Stoneyfield Yogurt have some; used in low traffic areas. Deb Brewster came in one night and demonstrated. The Church is non-profit, how would they maintain this?

P. Holden: It would have to be vacuumed to open pores.

J. McHugh: Any liability issue with woman in heels and potential for heel getting stuck in this type of pavement?

D. Tatem: MTS in aquifer and storing gas powered vehicles. ZBA made applicant use paving. I think this project is different.

Y. Nahikian: Last time you came, no problem with shoreline? This is much nicer layout for parking than the previous one.

P. Holden: ZBA can give you relief but cannot decide.

D. Hemeon: Abutters happy with this?

Heather Shumway: We would like a copy of tonight's plan.

Todd Rainer: They have worked with us, and this plan is far better.

P. Holden: 71 parking places.

D. Hemeon: This plan is much nicer.

P. Holden: Town could go to State and have designated areas taken out of State shoreline protection requirements. A waiver is needed for lighting for additional parking. Existing lighting is where night guests would park.

D. Hemeon: Is there a street light at the entrance?

M. Sorel: I am comfortable with this.

D. Hemeon: Abutters happy, light at the entrance.

R. Guay: I am OK with it.

J. McHugh: There are some evenings the additional parking may be used. I am for the lighting. I am OK with the permeable paving.

D. Jodoin: I am OK.

D. Dreffs: I don't think lighting should be added for the abutters' sake.

Y. Nahikian: End result much better. I thank the Church for working with the Board and the abutters.

P. Rueppel: I have no problem with this plan.

Open Public hearing

T. Rainer: Since I have lived in this house, there has been no reason for parking at night. Therefore no lights needed.

Jeff Shimal, Planning Committee @ Church: This has been a long process for us. We thank you for your time.

P. Holden: Because we are applying for a State permit, we won't have this prior to the Planning Board motion to approve. We will ask for a condition of approval = DES Shoreland Permit.

D. Tatem: As a consulting engineer, I do not recommend waiving the lighting requirements.

D. Hemeon: Are you phasing the landscaping? If phasing is needed, I would like the landscaping completed by the abutter in phase I, then phase.

M. Sorel motioned to continue to November 17, 2008. Seconded by D. Jodoin. Vote unanimously in favor. (2 waivers to be motioned at next meeting a) pavement & b) lighting).

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

R. Duhaime motioned to adjourn at 11:18pm. Seconded by D. Jodoin. Vote unanimously in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair J. McHugh declared the meeting adjourned at 11:18 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 17, 2008 at 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH Town Hall Chambers (room 105).

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator