

**Official
As of 08/18/09**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, August 3, 2009**

CALLED TO ORDER

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 7:04pm

ATTENDANCE

Chairman J. Gryval, D. Marshall, M. Cannata, F. Kotowski, B. Sullivan, R. Duhaime, and Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy.

Excused: Town Administrator, C. Granfield, R. Guay, and Y. Nahikian.

Absent: D. Hemeon.

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

Stantec Engineer, Dan Tatem.

Excused: Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 06/23/09, 06/30/09, & 07/13/09

R. Duhaime motioned to approve the minutes of 06/23/09. Seconded by N. VanScoy. N. VanScoy in favor (1). J. Gryval, R. Duhaime, D. Marshall, M. Cannata, B. Sullivan, and F. Kotowski abstain. NEED (5) VOTES, MOTION CONTINUED TO AUGUST 17, 2009.

N. VanScoy motioned to approve the minutes of 06/30/09. Seconded by R. Duhaime. N. VanScoy, J. Gryval, R. Duhaime in favor (3). D. Marshall, M. Cannata, B. Sullivan, and F. Kotowski abstain. NEED (5) VOTES, MOTION CONTINUED TO AUGUST 17, 2009.

N. VanScoy motioned to approve the minutes of 7/13/09. Seconded by D. Marshall. D. Marshall, M. Cannata, N. VanScoy, B. Sullivan, and R. Duhaime in favor. F. Kotowski abstains. Motion carries, minutes approved.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

5. 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

J. Gryval: If any abutters are here this evening, we will be motioning for a continuance on this application.

D. Marshall motioned to continue application to September 14, 2009 and that the applicant must renotify the abutters. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Vote unanimously in favor.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO SEPTEMBER 14, 2009.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION

- 1. DAIGLE - CROWN COMMUNICATION (#09-11)**
210 Whitehall Road, Map 15, Lot 86-1
Special exception to Article 11, Section B.2, to construct a 150-ft monopole wireless communication tower in the Industrial Zone.

Dan Klasnick, Attorney for Crown Communication: Once again, my name is Dan Klasnick and I am here on behalf of the wireless tower developer Crown Communication. The Board has received the complete application that was provided to the Board of Adjustment (ZBA). In addition to the complete application, there are copies of the separate power point we presented to the ZBA. The applicant realizes that in addition to zoning, that we needed to present to this Board as well. We will be presenting again for the site plan review. I can go over the proposed design. I can certainly give you whatever input you need.

J. Gryval: We did review the information you sent.

D. Klasnick: When we met with the Board of Adjustment, Crown's multi-carrier solution was for the significant gap in coverage. AT&T wireless is the co-applicant for the special exception. The tower delivers wireless service and has the opportunity for additional co-locators. Sheet C1 of the original plans submitted has the beneficial attributes per the planning perspective. The access from Whitehall Rd was already established. It is the rear part of the lot. The existing driveway is along the property owner's house. There is a large commercial grade garage. It is a 16.67 ft gravel drive with a gate; 500 ft from the beginning point to the proposed telecommunication compound area. There is an existing service overhead to the residents. Crown will tie into the existing; power underground. The goals accomplished were to minimize the disturbance to the lot itself. Grading of the lot itself was not a lot of disturbance. Sheet A2 is a close-up of the compound for proposed facility. Electric and telephone lines are along the easement itself. The CSC cabinet is inside the fenced in area. It is a multi-use facility. The additional co-locator has a multi-user meter board in the compound. It is a 100 x 100 area with only 50 x 50 being developed initially. There is a chain link fence with 3 strands of barbwire. AT&T wireless will have a 20 x 20 shelter for electronic antennas. There will be a cable tray for the monopoles to the antennas. There is a pad proposed for an emergency "diesel" backup generator. Sheet A3 shows the 150 ft

monopole. At the Board of Adjustment hearing, we provided substantial evidence why this height is necessary. AT&T antennas have a six (6)-panel antenna ray. Two (2) antennas on each for a 360-degree coverage. Three (3) other wireless locators could attach their antennas in the future. Here is the elevation view, meter banks, CSC cabinet, transformer, proposed shelter, and fencing with 3 strands of barbwire. It is very straightforward to install, due to the existing access. That is the essential components.

