

**Official
As of 12/20/10**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, November 29, 2010**

CALLED TO ORDER

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 6:05pm

ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD

Chair J. Gryval, Vice-Chair R. Duhaime, Town Administrator, Carol Granfield, D. Marshall, M. Cannata, D. Hemeon, Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy, T. Walsh, F. Kotowski, and Y. Nahikian.

Excused: J. Mudge.

Absent: B. Perry.

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 J. Mudge.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT REGULATION CHANGES

Open public hearing

J. Gryval: *Section 19 Logging/Land Clearing Requirements to take off last sentence of #1, keep #2 and drop off #3.* Any public comment?

No public comment to section 19 Logging/Land Clearing Requirements

J. Gryval: *Section 17 Demolition Regulation to remove 75 years and replace with 50 years.* Any public comment?

No public comment to section 17 Demolition Regulation

J. Gryval: *Section 6.13 Protection of Stone Walls & Preservation of Natural Resources to strike building visibility language.* Any public comment?

Don Duval, Duval Survey, Inc.: Stone walls – is this for all stone walls on the property or just the roadway walls?

J. Gryval: It was discussed at the proposed Development Regulations public hearing on November 8, 2010 that it is just roadway walls.

D. Hemeon: Jo Ann and I met with Kathie Northrup and went over Town walls. Jo Ann did we ever finalize?

J. Duffy: No. I called LGC regarding the procedure, but I need to call the Town Atty. The RSA asks for 10 registered voters. The Hooksett Charter asks for 2% of the registered voters. Kathie is going to come up with a few more questions, before I contact the Town's Atty. I am waiting to hear back from Kathie.

D. Hemeon: I am in charge of roads. I need input in that.

C. Granfield: Is that what we are talking about here?

J. Duffy: This is to protect stone walls. Kathie wants to propose Goffstown Rd. as a scenic road.

D. Marshall: We don't have scenic roads in this Town.

D. Tatem: Don, my opinion is right-of-way, but not an interior stone wall.

D. Duval: It says you have to locate all walls, and there are a lot of interior walls. I just want to make sure it is clear that it is only roadway walls.

J. Gryval: ***Section 11.20 Traffic Impact Analysis Requirements and #6 into the proposed Development Regulations.*** Any public comments?

No public comment to section 11.20 Traffic Impact Analysis Requirements.

J. Gryval: ***Section Architectural Design into section 3.05 of the proposed Development Regulations.***

No public comment to section 3.05 Architectural Design.

J. Gryval: ***Take out section 8.04 Aesthetics Committee from the proposed Development Regulations.***

No public comment to section 8.04 Aesthetics Committee.

J. Gryval: ***Staff to research and present back to the Board alternate approaches (series of suggestions) through rules of procedure for the Board to maintain some form/intent of the Aesthetic Committee with the Board making a future decision based on the suggestions.***

J. Duffy: I have information on what other towns are doing for aesthetics. Would you like me to review that now?

J. Gryval: It would be a good idea to have a night just on aesthetics.

Discussion on other section of Development Regulations

D. Duval: The Town requires stone bounds at all corners. Has the Town considered using iron pins at rear borders? The iron pins are a lot easier to carry (½ dozen pins at a time); bounds get heavy. As a surveyor, I use #5 bar 3 ft with a plastic cap that has my name and license # on it. Would the Board consider using those for rear corners?

D. Tatem: Some towns use iron pins, drill holes, and railroad spikes for paved areas. Hooksett has always required bounds. Towns differ on this item. People have asked for waivers from bounds to use iron pins and the Board has said no.

D. Duval: Bounds are costly and time consuming. Iron pins work just as well. A 3 ft pin you can pick up easily with metal detector; #5 = 5/8th.

J. Gryval: We can't change it in our regulations now, because we would need another public hearing.

D. Duval: 4 ft bounds are ridiculous because of concrete to ledge or whatever we hit. You can't change it to a 3 ft bound?

N. VanScoy: This is the 2nd public hearing on regulations, so we can't make changes.

D. Marshall: We do want to hear from you. Perhaps in 4 months from now we can make minor revisions to the regulations.

D. Duval: Is the Town going to start having the Town engineer or CEO witness all test pits? I saw this under fees for engineers; section 9.05 or 9.06.

D. Tatem: That hasn't changed. The CEO does that.

D. Duval: Two test pits per lot, is that new and why?

D. Tatem: Yes new. What we found, I am a licensed septic designer as well, is that a lot of other towns require two test pits 4 ft apart. For a 4,000 sq ft area have an area good for the original septic installation and another area for possible replacement. The State only requires one test pit; Durham requires five.

J. Gryval: What is the problem doing a 2nd test pit?

D. Duval: We should just satisfy the State test pit; 60x60 is a 4k area. For the actual design you can use same one or anywhere else on the lot.

D. Marshall: Technically it is the 1st hearing on some of these items that were added or changed.

***D. Marshall motioned to close the public hearing for the proposed Development Regulations. Seconded by C. Granfield.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

C. Granfield: Once the Development Regulations are in the final version, it will be codified.

J. Duffy: Only the Planning Board votes on the Development Regulations and therefore they will be in affect as soon as you vote.

Vote unanimously in favor.

***D. Marshall motioned to adopt the proposed Development Regulations. Seconded by C. Granfield.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Enter non-public session - RSA 91A:3 II (e) at 6:30pm

R. Duhaime motioned to enter non-public session per RSA 91A:3 II (e). Seconded by D. Hemeon.

Roll call

**N. VanScoy – yes
M. Cannata – yes
Y. Nahikian – yes
J. Gryval – yes
R. Duhaime – yes
D. Marshall – yes
D. Hemeon – yes
F. Kotowski – yes
Tom Walsh - yes**

Exit non-public session - RSA 91A:3 II (e) at 6:40pm

R. Duhaime motioned to exit non-public session per RSA 91A:3 II (e). Seconded by D. Hemeon.

Roll call

**N. VanScoy – yes
M. Cannata – yes
Y. Nahikian – yes
J. Gryval – yes
R. Duhaime – yes
D. Marshall – yes
D. Hemeon – yes
F. Kotowski – yes**

Tom Walsh - yes

M. Cannata: With AutoZone not adding any more water there, although they may come in that flood condition may still happen.

J. Gryval: Unless we are assured it will add to the flood problem, we can't stop a project.

D. Marshall: They filled the swamp in 1970s for K-Mart. Merchants claims the State plans are under design. We haven't seen anything going across Merchants for a 100 yr flood.

C. Granfield: We are meeting with the State.

Conflict of Interest

T. Walsh: I did my convention on the subject of conflict of interest. I am the Director of the Deerhead Sportsmen Club. We have been approached behind us for land. Deerhead is asking for parking. How much can I get involved in this? I gain nothing financially. Should I just pass off this item to another member?

J. Gryval: I don't see a problem unless you were to vote on it. You could abstain from voting. Anything you have on this case, we would like to know about it.

D. Hemeon: No monetary gain, don't need to step down.

C. Granfield: Some individuals just step down even if no monetary gain, while others say "I am a Director of "x" and let me know if I should stay on". No monetary gain is the key thing, but others don't even want to be part of the discussion and step down.

J. Gryval: Even if the Board voted that you should step down, you can still stay on.

Head's Pond

D. Hemeon: Jo Ann, MS&G, do they go under old rules?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. Tatem: Driveway permit application you will be following current regulations at that time. Regulations now say until subdivision road accepted, the Town will not maintain it. When Head's Pond gets built in 5 yrs, will the Town maintain it? For maintenance of roads, do they follow under new regulations?

J. Duffy: When Bart was here part of the Head's Pond requirement was to have a Development Agreement. Now that agreement wouldn't be as inclusive. David Campbell would have our legal review it. I believe Bart would still review because he had reviewed this project thus far. David would propose vesting language (i.e. donation of school land to the Town).

F. Kotowski motioned to send a letter to the SAU/School Board requesting them to clarify their position on negotiations with MS&G on the land swap/transfer for school land. Seconded by C. Granfield.

Vote unanimously in favor.

C. Granfield motioned to adjourn at 6:55pm. Seconded by N. VanScoy.

Vote unanimously in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 6:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,
Planning Coordinator