

**Official  
As of 06/01/09**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
Monday, May 18, 2009**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

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

**ATTENDANCE**

Chairman J. Gryval, D. Dreffs, D. Hemeon, D. Marshall, R. Duhaime, B. Ehlers, M. Sorel, and Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy.

Excused: Interim Town Administrator, C. Granfield, Vice-Chair J. McHugh, and Y. Nahikian.

Absent: R. Guay.

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

J. Gryval: D. Marshall will be a voting member this evening in place of Vice-Chair J. McHugh.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 05/04/09**

*N. VanScoy motioned to approve the minutes of 05/04/09 with edits by M. Sorel.*

*Seconded by M. Sorel.*

*Vote in favor. D. Dreffs, D. Marshall, and R. Duhaime abstain.*

**COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**1. AV HOOKSETT (#09-10)**

Hooksett Road, Map 25, Lot 19

Amended site plan to the original non-residential site plan application (#07-44) and parking lot expansion (#08-40) to now include site signage for directional, route traffic, and main directional.

Adam Wagner, Sr. Architect Cube 3 Studio and Kathy Champagne, owner Jutras Signs.

A. Wagner: I am here tonight for a site plan amendment to 20 Chambers Road; the tenant is the Elliot Health Care Systems. The amendment is for the complete signage package (directional, directory, and building). When the site plan was originally submitted, the building developer did not know who the tenants would be. There are several tenants. Signs #3,4,5 & 8 are directional signage by your definition and are in compliance with

your ordinance (not on original plan). The back part of parking lot and service area are simple signs with no logos, "Entrance B" & "Service Entrance" and arrows how to get there. There is a total of 4 waiver requests: **1) waiver of checklist** - only amending signage package, no other revisions, **2) waiver for signage #2** - located to right side of drive aisle for the purpose to designate which practices are within the medical facility and how they are accessed from each level (at grade access, patient entrance on both sides of building – ie. Family Practice on first floor since many patients are ambulatory), we were allowed one free standing 32 sq ft sign and are proposing a 60 sq ft print, part is 40 sq ft because it is set so far back from the road, and **3&4) waivers for signage #6 & #7** for additional directory signs located at each entrance of the building; entrance A & B practices (from entrance B, there is still some final use to be determined), we are allowed one, we are asking for three.

J. Gryval: This is an amended site plan.

J. Duffy: The signs themselves **#6 & #7, and #2**, the applicant is referring to these signs as directional, and they should be directory. I have said this for a month now, and no one seems to want to change it. Directory signs cannot have symbols.

D. Marshall: Is it complete?

J. Duffy: Yes.

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

D. Marshall: You repeat where to go for entrances A or B. Why do you need to repeat it?

A. Wagner: We hope from the hospital side, that a patient who comes up to a door for services (someone who has an inability or is ambulatory), will want it very clear how to access the building.

M. Sorel: I went to the building today. I drove and walked the site. It is a very large site, and there is going to be a lot going on there. After reading the waivers and being there (site) for 45 minutes, I was comfortable with the waivers. I have also had an opportunity to go to Concord Hospital many times. Without signage, it is difficult to locate where to go.

J. Duffy: The pylon sign and building sign (32 sq ft) have already been permitted. The only thing I was confused about is since the Planning Board is supposed to approve new signage, I was surprised the Building Department issued the permit for the building sign. It should have come to the Planning Board. I do have a picture of the building sign, so for the record, you may want to give it your blessing that the Planning Board did see it.

A. Wagner: The building sign and elevations were shown on the original plans.

J. Duffy: If you say it was, then you don't need the permission of the Planning Board.

R. Duhaime: Are any of these signs you are asking for internally lit?

K. Champagne: None are lit.

A. Wagner: On the building, it is internally lit.

J. Duffy: Here is what it looks like and it conforms.

D. Hemeon: Can you tell me what the hours of operation are?

A. Wagner: The State HHS requires that since we have a lab, we have to post the hours on the door. I don't want to speak on behalf of the Elliot, but I will say they are open during normal business hours.

