

Official
As of 05/04/09

HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, April 20, 2009

CALLED TO ORDER

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 7:02pm

ATTENDANCE

Chairman J. Gryval, Vice-Chair J. McHugh, D. Dreffs, D. Hemeon, D. Marshall, M. Sorel, R. Duhaime, Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy, and Y. Nahikian (arrived 7:07pm)

Excused: Interim Town Administrator, C. Granfield, and B. Ehlers.

Absent: R. Guay.

Stantec Engineer, Dan Tatem, representing the Town of Hooksett.

Excused: Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 04/06/09

D. Marshall motioned to approve the minutes of 04/06/09. Seconded by J. McHugh. Vote in favor. D. Hemeon abstained.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING

1. COTE/HINES/BUCK (#09-07)

1271, 1275, 1279, & 1281 Smyth Road, Map 48, Lots 24, 25, 25-1, & 25-2

Lot line adjustment between tax map 48, parcels 24, 25, 25-1, & 25-2

Don Duval, Duval Survey: There are two brothers and a sister taking each a parcel of land of the total three parcels. The backland is adding to the front of the property. There are no new lots, just lot line adjustments.

J. Gryval: Staff comments.

D. Tatem: It is complete. We also have some comments after you find the plan complete.

D. Marshall motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by J. McHugh. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Tatem: We take no exception to the requested waivers.

Waiver #1 – Checklist items #1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14. J. Gryval: Received and read the waivers into the record.

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #1. Seconded by J. McHugh. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Tatem: Referred to Stantec letter dated April 16, 2009 (2nd review for completeness and lot line adjustment plan). I spoke to Don on sheet 2, item 2 for the right-of-way bound per roadway shall be designated as a benchmark.

D. Duval: It will be on the final plan.

D. Tatem: All approved waivers must be added to the final plan.

D. Duval: It will be on the final plan.

D. Tatem: The regulations require that all property corners be monumented with granite bounds.

D. Duval: The set bounds are shown on the plan. The back portion of the lot has a 7-8 ft jog. Dan states that per the regulations, we need to put in bounds. All the new lot lines are shown. Adding 4-5 stone bounds is another added cost to my client. These bounds have nothing to do with what is presented tonight.

J. Gryval: If it is in our regulations, it should be done. How does the Board feel about the bounds?

D. Duval: The bounds will be an additional \$500-\$600. All distances will be on the plan. They just won't have stone bounds.

J. McHugh: Down the road, if someone decides to subdivide and you don't have the stone bounds, what could happen?

D. Duval: Any reputable surveyor could define the bounds. There are enough monuments to reproduce a survey.

D. Tatem: In the past couple of years, site plans that are not adjusting property lines have their corners properly bound. Don is right that this is a lot line adjustment.

J. McHugh: Doesn't it (no stone bounds) affect the deed?

D. Tatem: Yes, without the stone bound, it would affect the deed description a bit.

D. Duval: There is no chance the property line would not be able to be defined in the future.

M. Sorel: I thought I heard Mr. Duval say there are already monuments there.

R. Duhaime: There are existing iron pipes to reestablish lines.

M. Sorel: These are not lot corners?

J. Gryval: No.

D. Tatem: Yes, they are lot corners.

M. Sorel: Are we talking about 4 stone bounds? Is that what we are discussing here?

D. Duval: Yes, 4.

J. Gryval: How does the Board feel about the stone bounds?

D. Dreffs: This is a rhetorical question, but why do we require them (stone bounds)?

J. McHugh: Because it is in the deed.

R. Duhaime: The other corners have granite markers.

D. Duval: And there are existing iron pipes.

R. Duhaime: What about Smyth Road?

D. Duval: There are physical monuments.

J. Gryval: The regulations state we have to have these bounds. What is the pleasure of the Board?

Duhaime: What is the jog?

D. Duval: 15 ft.

R. Duhaime: This kind of stuff (line swings 15 ft) is what landscapers do not like.

J. McHugh: If we do this (waive stone bounds) for Mr. Duval, don't we have to do this for others? There is a reason for having them. If we excuse these, does this mean down the road there may be issues?

D. Duval: You have to look at bounds case-by-case.

R. Duhaime: We are talking about 6 stone bounds?

D. Duval: 4 if you don't like the existing pipe that is 115 ft away.

J. McHugh motioned for the applicant to provide granite bounds at all unmonumented or new lot corners. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

M. Sorel: Educate me on these bounds.

J. Gryval: Stone bounds on each corner/all points.

M. Sorel: Granite bounds?

D. Tatem: Yes, granite bounds.

D. Duval: The previous Town Planner required the applicant to take out the existing bound(s) and insert a granite bound(s). My right as a surveyor, does not allow me to pull out an existing bound(s).

D. Tatem: I agree with Don not to take out existing bounds. Only unmonumented and new lot corners to have granite bounds.

D. Hemeon: Are you asking us to waive the rules?

D. Duval: Yes.

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Tatem: Referred to Stantec letter dated April 16, 2009 (2nd review for completeness and lot line adjustment plan), item #6 for existing wells. The well is close to the property line. The State (NHDES) requires a 75-ft protective well radius. NHDES states that wells prior to August 20, 1989, has protection no matter where it is. The applicant has two choices (1) applicant signs a release and gives up the right to the well to become “abandoned” per NHDES requirements (release submitted to the Town for recording), **OR** (2) applicant signs an easement for the protective well radius and that they will not do anything to the area within this radius (easement submitted to the Town for recording).

D. Duval: I have discussed the well issue with the applicant. We will have the well issue resolved prior to the Board Chair signing the final plans and having the plans recorded.

D. Tatem: There are two wells on site. Don notes one well as already abandoned. The supply lines have been cut. There should be a note on the plan that this well is abandoned per NHDES requirements or there is protection around it.

J. Gryval: They abandoned that well?

D. Duval: If abandoned, we need to fill the well per NHDES requirements or have protection around it.

D. Tatem: Bounds are not set now, but will be set before revising for the final plan.

R. Duhaime: Parcel C has wetlands.

D. Duval: One thought was to go to the ZBA for a variance on the frontage. Since then, my client decided not to have an additional lot(s). It costs more to locate all the wetlands.

J. Gryval: We can have a conditional approval based on Stantec's final review. It is not necessary for you (Don) to come back to the Board on this application.

Open Public Hearing

No Comments.

Close Public Hearing

D. Hemeon 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 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 (see letter dated April 16, 2009 from Stantec)
- Right-of-way bound per roadway shall be designated as a benchmark
- Applicant to provide granite bounds at all unmonumented or new lot corners
- Existing wells, applicant has two choices (1) applicant signs a release and gives up the right to the well to become "abandoned" per NHDES requirements (release submitted to the Town for recording), **OR** (2) applicant signs an easement for the protective well radius and that they will not do anything to the area within this radius (easement submitted to the Town for recording). Town Attorney to review and approve the release or easement document for either option.
- Bounds are set before revising for the final plan
- 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."

Seconded by M. Sorel.

Vote unanimously in favor.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. BEAVER BROOK HEIGHTS – PHASING (#09-03)

By-pass 28 & Jacob Ave., Map 48, Lot 26, AND Map 49, Lots 49 & 58
Amended phasing plan.

CONTINUED TO MAY 4, 2009.

3. WEBSTER WOODS PHASE II (#07-37)

Hooksett Road, Map 6, Lot 114

Residential site plan to improve and develop phase II of “Webster Woods” to include 23 duplex ranch style buildings totaling 46 units and 7 single ranch style units for 55 & older person housing

CONTINUED TO MAY 4, 2009.

4. RAVENWOOD (#06-23)

Laurel Road & Spruce Court, Map 21, Lot 15

Subdivision plan to create a 39-lot open space subdivision. In addition, lots 15 and 15-41 are open space lots.

