

**Official
As of 06/20/11**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, June 6, 2011**

CALLED TO ORDER

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD

Chair J. Gryval, Town Administrator, C. Granfield, D. Marshall, M. Cannata, J. Mudge (arrived 6:05pm), F. Kotowski, Town Council Rep. William Sirak, D. Urquhart, and Y. Nahikian (arrived 6:10pm).

Excused: Vice-Chair Robert Duhaime, B. Perry, and Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy (Councilor Sirak attending in place of Councilor VanScoy).

Absent: T. Walsh.

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 05/16/11 (public & non-public)

D. Marshall motioned to approve the public minutes of 05/16/11. Seconded by M. Cannata.

Vote 6 in favor. Town Administrator, C. Granfield and Town Council Rep. W. Sirak abstain. Motion carried.

D. Marshall motioned to approve the non-public minutes of 05/16/11. Seconded by M. Cannata.

Vote 6 in favor. Town Administrator, C. Granfield and Town Council Rep. W. Sirak abstain. Motion carried.

DISCUSSIONS

1. LEED CERTIFICATION – 9+ MULTI-FAMILY UNITS

The Jordan Institute presenters/ reps.: Dick Henry, Executive Director, Paul Leveille, High-Performance Buildings Program Manager, and Heather Nolen, Project Manager/ BPI.

P. Leveille: Presented slide show on LEED as it pertains to the Town of Hooksett regulations for 9+ multi-family units. In NH Hooksett is the first to require LEED for residential and Epping is the first for commercial.

W. Sirak: Cost ramifications?

P. Leveille: For multi-family to register and certify \$450.00 + 3 ½ cents per sq ft. There are also rebates and the payback is lower utility bills

D. Henry: As the owner of the project it will be easier to rent to a tenant because the energy costs are lower; 20-30 % reduction in energy. You also get away from energy volatility.

P. Leveille: Some places had a 60% energy cost reduction. It may cost 3% more to build LEED “silver”.

M. Cannata: New construction primarily and the average homeowner, do you actively let the contractor and builder know what LEED is about?

P. Leveille: We are not daily advocating LEED. There is a NH Green Building Council. They are a new chapter in NH to advocate to builders.

M. Cannata: Can you define gut rehab and team?

P. Leveille: Gut rehab is taking the building down to the studs and rebuilding to improve insulation and air ceiling. The team is designers, architect, mechanical/civil/structural engineers, and the general contractor. If the designer already knows the program, he may or may not want a LEED consultant.

F. Kotowski: You mentioned material costs of 3%; what cost from your LEED standard to platinum?

P. Leveille: Some projects that are certified LEED platinum are at the same cost because they were integrated in the design process. For other new projects the cost could be 10-20% more for platinum.

F. Kotowski: Is there an incentive from one LEED level to another?

P. Leveille: There isn't any to the general public.

Y. Nahikian: The building code and LEED certification, how close are they?

P. Leveille: The biggest difference is the energy category with LEED having at minimum the energy star and be at least 15 % better than the building code.

Y. Nahikian: ComCheck, how far higher to meet LEED?

P. Leveille: ComCheck is a software tool for commercial buildings and ResCheck is for residential.

M. Cannata: The “code”, what are you referring to?

P. Leveille: IECC 2009 current State energy code.

J. Mudge: What is the LEED impact on resale?

D. Henry: We are in the middle of a market transformation. Neither appraisers nor banks have gotten enough comps to be comfortable. When folks heating with oil get to \$4.00 per gallon, they will be looking for a great deal of efficiencies. Example is the energy shortages in the 1970’s. The price of old Victorian homes plummeted, because the price for energy was too high. The market at this time does not recognize the LEED value, but that will change in the future.

2. BERRY HILL – VINCENT IACOZZI (#04-22)

Cherry Lane, Map 25, Lot 26

Request to separate duplex units 106 & 107 into single units to include the 15 ft extension of Cherry Lane to accommodate the relocation of the driveway for unit 106.

Vincent Iacozzi, Developer: I am here tonight for an amended site plan. It requires no Planning Board approval, because this project was previously approved for a mix of single and duplex units. This was administratively processed through the Town Planner. I am just here out of courtesy. I am taking a duplex unit and separating into two single units. The setbacks still conform. The total previously approved of 107 units does not change. I am required submit an amended as-built and updated condo documents for recording.

J. Duffy: Add a signature block on the plan for recording.

EXTENSION REQUEST

3. RAVINIA COLD STORAGE (#07-04)

East Point Dr., Map 49, Lot 4

Site Plan to construct a 340,000 sq ft freezer facility.

Request to extend:

- One year extension of the approval (approved 6/18/07 with an expiration of 6/18/10 and then on 6/28/10 the Planning Board granted another year to expire 6/18/11)
- One year extension to the vesting rights for active and substantial development

J. Duffy:

> Approval = expiration was June 18, 2011; requesting another 1 yr. extension to June 18, 2012

> Active and substantial development = was 36 months (June 18, 2010) now RSA allows 6 yrs (June 18, 2013)

***F. Kotowski motioned to grant June 18, 2012 approval expiration AND June 18, 2013 active and substantial development expiration. Seconded by M. Cannata.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

- 4. HEFFRON ASPHALT CORP. (#11-02)**
Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 57 & 58
Lot line adjustment.

J. Duffy: An abutter on Cate Rd. recently purchased property and neither he nor the prior owner were notified of the hearing. Our Assessing tax maps don't identify the wide strip as a roadway. The new owner is saying our tax map is incorrect.

D. Marshall: Is the new abutter present tonight? If the abutter appears at the meeting, then he has been actively notified.

J. Duffy: I explained that to Mr. Sorel (new abutter), but he doesn't feel he was properly notified and now hasn't had the time to prepare for this meeting. At the last Board meeting Rob Duhaime informed us he attended the ZBA meeting and that the old gravel pit was not reclaimed. Peter Rowell, CEO, went out to the site and felt the site was left incomplete and the excavation permit expired. He was going to follow-up with a notice of violation. Do you want to have a joint meeting with the ZBA so the applicant can present to both Boards at once?

J. Gryval: Yes, we should meet with the ZBA jointly.

Mike Sorel: I have concerns with this application and would like to be given the opportunity to have answers to those questions. Should I address my concerns to the Planning Board via correspondence or to the Community Development Dept. Town Planner?

J. Gryval: No public hearing tonight. Address your concerns to the Town Planner and she will put in her comments to the Board.

Y. Nahikian: Explain this application to me?

J. Gryval: It is just a lot line adjustment application at this time. We don't know what the applicant will pursue for a project after that. There is also reclamation of the gravel site.

D. Marshall: It is a lot line adjustment application and under our regulations the applicant has a right to the lot line. However the new owner/developer will inherit the problem of the reclamation.

J. Gryval: We can grant a lot line adjustment at a public hearing that has been properly noticed.

*D. Marshall motioned to continue the public hearing to June 20, 2011 as a joint meeting with the ZBA. Seconded by C. Granfield.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED TO JUNE 20, 2011 AS A JOINT MEETING WITH THE ZBA.

PUBLIC HEARING

5. PSNH (#10-17)

Off Legends Drive, Map 25, Lot 80

Site plan for the proposed PSNH Transmission Construction, Test and Maintenance

(CT & M) Facility. This will compose of the construction of a one-story office, garage, and warehouse building. It will provide PSNH with 17,700 sq ft of office, 39,400 sq ft of warehouse, and 10,250 sq ft of mezzanine as presently composed.

Nick Golon, TF Moran, Laura Games, PSNH (applicant), Carol Burke, PSNH (CT & M Facility Manager), David Plante, PSNH (Project Manager for another location), and David Udelsman, Architect.

N. Golon: The project team came before the Planning Board previously for the waiver of roadway impact fees in lieu of extending roadway . The Board made a positive recommendation to the Town Council who in turn waived it. We met with you last month on the site plan submittal and reviews with Stantec.

C. Burke: I am the manager of the transmission construction testing. We had quite a few facilities across NH (to include Bow NH Merrimack Station) and wanted to combine all offices into one facility. We will still have our warehouse at 1250 Hooksett Rd. We needed a site central from our location to Keene, Portsmouth, Littleton/Berlin and Nashua and Hooksett met this requirement.

N. Golon: This lot is adjacent to the safety complex. It is an existing sand and gravel lot with good soils. For the most part it is a wide open area. There will be a 17,700 sq ft office, 39,400 sq ft warehouse, and 10,250 sq ft mezzanine. The layout includes a cul-de-sac, entrance, line garage, office space, and loading doc. The building will be located centrally on the property. There will be 104-105 parking spaces in a porous parking lot. The area behind the building will be the pole storage area. There will be a sewer easement (transmission north-to-south), and an easement at the end of the cul-de-sac for emergency vehicles and

DPW vehicles. PSNH's legal and the Town's legal will review prior to plan signature. There will also be an easement to maintain the drain line. There will be no impact to the safety complex or its operations. For the parking lot, the site is in the groundwater protection district. For peak flows the site is very well drained. There are two infiltration basins. We mitigated the peak run off and reinforced the groundwater requirements. For the pole storage area, at the TRC meeting there was some environmental concern as to the treatment on the poles. It is a wood preservative used for poles that line all of our streets. For the operation and maintenance plan of the pole storage area, we discussed this on the phone with Stantec. We will have a long-term testing program on a yearly basis to meet the minimum criteria. If the outcome is higher than acceptable, they will replace the area. Landscaping will include shade, flowering, and buffering trees. There is a nice grade differential between the safety center and our project. For traffic we have a waiver request for peak am hrs. We are below the threshold for a full traffic study. Glencrest 2000 traffic study - we looked at volumes to actual trip counts now. For the generation rate we are considerably below. There will be B or better service. For accessibility through the site, the Police & Fire Depts. means of access from the safety center will be a fire lane at the westerly corner of the property with a knock box in an emergency basis if Police & Fire cannot access Legends Dr.

Y. Nahikian: Where is the main road?

N. Golon: This site is an extension of Legends Dr.

Y. Nahikian: You have no plantings in the back pole storage area?

N. Golon: The westerly grade you won't see. Easterly there is an earthen berm (natural screen). North is an existing 2-story loading dock. More screening becomes a safety concern for PSNH. There will be a close captioned system for security monitoring and PSNH does not want this screened out.

J. Mudge: How often will you be transporting poles?

C. Burke: We will have a lot of stock but not a high turnover. Transportation will be for projects or emergencies.

M. Cannata: What will you be doing there? I heard you are phasing out a number of rented/leased areas.

C. Burke: We have been at the Bow facility for over 40 yrs. 10 yrs ago the utilities in NH industry split assets. We split off from the 1250 Hooksett Rd site. We want to move to Legends Dr. from the multiple locations to include Bow and Sutton circle in Hooksett.

M. Cannata: For runoff in the pole storage area you stated testing completed yearly to see if in compliance. Who will do it?

N. Golon: Probably a firm hired to do the study will complete testing and submit results on an annual basis.

F. Kotowski: Will you have transformers on the site?

C. Burke: Yes, small ones.

F. Kotowski: Will the property be fenced?

C. Burke: Yes with bob wire.

F. Kotowski: I am a retired PSNH employee and this applicant has approached this application with a degree of care for the expansion. I am pleased you are bringing this tax base to Hooksett. We need the money and I welcome you.

D. Urquhart: The emergency road maintenance (fire lane), who will maintain it?

N. Urquhart: PSNH will maintain it. It is not on the plan now, but we will update it that we have Police and Fire approval.

C. Burke: We will also use this fire lane for an emergency exit for people in our building, so it will be cleared.

Y. Nahikian: I highly recommend they have landscaping in the pole storage area as if it was a parking lot.

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

Waiver #1 11.13 Exfiltration Rates

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

Waiver #2 11.13(2)(JJ) Pond Slope

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

Waiver #3 11.20 (1)(A)(1) Full Traffic Impact Analysis

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #3. Seconded by C. Granfield.

M. Cannata: Have you looked at traffic flow outside the future projection years?

N. Golon: Relative to the values recorded in 2009 and the order of magnitude including our volumes, we are 15-20% less. 10 yrs down the line "future", we haven't done an evaluation in that corridor.

M. Cannata: At what point in time will the volume trigger further traffic analysis?

D. Tatem: The traffic on Rte 3 is the main component and this site's traffic is not enough of an impact to do an analysis now or in the future.

J. Mudge: The dirt road down the right side of this site's parking lot, will there be any access to Petersbrook?

N. Golon: No proposal for access.

D. Urquhart: There is a skateboard lane by the safety center to be cautious of when driving in that area.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Waiver #4 11.03 Monuments

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #4. Seconded by J. Mudge.

J. Gryval: There is an error on the eastern boundary line?

N. Golon: We identified the monuments on the site and it is for future consideration to have the surveyor correct.

D. Tatem: The surveyor has all the existing boundaries off by 4 ft. What they have done is adequate for what they are proposing. The Town can contact the surveyor and have him correct the boundaries. This applicant can't legally move the boundaries.

J. Duffy: The surveyor has been contacted twice and we will pursue further.

D. Urquhart: The boundaries should be where the boundaries should be.

F. Kotowski: What would we do if the original surveyor was not available or refused to move the boundaries? Can we move them ourselves?

N. Golon: The boundaries shown on the plan are appropriate and recorded at the registry. The only reason we know they are wrong physically is because they were installed incorrectly. The boundaries don't change, it is that the physical monuments were not placed in the right area.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Waiver #5 11.13 (2)(G) Surcharge

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #5. Seconded by J. Mudge.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Waiver #6 11.13 (2)(T) Pipe Velocity

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #6. Seconded by M. Cannata.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Waiver #7 16.05 (4) Parking Lot Lighting

M. Cannata motioned to grant waiver #7. Seconded by C. Granfield.

M. Cannata: For lighting, are the Police OK with this site for security?

N. Golon: Illumination was approved by PSNH for the storage area. The safety complex has received the plans and have no comments.

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Tatem: From our June 3, 2011 site plan review letter, we should discuss 6 comments tonight for a conditional approval.

#20 cul-de-sac easement – D. Tatem: Cul-de-sac at entrance of project where the Town land becomes private, the DPW will have to go around the cul-de-sac for plowing. In that easement they will leave the plow down, but DPW is not responsible for plowing. Also Town should not be responsible for damages to the private roadway/cul-de-sac.

D. Urquhart: Cul-de-sac is $\frac{3}{4}$ PSNH and 220 ft $\frac{1}{4}$ DPW. In your design we just want pavement. If vertical curbing on outside, we are not responsible for damages from dropping the plow and wing. I am all set with the easement if it states this.

N. Golon: Driveways are PSNH's responsible for maintenance. This has been reviewed thoroughly.

Board consensus: #20 – OK as commented.

#54 adding landscaping on northern perimeter of pave storage area - D. Tatem: Add landscaping on the back line where Petersbrook Road is located; fir tree screening on that one property line.

N. Golon: It is a safety issue to add landscaping. There is valuable equipment with a chain-link fence (top bob wire) and a surveillance system. PSNH takes safety seriously and doesn't feel comfortable adding landscaping in this area.

Y. Nahikian: 4 ft high landscaping you can still see over.

N. Golon: There is an 8 ft grade change.

Y. Nahikian: If there is a future subdivision, you don't want to drive past a huge paved area.

Board consensus: #54 – no additional landscaping required.

#64 Public roadway cross-section transition to private roadway cross-section –

D. Tatem: 200 ft of the Town road is to be extended. – typical cross-section 18” sand, 18” gravel, 4” crushed stone, and 4” pavement.

J. Duffy: CEO & Fire considered PSNH a driveway vs. roadway.

D. Tatem: It is a roadway. The applicant received a waiver of roadway impact fees in lieu of the road extension.

D. Marshall: It should be built to Town standards, because trucks will be transporting poles, transformers & heavy loads. The trucks will break up the roadway really quick.

D. Tatem: It will be a Town road that the Town will fix in the future.

D. Urquhart: How many trucks will be going in and out?

C. Burke: Daily trucks, but not a significant amount.

N. Golon: There will be truck traffic and standard cars for the office. Pole storage is for intermittent use for emergency use only.

D. Urquhart: The part that is already paved, what is the gravel underneath?

N. Golon: In the geotechnical report we reviewed the cross-section and deemed it appropriate for this facility. It doesn't add in your DPW trucks accessing the roadway. If you want to beef up the gravel, it is an added cost to the Town.

D. Urquhart: 200 ft of roadway extension and utilities outside of that. It should hold up with the amount of traffic.

D. Marshall: They need a road to get to this facility. Why is the Town building it?

N. Golon: If we can build the road efficiently, then some money goes back to the Town.

D. Marshall: For every development in Town, these are things the developer must do to open for business. If they need a Town road to get to their entrance, then it is built to Town road standards and we take impact fees for this.

J. Duffy: When the safety center was built the road was supposed to be built. However when they built the safety center, they only built a portion of the roadway. Therefore the Town is responsible to build the rest of the road that they were supposed to do in the first place. At first the design was a turnaround, but then PSNH came up with a roundabout design. Mr. Corriveau donated the land for the safety center, and PSNH is paying for the Town to build the roadway in lieu of roadway impact fees. Fire & Building felt it is a driveway and not a roadway that would ever go through to the opposite side. If it is a road, they would have to give it a different address via E911. 20 yrs from now I can't say if it would become a road.

N. Golon: I confirmed with Peter Rowell that we do have frontage on a Town road.

D. Marshall: Then stop calling it a driveway. It is a class V road with standards outlined by DPW.

N. Golon: Road A to extend so PSNH has legal frontage. If the Town wants it built to Town road standards, then that is what we will do.

D. Tatem: 18" gravel and 6" crushed stone because sand is already there.

J. Duffy: If this is a road vs. driveway, then I would take Legends Dr to the 3 way intersection (Golf Course, Safety Center, and PSNH). Then I would rename the street in front of the safety center if extended through MS & G property in the future.

Waiver #8 roadway cross-section

D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #8. Seconded by J. Mudge.

Vote unanimously in favor.

#88 100' + need break or off-set

#89 roof materials & pitch, locations of heating & cooling equipment, generators, etc., and window dimensions

#90 benches, bike racks, etc. at site

David Udelsman, Architect: There are 4 major elements: garage for vehicle storage, bay warehouse, office, and indoor loading. This is an outdoor vehicle area with covered parking. Exterior elevations are two dimensional. The large warehouse is the taller portion of the structure up to 28 ft. The front is wrapped with the lower 14 ft extended structure moving in and out as you go past it. The loading area is another elevation. The materials for the warehouse are a composite metal siding, front elevations are faced with brick veneer, smooth metal panel with flared top edge "Cornish", and a flat roof membrane with roof drains.

M. Cannata: LEED group presentation tonight, does this in any way meet LEED?

D. Udelsman: For installation and recycled materials, there are lots of opportunities for LEED. We are not there just yet, because we are only looking at the exterior of building at this time. PSNH used 4 1/2" of insulation on their 3" thick roof. We are using internal motion "occupancy sensor" lighting that will save electricity. We will have a heat pump type system for multi-use.

M. Cannata: HVAC roof system design?

D. Udelsman: I have not designed that yet. If rooftop units, if visible from Legends Dr., we will screen appropriately.

F. Kotowski: I would like to hear comments from our architect on the Planning Board.

Y. Nahikian: This design complies with our regulations and is a good design. Either screen the roof HVAC or put it in back.

D. Tatem: Also, the regulations encourage benches, bike racks, etc. for the site.

Board consensus: No benches, bike racks, etc. required.

WAIVERS #1-8 ABOVE PER RSA 674:44 (III) (E) (1)/(2).

D. Marshall motioned to approve the application conditional:

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to the Community Development Dept.
- 2 mylars, 8 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction (see letter dated 06/03/11 from Stantec). Applicant submits two (2) final plan sets directly to Stantec for their review and final letter to the Community Development Dept. recommending plans be signed and recorded
- All outstanding Federal, State, and local permits are obtained and submitted to the Town and Stantec
- Letter from Central Hooksett Water Precinct stating they have capacity and approve this project
- Letter from Hooksett Sewer Commission stating they have capacity and approve this project
- 1) Sewer Easement, 2) Emergency Access Easement AND 3) Cul-de-Sac DPW Easement to be submitted and reviewed and approved by Town Attorney
- 3 signed easements above to be submitted to Community Development Dept. for recording with plan set
- All waivers noted on plan cover sheet
- Applicant agrees to attend a required pre-construction meeting after (a) all sureties are submitted and approved, (b) site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place and the Inspection Funding Agreement is signed and submitted, (c) the plans are signed and recorded, and (d) signed as-builts are provided to the Town and Stantec
- Applicant agrees to site plan compliance monitoring
- Note on plan "Approval of this plan shall expire four (4) years from the date of the Planning Board approval, as recorded in the Planning Board Minutes, unless the right to develop has vested."
- Roadway impact fees waived in lieu of using funds to extend roadway A to the property line shared by the Town and PSNH. Should the roadway impact fee exceed the cost of extending the road, the remaining fee would be provided to the Town for deposit into the impact fee escrow fund. Should the cost of extending roadway A exceed the roadway impact fee, the remainder of the cost shall be assumed by the applicant and/or seller of the land at no cost to the Town.

- Roadway A classification to be determined by Town Planner, CEO and Deputy Fire Chief as either a roadway or driveway and named/numbered appropriately
- Applicant agrees to remit \$30,618 in public safety impact fees 10 days prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy subject to NHRSA 674:39

Note: The above conditions in no way reflects all requirements to be met by the applicant per the Town of Hooksett Zoning Ordinances, Development Regulations, Minutes of Boards/Committees/Council, Stantec, and Merrimack County Registry of Deeds.

*Seconded by J. Mudge.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

OTHER BUSINESS

NHDOT Public Information Meeting Rte 3/28 Benton Rd culvert & roadway improvements

J. Duffy: NHDOT holding a public info. meeting @ 7 pm on June 8th.

Joint Land Use Meeting to Discuss MRI Survey

J. Gryval: I would like to have a joint meeting between the Planning Board, Conservation Commission, & ZBA for the following:

- Discussion on the MRI Survey Questions
- Comments/opinions from this discussion will then be formulated into one report and submitted to the Town Council

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

ADJOURNMENT

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 8:25pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,
Planning Coordinator