J. Gryval: Staff comments?

D. Tatem: The only comment Jo Ann had was the ZBA specifically asked for an independent study for the impact to the neighborhood for impact on home values. She recommends the Board take no action until that study has been reviewed.

J. Gryval: We don't have enough information tonight. We have been out to the site. I spoke to the ZBA Chair, and he has recommendations.

R. Duhaime: Is this a leased agreement with easements?

D. Klasnick: It is pertinent to rights.

R. Duhaime: 150 ft, AT&T is looking for the top of the tower. Why can't it be 120 ft? Is it due to the elevations?

D. Klasnick: I didn't visit the site. At the Board of Adjustment, Dan Goulet, applicant, described in detail the 147 ft height minimum requirement for AT&T.

J. Gryval: The issue is for the ZBA.

D. Marshall: Are Cingular and AT&T the same company now?

D. Klasnick: Yes.

B. Sullivan: At the bottom of the hill, he is already 35-40 ft down from the peak. He is already in a valley. It is the line of site performance. Is this a fair statement for the height need?

D. Klasnick: I will refer you to Dan Goulet.

D. Goulet: Yes that is a fair statement. We have to overcome trees too.

F. Kotowski: 50 x 50 ft developed out of the 100 x 100 ft. When would one expect to develop into the remainder of the 100 x 100 ft site?

D. Klasnick: No timeframe. It simply allows for the potential future expansion. Providers may come up with new technology. The industry standard is a 100 x 100 ft lot for clearing and construction.

F. Kotowski: Are you currently one company?

D. Klasnick: With one co-applicant AT&T.

F. Kotowski: A 147 ft is needed for one tenant. What would the other tenants of the pole need?

D. Klasnick: Each of the wireless service providers uses different technology. The industry is first in time, first in right to the tower. Other wireless providers, for the height on the tower will look at what would make sense.

F. Kotowski: With the technology you (AT&T) are using, you need the needed 147 ft. Other providers may not need the 147 ft, because of their technology. Could AT&T use other technology, so their need is less than 147 ft?

J. Gryval: We will take no action tonight. There is not enough information.

R. Duhaime: How long will it take for the home value study to be completed?

J. Gryval: It is a third party study. All i's need to be dotted, and all t's crossed.

D. Tatem: Who is the study provider?

D. Klasnick: The Town contracted with an independent provider separately.

B. Sullivan: The ZBA is funding the study. You would like to get this done before winter. Board of Adjustment, we support them and if they are asking for a study on impact to home values, we would also like to see that.

J. Gryval: When we get the information from the ZBA, we will reschedule you to come back to this Board.

COMPLETENESS

2. AUSTIN WOODS (#08-02)

South Bow Rd & Mountain View Rd, Map 12, Lots 13, 14-4 & Map 16, Lot 53

- proposal to subdivide Map 12, Lot 14-4 into a 6-lot conventional subdivision, consolidate Map 16, Lot 53, and Map 12, Lot 13 into one lot, and simultaneously subdivide it into 37 residential lots and 2 open space parcels for a conservation open space subdivision.
- proposal for lot line adjustment to provide for the transfer of parcel "A" (15,130 sq ft) from Map 16, Lot 53 to Map 16, Lot 53-1
- Special Use Permit for Conservation Subdivision – Zoning Article 8, Sec. K

J. Gryval: Staff comments?

D. Tatem: It is complete.

***D. Marshall motioned to find the application complete and that the applicant must renotify the abutters for the September 14, 2009 public hearing vs. August 17, 2009 public hearing. Seconded by B. Sullivan.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Gryval: Renotify abutters for the September 14, 2009 public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING SEPTEMBER 14, 2009.

3. SUPERMARKET (plan #09-15)

Interstate 93 & Rte 3A, Map 37, Lots 2-3, 3, 4, 5

- Consolidate 4 lots into one and then subdivide into 2 separate lots
- Non-residential site plan to construct a 76,325 sq ft supermarket

J. Gryval: Staff comments?

D. Tatem: It is complete.

R. Duhaime: Regulations for trees?

D. Marshall: The Board received a letter from Attorney Craven on behalf of Mr. Tombs (abutter).

D. Tatem: A written letter has been submitted for the trees. At the public hearing, we can discuss it.

D. Marshall: There is a bridge on the project. Bob would like further discussion on this.

***B. Sullivan motioned to find the application complete. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

PUBLIC HEARING

4. RIVERSIDE PUBLIC STORAGE (#09-13)

5 Cross Road, Map 17, Lot 37

Non-residential site plan for the proposed construction of a 3-story (32,400 sq ft per floor) total of 97,200 sq ft of public storage facility

Matt Peterson, Woodland Design Group: Sheet 1 of 12 of the plan set shows a 5-acre lot to the north side of Cross Rd. and next to the MTS site that was approved and built last year. The site is to the west of West River Rd (Rte 3A). There is an existing house with access off Cross Rd. The large Santa Claus can be seen off the highway. The site is a

mainly flat area. We are accessing off the access road for MTS. We showed the existing conditions. Sheet 2 is the demolition plan of items to be removed to include an existing house, garage, well, and driveway. The well will be abandoned and we have provided the limits of clearing left to be done. Clearing was done for the MTS site plan. We showed a pile of dirt, which has been removed in the last couple of weeks. Sheet 3 is what the applicant is proposing; a 3-story high 32,400 sq ft climate controlled storage facility. The main access is off the access road for MTS. There are no new curb cuts. The parking has been laid out. It is a gated access to the back of the building where the main entrance for customers is located. We met with the Aesthetic Committee twice (once before this meeting tonight). We have shown all of the site criteria; 35 ft wide in the back, snow storage, dumpster pad, bollards, and all the things Stantec has requested. We have included the Fire Dept. notes. Next is Sheet 4, the meats and bones, grading and drainage. This project fits in as nicely as it could come out for the 15 yrs I have been doing this. There is minimal impact. The topo is 240 and the building is at 240.25. The existing house from the plateau has a detention basin. At the bottom of the detention basin, we had test pits and we have great sand. There is a closed drainage system to a fore bay to infiltration for 2, 10, 25, 50 & 100 yrs storm. The 100 yr storm is as if the system was frozen. There is freeboard to the highest elevation to the berm. There is a reduction in the peak runoff and volume. This site makes sense and fits nicely. All storms had no water coming out of the filtration system. There is a swale at the existing driveway to Cross Rd. There is minimal grading and everything else ties in. We met all the criteria within your regulations. Sheet 5 of 12 has the existing utilities, and these are stubbed at the property line within 75 ft. We propose a small septic, under 500 gallons per day for two bathrooms.

B. Sullivan: MTS brought the utilities up hill.

M. Peterson: Sheets 6 & 7 were reviewed with the Aesthetic Committee. It is a nice landscaping plan with the aesthetics of the building. Randy Knolls is our landscape designer and is one of the best around. We moved around trees and added trees, and they (Aesthetic Committee) seemed to like what we put forward. Sheet 8 has the pole light. It is 18 ft high with a 2 ft base and wall packs around the building. We have received the latest review letter from Stantec. Sheet 9 shows the closed drainage system, the depth of catch basin, and proposed grades. Sheets 10-12 show the construction details. What I will handout now for the architecture is what we handed out to the Aesthetic Committee earlier. The 8 ½ x 11 plan in front of you, we changed a couple of times. The arch design is to break up the building because the regulations say no more than 100 ft without breaking up. I am also providing you with samples of a built structure in Nashua. We met with them (Aesthetic Committee), and agreed to make changes. The back of the building has the public access. The sliders in the back are recessed 6 ft from the building with overhead doors. Next is the side view that faces Cross Rd. Again we are breaking up the length. We discussed with the Aesthetic Committee what they were looking for. Next is the cross section from West River Rd and Cross Rd. Sheet AA is Cross Rd. with a substantial tree buffer, and plantings along the driveway. There is a change in elevation and in the winter leaves will fall off, but there is still substantial growth. The chances of seeing it are not great. We did a nice building and screened it. Sheet BB is West River

Rd, we are not touching the slope and the tree growth will remain. I did see questions from an abutter. The 3-story aesthetics is nice, and I hope the Board thinks this is nice. Also the abutter talked about landscaping. The other thing in the packet, he said something about traffic on Cross Rd. This is a mini-warehouse. Traffic estimates (per ITE based on building square footage) 7-9am 14.58 trips, 4-6pm 25.27 trips (12-13 cars coming in and out). It is a low impact, low volume, and aesthetically pleasing project. For the water district, there is 75 ft of extension. I have a letter that they are all set with that. The Fire Dept. is all set. We have final review from Stantec. We are upstairs in their building, so we can bug them a bit. The last outstanding items:

- 1) letter from Water Precinct
- 2) letter from Fire Dept.
- 3) easement: detention basin – we showed our fence and will rewrite the easement
- 4) wetlands stamp: there are no wetlands, TF Moran will state on the plan that there are no wetlands on site
- 5) last outstanding item, discussion with the Board tonight, handout – Article 19 Groundwater Resource – my take is this article is to protect the groundwater from pollutants. Section 4.02.06 references groundwater in that section of the regulations. Section 603.03 references the standards; regulating contaminants on sites with storm water drainage, pretreatment with fore bay, and snout oil gas separator. I guess we wanted to get direction from the Board. Dan said the agreement would be with storage users. Dan can coach you better than I can. We are not trying to hide anything on this project. What else would the Board like from your regulations. I open up to you guys for questions.

J. Gryval: Staff comments?

D. Tatem: In speaking with Jo Ann today, she said the applicant should speak with Peter and the Fire Dept. for approval of the roadway name per 911. There is the easement for the detention; also a sign easement at Cross Rd. The easements were written for the MTS property. The easements would need to be updated.

M. Peterson: The question about the bound, TF Moran said it was a State DOT bound, and DOT said they did not need to reset it. I will get that in writing.

D. Tatem: No vehicular storage off the paved area, there should be a note on the plan per Jo Ann. One thing Matt, show the oil separator on the plan. Regulations are on all basins, not just last one. I was just checking that now. Last thing, Groundwater, read from Article 19 “. . . at property boundary”. We discussed this with our groundwater specialist in Vermont. He said Article 19 was well written, but questioned if it is applicable to this type of project. For groundwater at Rte 3A & Cross Rd, you could have monitoring wells for negative effects of salting the parking lot or anything else going on site. This would be submitted to the Community Development Dept. We don't think anything else is applicable.

J. Gryval: Do we have enough information?

D. Tatem: I spoke to Jo Ann today, there is the street name, sign easement, monitoring wells; Jo Ann had no issues either.

D. Marshall: This is a 3-story building, are there elevators?

M. Peterson: Yes.

D. Marshall: Elevators don't show on the plan.

M. Peterson: We didn't do any internal design yet.

R. Duhaim: The abutter from Willow Street will have minimal disturbance. I wanted some screening on 93, and they added trees. It is an attractive building, color and lines, and arches. There is no outside storage on this property. It is fenced on 2 ½ sides, so they couldn't park off pavement. Monitoring wells are not a bad idea. Does the MTS site have monitoring wells?

D. Tatem: No.

M. Cannata: The applicant is OK for monitoring wells?

M. Peterson: Yes.

M. Cannata: Nothing on the pavement; ie boat storage?

M. Peterson: No outdoor storage on site. We are using the same fencing as Profile Self-Storage; black wrought iron, not chain link.

J. Gryval: My question, for no storage of chemicals, how do you control that?

M. Peterson: In our lease agreement.

D. Tatem: We recommended that the typical lease agreement should be for each storage unit. It would be handed in to the Town, so that they could enforce if it if that happened (stored chemicals).

M. Peterson: Then there are the monitoring wells.

B. Sullivan: The reality is that you have to have some faith that the individual won't store chemicals.

F. Kotowski: The list of hazardous chemicals for water quality, have this list in the lease agreement of what is hazardous.

B. Sullivan: That is not his list, but it is the State's list.

F. Kotowski: Things we are concerned about should be in the lease agreement.

M. Peterson: I will add to the lease.

J. Gryval: This is a public hearing.

Open Public Hearing

M. Sorel, 54 Cross Road: I am not able to hear most members of the Board this evening. As a point of interest, we were not able to hear because the microphones are not being used appropriately. I am seeking information and knowledge for the intersection of Cross Rd and Rte 3A. I have first hand knowledge, because I live at 54 Cross Rd. Richard, this is becoming and is a busy intersection. We have MTS, and now this storage facility. I don't know how many rental units it will have. I heard it is a 97,000 sq ft 3-story building, but didn't hear how many units. Do the regulations require a traffic study for this project? Richard Doyon, nearby property owner, sooner or later his land will be developed. The ice cream shop and pizza have the curb cut on Cross Rd. Feeding to the traffic is the proposed Austin Woods project. They will cut through Cross Rd. Roy Rd and Quimby Mtn. will also impact the traffic. How are you going to apply impact fees? Who will upgrade the road in the future, the Town or DOT? Planning for that, could that be done at this time? And financing of that will be from different contributors that are going to impact? And require the intersection be done? Mammoth Rd and Rte 3, 2 ½ 3 yrs ago was redone. I don't know if a traffic light is needed at Cross Rd. and Rte 3A. The northbound lane on Rte 3A, DOT made the shoulder wider. Northbound traffic, including tractor-trailers, are suppose to pass on the right side. This is a very, very busy intersection. I don't know if the Hooksett PD has accident reports. I hope you will consider traffic at this intersection for this project and other projects. I don't know if you as a Board want to look at future long term planning. The applicant said the project is low impact, but I don't know how many units there will be. I think it is a good project for our tax base.

J. Gryval: Number of rental units?

M. Peterson: The traffic generation is based on the building square footage; 97,200 sq ft. The units may be 5x5, 10x10, etc. What we can only provide traffic estimates based on square footage. My partner is a traffic engineer. There are 14.58 cars in am, 25 in pm @ peak hours. I hear what you are saying about traffic on Rte 3A. We looked at a hotel and another type of commercial project. This project is the least traffic impact. Cross Rd ties into Hackett Hill where drivers access the apartments. Everyone has their own way of driving.

J. Gryval: For the number of trips on the square footage of a building, the smaller the stall, you will have more traffic.

D. Marshall: You are using the ITE figures?

M. Peterson: Yes.

D. Marshall: My problem with a lot of things like this, you are probably accurate on your trips, but it is added to the traffic of what is already there. We only have yours added to what is existing. \$64,000 in impact fees is adding to the corridor. The next two pieces of property, other developments may add to this fund. It is an incremental problem. At some point in time, there is the development “the straw that broke the camels back”. Maybe you’re lucky and came in early. Maybe Mr. Doyon’s project will need to address the impact. We probably need the traffic impact analysis. Traffic light, distant future, other thing (turning lanes, better site distance), but I am getting nervous. We need better analysis. Who is your traffic study person?

M. Peterson: Robert Woodland, my partner.

D. Marshall: My thought is a study needs to be done.

M. Sorel: We need more definitive data; “x” amount of units with “x” amount of traffic. I would argue and suggest, that the gross square footage – 90,000 sq ft with 60 units would change the traffic count. My other comment or question, our impact fee structure, does it always rest on the final developer, or do we collect impact fees over a period of time?

D. Marshall: Impact fees are collected within the corridor. Any impact fees the developer pays, stays in that corridor, but not for a specific project. At the interstate, Lowes and Walmart were a large project of almost \$1million in impact fees. Now we just started collection of fees from the mid-section of Rte 3A. By the time you need it, there are sufficient funds to merge with DOT funds. If not, it is the last man (developer) in.

M. Sorel: Or tax payers, even if it is DOT.

J. Gryval: The Board can request whatever studies are necessary to make their decision.

M. Sorel: The bottom of Cross Rd. looking north, the line of site is not a good one. It is an “s” curve, traffic at 45 mph & 60 mph. A larger vehicle is not sure about the southbound lane, because the inside vehicle is going south. Hooksett PD data should have accidents there over the last 4-5 yrs. Thank you for your time this evening.

B. Sullivan: At what point do we decide we become planners. We should turn to our Town Planner and have her start looking at it (traffic impact). I take that road (Cross Rd.) more often, and it is used by Hackett Hill residents. To the Town Planner, how much will it take to evaluate the impact to the road? \$64,000 could be used for this road (traffic impact study). It doesn’t need to go into a big kitty pool. There is a need to be proactive to ask the Town Planner to do basic things.

J. Gryval: I think you are confusing impacts fees with off site improvements.

B. Sullivan: No, Mr. Marshall said using impact fees is to close the gap in the road. Impact fees are for basic engineering. This is a Town road. All I am asking is we look at that.

J. Gryval: Right now, it is open to the public to speak.

D. Marshall: Dan, is this one of the intersections to look at?

D. Tatem: Rte 3A is the corridor for that area, and any intersections along Rte 3A.

D. Marshall: Don't do band-aid approaches. Intersection improvements start at \$200,000. \$64,000 is a band-aid.

B. Sullivan: I would like to understand what needs to be fixed, and I think \$64,000 will tell us that (study).

M. Sorel: For the sign easement, the Board knows how signs are dear to my heart. Wherever the sign is, I want to assure that it doesn't screen the traffic.

M. Peterson: We showed the sign on the site plan and it is out of the line of sight.

B. Sullivan: It is the same sign as the one for MTS golf cart facility. They will just take it over. It is already approved for the golf cart facility. That is my recollection.

M. Sorel: I can come in (Town Hall) and take a look at it.

R. Duhaime: The building sample located in Nashua, how many units?

M. Peterson: I don't have that. I can look into it.

R. Duhaime: Reeds Ferry Rd improvements, have a slow down right hand turn lane and have an easement for future needs? The applicant give us that and the impact fees. A slope easement, or any kind of easement. A little bit of site line issues. Don't destroy the buffer.

B. Sullivan: Because of the road design, make some minor changes to the site at the very base of the turn (Cross Rd). The other concern is the entrance at the top of the hill (Hackett Hill), it is almost like you slope into the road. Correct me if I am wrong Michael.

M. Sorel: We asked Dale not to pave Cross Road, but he did.

J. Gryval: Close the public hearing?

N. VanScoy: There is an existing study being done. Is this one of the ten intersections in Town being studied to determine where we should use impact fees? Do we know when it

is expected to be completed?

J. Gryval: Dan, is this one of the intersections?

D. Tatem: The first phase was to choose 10 intersections. Next is to choose 2-3 of the intersections to design. Impact fees are separate from this project. If it costs \$1 million, the Town would have to come up with half (\$500,000). What percentage would be paid by the Town, and what is paid by the developer? Impacts fees are pretty in depth, and it is somewhat difficult to use the money. I can check with my traffic engineer to determine if this is one of the intersections.

B. Sullivan: Pair down the 10 intersections. Look at which roads are feeder roads. Go down the corridor; houses along the river itself. The most dangerous one is Cross Rd, because it is a feeder road for the developments on Hackett Hill. People are trying to get to the highway. Do you go all the way to exit 11 or go through Cross Rd? Those three entrances into the corridor are heavily traveled.

J. Gryval: Do we continue the public hearing or get more information?

B. Sullivan: I wasn't asking the applicant for a study. I was asking the Town Planner for it. It is a feeder road.

R. Duhaime: I don't think impact fees . . . I would hate to see . . . traffic thrown onto Hackett Hill and Rte 3A. Tractor-trailers are using Hackett Hill; a Town road to access Manchester. At the same time, impact fees will cover improvements. This intersection does need improvements.

J. Gryval: Do you want a traffic analysis on the intersection and a continued public hearing?

R. Duhaime: And the # of units?

M. Peterson: One of the major points, there is an ITE manual, that is all we have to go by. The bigger concern is coming back here. You are absolutely right, 2-3 miles, 3-4 miles, the density coming out of our driveway and going right. Rob will put this together. We may say 75% may turn right. It may be the quickest way back to the residential area. And our water impact fees are \$30,000. Impact fees are for off site improvements. I don't think I would give you what you are asking for. 15 trips for a 97,000 sq ft building. There is no breakdown for # of units. ITE is based on sq ft. I need direction from the Board.

M. Sorel: The engineer representing the applicant keeps referring back to 97,000 sq ft. I have raised a question, and I plead to the Board "how many rental units?" This will tell how many trips per day. Without being argumentative to the applicant, 97,000 sq ft . . . the more units the more slices of pie you will serve.

D. Marshall: It gets into a long a complicated debate. Every traffic engineer uses ITE. A storage facility uses ITE. What is the visitation to these units. It is not daily. Nationally ITE uses 9 units. Taking 5 units in Manchester, and 4 units in Hooksett, and give us trip generations, this is just not done. First thing is to analyze the intersection for turns, then go to ITE for new loading. Have a base line study of that intersection; traffic on Rte 3A & Cross Rd in the AM & PM. From that point on, we can instruct the Town Planner on any future developments based on the base line study.

M. Peterson: Do you already have a base line study?

D. Tatem: I don't know.

R. Duhaime: Austin woods will impact the traffic. Should Austin Woods pay into this base line study?

J. Gryval: We will continue the public hearing until the base line study is complete.

D. Tatem: If we already have it done, do you want to see it?

M. Peterson: Yes.

B. Sullivan motioned to continue application to August 17, 2009, pending completion of base line traffic study at Rte 3A and Cross Rd.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO AUGUST 17, 2009.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 5. WEBSTER WOODS PHASE II (#07-37)**
(see page 2 of these minutes for details)

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO SEPTEMBER 14, 2009.

- 6. RIDGEBACK SELF-STORAGE (#06-33)**
Thames Road & Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 49D
Non-residential site plan for a 49,500 sq ft metal self-storage unit buildings and an 864 sq ft granite block office building

J. Gryval: Dan, did you get new information on this project?

D. Tatem: Yes, and I issued a letter on Friday (7/31/09).

D. Marshall: And your recommendation?

D. Tatem: The easements will be reviewed by the Town Counsel, and he meet with Mike Hoisington to make sure he is all set.

John Wight, applicant: And we need sign approval by the Board.

R. Duhaime: I talked to my colleague on the Aesthetic Committee (Y. Nahikian). He (applicant) has hired an architect. We wouldn't want to see a conditional approval. The building design may take a few more weeks. It should be completed within the next month. With a project this size, we got a minimal design. After seeing the last storage facility (Riverside), that one has site lines. This project has 2x 3-story buildings, and one of the buildings is facing a residential neighborhood. I would like to see a more substantial design, before we conditionally approve.

J. Wight: I talked to your colleague and thought we had a workable situation with him.

R. Duhaime: I wasn't in agreement with that.

J. Gryval: This is a public hearing. You can continue if you would like.

J. Wight: We have an aesthetically workable situation with Yervant and our Architect. We would like conditional approval.

J. Gryval: This board is not that great with conditional approvals. If the Aesthetic Committee is not satisfied, we should not approve. Any one from the public wish to speak?

Open Public Hearing

B. Sullivan: Could we talk about the sign; 10 ft high sign?

R. Duhaime: Aesthetically, I don't know if Jo Ann has a current rendering. It meets the Performance Zone; height and landscape screen. Interesting, I am not in favor of a conditional approval of the whole site. Who is going to make sure this gets done before the plans are signed? What is the square footage?

J. Wight: 25,000 sq ft each 3-story building, and the smaller building is 8,000 sq ft.

B. Sullivan: 49,500 sq ft, are impact fees going to change?

J. Wight: No, actually the total square footage is 49,500 sq ft.

Phil Fitanides, abutter to project - Fireworks: Distributed typed information on his concerns.

B. Sullivan: Mr. Chair, I have had a discussion on this project with this particular gentleman (P. Fitanides).

P. Fitanides: I would like to read my concerns into the record. Thank you.

J. Gryval: Thank you.

B. Sullivan: DOT permit?

J. Gryval: DOT gave us a permit.

J. Wight: I have a DOT permit.

B. Sullivan: He already has a DOT curb cut.

R. Duhaime: If the State wanted to put an island there, we couldn't stop them.

J. Gryval: Anyone else from the public?

B. Sullivan: Ideally , I agree with Phil, I wish you had access through Thames Road.

J. Wight: We never had access from Thames Road. We thought we did, but we didn't. The access has been going on for almost a year. Today, with the Aesthetic Committee, I thought we could meet that. It is not fair to keep going on with this.

J. Gryval: Donna, do we have a Dot permit?

D. Fitzpatrick: Yes.

R. Duhaime: The road entrance ramp from the shops, at one time this was two lots. It is the same owner at one time.

B. Sullivan: So how can they pull his access off Thames Road? If you didn't have a curb cut, how is Granite Hill Society allowed to pull it?

J. Wight: We cannot have any commercial traffic on a private road.

R. Duhaime: There is commercial access on that lot right now. The ramp on the front of the property is for the Granite Hill Shops and the road goes around. He wanted to gain access from Thames Road. There is actual frontage farther up from the Granite Hill Shops. He can't get access from the back of his property.

P. Fitanides: I might add, the driveway permit from DOT was based on a separate set of figures given to the TRC. It is the figures on the square footage. The DOT permit issued was for 20,000 or 30,000 sq ft, the actual square footage on the recent plans is 49,500 sq ft. I would like to also clear up parking spaces. The Granite Hill Shops have 30 parking spaces inside of the wall, and this was part of the shopping center approval to let that project exist. The 30 parallel spaces are covered with sand. I went out and looked at them today at the right of way, where the new road will go.

J. Wight: Bart Mayer has already ruled on the access.

J. Gryval: We can look into the condition and square footage of the DOT permit.

B. Sullivan: That would be something you would ask the DOT, because it is on US Rte 3 .

P. Fitanides: The DOT permit is only good for the original plan.

B. Sullivan: Even if it wasn't a question on the DOT cut, it isn't our road.

F. Kotowski: This could be resolved quite easily, through our Town Planner. If the curb cut is valid, and if it can be used today. I think this discussion back and forth is good, but when developers come in here, we should be able to say to our Town Planner "confirm this".

B. Sullivan: I disagree, he has several points in what he submitted to the Board, to include a legal statement to Town harm to public.

D. Marshall: When was the permit issued?

J. Wight: April this year from plans from Brown engineering.

D. Marshall: And the DOT permit is based on the same plan information as today?

D. Tatem: It is not just the aesthetics, but also the signage is in PZ. Example, Catamount Management signage is in the PZ. Typically that does not go through the Aesthetic Committee. Sight distance per the State is 400 ft. Hooksett requires 495 ft, and they have over 500 ft.

D. Marshall: Will this be resolved by August 17th?

J. Wight: Our architect and Yervant discussed the building design at the Aesthetic Committee meeting tonight, before this meeting. I thought we had an agreement with Yervant that we would work it out.

R. Duhaime: I was late in arriving to the meeting.

J. Wight: Three quarters of the Aesthetic Committee meeting went by before he (Rob) showed up.

R. Duhaime: I discussed it with Yervant. We did ask for multiple options and you only provided us with one.

J. Wight: Dan's comments and the Aesthetic Committee approval, we thought we would get a condition approval .

J. Gryval: Aesthetic's Committee wants to see it (updated building design). Do we have a motion to continue?

M. Cannata: What are we looking for from the applicant?

R. Duhaime: Aesthetic design of all sides, not just a side view. I expected to see more architecture in the design

D. Tatem: There is also:

- 1) sign approval by the Board
- 2) sewer easement AND groundwater easement, reviewed and approved by Town Counsel

D. Marshall motioned to continue the application to August 17, 2009, and have the revised building design reviewed by the Aesthetic Committee at the Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO AUGUST 17, 2009.

OTHER BUSINESS

7. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON HOLDING A FUTURE DATE FOR A HEARING TO RECONSIDER THE DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR 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.

J. Gryval: This application continued and continued. The abutters never knew when the public hearing would be. Tonight is a discussion as to whether or not we want to schedule a date to reconsider the denial on this application. How many times has this been continued?

R. Duhaime: For years on this Board, I have seen the Board spend so much time going over the same old ground again and again. For this project I would say it is because it was poorly designed, not well designed, and it doesn't fit the site. It didn't speak to the spirit of the ordinance. We didn't like shared driveways, but the applicant still moved ahead. I don't believe the engineer ever heard all the comments I had. I still have comments from the first meeting that haven't been addressed. Continued, continued, continued . . . I would have to go back two years to find my original comments, and have the engineer hear my comments. I don't know where the Board wants to go with this.

D. Marshall: The reason for the denial is in the denial letter dated 7/15/09 (excess continuations AND failure to comply with Development Regulations in a timely manner). This isn't ready, that isn't done, I am sorry, but go back and do it right. There is nothing that says we have to grant continuations.

B. Sullivan: You stole my thunder.

M. Cannata: For my money, based on what Richard has just stated, in addition it is very unfair to abutters. It is an abutter hardship.

B. Sullivan: It sets a bad precedent to reconsider.

D. Marshall: There is nothing that prevents the developer from presenting another plan. Just do it right the first time.

D. Marshall motioned to hold a hearing on September 14, 2009 to reconsider the denial of application on Ravenwood. Seconded by B. Sullivan.

N. VanScoy: Did the applicants have any comments tonight? (no comments from the audience).

Vote unanimously opposed. Motion failed, no reconsideration of denial.

R. Duhaime motioned to adjourn at 9:15pm. Seconded by N. VanScoy. Vote unanimously in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 9:15pm. The next Planning Board Meeting is August 17, 2009 at the Hooksett Town Hall Chambers, room 105 @ 7:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator