

**Unofficial  
As of 04/20/10**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
Monday, April 19, 2010**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 7:00pm

**ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD**

Chair J. Gryval, Vice-Chair D. Marshall, Town Administrator, C. Granfield, D. Hemeon, M. Cannata, J. Mudge, Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy, F. Kotowski, B. Sullivan, and Y. Nahikian (arrived at 7:08).

Absent: R. Duhaime.

**REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT**

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy, and Stantec Engineer, Dan Tatem.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 04/05/10**

*N. VanScoy motioned to approve the minutes of 04/05/10. Seconded by C. Granfield. Vote in favor. F. Kotowski, B. Sullivan, and Y. Nahikian abstain.*

**DISCUSSION**

**1. Southern NH University (SNHU) (#10-04)**

North River Rd, Map 33, Lot 67

Proposal to construct a 1-story operations center (26,711 sq ft footprint and a 7,322 sq ft mezzanine), associated access, and parking.

Jeff Kevan, TF Moran: Provided an overview of SNHU. This proposal is to consolidate the operations facilities that are currently in numerous smaller & older buildings into one new operations center. The need is due to the aging condition of the buildings. When the funds are available, they will take down the older buildings. The long-term planning for SNHU is a green way to future development of the campus at the large upland area. They did not want the operations center near that area. They wanted it closer to the highway. We tucked it in between the wetland areas and the buffer to the highway. The site is 203 acres in a mixed-use zone. It will come off the parking lot across the street from the tennis courts and set in the upland area. It is a 26,711 sq ft footprint with a 7,322 sq ft mezzanine. It is for 40 employees. We will get the utilities, water, gas, telephone and electric, from River Road. The sewer is not near; therefore we will have septic. David Udelsman, architect, will go through what the building will look like. There will be

overhead doors for the shop entrance, a dock in the back, and a couple of sheds (3-sided with a roof and open front). There will be a sand & salt shed. There will be five spots for vehicles to park out back near the concrete bin areas. The whole facility will be fenced and there will be a gate at one section. The parking at the front section of the building is for those who have appointments. There are 54 parking spaces in the back. We will lose 10 parking spaces in the existing parking lot to create the new access for this site. SNHU is required to have 2,110 total parking spaces, and we have 2,130 spaces now. The ADA parking requirement is 41 spaces, and we have 60 ADA spaces now. There are a couple of dumpster locations. There is parking within the fenced area for employees using the shop. The lighting for this site will be the same as SNHU has elsewhere; shoebox style to include building mounted lights.

J. Gryval: The Board has received a copy of the 4/8/10 TRC minutes to include the SNHU operations center presentation to the TRC.

J. Kevan: For traffic, this is not a new function. It is the same campus traffic, just redistributed to a different location on campus.

J. Duffy: I asked Jeff at the TRC if he could include that layout of the southern leg of the parkway into his plan when he submits for plan review. Also, you stated that the proposed access roadway coming in through the existing parking lot could be a loop road someday?

J. Kevan: The long-term projection is to loop off at the end of the dormitory roadway to the base of the access roadway upland area.

J. Duffy: So there is not another need for a wetland impact?

J. Kevan: Schauer completed the wetland impact in 2005. We should not need an additional wetland crossing.

J. Duffy: If the loop road happens, you would need to reconfigure the parking lot, boulevard it, and landscape the sides. Fire commented whether the new access road would be a street or not. The Conservation Commission will comment on the ZBA special exception as well as this Board. The Conservation Commission said they would wait until the special exception site walk to comment to the ZBA. I don't know if you want to do the same, or comment tonight for SNHU's special exception.

J. Gryval: I think we should hold off on our comments until after the site walk.

B. Sullivan: How many workers does SNHU have?

J. Kevan: 40 staff.

B. Sullivan: Will there be trucks going to this site?

J. Kevan: Yes, tractor-trailers with bulk items. They will back in and maneuver the same way out.

B. Sullivan: That driveway off the corner of the parking lot, at any time of day it is a difficult parking lot. I go by everyday, and kids use that parking lot. You don't see this configuration as an issue? Why is the parking lot becoming double duty, a parking lot and an access roadway, other than just that it is a convenience.

David Udelsman, architect: The tractor-trailer deliveries are estimated to be 1-2 times per week. For US Postal mail, UPS, Fed Express, those trucks will go elsewhere on campus. There will also be box truck deliveries at the new operations center.