CONTINUED TO MAY 18, 2009, ABUTTERS TO BE RENOTIFIED.

OTHER BUSINESS

5. PIF TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

1370 Hooksett Road, Map 18, lot 46

Lease of warehouse area

Samuel Ruddy, owner: Distributed photos and proposal for the site. Stephen Robinson and Gary Saklad are here tonight. We occupy the back half (facing Central Water Precinct) and we are partners. We occupy 64,000 sq ft for PIF Technologies. It cost us \$300,000 to renovate the back half. The front of the building (facing Hooksett Rd) is 2,800-2,900 sq ft. When we first bought the building, there was a stipulation that if the front is ever occupied, we would come back to the Board with a whole new site plan. We are here to ask you tonight to waive the site plan requirement. We have included a letter from the potential tenant for the front, CBS Outdoor (CBS letter dated April 15, 2009 and made part of the record). We met with Peter and Jo Ann. Basically, it is a 2,800 sq ft area with one wall to go up to accommodate four (4) employees (3 of which have working hours 6:00-2:30). The nature of the business is outdoor advertising on billboard structures. They will have the following items stored in the warehouse: trucks (at night), old advertising copy, rods/ratchets, safety material for their structures, platform material, Brush Hog brush machines chainsaws Chipper etc., ladders, water based apron paint ronan stored, tools, safety materials (see CBS letter dated April 15, 2009). We are hoping that this is not a change in use. We have some office furniture we are storing there now. They are coming from Bow, NH, and they wanted to relocate to Hooksett. There is a time restraint, because the tenant wants to move in by May 1st for storage. Secondly, a full site plan would be costly and time consuming for a proposal to add a tenant in such a small area of the building. We are hoping to get the site plan provision waived.

J. Gryval: As I recall, there was also a parking issue on this site.

S. Ruddy: There are 21 spaces out back and we use 17 of them. In the front of the building (facing Rte 3) there are 21 spaces and they have 4 employees. We are going to have all the cracks repaired. We will fix median and re curb. On the Industrial Park Drive side, we will extend the sprinkler system we put in for PIF's back location to the corner at Rte 3. We will have loam brought in. We did seeding last year, however it did not take. The loam and seeding will all be redone for both the back and front of the building. The front of the building looks abandoned right now. We want to level off the area. We want to improve some things. We have a tenant who would like to occupy the space. With the time restraint and cost for a site plan, we will lose the tenant.

Gary Saklad, owner: Peter went through the parking with us last week. Per the parking regulations, a total of 26 or 27 spaces is needed on the entire property. We now have 42 spaces on the property. There are 21 spaces in the rear of the building, and 21 in front. 3-4 spaces will be used in front by employees. According to Peter, we are well within the parking requirements.

R. Duhaime: Welcome to the Town gentlemen. You did a nice job on the back part of the building. I would like to see the same for the front. The Board wants to improve the look of the DW Highway corridor. Members of this Board put conditions that if you use the front, you must meet some of Performance Zone (PZ) criteria. What you distributed is the landscape design?

S. Ruddy: The median out front will be redone. The wall where glass is now will be redone. The front door will be replaced. The whole side on Industrial Park Drive will be sprinklered, loam, and seeded (sprinkler stops half way up and will be extended).

R. Duhaime: The ugly part is facing DW Highway. I look for the existing trees every 50 ft. You have small narrow islands and can have a tree section facing DW Highway every 50 ft.

S. Ruddy: Linear frontage?

R. Duhaime: Yes, linear every 50 ft.

G. Saklad: Out of the 200 ft, 125 ft is pavement.

R. Duhaime: That (pavement) is the problem. Do whatever you can to mitigate that. We don't want you to have to do a whole site plan for a minimal amount of tenant space.

S. Ruddy: We want to do whatever we can do financially to improve the site.

J. McHugh: The front of the building looking at two doors (white), is that where trucks will park inside?

S. Ruddy & G. Saklad: Yes, no vehicles will be parked outside.

J. McHugh: Is a Brush Hog machine manually operated?

S. Ruddy: Yes.

J. McHugh: Anything to improve this site.

S. Ruddy: We will seal and black-coat the front parking.

G. Saklad: We will carry the same theme from the back of the building to the front.

S. Ruddy: The garage doors off to the right, this area has been used by people as a dumpster. Debris will need to be removed.

J. Gryval: You don't intend to do anything to the big doors (white)?

J. McHugh: You could paint the doors ½ one color, and ½ another color.

S. Ruddy: Right now as a business owner, I can't spend \$20,000 in improvements for a \$1,300 a month tenant.

N. VanScoy: I was curious for lighting over there on that side of the building.

S. Ruddy: Lighting was done when we completed the back section for PIF.

D. Hemeon: You are talking sealing. This is cheaper than paving.

S. Ruddy: There is one crack to seal. The remaining pavement is in good shape. We work in this building everyday. We want the front of the building to look like the back of the building. The front has been vacant for a year. It would cost us \$100,000 to match the back improvements to the front. We could paint.

J. McHugh: And some lighting?

N. VanScoy: The glassed in area is just an entrance. What about the other door?

G. Saklad: It is just another access that gets to the same area.

J. Gryval: The whole idea is to make Rte 3 look better than it does now. Nancy, you would like to see more lighting?

N. VanScoy: Yes, more lighting. And parking, are there plans to put lines on the spaces in front?

S. Ruddy: There are only 4 employees.

N. VanScoy: They (employees) will park as close as they can. No plans for lines?

R. Duhaime: We waived some of our updating for the site plan, but we noted to come back to the Board if front section will be use and we expect some improvements (i.e. no outside storage, berm the island). Remember it is in the PZ. You can change the aesthetics on how it looks now. Find compromises for the landscaping to make the building disappear.

J. Gryval: There is no reason why they can't add a couple of trees.

G. Saklad: Where do you want to add the trees?

R. Duhaime: You don't have a plan showing that?

G. Saklad: You do have a landscape plan in front of you. The estimate you are looking at is to rework the island with appropriate trees, landscaping, and a new curb. We will have additional landscaping around the building (foundation plantings).

Stephen Robinson, owner: We will improve the visual from the main road.

J. Gryval: Does the Board want to waive the site plan?

Y. Nahikian: You have made improvements since the previous owner. I don't want to sound negative, however all you are talking about is landscaping and pavement.

S. Ruddy: To duplicate the improvements from the back to the front, you are talking about another \$100,000.

Y. Nahikian: That doesn't matter. You should do what you did for the back. Do something that you have intention to improve it. I am talking only from an aesthetic point of view. A storage tenant will not cover improvement expenses. What if it was a higher rent?

G. Saklad: If tenant paid a higher rent, we would do that (improve like we did for the back section). The front area has been vacant for a year.

S. Robinson: If we ask for higher rent, we will have no tenant and do nothing to the front of the building.

Y. Nahikian: You can't chop up the building. I know economically that it won't work. It is a Class A building with a smaller size tenant. Make improvements in proportion to the proposed tenant.

S. Ruddy: It will cost \$12,000-\$13,000 with the proposed improvements. With extending the sprinkler system, it will cost \$15,000-18,000.

G. Saklad: Examples of improvements we made in the past to the whole building (back and front) include: new roof, heating and ventilation. The front part can take advantage of those improvements. The only thing not done, was the Board recommended painting the front of the building, siding, and glass store fronts. The tenant needs the overhead doors (white), but we could paint them to blend in with the rest of the building. It would cost \$20,000-30,000 to side the front of the building. Landscaping, pavement, and parking is 100% complete on the back of the building. I don't know if we will get another tenant. It's been a year since we have a proposed tenant.

S. Robinson: With a tenant, we will improve the site. Without a tenant, we can't afford to do anything.

J. Gryval: The Board is considering the front of the building as frontage on Rte 3.

D. Tatem: Just my opinion John, the site plan was waived back then to get them (PIF) into the building. In this situation, the proposed tenant will not justify the improvements the Board or Town would like to see. Look at what they want and can afford to do. Continue the restriction that if they rent out for retail use, they would have to come back to the Board and be required to make more site improvements. It seems to me if the Board gets the full facelift, then nothing is going to happen to this site (front).

J. McHugh: Who is the back tenant?

S. Ruddy: Our business, PIF Technologies (document storage).

J. McHugh: Isn't it nice you have the improvements completed for your area. The intent was that you would lease the front and use the back. Whatever money you had, you spent the whole thing for your area only.

M. Sorel: For the Board's consideration or information, the vacancy rate in southern NH is at 15-20% now, and expected to get larger in the next 12-24 months. The market is almost dead and it is hard to find good lessees. Whatever they do is going to be an improvement. Yervant, we talked about the building appearance, they are willing to repaint. What about a difference in color schemes to look aesthetically pleasing?

Y. Nahikian: Carry the color schemes from the back-side. Get rid of the white overwhelming doors. I am not against this developer. In general, we are asking all the commercial lots for improvements as they appear before the Board (both new and existing sites). I understand it is difficult for them to be financially responsible.

M. Sorel: The alternative is it stays empty until another proposed tenant. Then they come back before this Board. The market is almost non-existent. He has a warm body to sign a lease. Whatever we can do to encourage him and satisfy our needs (i.e. two-color paint scheme improvement), we should do.

R. Duhaime: They did irrigate last year and are willing to carry it over to the front side.

The way they do business (quality), eventually they will complete the full improvements. At least they are in Town now.

N. VanScoy: You're talking about painting 2 or 3 sides?

S. Ruddy: Just paint the front side with the overhead doors. The other 3 sides were painted last year.

N. VanScoy: And you will carry the paint theme?

G. Saklad: Yes, the earthier brown will be continued to the front and overhead doors.

J. Gryval: Meet with Aesthetics Committee.

J. McHugh: And lighting?

N. VanScoy: Lights and parking space lines out front. I would like to see parking lines.

J. Gryval: Add parking lines in the front.

G. Saklad: The lighting is already there.

D. Dreffs: Any signage?

G. Saklad: Neither business needs signage.

D. Marshall motioned to waive site plan conditional that the CBS Outdoor tenant can occupy the front space by May 1, 2009, and the following items are completed by July 1, 2009:

- Aesthetic Committee - meet with the Aesthetic Committee prior to painting the front of the building and landscaping the site
- Painting - carry the color theme from the back of the building to the front (earthier brown)
- Landscaping – rework the front island with appropriate trees, landscaping, new curbing around landscaped beds, foundation plantings around the building, and loam and seed whole side of Industrial Park Drive
- Irrigation - extend irrigation system to the front corner of Rte 3
- Parking – seal and black-coat front parking and line out 5 parking spaces in the front
- Debris - clean-up and disposal of all site debris
- Should the intensity of the use change, as determined by the CEO, the applicant must come back to the Board

***Seconded by N. VanScoy.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Webster Woods – erosion issues and existing construction activity

D. Tatem: Distributed Stantec letter dated April 20, 2009 regarding the above issues for Webster Woods. The developer has been notified in writing. An abutter previously sent in pictures to the Board. We did a site walk. The erosion is affecting their (abutter) property. Phil LoChiato joined us on the site walk. The natural stream channel between Webster Woods I units 32 and 33 and the rear of the residential lots located at 22,26, and 30 Bert Street have experienced considerable erosion over the past many years. We did see erosion on the ravine side; it is washing away. Development units 32 & 33 have an outlet pipe, and this is where the erosion is more intense. My recommendation is to have the developer have their own Geotech Engineer stabilize this. Dale, the back of the units, it was 30-40 ft. Where it drops off at the slopes, fix those. I could see a deck falling off if it is not fixed. We should get something in writing from their engineer that the slope analysis is OK, or they will move the units. Many of the phase II units are proposed even closer to what appear to be similar type slopes, with some of the rear decks closer than 10 ft. Second, Rene and I noticed stockpiles out back. They have basically started phase II. I don't think they have State permission to start phase II.

J. Gryval: Peter could give them a Cease and Desist.

J. McHugh: Those areas you feel are in jeopardy are in phase II?

D. Tatem: Yes, these units are too close to the slope. We walked the whole ravine.

J. McHugh: Did they (developer) do it, change it, according to your recommendation, or did they ignore it? My concern is, they say "let the buyer beware", however buyers are not always aware when these things happen. How are you going to resolve this?

D. Tatem: I had not done a site walk until now. We had previously said the developer had to at least be able to get a lawn mower between the unit and the slope area. Now there is only about 10 ft. After the site walks, the units are a lot closer to the slope. All we can do is have their engineer put the slope analysis information in writing to us.

J. McHugh: So many times in this community, someone buys a piece of property, and it is the poor owner that suffers. And I often hear "let the buyer beware". Someone has to be protecting them (owners).

D. Tatem: This letter (Stantec letter dated April 20, 2009) now states they should look at these slopes in more detail and have their engineer comment in writing.

J. Gryval: We should send a letter to Peter to go out there for phase II. Table the rest of this (i.e. hammerhead, trail, developer's Geotech Engineer), until they have everything done for us review the plan for phase II.

R. Duhaime: Mr. Chair, we should have Peter go out to investigate phase II.

D. Marshall: Phase I is all built with 4 of the units unoccupied. At this point in time, this Town has no responsibility for phase I. Phase II is where we (Board) come in. To put weight on the developer for phase I, we just crossed the line. We can only guarantee for phase II.

J. Gryval: Why don't we have recourse? And if they didn't build to standards?

D. Marshall: Units in phase I were built to standard (per approved plan). Now the slope erosion is after the fact.

D. Hemeon: We went to the homeowner with erosion issues, but she ran away from us.

R. Duhaime: First thing that comes to mind for phase II is the elevation issue. They own the property to the other side of the ravine. Silt flooding the wetland or elsewhere, we could make them stabilize it. Fencing builds good neighbors. People on Berch Street have been dumping into this area. You could screen neighbors, but I didn't want to get into it. The landscape plan for Webster Woods, I didn't like it (it is a stamp landscape plan). We have a chance to have them plant for stabilizing and screening.

M. Sorel: Joanne's concern, homeowner's having wetlands on their property and they would not know how to address that. I have addressed this to the Conservation Commission, as your (Board) member to the commission. Austin Woods is an example of some lot owners who will have wetlands and conservation easements on their property. There should be a separate site plan per lot recorded at the registry, so the potential property owner will know what area of their property cannot be used in the future. There is a way of addressing that. Somebody who wants to put a shed on their lot would know if they can up front. Fair market value should include site restrictions.

J. McHugh: I guess what I was thinking about is the Beauchesne development. I would hate to see this Board, or our community as a whole, remedy these sorts of issues. The comment is always "let the buyer beware". I understand where Dick is coming from. We should have Jo Ann have a discussion with our Town Attorney on how to address these situations. When folks have issues in their community, they come here and want us to take care of it. I don't know what our responsibility is.

D. Marshall: Joanne, I can appreciate what you are saying. I think the attorneys will say it is a civil matter, it was built per the approved site plan, and built in the right location. It is a civil matter with the developer. I know you want to cure all the ills.

J. McHugh: I don't want to cure all the ills. I need to know what our (Board) responsibility is for a completed project.

Y. Nahikian: The project is phased and phase I is part of the common area. We are now in phase II planning process. It may be our responsibility.

D. Tatem: Two issues: 1) phase II units are too close to the slope, and 2) phase I issue of runoff erosion affecting a wetland. The erosion in phase I is a code issue that Peter could take up with the company if the Town Attorney says the Board can't.

M. Sorel: We have had an opportunity to learn from the Beauchesne subdivision. We didn't know back then that the upland development would affect their subdivision. As a Board, we can ask for Geohydrologist reports, as well as traffic studies, etc. Good land has been used up. Other areas in Town as examples of water that will affect a subdivision are Austin Woods and the site condominium site off Mammoth Rd.

J. Gryval: We can do that in phase II. Phase I, if it is impeding into the wetlands, what can we do?

20 Commerce Signage (AV Hooksett – Elliot Medical Office Building)

D. Tatem: Peter and Jo Ann had a discussion about the sign applicant for Alex Vailas' medical office site (20 Commerce). They have 40 sq ft signs beside the road that say the facility on the first floor has "x" tenant. These are direction signs. They (applicant and Peter) are calling them directional signs. Directional signs have no logo or name, merely "exit" or "entrance". Jo Ann agrees the 40 sq ft signs look nice, but they don't meet the PZ ordinance. She said they (applicant) needs to come in for a waiver and wanted your opinion. If it has to get a waiver, then it has to be on an amended site plan. Catamount Management had signage on their plan originally, therefore they do not need to come back to the Board for an amendment site plan. For the future PZ sites, maybe they (applicants) should all have their signage on their plan originally. The question with Vailas is should he have had it on the plan originally?

J. Gryval: Directional signs or not, have them (applicant) bring the signage in and we will determine if they are directional signs or not.

D. Tatem: Peter's last e-mail, he stated the applicant is to come before the Board.

Harmony Place – Beauchesne Development Drainage Improvements – part II of Stantec recommendations

D. Hemeon: Sonny Sell and I discussed the drainage improvements and I provided him a plan. I quoted him \$155,000 for the Town to do the work. The estimate was broken down per yard of stone and labor fees. He liked the plan. I gave the plan to Carol and she will bring it to the Council.

Site Walks – Planning Board

R. Duhaime: Why doesn't this Board do site walks? An example of a needed Planning Board site walk is Ridgeback Self Storage. Have any of you been on this site? For access for their driveway, they will have to take down a 15 ft high boulder wall and trees that are planted there. The same owner owns two lots. Part of the PZ is to limit access. Now they want to tear down a wall and trees.

D. Marshall: Were you not here when Jo Ann gave us a whole explanation from the Town Attorney?

R. Duhaime: Is it debatable with the Town Attorney? If we walked to that site, there is no way someone can put an access there.

D. Marshall: I was blue in the face over the access.

R. Duhaime: Why are we approving this plan with this access?

D. Marshall: Because if you don't, we will go to court.

R. Duhaime: Also, the lots on Nancy Lane, these roads up there are loop roads off Lindsay Rd. There is a story of how subdivisions are to be created, going back to the Kings. At the top of Campbell Hill, a road was built. We did not let them build this road to Berry Hill.

D. Marshall: There is no road connection for Nancy Lane and Berry Hill. This has nothing to do with elderly housing.

R. Duhaime: Why weren't the 5 lots added at Nancy Lane with the original Nancy Lane development?

D. Marshall: There was a change in ownership.

SNHU – Rock Wall

M. Sorel: My memory states there was discussion about the SNHU house that moved and because of that move, the stone wall was removed and it was a condition that it be replaced.

D. Tatem: It is to be built as one of the requirements. This was a condition to be met prior to the CO.

M. Sorel: Has the CO been issued?

D. Tatem: I do not know if Peter issued the CO.

M. Sorel: Could you follow-up on this?

D. Tatem: Yes.

***J. McHugh motioned to adjourn at 8:38pm. Seconded by M. Sorel.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

ADJOURNMENT

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 8:38pm. There is a Joint Planning Board and ZBA meeting for a special exception on Thursday, April 23, 2009, at the Hooksett Town Hall Chambers @ 7:00pm

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator