

**Unofficial
As of 10/19/10**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, October 18, 2010**

CALLED TO ORDER

Vice-Chair R. Duhaime called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD

Vice-Chair R. Duhaime, D. Marshall, M. Cannata, J. Mudge, D. Hemeon, Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy, and T. Walsh.

Excused: F. Kotowski, Chair J. Gryval, and Town Administrator, Carol Granfield.

Absent: B. Perry and Y. Nahikian.

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

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

J. Gryval: Alternate T. Walsh will be voting tonight in place of F. Kotowski.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 10/04/10

D. Marshall motioned to approve the minutes of 10/04/10. Seconded by J. Mudge. Vote unanimously in favor.

EXTENSION REQUEST

1. WEBSTER WOODS II (#07-37) – EXTENSION REQUEST

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:

- One year extension of the 11/02/09 approval
- One year extension for vesting rights

J. Duffy: I am distributing to you the conditional approval for Webster Woods II and e-mail correspondence from late this afternoon. There was a meeting this morning between DES and Atty. Ratigan, on behalf of the applicant, to go over the wetlands permit application and AOT. I received an e-mail today that the 1988 AOT lapsed; the newer AOT supersedes any previous AOTs. I received an e-mail over the weekend with photos recent photos of the Webster Woods site (distributed to the Board). After seeing them, Dan and myself (and Peter at different time) went out to the site. There is now substantial additional erosion behind Hickory Court. The plan resubmitted in the application with the State has the work for next summer. I think that is absurd. The

photos look terrible, but it is even worse in person. My suggestion, after hearing what Atty. Ratigan has to say, is I believe the Town needs to have a meeting with DES. This keeps getting delayed and delayed and delayed and the yards of the people living there keep getting washed away. There is a dangerous cliff now and the homeowner's association has put yellow safety tape around it. There is no bond on this. We need a meeting with DES to determine what can be done before next summer.

D. Tatem: Jo Ann covered my comments, unless there are specific questions by the Board.

John Ratigan, Atty. @ Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella: I represent Webster Woods. With me tonight is Eric Nickerson, developer for Webster Woods phases I & II. We have no issue to meet with DES and the Town to resolve this. Since the last meeting, we submitted a Dredge and Fill permit. We met with DES this morning with our plan. The southern ravine area is worse than the northern ravine. We will make revisions on our plan and complete the southern ravine within 30 days. DES said they need a new AOT permit for each side. We will do the northern ravine over the winter. We will be responsive to whatever DES will require as to urgent situations. We are back before you. The financial responsibility of doing this work is tied to phase II. We are here again for the extension request and we hope you will be granting it this evening. If this requires additional meetings, we will be happy to participate in them.

R. Duhaime: Do you have a plan to get these items done?

J. Ratigan: You asked us what is the plan for the permits and what is the timeframe to get the work done. That is whenever DES wants it done. DES doesn't usually let you work in wet conditions, however if there is a dangerous situation they may let us work then.

J. Duffy: It seems that things are getting dragged on by the developer. The last time Atty. Ratigan was here, we asked if the Dredge and Fill application was submitted and he said it had. They just submitted it to the Town Clerk's office 4 days ago. He met with DES several months ago. Collis Adams told him to file the appropriate papers within 2 weeks; that was the middle of September and yet it was not submitted until Oct 18th. I recommend nothing be done this evening until you consult with the Town Atty., DES and AOT. We are heading into winter and this is going to be a big issue. I know there are tons of people in the audience tonight, and some of them may want to speak. I don't know if you are taking public comment tonight.

J. Ratigan: Last we were here, there was a deadline for us to submit to DES. We met that deadline.

D. Hemeon: You also said you will have a plan to take care of that site. I thought you had already been to DES and were coming backing with a DES approved plan. Obviously you haven't done that because you just submitted to DES.

J. Ratigan: Well, when we were here last time we talked that there was a September or October deadline to submit to DES and that was quite clear. Jo Ann told you that. That didn't come from my mouth, Jo Ann told you that, both Jo Ann and Dan reiterated that we had a deadline. We met that deadline. They are satisfied.

D. Hemeon: Are you going to have a plan for taking care of all the problems on that site?

J. Ratigan: We can't waive a wand to do this. You need a permit from DES to do this. They have jurisdiction over this. They have to approve the plan. They have to approve it. Just like you approve plans for doing work, they have to give us a permit to do it. We can't work in wetlands. That was the plan that was submitted. We can't work in wetlands alright and we can't alter terrain if they find that we require a permit until they give us that permit. So that is where we are. We've given them, we are in the process of giving them the AOT permit which they did not require until today and we have submitted a wetlands permit which we are going to modify after the meeting we had today. We came up with a better solution for addressing this. So you know to suggest that um to suggest that this is like slipping when actually we have moved rather quickly to address the concerns that you expressed and the concerns from DES, they have been out to the site they walked it several times. I understand that haven't probably seen the most recent rainfall, but they walked the site several times. If you look at the e-mail correspondence, DES says that they are satisfied with what we have given them.

J. Duffy: When I saw this e-mail today, I was not aware there was a meeting with DES and the developer today. We were not invited to this meeting to have representation (Town engineer). We have had no input in this for the solution to this process. We have been in touch with residents.

J. Ratigan: You have a period to comment under the normal course. We didn't know they would have another option of a design for the plan during the normal course of State permitting.

N. VanScoy: Because we have not had representation at the DES meetings, has there been any expression of urgency to correct a known problem for a year? Are they prepared to provide us with an overview of the meeting with DES today? Did the State have comments that this site is unsafe?

J. Ratigan: We don't need a permit to address some of the items. The tree that Mr. Ingalls asked us to remove has been removed with a crane. However we can't take a backhoe to the site even though we have a perfect solution to fix it until we are permitted by DES.

R. Duhaime: Over a year ago they knew improvements needed to be completed.

J. Ratigan: To find a bank to lend to you; arrange for funds? Now it is difficult to find banks to loan in this economy. DES letter 2nd paragraph – Webster Woods II viability . . .

this is a recognition of underlying economic challenges. If we can't get funding and get permit extension, my client can't go to the bank to get funds.

R. Duhaime: 6-7 yrs sitting on Board I don't like conditionally approval, however I motioned on phase II approval and a year letter not fixed. Now you are saying not slipping, it is Oct 18th a year later.

J. Ratigan: Yes your understanding is correct. It is going to take thousands and thousands of dollars to do this and it needs to come from the bank. If you do as Jo Ann is recommending and let phase II lapse, we can't get funding for phase I.

R. Duhaime: We didn't have to give a conditional approval on phase II, but this Board did. 1 yr later the issues are not fixed.

J. Ratigan: None of us knew how the economy would be. My client is trying to do as best he can in this environment.

J. Duffy: The complaint filed by the Town was in April, and we are still where we were in April.

R. Duhaime: At least stabilize for winter.

J. Ratigan: DES was out at the site. If circumstances change, we have no problem with working with DES on these issues.

J. Duffy: DES was out at site in April.

N. VanScoy: I would ask our staff to contact DES on the urgency of the situation.

D. Hemeon: This is all a little tough to swallow. Where did the phase I profit go?

J. Ratigan: Sales prices fell.

Eric Nickerson, Mahomet: We have only sold one unit in 2 yrs.

D. Hemeon: All the work should have been done in phase I. Now you are relying on phase II sales? If you don't get financing, we do we go from here.

E. Nickerson: Can I make a couple of comments about the DES? Since last April it hasn't that we haven't been doing anything. I could show you a stack of engineering bills, soil scientist's bills, and we have put a lot of effort to getting everyone out there. But there is no urgency with DES to do anything, and I don't know how many different solutions Jim Gove our soil scientist and I think he met with Town officials 2 or 3 times to come up with a solution for this. Every time it changes a little bit. Just like after this meeting, and I hope we do get together with DES with Town to get some urgency on this

and come up with a solution for the immediate need of this washout. But it's just, it's very very hard working with DES and getting them to get off the butt quite frankly.

D. Hemeon: I don't disagree with that, it is tough.

E. Nickerson: We are ready to do something, but it's just, you know like when we went up there today and they site specific isn't any good and all the way through it was OK you had a site specific that was good. And now they said there was one done in '95 which I think was the extension you gave the original developers that probably filed another site specific which now supersedes the original one. So that changes our direction again, where we have to file another site specific. It's just all, it takes time and time and time. I think it would be a great idea to get together with them and say OK we have an emergency to at least resolve the problem of this wash out.

D. Hemeon: Jo Ann, is that something you can arrange; a meeting with developer, DES and Town reps.? We need to do something before winter to stabilize the ground.

E. Nickerson: Contact myself or Jim Gove to get this moving. Have riprap or something.

D. Hemeon motioned to have Town Planner contact DES to set-up a meeting between DES, developer and Town representatives asap to discuss resolution of phase I before winter. Seconded by M. Cannata.

M. Cannata: Mr. Ratigan you mentioned your finance is contingent upon the bank's willingness to lend.

J. Ratigan: Eric said he can handle a temporary solution by DES, however for a long-term solution he will need financing.

M. Cannata: Can you get a letter from the bank in good will?

J. Ratigan: To go anywhere, we need this extension on phase II tonight to take a viable project to a lender. We can't get you a lender letter without the Board's extension.

R. Duhaime: Is phase II going to run out?

J. Duffy: I want to check with the Town Attorney to determine if in fact phase II is running out.

J. Ratigan: I represent many municipalities and would recommend an extension. The current residents of Webster Woods I will be the ones who suffer. My client is here and says he will go to meetings.

D. Marshall: 11/02/09 approval lapses when?

J. Duffy: Our previous Town Atty. said the 3 yr. expiration is from the approval date and it is 1 yr for the active and substantial development. Our new Town Atty., I have not discussed this with him. At the recent Law Lecture Series, the material states the 4 yr rule (State statute) doesn't begin until the plans have been signed and recorded.

D. Marshall: From the previous Town Atty., the November 2nd approval lapses when?

J. Duffy: Approved 11/02/09 = 11/2/10 for vesting and 11/2/12 for 3 yr approval.

D. Marshall: More important of the two dates is vesting.

J. Duffy: If you continue to Nov 1st, they still have one day (11/02/10) for vesting. This way we could have time to contact DES.

J. Ratigan: There are complaints by DES, and Jo Ann is saying DES is not being cooperative.

J. Duffy: I never said DES was not being cooperative.

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Marshall motioned to continue extension request to November 1, 2010. Seconded by N. VanScoy.

D. Marshall: That will give you one day to meet what needs to be done. I have trouble with someone who says: "trust me we are taking care of this" when a year has gone by and it is not done. This project and Miacomet go back a long way. Continue another two weeks and on November 1st we will make a decision.

N. VanScoy: #2 on your conditions from the 9/13/10 motion, you were asked to provide the Board a timeline. What are the plans, what are you proposing to do, and when are you planning to do it? We asked for this two weeks ago.

J. Ratigan: We submitted to DES and when they are satisfied, they will tell us when we can do the work.

J. Duffy: He is talking about the Dredge and Fill permit (application) that was submitted to the Town Clerk's office last Thursday.

N. VanScoy: So they have paid all these people to come up with a solution, but I am not hearing anything other than we need the money.

D. Marshall: They submitted a plan to DES with no assurance it will be accepted by DES or if restrictions will be placed on it by DES. They can't move forward to do anything until DES gives them permission. That is the way the process works.

D. Hemeon: I want to see that plan, their intentions, whether DES approves it or not.

E. Nickerson: We have our engineer here tonight with the plan.

D. Tatem: The status of the work to get done could change with the DES meeting you just asked to get scheduled by Jo Ann.

M. Cannata: Can their engineer give us a timeline assuming DES gives approval?

E. Nickerson: We need to get DES to understand the urgency to this washout. There have been soil scientists sent out there dozens of times, and DES says there is no urgency.

Mike Gospodarek, Edward N. Herbert Assoc., Inc.: We had a meeting in April and walked the site with DES. At that time they said we needed to do something preliminary and we complied with that plan set. DES came back and said we had a certain amount of days for the final plan, however DES stopped us from working. The ravine shaped liked a “y” has a lot of erosion and requires taking out soils. Provided overview of how the soils and groundwater are working. Our proposal is to raise the ravine 14 ft., houses at a 3:1 slope, and two forbays on each end of culvert. At that time we didn’t know about the AOT. We will fill 16 ft. and come back off the 3:1 slope to basically eliminate the erosion you see here. We decided to build up the whole thing. We want to accommodate for high flows and low flows. We are not just treating our development, but Rte. 3, a condo development up the street and the Town drainage; all abutting waters.

D. Marshall: If you had to do all that work based on an approval today, not dependent on the time of year, how long would it take you?

M. Gospodarek: 3 months at least. There is a lot of fill needed. The southern ravine is the main one. Typically work is done in a low flow summer.

J. Duffy: Behind the homes on Hickory, work was done 1 – 1 ½ yrs ago. Do you know what has happened since and why that work failed?

M. Gospodarek: I wasn’t working on this site back then. I don’t know the history.

J. Duffy: But you are designing this and don’t know there were problems back then?

D. Tatem: The big slope where the erosion is really bad, we were told it was redone 2 yrs ago. She is asking if you knew about that.

J. Duffy: It would be important to know the history when designing now.

M. Gospodarek: Not necessarily, because I am filling and you won’t see the steep slope. Instead of walking out there and falling off, you will have a nice 3:1 gentle slope.

D. Tatem: Geotech borings are involved in your design. Produce some type of summary/report that they agree with your design and include the type of soil and riprap.

M. Gospodarek: Yes.

D. Tatem: For the development of phase I, the ravines would have eroded anyways. It seems the phase I area is worse. Knowing this, would you redesign phase II?

M. Gospodarek: What I am doing is for the ravine.

D. Tatem: Do you remember if phase II has flow running down?

M. Gospodarek: We had extensive underground drainage. By filling this up, we can get rid of under drains.

D. Hemeon: I agree the more you fill the ravine you will make people happier on the other street and stabilize the bank for these people. There is a developer up the street that would have lots of fill for you. 3A Development has contacted us numerous times to get rid of their fill.

R. Duhaime: This is what DES has recommended for restoring wetlands not erosion. Erosion from phase I went into the wetlands.

M. Gospodarek: Original plan for phase I said there wasn't a wetland. Now for phase II it became a wetland.

R. Duhaime: We will hold public input until November 1st.

Vote unanimously in favor.

EXTENSION REQUEST CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 1, 2010.

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARING

2. **ALL OR NOTHING, LLC (#09-12)**
254 West River Road, Map 17, Lot 36
Condo conversion.

J. Duffy: It is complete and the Town Atty. found the condo docs satisfactory.

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

Doug MacGuire, Woodland Design: The Board approved the site plan. We are coming back to condo the units: pizza - unit 1, dance - unit 2 and remainder common area. The approved site plan showed a proposed building for future use. We are not sure what that

use will be, so we show it in the condo plan and docs as “convertible land”. Any questions?

J. Duffy: The site plan has 2.29 acres and should be 2.34 acres. A amended/corrected site plan must be submitted, signed and recorded at the registry.

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

D. Marshall motioned to approve the application conditional:

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- Submit original signed condo documents for recording (documents approved by Town Attorney on 10/13/10).
- Submit check payable to Town of Hooksett for recording of condo documents (\$12.00 1st pg, \$4.00 each pg thereafter plus \$1.99 postage return). This check can be combined into one check for other fees due to the Town of Hooksett.
- Submit \$120.00 check payable to Town of Hooksett for Town Attorney review of condo documents.
- Submit corrective site plan sheet and cover sheet for acreage (site should be 2.34 acres vs. 2.294 acres) = 2 mylars, 8 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital.
- Submit \$60.00 check payable to Town of Hooksett for recording of corrective site plan set.
- 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 J. Mudge.

Vote unanimously in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING

3. MICHELLE FERMIN (#10-12)

50 Whitehall Rd., Map 25, Lot 31

Subdivision plan for one new building lot from the subject parcel.

Joe Wichert: I am the surveyor on behalf of Michelle Fermin. We were found complete a couple of weeks ago. Dove Star school was grandfathered in the MDR zone. The proposal is to take the subject 8.12 acres and subdivide to create an additional lot. We want to abandon the existing commercial building use and allow for residential use. The garage, barn, and screen house will be removed. Municipal sewer and water are

available. We asked for two waivers. Both lots comply with the ordinance as is. We are showing 5 ft contours for reference and asking for a waiver of 2' contours on the entire property. Because of municipal sewer and water, we are asking for a waiver for soil mapping. There are two existing curb cuts to have new driveways. The easterly driveway is narrowed down and defined to service a new building. The DOT permit is pending. Referred to Dan's 2nd review letter dated 9/30/10; we talked about the waivers. #10 – storm water drainage = existing barn 28 x 53 when it gets removed. There is the sewer hookup detail. #12 – we talked to Central Hooksett Water Precinct and sent an initial letter. For a building permit, CHWP needs \$1,100 for review of plans. #18 - typical plans for underground utilities; we agreed to separate the water and sewer by 10 ft Benchmarks, we are agreeable to do that. Proposed 200 ft of sight distance, curb cut by DOT requires 400 ft.

J. Duffy: Put a note on the plan that both lots are for single-family house lots at the recommendation of CEO due to frontage.

J. Wichert: The larger lot has the capability to be converted to two-family (in-law apartment).

R. Duhaime: I am familiar with the site. There is a lot of gravel area to remove. This would help with impervious if loamed or reclaimed. Even if two-family, you won't need all those parking spaces.

J. Wichert: I believe that is reasonable.

D. Tatem: MDR two-family requires no less than 200 ft of frontage.

J. Wichert: Are we allowed to have an in-law?

J. Duffy: In-law falls under accessory.

Norris Viviers, property manager for Michelle Fermin: Prior to Michelle purchasing this property, I had a meeting with Jo Ann. She didn't feel comfortable without having Peter at the meeting so I met with both of them. Article 5 section A.7 provision contemplates conversion of existing buildings "any dwelling . . . March 12th may not be converted to more than 6 dwelling units". Item C parking - the building is 3,000 sq ft+, there is an old farmhouse in front, and in the 1970's the yoga retreat and message use added a structure in the back. Functionally the buildings are obsolete. They are 1,500 sq ft per unit. At the CEO's recommendation we went forward with this subdivision and he (CEO) would grant a permit for a two-family.

J. Duffy: That is correct that he would need to discuss with Peter and that Peter agreed to permitting for a two-family. However when I received my dept. head comments for this meeting, Peter requested the single-family residential note be added to the plan.

D. Tatem: After reading #7, the building is plenty big enough. All along I have been talking to Joe for a one unit residential, not for 2. I didn't know there would be one single-family lot and one duplex lot. Water and sewer need to know about it. I don't know if the intent of the ordinance is to subdivide and then create a duplex lot.

N. Viviers: Intensity of use on existing - they did massage, showers, etc., so we are going from a commercial to residential and that is less use. We are not creating a duplex lot. Before we do that we need to apply to discontinue the commercial use. The ordinance says "any dwelling". Change of use then apply for Article 5 for the 2nd unit.

D. Marshall: Had you not subdivided the land, you can divide the building into two units. Now you are intentionally subdividing into two single lots, but now want one of those lots into two units.

N. Viviers: I don't disagree. I called Jo Ann and had Peter come to the meeting. This is what Peter recommended.

J. Duffy: That is true. I was at that meeting.

N. Viviers: I made an effort to meet with Jo Ann and she brought Peter in.

D. Marshall: So staff agrees with what he is proposing?

J. Duffy: Except now Peter is providing different comments.

N. VanScoy: It is not this approval that creates the non-conforming, it is the next phase of the two-unit.

D. Tatem: If this is something that needs clarification, come back in 2 weeks. You are waiting on the DOT permit and need to update sewer and water for a two-unit.

J. Wichert: CHWP looks at availability vs. capacity and they were OK. Bruce @ sewer knows we are converting from commercial to residential.

D. Marshall: The other lot is just single family, right?

N. Viviers: Yes.

M. Cannata: Can we resolve this with Peter along the way for a consistent theme?

N. Viviers: I would like to be in on this meeting with Peter.

D. Tatem: Joe mentioned 400 ft of sight distance. When you get the DOT permit, we want to know about their comments. Question: if no restriction on the plan, could someone come in to build a massive plan? Could you put a restriction for the impervious?

J. Wichert: The existing house pre-dates K-Mart. Any other house in that area can request a permit for an addition and they won't have restriction on their impervious.

D. Tatem: Make the gravel parking area smaller and into grass. This could buy you more square footage.

J. Wichert: Is it a variance or Board requirement for restriction on the impervious?

R. Duhaime: Through the Board.

Open public hearing

No comments.

Waiver #1 – part II section 2.02 (1) – 2' contours on entire property

Waiver #2 – appendix II checklist – site-specific soils mapping

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waivers #1 & #2 above. Seconded by J. Mudge.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

D. Marshall motioned to continue public hearing to November 1, 2010. Seconded by J. Mudge.

Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Wichert: Notify us of the meeting with Peter.

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 1, 2010.

OTHER BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS

Jeff Burd, representing Greenview Mng.: When we last discussed this project on June 15, 2010 Greenview Mng. was not yet the owner. They are now the owner for tonight's discussion. I am asking for extension from the June 15, 2010 construction agreement. We bid out with a new owner and not sure of a regular general contractor (GC). We did stay with Thibeault Construction and they did the bulk of the work. The items left to do are mostly clean up items. We had a Town staff meeting to go over the punch list items and resolve our concerns. The items are not all GC items. For the other half I need to hire someone to clean clean catch basins for phase I, sweep the streets, and do the speed limit signs. I am working on getting people out there. The punch list is the toughed thing. Once the GC demobilizes, it is hard to get them back. I would like to ask for another month or month and half before snow flies to button up. The project looks good up there. The new owner wants to do right for the project and the Town.

J. Duffy: I respect what Jeff has just said, however there was an agreement made with this Board back in June. That section needed to be done in October. Two weeks ago we met in

Dale's office and went over the items in this letter and everyone said most should be done. I don't know if anything is done yet. I sent an e-mail out the other day for the punch list to be done by Friday. Why did they agree to this 4 months ago, then at the last minute can't make it then they ask for more time. The snow will be here then they will say they can't do it now. This is our 2nd dealing with this project. My personal feeling is to compromise for a 2 week extension vs. one month. Have it extended through Oct 29th or we pull their bond and start doing the work ourselves. You have to put your foot down at some point.

R. Duhaime: Dan are there any conditions we can cross off?

D. Tatem: We made a list as of Oct 1st. They did 99% percent of that work and the rest are punch list items. I don't think an extension is a terrible idea. As Town Engineer we have asked that those catch basins be cleaned for 3 years. Jeff, once your contractor is on site it is probably 3 days of work.

J. Burd: There is the guy with the machine, and laborers; will take 5 guys.

J. Duffy: The items have been on their punch list. Shouldn't they have cleaned up their mess before they left?

J. Burd: Thibeault did A+ work while they were there, but their last day they left things. The punch list is cleaning up the subdivision and has little to do with the drainage work we were concerned with in June. There is the phase I catch basin clean up.

M. Cannata: What is the reaction time to calling them to come back to clean up their mess?

J. Burd: This week.

*D. Marshall motioned to extend the completion of punch list items remaining as of October 18, 2010 to October 30, 2010. Seconded by N. VanScoy.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

J. Duffy: Read through the Development Regulations one more time. We will send you a full Copy. We will have the public hearing on November 8th at 6:00pm.

SIDEWALKS

N. VanScoy: Alternatives are to have the pavement wider or have a grass strip.

D. Hemeon: 6 inch vertical between the sidewalk per AASHTO.

D. Tatem: I need to research with AASHTO further.

D. Hemeon: I am not opposed to sidewalks, I just need funds to maintain them.

D. Marshall: The Council recommends the Board doesn't approve sidewalks. We will come up with a subdivision that has sidewalks. We know what the public wanted from the Master Plan.

J. Duffy: I brought it up at the joint meeting with the Council that sidewalks are in the Master Plan. I had no expectation the Council would vote on it at their last meeting. It would have been nice to have one more meeting with the Council.

N. VanScoy: Nobody wanted to get rid of options, but no one would say we will up your maintenance budget.

D. Hemeon: They should have started it at the CIP budget process.

N. VanScoy: The Council said at the joint meeting that the Board should use their discretion, but then we found out that Dale is not only responsible for the State sidewalks but also other sidewalks in Town.

R. Duhaime: I was shocked at a sidewalk vote 7-1 not recommending them.

D. Marshall: We spent 2 ½-3 yrs doing the Master Plan and the public is saying they want sidewalks.

R. Duhaime: Does the Board want to respond to the Council on their vote?

***D. Marshall motioned to send a memo to the Town Council that the Hooksett Planning Board is in receipt of an e-mail from Carol Granfield, Town Administrator, dated October 14, 2010 stating that the Council passed a motion that it did not want more sidewalks in Hooksett. We appreciate the effort you put into this, and we will keep your recommendation in mind. Seconded by. M. Cannata.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

MASTER PLAN – GENERAL DISCUSSION FOR FUTURE UPDATES

J. Duffy: To update the 2004 Master Plan, we only put aside \$10,000 from last year. This items was always defeated by the Council, Budget Committee, and voters. In talking with planners from other towns their Master Plan costs: Londonderry \$50,000, Bedford \$128,500, and Derry \$36,000 (through SNHPC). SNHPC currently charges up to \$50.00-\$65.00 last year. For this year's CIP, I put \$25,000 for the next 3 yrs and am meeting with the CIP Committee next week.

D. Marshall: Two options: 1) update the whole thing at once and get a dollar amount to do it OR 2) reaffirm the existing plan with the exception of numerical values and hold a public hearing.

J. Duffy: EDC section is being updated per contract with SNHPC. When talking to David Preece about pieces, David didn't recommend it. Since our plan was approved, there are

several other chapters being recommended by the OEP. We need to start asking for more than \$10,000.

CRANTON VERNON (55 Plus LLC)

J. Duffy: The plaintiff requested a motion for reconsideration; a prelude to an appeal.

TRACTOR SUPPLY

J. Duffy: They need a permit from the State to sell off-highway recreational dealer license for items such as mini-bikes, go-carts, fishing boats, and kayaks. We would need to supply a letter to the DOT. Before I sign the letter, I wanted to make sure the Board was OK with this. These items would be parked on the sidewalk and in the fenced parking area and fenced area next to the store.

D. Marshall: They can't have any blockage of the sidewalk

N. VanScoy: I thought they could sell anything in the fenced area, but the sidewalk only mowers.

J. Duffy: They need to stripe their sidewalk for ADA compliance.

Board consensus: OK with off-highway recreational items noted above.

M. Cannata: Will they have snowmobiles and jet skis?

J. Duffy: I will have to check on that.

MRI SURVEY

R. Duhaime: Initiated Board discussion regarding MRI survey that was recently sent to Board members. The Board is awaiting Mr. Jutton's reply to John Gryval's (Chair) letter dated October 15, 2010.

ADJOURNMENT

M. Cannata motioned to adjourn at 8:50pm. Seconded by D. Marshall.

Vote unanimously in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair R. Duhaime declared the meeting adjourned at 8:50pm. The scheduled Planning Board Meetings in November are at the Hooksett Town Hall Chambers, room 105 @ 6:00pm on November 1, 2010, November 8, 2010 (Development Regulations public hearing), and November 15, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,
Planning Coordinator