J. Kevan: The access roadway through the existing parking lot is for financial reasons, and why add more pavement.

B. Sullivan: That is one point of view. And for storage?

J. Kevan: Within the roofed in area, there will be storage for salt, sand, and other raw materials. They don't keep bulk fertilizer.

B. Sullivan: Nothing different than what you currently store? No storage of oils and gas?

J. Kevan: It is the same storage, and we do not repair vehicles on site.

B. Sullivan: Planner, I know you asked SNHU to put the parkway on their plan, however most of this Board did not agree with SNHU's location of the parkway. Most of the parkway is on the red line (abutter) and not on SNHU's land. Even if he puts the road in there, there is still a discussion to be had. Some of us did not agree with the location of the parkway by SNHU. The Board thought the parkway would reduce traffic through the university. We were going to take land from the abutter vs. SNHU. It is a fine point that it is not the best parkway structure for the Town and the university. For the engineering of the parkway, there is not a lot. He basically walked the land.

J. Duffy: My understanding of the parkway was that it is for further discussion.

B. Sullivan: The parkway is almost impossible as it is shown.

J. Kevan: The only thing I could find on paper that showed this by-pass has been out there for 10-20 yrs; Mystic Brook at the top part of ridge, etc.

B. Sullivan: Yes, the parkway design was done by the university. We were hoping not to flatten out the property vs. taking from that gentleman (abutter). Charles, former Town Planner, was part of that discussion.

J. Duffy: The little I know about it, MS&G and the university did a parkway study by Holden Engineering.

D. Hemeon: When was that done?

J. Duffy: Around 2001.

D. Hemeon: That was all under the old SNHU president. We haven't met the new president.

F. Kotowski: The parking lot through which access will be made, could you make the drawing for cars and trucks on the northern edge of the existing parking lot?

J. Kevan: It is through the center of the parking area.

F. Kotowski: Could you move it to the edge?

D. Marshall: Right now the access drive lines up to the access across the street. If the access is moved to the north side outside the parking area, then the alignment is thrown off.

J. Gryval: The access design now is the least impact to the wetlands and is the "T" intersection.

D. Udelsman: The facilities inside include shops on the south side for plumbing, project managers, carpentry, housekeeping, and grounds keeping, as well as small hand tools. The center core will be for the warehousing of extra bulbs, sinks, toilets, refrigerators, brochures, literature and other items. There will be a break room. There will be storage for a golf cart that is used on campus. The mezzanine level storage is primarily for extra dorm furnishings such as chairs, desks, sofas, bunk beds, mirrors, etc. The exterior structure of the warehouse is pre-engineered. We upgraded the skin for engineering efficiency. The roof is white and is a simple saver roof installation (R30+ with thermal break design). The wall composite is metal panel ribbed 3" thick (R27). There are overhead doors, canopies, a loading dock, and an area for trash dumpsters. The front section of the building will have a white single ply metal roof, and light gray siding with brick veneer for the office section of building (R10 outside = R30 + total). It will have radiant floor heat and alternate energy sources. Jeff talked about the exterior lighting. They will be full cut off that is required by the Town. SNHU is looking at LEDs. They want the lighting to be "green", have low maintenance and be durable.

Y. Nahikian: How long is the building?

D. Udelsman: 235 ft long, and it is 1,000 ft down the road.

Y. Nahikian: Maybe 20 yrs down the road it won't be 1,000 ft down the road. The coloring should integrate into the environment. A white roof doesn't do good to blend with the environment.

D. Udelsman: You want a dark roof?

Y. Nahikian: No, just something that will blend in to the environment.

J. Kevan: This site is 300-400 ft from any additional development from the college side and 1,000 ft from any residence. That is why we thought that for this type of development, this architectural design was appropriate.

Y. Nahikian: 6 months out of the year there are no leaves on the trees.

J. Kevan: The site is 500 ft from the highway, 1,000 ft from any abutter, and over 1,000 ft from River Road.

D. Marshall: There should be architectural breaks for aesthetics.

J. Duffy: We are scheduling an Aesthetics Committee meeting on this project in the next couple of weeks.

M. Cannata: I would like to see the trips you are generating for traffic to that intersection both internally for the university and externally coming through the university.

B. Sullivan: Radiant heat is a great idea. Will you have summer cooling?

D. Udelsman: For the offices yes.

B. Sullivan: No air conditioners will be hanging out of the building?

D. Udelsman: Correct.

### **SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

#### **2. Southern NH University (SNHU) (#10-04)**

North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67

Special exception to Article 18, section E.1 to allow a wetland crossing for the construction of a driveway access road with a sidewalk and utilities for an operation center at SNHU.

J. Kevan: The wetland crossing is a defined channel that goes over N. River Road to a 36" culvert. There is another 36" culvert towards Manchester. For this crossing, in 2002 Opechee got a wetland crossing permit for 1,840 sq ft of impact with two 24" culverts. The stream channel meets in this location and joins as it goes through. Now in addition to that, when we did the Dining Facility for mitigation, the wetland impact is an

“accumulated” impact for last 5 yrs. We paid mitigation for 1,840 sq ft at that time. Now there is a total 4,844 sq ft for this crossing to allow me either a twin or single pipe to burry and leave natural. There are raised utilities to provide coverage over. This results in about 3,000 sq ft greater wetland impact than before. Now there is a 6,747 sq ft buffer impact. I met with staff at the wetland’s bureau about filling in the bottom of the culvert. Other than that, they didn’t see any issues with that. They said we would need to pay additional mitigation for the 3,000 sq ft.

J. Gryval: Staff comments on the special exception?

J. Duffy: No.

J. Gryval: I don’t think we should comment on this until we complete the site walk on April 26th @ 6pm.

J. Kevan: We are planning to come back to you for a formal application on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

M. Cannata: Where will we meet for the site walk?

J. Kevan: I will check with the ZBA for the meeting place, and make sure they inform everyone.

***SPECIAL EXCEPTION CONTINUED TO MAY 3, 2010.***

**COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING**

3. **DIANE & STANLEY BIELIZNA (#10-02)**  
1266 Smyth Rd., Map 48, Lot 19  
Subdivision plan to create 6 lots.

Don Duval, Duval Survey Inc.: This is a 42-acre site and is located on Smyth Road at Prescott Heights. The back of the property is on Johns Drive. We want to create 5 residential lots fronting on Prescott Heights and leaving one of those lots as 20 acres. There will be one 5.7 acre lot and the rest are 2 acre lots. On 4 lots we did test pits. For Prescott Heights we could not find the actual stake layout. There is evidence that it seems like a 3 ½” rod road. We propose a 25 ft road widening. For completeness, I have waiver requests.

J. Gryval: Staff is it complete?

J. Duffy: Yes.

***D. Marshall motioned to find the application complete. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Vote unanimously in favor.***

**Waiver #1 all buildings within 200 ft.**

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

**Waiver #2 all driveways within 200 ft.**

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

**Waiver #3 topography and wetlands**

D. Tatem: The drainage analysis includes topos. I am OK with this waiver.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #3. Seconded by F. Kotowski.*

Y. Nahikian: What is the maximum grade on the driveway?

D. Duval: 8%

B. Sullivan: Is the middle lot worse than that?

D. Tatem: Most are 2-4%. He did stay under 10%.

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

**Waiver #4 site specific soil survey**

D. Tatem: Typically for a 1 or 2 lot subdivision you would waive the soil survey. This application is for 6 lots. They have notes for a silt fence. I don't think soil mapping is critical on this, because no road is being created.

*B. Sullivan motioned to grant waiver #4. Seconded by C. Granfield.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**Waiver #5 lot 19-1 drive is less than 50' from abutting existing drive.**

*D. Hemeon motioned to grant waiver #5. Seconded by F. Kotowski.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

D. Duval: The existing utilities are on the west side of Prescott. I assume you will want PSNH on the southerly side of Prescott, and then go to the house. Would we need to service these lots underground for only 100 ft? Can we go over ground?

J. Gryval: The Board would prefer underground utilities.

F. Kotowski: The front property line has 4 lots adjacent to the roadway. PSNH could feed all 4 lots underground.

D. Duval: I will take it up with public service.

M. Cannata: If it is a pole for each lot, that will be quite ugly.

D. Duval: Could PSNH tie into the existing telephone poles?

D. Tatem: Comments from my subdivision plan review, Dale #24 ROW, do you need to see this on a detailed plan?

D. Hemeon: As long as they have bounds I will be happy.

D. Tatem: Comments 39-43, flooding – flow channel. For the drainage study, we have 4 or 5 comments. That could be a significant deal for drainage on this property. This will be a big thing to address with Don's engineer when he comes back into Town.

J. Duffy: Tennessee Gas Pipeline sent me a letter. They would like additional notes on the plan about dig safe and that nothing is to be done on site without their approval.

D. Duval: I will add a note on the plan if any construction in the ROW, they will be notified.

J. Duffy: The Conservation Commission said they would like to meet with the applicant. Lot 19-2 has a fairly good size wetland on the side of that lot. Down the road when someone is living there, after awhile the wetlands may be filled in (i.e. for a swing set, or other yard items).

D. Duval: I did not go to the Conservation Commission. At the ZBA site walk, there was a member of the Conservation Commission there. I will contact them.

J. Duffy: Lot 19-2 does meet our requirements, but I don't think it is good planning. In the future, with this layout, the wetland may not be there.

M. Cannata: How much of a problem would it be to change the lot line?

D. Duval: I am not sure the way to adjust it. I may be able to gain 10-15 ft.

D. Marshall: Jo Ann, you say they may fill the wetlands. If the owners started to play around with the wetlands, they would destroy their own lot. Water must go somewhere. It would be difficult, if they touched the wetlands, not to affect their lot.

J. Gryval: Board?

B. Sullivan: Wetlands are critical.



D. Duval: A 75 x 100 buildable area with a 36 x 50 attached garage, there is nothing to say that would be built right next to the wetlands. It is the same scenario with the 4K area. I don't think it will be densely developed.

N. VanScoy: I would like to hear what the Conservation Commission has to say.

J. Gryval: Meets and bounds?

D. Tatem: All set.

B. Sullivan: Dan, do you see anything easily changeable for the lot configuration?

D. Tatem: The rear triangle was part of the lot, and I mentioned the same thing about not using the uplands. I think he made appropriate changes.

F. Kotowski: Is it conceivable for the deed on that lot to add covenants and restrictions to prevent any fill or disturbance of the wetlands? And to give the Conservation Commission some solace for whoever builds on that lot?

D. Duval: If someone is going to violate zoning, they are going to violate your regulations too.

F. Kotowski: If there are restrictions on the lot I buy, chances are I won't make any attempt to fill the wetlands. This may satisfy Jo Ann's concern and the Conservation Commission's concern.

D. Tatem: Don's point is valid, as are all the comments made tonight on this subject. There are very few people who read their deed when they buy their house. A suggestion is to have metal green garden stakes that say "conservation/wetland buffer". This is an inexpensive way for the CEO to enforce.

M. Cannata: Dan, will that show on the plan?

D. Tatem: Yes.

J. Gryval: We will wait to hear from the Conservation Commission.

**Open public hearing**

Bob xxxxx, 36 Prescott Height Road: I have lived at this property since 1984. It is about 80 ft upslope from the proposed subdivision. I am all for this subdivision, however upslope we are all running out of well water. Adding 6 more wells could have an affect on our existing wells. We may want to see a hydrology study done.

D. Marshall: We haven't had much luck in the past to determine whether your well or someone else's well will have an affect from this subdivision. That would take mapping water tables. Who will pay for that very large expense?

D. Tatem: For a job my company did in another town, there were 16-18 lots next to another subdivision and the wells per 10 ft apart. We have a Geohydrologist in our office, and I asked him if those wells would affect each other. He said it is almost impossible to tell. Are your wells drilled?

Bob xxxx: Yes mine is 150 ft drilled, and my neighbor's is 180 ft.

D. Tatem: I have seen abutters have an independent test completed before and after a subdivision. 10 ft from your well may not affect, or a well several hundred feet from your well may affect; it is hard to determine.

Bob xxxx: I am for this subdivision, however I am just worried about the existing wells.

D. Marshall: I used to live at the corner of Smyth Road and Prescott Heights Road. I had one well 176 ft deep, another 125 ft deep, and a third well at 179 ft deep. I am very familiar with well issues in that area.

*D. Marshall motioned to continue the public hearing to May 17, 2010. Seconded by C. Granfield.*

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

*CONTINUED TO MAY 17, 2010.*

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **Cinemagic – south abutter**

J. Duffy: I received a letter for the Planning Board from Jane Lazar, abutter to the south next to Cinemagic. She is having problems with water gathering in the field area near the entrance to Cinemagic. Last year she had a problem with her septic system. She sent this letter that there are still water issues. Imax planted a tree in the ditch. She is not happy with Imax. Her trees are not surviving because they are getting too much water. She had a perk test done. There have also been three accidents from traffic leaving the movie theater. Peter and I looked at the plan. I talked to Dan and Mark Adam. Peter thinks the tree is causing the issue. The trees that are there now have been there since the beginning. Part of their landscaping in the Spring is to enlarge the ditch between the two properties. They thought that might help. I wanted Dan to go out and look at it. Jane seems to think Imax is causing the problem. Imax says the wetland was there from day one.

M. Cannata: What about the Septic?

J. Duffy: We had received a previous letter that her septic was going into her house. On the phone she said she had a failed septic system last year.

D. Tatem: There have been questions about the pond in the field. It was a pond when we reviewed it and we identified it as a wetland. What is the age of her septic?

D. Marshall: I have a feeling groundwater is coming up.

J. Duffy: We can have Stantec look at this, but we have no money for engineering. I have some money I can use from another source if needed.

C. Granfield: If it was constructed per the site plan approved, then it is not a Town issue.

J. Duffy: The Imax engineer stated the site was built the way it was designed on the site plan.

D. Hemeon: Didn't we go back for several issues at this site; fencing, grease disposal, and traffic issues? I think she probably has some legitimate gripes. We do have to answer to the taxpayers.

J. Gryval: Maybe this is a good time for him to come in to see the Board. He still has a traffic issue.

C. Granfield: He came in and we agreed resolve the traffic issue by him hiring a certified traffic controller, New England State Traffic, to manage the traffic at the entrance on Hooksett Road.

D. Hemeon: He planted trees in the ditch line?

D. Tatem: Yes, two trees.

D. Hemeon: When we had a meeting with Peter, he was supposed to address the trees.

J. Duffy: They are supposed to be removing the trees and making the ditch larger.

**SNHPC Town Rep.**

J. Duffy: Mike Jolin, one of the Town's reps to SNHPC, has a term expiring June 30<sup>th</sup>. I checked with him and he would like reappointment. You can choose to recommend him to the Town Council.

***D. Marshall motioned to recommend the Town Council reappoint Mike Jolin as the Town of Hooksett representative to the SNHPC. Seconded by C. Granfield.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

**Merchants Vacant Building (old Pancake House/Doctor's Office) – Fruit Stand**

J. Duffy: The owner of the fruit stand on Webster Street in Manchester would like to open a satellite location here in Hooksett. He would like to use the parking lot of the vacant building abutting south of Merchant's Motors; white building (old pancake house/doctor's office). He would have a 20 x 30 tent in front of the white building in the parking lot Mon-Fri 9-6, Sat

hours to be determined. He would lease the area from Merchants from May to Oct. He would only use the building to store his cash register. There would be no other use of the building. My question in the Performance Zone (PZ), display or .

J. Gryval: I would like to see a Farmer's Market, but not a tent city.

D. Marshall: If it does go in, I would want it far away from the roadway. A left-turn out of this business is almost impossible. I would discourage where he wants the tent now, and have him move it to the side of the building.

J. Duffy: If he locks up the parking with the tent, then the Singers can't lease out the building.

D. Tatem: Can you mark up the pancake house site plan for where you want the tent, and that would be the revised site plan?

J. Duffy: He would be using a generator for his electricity. He will load his vehicle with the produce each night.

J. Gryval: There would be noise from the generators.

D. Marshall: This sounds like an individual Farmer's Market.

J. Duffy: He would have 4 tables within 32 parking spaces.

C. Granfield: Since this is in the PZ, and with the feeling of the Board tonight, if he wants to proceed he will have to appear before the Board.

#### **Irving Stations – Bark Mulch Sales**

D. Hemeon: The local Irving Stations are selling pallets of bark mulch on their lots.

J. Duffy: I can tell Peter to go out to the sites and enforce.

#### **Planning Board – New Alternate**

J. Duffy: Brendan Perry as been appointed by the Town Council as the new alternate to the Planning Board. He has served on the Board in prior years.

#### **Exit 11 Hooksett Gateway – Proposed Development**

C. Granfield: Hooksett Gateway public hearing is tomorrow night, April 20<sup>th</sup> @ 6:30pm at the Town Hall.

B. Sullivan: Development in that area is good.

F. Kotowski: This State needs jobs.

D. Marshall: The TIF for Exit 11 will have to go to the voters.

C. Granfield: The Town Council can expand the TIF area.

B. Sullivan: There is already money going into the general fund from the Exit 10 TIF. The voters should be educated in TIF.

***D. Hemeon motioned to adjourn at 8:45pm. Seconded by B. Sullivan.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 8:45pm. The next Planning Board Meeting is at the Hooksett Town Hall Chambers, room 105 @ 7:00pm on May 3, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick  
Planning Coordinator