D. Hemeon: If they were going to be open at night, then I thought they (signs) should be lit.

B. Ehlers: You could save lettering if "Elliot" was not repeated on everything. People would understand "going to rehab".

A. Wagner: Elliot is not the building owner. In a future phase plan, they may not be the sole source tenant. They want to designate where they are.

B. Ehlers: Signage should be to get patients to where they need to be in a most expeditious way.

R. Duhaime: The signs are all 10 ft tall?

A. Wagner: Only sign type #2 is 10 ft tall.

R. Duhaime: The directional is 10 ft?

A. Wagner: Just sign #2 is 10 ft.

R. Duhaime: Reducing size of other signs, how tall is the lettering?

A. Wagner: I am not sure off hand.

D. Hemeon: If you shrink the signs, the letters get smaller.

K. Champagne: We scaled the lettering for the smallest height possible for it to be legible. In theory ½ inch tall and legible. 2 ½" and 3" are the minimal heights. We layout all of the copy and box it in to the size of the copy you need. You take the longest line

and this determines the length of your sign.

D. Hemeon: You put everything in and it gives you the height, dimensions, etc.

K. Champagne: We were trying to make the signs as reasonable as possible. If that copy is any smaller, people will be stopping to try to read it.

D. Dreffs: It looks like on sign #2, that there is room for a future practice. On signs #6 & #7, there is no more room.

A. Wagner: On signs #6 & #7, you will see “name of future practice”.

D. Tatem: What is the reason for the brown sections on the signs?

A. Wagner: It is the face of the sign.

D. Tatem: Read from the PZ Ordinance on Signage. Does your signage area include the brown sections? The waivers should include the area for the brown sections.

K. Champagne: I am not arguing. If you take the aluminum (brown) cover off, it is the base of the sign.

R. Duhaime: Comment to the Board, this is a commercial site and the Elliot Hospital wants it to look like the Elliot Hospital in Manchester. I wish, as an Aesthetic Committee member, I would have had a chance to review this earlier. It is commercializing the site more and more. We should be minimizing the signage. I would not want to dress it (site) up with larger signs. The signage can be aesthetically pleasing if it is built into the landscaping. There is so much information on the signs. There is a lot to look at.

M. Sorel: I had some of those thoughts that Robert has, until I went to the site and spent 45 minutes there. People have to find their way. I drove the site and then I walked it. It is a very large building, and a great deal of activity with many people having different services. I thought their waivers were reasonable and prudent.

### **Open Public Hearing**

No comments.

### **Close Public Hearing**

D. Tatem: If you approve the waivers, include the background (brown) areas for square footage.

N. VanScoy: Directory signs are not supposed to be advertising signs. Mr. Ehlers commented about not repeating “Elliot” on the signs.

D. Marshall: #6, #7 & #2 are directory signs. #3, #4, #5 & #8 are directional signs with

no advertising.

***D. Hemeon motioned to approve waivers #1, #2, #3, and #4 with edits to include adding the background (brown) areas for square footage, and renaming signs #6 & #7, and #2 to be directory (not directional) AND approve amended site plan conditional:***

- \$25.00 LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to the Planning Dept.
- 2 mylars, 5 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- Update plan: a) show 7"x1" recording block in top left corner, b) change "Overall Site Plan" to "Amended Site Plan" in bottom right description block, and c) signage - add the background (brown) areas for square footage and rename signs #6 & #7, and #2 to be directory (not directional), and d) change site note # 1 to read " The intent of this amended site plan is to show the directory and route traffic signage to the existing 2-floor 56,000 s.f. medical office building."
- 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 in favor. R. Duhaime opposed.***

M. Sorel: I give credit to the developer. They have done well with what they had to deal with for their site.

**2. PAUL A. MAURAIIS (#09-08)**

49 Mammoth Road, Map 45, Lots 30 & 33

Lot line adjustment between tax Map 45 Lot 30 & tax Map 45 Lot 33, and roadway and sewer extension

J. Gryval: The applicant has two issues, 1) the lot line adjustment and 2) the road and sewer extension. Tonight, we will just review the lot line adjustment.

D. Tatem: John, the lot line adjustment is complete.

***D. Marshall motioned to find the plan (lot line adjustment) complete. Seconded by M. Sorel.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

Matt Peterson, Woodland Design: Provided an overview of the plan; Castle Drive is to the south, Mammoth Road is to the west, Hale Ave. is to the west, and Lamberts Auto is to the north of this parcel. Sheet 1 of 13 is an overview of this project. Paul Maurais's property is a 14.16-acre parcel. There is a 50 ft right-of-way to Mammoth Rd. 10 yrs or so ago, there was a proposed subdivision of approximately 28 units. I don't know the whole history on that. The developer went belly up and the land went back to Mr.

Maurais.

J. Gryval: Let's just discuss the lot line adjustment on Mammoth Rd. We are not here tonight to discuss the road.

M. Peterson: I am only touching on the lot line. Here are lots one and two on the plan. The second parcel is approximately 6 acres in size. Sheets 2 & 3 have the existing conditions (topos, setbacks, and stuff like that). Sheet 4 is the old Berube piece; 6 acres. We want to change the lot line and add the remainder of the parcel to total 18.75 acres. .96 acres will be on Mammoth Road. The issue with the lot line is that I have 2 waivers. The Berube piece was recently torn down on Mammoth Road. The applicant would like to replace that house with a new house in the buildable area to the front of Mammoth Road. We had Christopher Danforth do the setbacks. 75x100 is the required buildable area. It is a 41,000 sq ft lot with sewer and water. Map 45, Lot 33 is for future development. Paul and his son are still looking to do something on a smaller scale development. That is why we are asking for a waiver, and not show the 75x100 buildable lot. We went to the TRC Meeting the other day and submitted a conceptual (distributed lot sketch "Riverbuilt Subdivision" to the Board). We want to put the house up front. Paul has asked me to tie it to the back of his house to continue with his land. One comment that came up at the TRC was they would like us to push the house to the furthest northern setback. There are some pine trees there. It was also suggested for a potential side load driveway and to utilize the existing curb cut (house was already there on Mammoth Road). The house (now torn down) originally has a front load driveway. The TRC asked for a side load driveway. The applicant is working on the building program.

D. Tatem: The TRC also asked for the buffer to be marked.

M. Peterson: Yes, with a post and rail system or some type of buffer fencing. Six months ago there were three structures between the wetlands and the buffer (house, shed). We would like to rip out the cement pads, loam and seed, and bring the buffer back. We met with the Sewer Commission to tie into the lot on Maurais Street. We have an easement. Robert Lariviere, builder, is here from Riverbuilt Homes. He has sewer letter.

J. Duffy: We still need the sewer capacity letter.

D. Tatem: For the record, I spoke with Bruce Kudrick at the Sewer Dept., and they do have capacity. We just haven't got the letter yet.

M. Peterson: That's it for the lot line adjustment.

J. Gryval: When the lot line is changed, what will that whole lot look like?

M. Peterson: Showed lot line adjustment on plan.

J. Duffy: There are 2 waivers (1-checklist, and 2-buildable area).

D. Tatem: There is also another waiver #3-site specific soil mapping spot grades. When there is less than 5% topography, you need spot grades.

**Waiver #1 – Checklist.** J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #1. Seconded by N. VanScoy.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**Waiver #2 – Buildable Area.** J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #2. Seconded by D. Hemeon.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**Wavier #3 – Site Specific Soil Mapping (Spot Grades).** J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

R. Duhaime: Spot grades may not be a bad idea.

*D. Marshall motioned to deny waiver #3. Seconded by N. VanScoy.*

D. Hemeon: Dan, why are you opposed to waiver #3?

D. Tatem: Because of the proposed future road construction.

*Vote unanimously in favor. Waiver not granted.*

#### **Open Public Hearing (lot line adjustment)**

No comments.

#### **Close Public Hearing**

*D. Marshall motioned to approve the lot line adjustment 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 May 15, 2009 from Stantec)
- Buffer to be marked with a post and rail system or some type of buffer fencing
- Letter from Hooksett Sewer Commission stating they have capacity and approve this project
- 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 R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Gryval: If you want to, set-up another time to go over the road. Should the road and/or sewer extension application come before the Board, the abutters will be renotified.

#### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 4. BEAVER BROOK HEIGHTS – PHASING (#09-03)**  
By-pass 28 & Jacob Ave., Map 48, Lot 26, AND Map 49, Lots 49 & 58  
Amended phasing plan.

J. Duffy: For the vesting and phasing, it is a policy decision. They can't get any building permits or sell lots, therefore Bart did not see a problem. Bart would prefer the whole road is built at once.

D. Marshall: Is the staff satisfied?

J. Duffy: Scott and the engineer are happy with it.

***D. Marshall motioned to approve the phasing 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 March 16, 2009 from Stantec)
- Original 87-lot residential cluster housing subdivision plan (plan #06-18) to be recorded prior to the phasing plan (plan #09-03). See plan #06-18 conditional approval letter dated May 21, 2008 for details.
- Note on plan that no lots shall be sold and no building permits shall be issued in Phase I until the surety is in place for Phase II and the remaining phase I improvements are submitted and approved by the Town Attorney.
- Note on plan for the additional phasing language for phases I-Beaver Brook Rd, II-Beaver Brook Road, III-Sophie Circle, and IV-Colleen Circle.
- Applicant agrees to submit the site plan compliance monitoring escrow fees and the signed Inspection Funding Agreement relative to all engineering and site inspection costs prior to the pre-construction meeting.
- Both plan #06-18 (original 87-lot subdivision), and plan #09-03 (phasing) must be recorded prior to any pre-construction meetings.



- A pre-construction meeting is required for all phases (1-4) and the surety must be submitted and approved by the Town Attorney prior to each pre-construction meeting.
- Applicant agrees to site plan compliance monitoring
- All waivers noted on plan
- Note on the plan that the project will be considered 100% vested pursuant to RSA 674.39 once all phase I road improvements are constructed to binder course of pavement and the surety for phase II and the remaining phase I improvements are at full value of phase I and phase II at the then current market value, and 10% of the full value of phase I improvements to secure against latent defects has been submitted and approved by the Town Attorney.
- 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 N. VanScoy.*

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

J. Duffy: The original 87-lot residential cluster housing subdivision plan (plan #06-18) has not been recorded. There are still conditions on that plan, to include but not limited to, the applicant submitting a \$5,000 fee due to the Conservation Commission, and submitting a signed Drainage Easement. It will be noted in the phasing plan conditions that plan #06-18 must have all conditions met and be recorded prior to this phasing plan (plan #09-03).

D. Hemeon: For the Drainage Easement, Mr. Bussiere and I are working on the signatures.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **Nancy Lane - gate**

J. Duffy: On Nancy Lane, when it was owned by Equivise for the 5-lot subdivision, they were to install an emergency gate at the Nancy Lane cul-de-sac to control access between Berry Hill and Nancy Lane. When Scott came in, the same condition for the emergency gate was put on the lot line adjustment. The Building Inspector said to Scott that he had to install the gate, and Scott said Thibault was responsible for the gate part of the road improvements. We asked him (Scott) for the Purchase & Sales (P&S) Agreement to determine if only bought the lots (and not the roadway). He has just given it to us tonight and I am reviewing at this moment.

Scott Bussiere: The road was completed. There is a Bond for \$28,000 posted by Thibault. Thibault owns the bond.

D. Hemeon: Who owns the subdivision? Who is responsible to build the road?

S. Bussiere: Thibault.

D. Tatem: Does the bill of sale include roads to be completed, etc.?

J. Duffy: Read sections of the P & S to the Board.

D. Hemeon: We need the question answered.

J. Duffy: We need more than just this P&S. Scott, get something from Thibault in writing.

**5. 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 JUNE 15, 2009.*

**OTHER BUSINESS, CONTINUED**

**Webster Woods – phase II**

Phil LoChiatto, Project Manager: I don't know if this is old business or other business. We (Phil, J. Duffy, D. Tatem, J. Gryval, and J. McHugh) met Thursday (5/14/09) and I am really here at the Board's pleasure. There was a recommendation to have a restoration/reclamation bond. There was question if work had been done at phase II of the project. We were concerned with that. Do we ask for a restoration/reclamation bond on that section, or a bond on the whole project?

J. Duffy: A reclamation bond for the area disturbed, or a site bond for 30% of the construction of the roadway system for phase II.

D. Marshall: Phase II has a problem?

D. Tatem: The slope erosion is for phase I, and their techs are working on that.

J. Duffy: There are two issues: 1) phase I erosion that they agreed to hire a tech and are working on, and 2) phase II where they were going to come up with a plan for the type and amount of the bond. He is here tonight for phase II.

P. LoChiatto: We are using Turner Consulting at the recommendation of Stantec. They were there with Dan. I have plans and I thought we discussed at our meeting (5/14/09) the overall site plan, and that we can mark out the plan and arrive at the square footage for the reclamation or site bond.

J. Gryval: What does the staff recommend?

D. Tatem: One of the two bonds (reclamation or site).

P. LoChiatto: We prefer a reclamation or restoration bond. It is too hard to bond for a site bond when the site hasn't been approved.

J. Duffy: They went into phase II, when they weren't supposed to.

R. Duhaime: I choose to listen to our engineer at times, and I am going to let him go to the pavement on this one. If he is OK with either a reclamation bond or a site bond, the applicant can spend his money somewhere else if it is a reclamation bond.

D. Hemeon: When is he coming before us for phase II?

J. Duffy: He would do the site bond at the time of the pre-con meeting. He is coming back for the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. He can move forward then on phase II.

J. Gryval: Why not bond the whole thing right now?

Sorel: 3 points I would like to make. I would like to see a resolution. I don't want to see the planning board take a punitive. I want to make sure the Town is served.

P. LoChiatto: We would only need to restore phase II, if the project was not going to move forward. The Board wanted reclamation, if something happened and we couldn't continue the project. I believe we have done a good site for the Town. We wouldn't intend to put it back to loam and seed.

D. Dreffs: Ask for a reclamation bond now.

J. Duffy: They can roll over the reclamation bond into the site bond when phase II is approved by the Planning Board.

M. Sorel: Do I understand that he will get a reclamation bond now, then roll over the reclamation bond into the site bond when phase II is approved by the Planning Board?

J. Duffy: Yes.

***M. Sorel motioned for the applicant to submit the following 2 items now for phase II: 1) reclamation bond, and 2) site plan compliance (SPC) monitoring escrow account (Stantec to provide estimate of the SPC escrow). Seconded by D. Marshall. Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Tatem: It will take 1-3 weeks to budget the bond in get it in place. Also, for the SPC escrow, we should be looking at it and what they should do (i.e. silt getting under silt fences).

J. Gryval: What would be the cost of that?

D. Tatem: We can follow through and get the applicant an estimate.

D. Hemeon: Are you going to have an abundance of fill on that property?

P. LoChiatto: It is a balanced site, therefore we shouldn't have to move fill off site.

J. Duffy: Why do you need some Dale?

P. LoChiatto: This is May 18<sup>th</sup>, if we don't have the reclamation bond in place by the next Board meeting, should we appear on June 1<sup>st</sup> if we are actively working towards getting it (bond)?

D. Tatem: And there is the left turn lane.

J. Duffy: The trail still needs to be worked through. It needs to be shown on the final plan. We just need it shown where it is located.

D. Tatem: If the left turn lane or the slopes are not done, what would you have for the June 1<sup>st</sup> Board meeting?

P. LoChiatto: We originally had lanes shifted to the east side of highway, but we had no luck for a temporary construction access with the property owners. We have a new plan into the State.

D. Tatem: If there is nothing to talk about, there is no sense to come in on June 1<sup>st</sup>.

P. LoChiatto: For the slopes, we will need the report from John Turner.

R. Duhaime: The slope issue was the distance from the buildings to the slopes. I would also like to see the report.

P. LoChiatto: There are no insurmountable solutions. If it is the Board's pleasure to wait another week or so, and if no positive outcome from the State, then we can request a continuance or postponement.

M. Sorel: Get something in writing from the Kiwanis about the trails?

P. LoChiatto: We do have it in writing. Ms. Duffy was just asking for something on the plan.

J. Duffy: I will send you my notes tomorrow. I know there are more items to be met.

D. Tatem: What about the 10% ADA unit requirement, so the Building Inspector will know where they are supposed to be. You were going to put them on the plan.

P. LoChiatto: If it is the Board's pleasure, we can do so. However, I would be hesitant to point out the specific 10%. For example, if we have lot reservations for phase II and they want to buy a unit and then I have to designate it handicapped, they may not want to buy it.

D. Hemeon: What if you get to the last 10%, and none of the units have been built per ADA? There has to be something in there for the 10% ADA.

P. LoChiatto: For 53 units with the ADA being 10%, would this be round to 6 ADA units?

D. Tatem: If he showed 6 potential ADA units, then the Building Inspector issued a permit for non ADA, then another unit would need to be designated as ADA.

P. LoChiatto: Whatever the Board wants. If you want 6 ADA units identified on the plan, we will do so.

J. Gryval: Show the 6 ADA units on the plan.

P. LoChiatto: If we build a unit as handicapped, but not sell it to a handicapped person, do we lose that unit to be in compliance with the 10% ADA?

R. Duhaime: No, it is still ADA compliant.

M. Sorel: If they don't designate the 6 ADA units on the plan, then the last 6 units may be the units designated all in one section.

J. Gryval: Show the 6 ADA units on the plan. If you have to move the units around later, then you move them around.

#### **Economic Revitalization Zones – Town Council Meeting**

J. Duffy: Wednesday night, May 27, 2009, you are all invited to attend the Town Council Meeting on the Economic Revitalization Zones at 7:15pm. Also the same night at 7:00pm, John Gryval and Joanne McHugh are presenting the Planning Board updates to the Council.

#### **Jensen's Appeal to ZBA tomorrow night (5-19-09)**

M. Sorel: Jensen's to trying to argue the variance and appeal all in the same night. They asked for a continuance to tomorrow night (ZBA). The ZBA Chairman said that would not happen.

D. Marshall: In this case, we need to send a letter from the Planning Board to the ZBA. The developer now has eight (8) remaining units for his project, all which must comply with the 10% ADA requirement. The Planning Board is not in favor of the developer having this requirement waived by the ZBA. The developer was well aware of the 10% ADA compliance. He let it go to the last 8 units. Why would you grant him a waiver?

M. Sorel: Jensen's will argue they did not know about the 10% ADA requirement.

D. Marshall: That is ignorance by the attorney.

J. Duffy: We can attach the application page the developer signed for the Planning Board as affirmation that the application and all related materials conform in each and every aspect with all laws, ordinances and regulations.

***D. Marshall motioned to send a letter to the ZBA, with attached signed application page, indicating the developer now has eight (8) remaining units for his project, all which must comply with the 10% ADA requirement. The Planning Board is not in favor of the developer having this requirement waived by the ZBA. Seconded by N. VanScoy.***

N. VanScoy: Our letter should start out “I thank you for accepting this letter/memo to the ZBA for your meeting this evening (May 19, 2009). I apologize for it being last minute, however the Board discussed this item at their meeting last evening (May 18, 2009).”

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

### **Butler Hockey**

J. Duffy: He put lights in and he is still is waiting for the 2 light poles. The lights he has installed are pretty good, but not perfect. Once the pole lights go in, all should be OK. One of our requirements is that he submits an “as built” lighting plan. He would have to have his engineer go out and mark every 5 ft for the number of the lights. Dan said it should cost the applicant a couple of hundred dollars. He is asking it not be done for his site. He is being asked to do a lot of things for a smaller business. In the future, we may want to add language in our requirements not be as strict for an “as built” for a smaller home occupation business.

D. Tatem: The two lights that haven’t been installed, have been ordered and are about 4-6 weeks out. The bases are in and wired and ready to install the lights when they come in. Where those two lights are slightly low, now they are only opened to 6pm at night and it is not dark. Our recommendation for the CO is to bond for the two lights, and have the lighting (2) installed by August 1<sup>st</sup> to provide enough light for all locations.

J. Gryval: Do you think the two lights need to be bonded?

D. Tatem: The site is bonded now for \$22,000. You can hold the two lights and landscaping from that amount.

J. Duffy: You (Board) will be OK not to have an “as built” for the lighting plan.

Board members: We are OK with bonding the two lights, having them installed by August 1, 2009, and not having the applicant submit an “as built” for the lighting plan.

### **New Town Administrator**

J. Duffy: Carol Granfield has accepted the position of Town Administrator effective June 29, 2009.

### **Maurais Road**

J. Gryval: The Maurais guy, at the TRC meeting, he wanted to push the road real bad, and build two houses. He tried to do the same thing tonight.

D. Hemeon: We are going to see a rash of people coming in here for pieces of road. Times have changed and it is a tough economy.

J. Duffy: But they can have 500 ft of roadway.

D. Tatem: For a 1,000 ft road, with two 500 ft sections, there will be two types of pavement.

D. Hemeon: I never understood the cul-de-sac rule for 1,200 ft of road. Cisterns have to be 500 ft apart.

D. Marshall: The length of the cul-de-sac changed a few times, since I have been here.

J. Gryval: That is what all the abutters were here for tonight (road).

### **Conservation Commission Update**

M. Sorel: The Conservation Commission is involved in a very large project. It is non-public, therefore I cannot provide you with details. If they can put it together, they will have an acquisition of a substantial amount of conservation land. Also, the Arleigh Greene site, he has been sited by DES for shoreline protection (cutting down trees and so on). It is a mandated reclamation. They (Arleigh Greene) came before the Conservation Commission with their engineer and showed a plan of what they were going to reclaim. Nothing was shown for land for a fire station. I read into record, a letter from the ZBA that a part of the original approval was to offer a fire station site. Then a second plan came out showing the fire land. They got the recommendation from the Conservation Committee for the reclamation. The land should be used for residential use and that was the consensus from the Conservation Commission. Mr. Greene offered the Fire Dept. another piece, but that land is not viable. I had never met the man. He was a very good speaker. I understood his attorney was going to contact the Town Attorney and the Council to discuss this further.

D. Hemeon: I heard today, he was going to offer a piece of land, but it would cost the Town of Hooksett a lot of money.

***D. Marshall motioned to adjourn at 8:25pm. Seconded by D. Dreffs.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 8:25pm. The next Planning Board Meeting is Monday, June 1, 2009, at the Hooksett Town Hall Chambers @ 7:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick  
Planning Coordinator