

**Official
As of 09/12/11**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, August 15, 2011**

CALLED TO ORDER

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

ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD

Chair John Gryval, Vice-Chair Dick Marshall, Martin Cannata, Town Administration Rep. Leo Lessard (DPW Director), Tom Walsh, Yervant Nahikian (arrived 6:05pm), and Town Council Rep. Nancy VanScoy (arrived 6:25pm).

Excused: Town Administrator, Brendan Perry, Frank Kotowski, and Jack Mudge.

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

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

J. Gryval: Alternate T. Walsh will be voting tonight in place of Frank Kotowski AND Y. Nahikian will be voting tonight in place of Jack Mudge.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 08/01/11

M. Cannata motioned to approve the minutes of 08/01/11. Seconded by L. Lessard. Vote 4 in favor. D. Marshall abstains.

COMPLETENESS

- 1. CRANTON VERNON, LLC (#11-03)
Thames Rd. & Avon Rd., Map 14, Lot 14-3
Minor 3-lot residential subdivision plan.**

D. Marshall motioned to find the application complete. Seconded by M. Cannata. Vote unanimously in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULED FOR SEPTEMBER 12, 2011

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING

- 2. MAUREEN HEMEON (#11-07)
29 & 31 Pinnacle St., Map 7, Lots 17-1 & Lot 17-2
Lot line adjustment.**

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

J. Gryval: We will wait to have the public hearing tonight pending applicant's presenter showing up.

PUBLIC HEARING

3. L&R REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT, LLC (#11-04) 1125 Hooksett Rd., Map 41, Lot 12

- Site plan for the proposal to demolish the existing structure on site and construct a 2,500 sq ft 4-bay car wash (2 self-service and 2 automatic bays) with associated parking and driveway.
- Conditional Use Permit

J. Gryval: Yervant Nahikian arrived at 6:05pm and will vote in place of Jack Mudge.

Wayne Morril, Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc.: I am here tonight with Tony Crawford of Circle T Carwash. This site was developed in the 1990s as the Ice Cream Depot. There is an existing paved parking lot, water & sewer, and drainage. There is a swale to the northern part of the paved surface. We propose a 2,500 sq ft car wash (2 auto-bays and 2 self-service bays). We will be utilizing the existing access point on Rte 3. There will be a one-way traffic pattern to the back of the site. There will be one employee bay and a screened dumpster on the north side. There is appropriate fire access. There are 3 lanes at the building itself. There is a 15 ft wide concrete apron. There will be three tanks outback to recycle the carwash water for cleaning the undercarriage of cars. The existing drainage is southerly. We are replacing drainage basin(s). We went to the Conservation Commission for the CUP on the 723 sq ft of wetland impact and the Commission found it acceptable. There is a wetland to the rear to a riprap swale to existing pavement. We want to relocate from the wetland to the detention pond to the catch basin in goes in now. It is a closed drainage system. The grade is down site; two concrete pads tip towards the building. Chemicals from washing the cars goes back into the system vs. road. There are three leaching catch basins on the access road. There is stockpile to the back of the lot, clearing, and in-let protection. We will utilize the existing utilities (sewer & water, underground electric, kiosk building in back). We will have 15 ft. high LED shoebox style lighting fixtures with 12 ft. high wall mounted. For landscaping we will keep to the existing edge of pavement, the trees are by code to include maple and cherry trees. Averages will be planted in two boxes in the front of the bays. Sight distance – traffic analysis by VAI = 360 ft. of safe sight at all times. We added a driveway profile to plan for State permit. We have applied to DOT, but have not yet received our permit. Our signage meets the monument sign PZ criteria. The building will have vinyl siding (yellow) with brick accent on bottom and a gray roof. The sign has a black base with blue Circle T Carwash.

Waiver #1 (3.08) = Development Regulations section 3.08 - Wetlands

J. Duffy: The applicant submitted this waiver, however this needs to be taken up with the discussion on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Waiver #2 (10-A H34C) = Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A Performance Zone, H - Landscape Performance Standards, 3 - minimum planting requirements, 4 – interior landscape areas, C – front landscape area planting requirements

J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

D. Tatem: Could the applicant show the Board where they don't meet requirements?

W. Morrill: We are talking about the buffer along the southerly edge. This is the only portion of the lot we are asking for the waiver.

J. Duffy: This waiver is for the 15 ft landscape area in the front and the property abutting to the south. We didn't want him pushing the building back any further, because then it would be closer to the Mammoth Rd. abutters.

J. Gryval: Waiver #4 is for the 15 ft frontage. They are supposed to provide a landscape plan.

J. Duffy: There is a landscape plan within the plan set.

J. Gryval: Waivers of a certain article are different than the waivers they are actually requesting.

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

Waiver #3 (15.01.5 AND 10-A G2G) – Development Regulations section 15 - Parking Standards, 15.01 - Parking, 5 - office, retail establishments and service businesses AND Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A Performance Zone, G – Access Management, Circulation and Parking Performance Standards, 2 – Performance standards for off-street parking accommodations, G – off-street parking density requirements for the US Rte 3 corridor performance zone district

J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #3. Seconded by T. Walsh.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Waiver #4 (10-A H3.2) Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A Performance Zone, H – Landscape Performance Standards, 3 – minimum planting requirements, 2 – front landscape area

J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

Y. Nahikian: How many feet is it?

D. Marshall: 15 ft.

W. Morrill: The regulations talks about a 15 ft. tree street strip and another 15ft of landscaping. We meet the tree street strip but don't meet the 15 ft landscaping.

Y. Nahikian: So you don't meet the landscaping because you aren't further back toward the neighbor.

W. Morrill: We are at the existing pavement line. If we pushed back further we would push the whole development toward the residential abutters in the rear and they may be sensitive to commercial use so close. Existing pavement, southerly and northerly, don't go any further. We adjusted our site for the fire trucks to go around the building.

Y. Nahikian: Can you compromise for landscaping in front of the building?

W. Morrill: We meet the total amount of site landscaping, because we moved some of the front to other sections on the site.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #4. Seconded by L. Lessard.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Nancy VanScoy arrived at 6:25pm and is present to vote.

Waiver #5 (10-A H3.3) Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A Performance Zone, H – Landscape Performance Standards, 3 – minimum planting requirements, 3 – perimeter landscape areas

J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

D. Marshall: The abutter (Dorothy Close) agreed to it.

J. Gryval: She may not always be the abutter.

W. Morrill: There is pavement there now. The future hope of the abutter is to have a commercial business on her lot. We are only requesting the waiver for this southerly boundary.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #5. Seconded by L. Lessard.
Vote 3 in favor (T. Walsh, D. Marshall, L. Lessard), 4 opposed (Y. Nahikian, N. VanScoy, M. Cannata, J. Gryval). MOTION NOT CARRIED.*

Waiver #6 (11.13.2.H) Development Regulations section 11.13 – Drainage Design Criteria, 2 – drainage design requirements, H – minimum coverage for closed drainage systems

J. Gryval: The applicant has **WITHDRAWN** this waiver.

Waiver #7 (11.13.2.T) Development Regulations section 11.13 – Drainage Design Criteria, 2 – drainage design requirements, T – minimum flow velocity in a pipe or culvert during a 2-year storm event is 2 fps

J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

D. Tatem: I am OK with this waiver.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #7. Seconded by M. Cannata.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Waiver #8 (14.01.3) Development Regulations section 14 – Erosion Prevention Plan (EPP), 14.01 – overview, 3 – existing conditions site plan

J. Gryval: Received and read the waiver into the record.

D. Tatem: I am ok with this waiver.

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #8. Seconded by T. Walsh.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

D. Marshall: We didn't approve waiver #5. What does the developer do now?

W. Morrill: The Board approved waiver #2, but denied waiver #5 for the same condition.

J. Duffy: There were two separate waivers (#2 & #5), because there are two different parts of the regulations.

J. Gryval: The Board approved the waiver for the landscaping on the southerly side.

Y. Nahikian: We don't have room for landscaping on the street side, because they want to keep their building away from the residential abutters (Mammoth Rd). The last waiver was for the immediate abutter to the southern right to come all the way over to her property.

J. Duffy: The abutters behind are on Mammoth Rd. The abutter to the south is also a residential home, however the property zoning is Performance Zone (PZ). Residential is not allowed in the PZ, but commercial is allowed. It won't stay residential forever.

J. Gryval: Waiver #2 doesn't state about the south abutter.

W. Morrill: The Board granted relief of the 20 ft., but did not grant the 10 ft. We have a favorable letter from the southerly abutter (Dorothy Close).

J. Duffy: If you grant waiver #5, you can specify it is only for the southerly side.

D. Tatem: When we did review of the landscaping and existing pavement, we found that some of the abutting driveways are on this project's property line. The 10 ft. is the buffer around the property area. Waiver #5 is only for the south side. They already have the 15 ft. buffer, what they don't have is the 10 ft.

Y. Nahikian: Is the grading the same as the southerly neighbor; 366 to 355?

D. Tatem: The subject parcel is slightly steeper. The properties start together at Rte 3. with a joint use agreement. This will promote commercial use in the future.

J. Gryval: But our ordinance now says use-to-use not zone-to-zone.

Waiver # 5 (10-A H3.3) Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A Performance Zone, H – Landscape Performance Standards, 3 – minimum planting requirements, 3 – perimeter landscape areas

*D. Marshall motioned to **reconsider** the denied motion for waiver #5 conditional it is limited to the south border. Seconded by T. Walsh.*

Vote unanimously in favor.

*D. Marshall motioned to **grant** waiver #5 conditional it is limited to the south border. Seconded by T. Walsh.*

Y. Nahikian: Why not move back the building?

T. Walsh: The south abutter is OK with it.

N. VanScoy: Is there other landscaping on the proposed plan? While it is in the PZ, we have strong regulations on how the landscape looks. If we waive one requirement, a tree or two should be placed in other areas on the site to keep the look.

W. Morrill: For the landscape plan and requirements, we have taken all the landscape and moved in other areas around the property to meet the total requirement.

N. VanScoy: Do you meet the requirement for frontage trees along Hooksett Rd.?

W. Morrill: Yes.

Y. Nahikian: The building design look is very basic. Why yellow and why not have a more interesting design?

Vote 5 in favor. Y. Nahikian opposed. MOTION CARRIED.

Waiver #9 (11.13.2.Y) Development Regulations section 11.13 – Drainage Design Criteria, 2 – drainage design requirements, Y – a minimum drop of 0.25 feet from the lowest inlet invert and highest outlet invert provided for each structure

J. Gryval: The applicant has **WITHDRAWN** this waiver.

Waiver #10 (3.04.4) Development Regulations section 3.04 – Landscaping Design Criteria, 4 – landscaping requirements

J. Gryval: The applicant has **WITHDRAWN** this waiver.

Waiver #11 (14.02) Development Regulations section 14.02 – Requirement Checklist

J. Gryval: The applicant has **WITHDRAWN** this waiver.

Waiver #12 (15.01.5) Development Regulations section 15 – Parking Standards, 15.01 – Parking, 5 - office, retail establishments and service businesses

J. Gryval: The applicant has **WITHDRAWN** this waiver.
WAIVERS ABOVE PER RSA674:44 (III) (E)

Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

J. Duffy: Waiver #1 above was not needed because it is part of the CUP. The site has a little over 700 sq ft of wetlands. The Conservation Commission reviewed the CUP and sent a favorable letter to the Planning Board. The applicant has applied for a minimum expedited wetland permit and is awaiting approval; this should be a condition of the site approval.

*N. VanScoy motioned to approve the CUP. Seconded by D. Marshall.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Open public hearing

Keith Ford: I am a resident in the Town of Hooksett and have worked with Tony @ Fratellos restaurant 10 yrs ago. Both of his carwash sites in Manchester and Raymond are beautiful facilities. Tony Crawford is a stand-up guy and I stand by him.

Close public hearing

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, 11 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction (see letter dated 08/11/11 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 to include Minimum Expedited Wetland Permit
- Letter from Manchester Water Precinct stating they have capacity and approve this project
- Letter from Hooksett Sewer Commission stating they have capacity and approve this project
- 1) 10' Slope & Access Easement Lot 12, 2) 10' Slope & Access Easement Lot 14 AND 3) 20' Drainage Easement Lot 12 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.”
 - Applicant agrees to remit impact fees 10 days prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy subject to NHRSA 674:39 to be calculated by the Town Planner

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 T. Walsh.

Vote 4 in favor (M. Cannata, T. Walsh, D. Marshall, L.Lessard), 2 opposed (N. VanScoy, Y. Nahikian). MOTION CARRIED.

Y. Nahikian: We did not go over the aesthetics for this project.

N. VanScoy: My understanding is that any review of aesthetics would be reviewed during a normal Planning Board meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE RECONSIDERATION OF THE 5/16/11
PLANNING BOARD DENIAL OF THE RECONSIDERATION OF THE 4/4/11
PLANNING BOARD DENIAL OF WAIVER REQUEST TO ELIMINATE
SPRINKLER SYSTEM**

**4. DONALD WINTERTON (#10-02)
10 Prescott Heights, Map 48, Lot 19-4**

Waiver request to Development Regulations section 11.12.1 (Street System – Roadway Requirements) sprinkler system requirement for single-family homes.

Donald Winterton: I am building my home at 10 Prescott Heights. HB109 legal opinion stated plans approved before 7/1/11 must abide by the development regulations (sprinkler system required), and plans approved by this Board post 7/1/11 are not required to have a sprinkler system. At the 4/4/11 Board meeting I quote member B. Perry: “If the bills are adopted, I think you would have grounds to come back to this Board based on the law.” I own Map 48, Lots 19-3 & 19-4 and am asking for waivers to the sprinkler system requirement for both lots. I spoke with Jo Ann (Town Planner) and there are a small amount of lots to be required to meet this sprinkler system requirement. There are no large developments with the sprinkler system requirement. My development is without a new road. The other issue is that these lots become more valuable to the Town of Hooksett. The

State of NH voters, the Governor Lynch veto was overridden by a small vote. At this late date, I ask for this waiver.

J. Duffy: As you recall at the Aug 1st Planning Board meeting, I received a legal opinion from Town Attorney Buckley. HB109 passed without the Governor's signature. If a Planning Board project was approved July 1, 2011 or prior, they still have to put in a sprinkler system. If project approved after July 1, 2011, the Planning Board can't require the sprinkler system. This afternoon I spoke with Fire Deputy Chief Hoisington and he doesn't agree with the attorney's opinion (referred to his e-mail dated Aug 15th "This is to follow up on our conversation today about the waiver request from Mr. Donald Winterton for 10 Prescott Heights. As stated previous times this department does not support waving the residential sprinkler requirement for this property. Even with the passage of HB 109 by the NH state Legislature this subdivision was approved prior to that adoption and the requirement should stand as previously voted by the Hooksett Planning Board.") The Fire Dept. is in the process of gathering information to submit to Attorney Buckley as they don't believe he interpreted the information correctly. Other subdivision project that require sprinkler systems include the Quimby Mtn. subdivision that has 2 houses built out of 12 total. There are other lots in Mr. Winterton's subdivision that require a sprinkler system and they would have to come before this Board with a waiver request. All larger subdivision projects are on public water (Head's Pond, Beaver Brook, University Heights, Ravenwood).

D. Winterton: I know I don't meet the typical abutter notice process for tonight. I had them (abutters) sign letters for proper notice.

Open public hearing

Keith Morency, Prescott Heights lot 19-2: In addition to owning lot 19-2 at Prescott Heights, I am a builder in Town. I am working on lot #5 of the last 6 lots at RaeBrook Farms. I am very familiar with the Town regulations. I recently bought lot 19-2 and I also don't want a sprinkler system. With 7 hard-wired smoke detectors, Captain Colburn stated first and foremost is to get out of the house in a fire. A sprinkler system will just keep the house from burning to the ground. It will not get you out of the house. In talking with Don I am a little apprehensive to be here tonight, because I am a builder in Town. Being an abutter & neighbor to Don, a sprinkler system is something I definitely don't want either. The new house (Bielizna) was not required to have a sprinkler system.

Close public hearing

J. Gryval: After July 1, 2011, you won't need it (sprinkler system).

N. VanScoy: I don't interpret it that way. If a sprinkler system requirement was on a subdivision plan prior to July 1, 2011, then he would need it (sprinkler system).

D. Winterton: If I wait to build until July 2013, the Planning Board approval would have expired. Since I started construction on my house, I have it plumbed for 44 sprinkler heads in a 2,400 sq ft house. This includes every closet with a light in it, an unfinished bathroom, and a 3-season porch. The Fire Dept. will come and say they have an example of the most

experience with residential sprinkler systems, however that is from Scottsdale, AZ not Hooksett, NH. The reason I am here tonight is because the law has now passed and I am asking for a waiver. I know this Board has said we do what the Fire Dept. tells us, however I wish you would do what your Town Attorney tells you.

Y. Nahikian: Is it in the new regulations that we don't require sprinkler systems?

J. Gryval: It is a new State law. His site plan stated he needed a sprinkler system and that still stands unless you decide to give him a waiver.

T. Walsh motioned to grant the waiver to Development Regulations section 11.12.1 (Street System – Roadway Requirements) sprinkler system requirement for single-family homes for Map 48, Lots 19-3 & 19-4 of the Bielizna subdivision approved by the Planning Board on 5/17/2010 (plan #10-02). Seconded by D. Marshall.

M. Cannata: This will set a precedent.

D. Marshall: How many other lots are we talking about?

J. Duffy: About 20 lots; most of them at Quimby Mtn.

VOTE 4 in favor (Y. Nahikian, T. Walsh, D. Marshall, & L. Lessard). 2 opposed (N. VanScoy & M. Cannata). MOTION CARRIED.

WAIVER ABOVE PER RSA 674:36 (II) (N)

- 2. CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1 & 2
MAUREEN HEMEON (#11-07)
29 & 31 Pinnacle St., Map 7, Lots 17-1 & Lot 17-2
Lot line adjustment.**

Tony Basso, LLS @ Keach-Nordstrom: Lot 17-1 is owned by Clarence B., Patricia A. & Maureen A. Hemeon. Maureen's sister Lorraine P. Keach (Deslauriers) owns lot 17-2. The purpose of plan is to move the lot line so the driveway is completely on the property. Lot 17-1 lose .04 acres (1.56 to 1.52 acres) and lot 17-2 will grow 0.69 to 0.73 acres. We received comments from Stantec on Thursday. Overlap plans, Hemeon and Keach will be quit claiming rights to overlay abutter(s).

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

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, 11 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction (see letter dated 08/11/11 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
- Copy of recorded quitclaim deed submitted to Community Development Dept. and referenced on plan
- 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."

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 N. VanScoy.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

OTHER BUSINESS

**5. MEGA X – gas station/convenience store/drive-thru (#10-03)
1560 Hooksett Rd, Map 13, Lot 46-1**

New tree plantings along Hooksett Rd. for Mega X and north abutter's 7/22/11 letter of concern regarding blockage of view to their building at 1562 Hooksett Rd.

J. Gryval: We will send a letter to the north abutter (Steven & Karen Courchesne) that the Planning Board members have viewed the site and the new tree plantings do not block the view of the business located at 1562 Hooksett Road.

**6. ALL OR NOTHING, LLC (#09-12)
254 West River Rd., Map 17, Lot 36**

Compliance with excavation/grading plan(s) and status of geo-tech grading plan(s) to be submitted.

J. Gryval: Referred to e-mail dated 8/15/11 from MJ Coronis of The Pizza Man (All or Nothing LLC). They are not ready for tonight's meeting, therefore we will continue them to the Sept 12th Planning Board meeting.

Tom Cote, 246 West River Road: I don't know what their (Pizza Man) plan is. The dance studio pulled out and there is no other business to come in. It is just a big hole. My

biggest concern is that they totally destroyed the buffer area to my house. They cleared right up to my property line. The bond should be released and the buffer restored. The settling of that area will never be the same.

J. Gryval: They expect the bank to approve something there.

T. Cote: This has been going on for 1 ½ almost 2 yrs. How long does this go on? Winter is coming. The buffer area should be restored this year.

D. Marshall: Dan, have you seen plans for the wall or any plans at all?

D. Tatem: Not recently. The last plans we saw were from last year.

J. Gryval: Dan, is the bond big enough for what is needed to be done?

D. Tatem: Yes.

D. Marshall: We should continue this to Sept 12th and if nothing happens, then go for the bond.

T. Cote: Jo Ann (Town Planner) has told me the buffer should be restored. The Pizza Man owners have said the landscaping and trees will not be the same until it grows back in. Trees of the same size that were cleared should be put back in there. They should restore the slope so the trees are where they were before and not at a lower grade. They should also install a fence along the border of my lot and their lot. Since the Planning Board meeting on July 11th, people have walked through my property to get to the Pizza Man business. My lot is very visible now from West River Rd. I have an issue with people trespassing on my property.

M. Cannata: The removal of the stumps currently on the site should be included as a condition in the Sept 12th discussion.

J. Gryval: We will continue this to Sept 12th and see what happens.

CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER 12, 2011

AESTHETIC REVIEWS

Y. Nahikian: Dan, did the car wash meet the aesthetic criteria.

D. Tatem: Yes they met the building design criteria in our regulations.

J. Gryval: We can look at the aesthetic “design criteria” section of the regulations and see where we should go from here.

WAIVER SUBMISSIONS

J. Gryval: Tonight's regulation waivers on the car wash project were not what were actually being asked for. A waiver is supposed to be requested only if the applicant can't meet a requirement, not because they don't want to do something. Staff should take the time to review the waivers as they come in for content and to assure no duplications. This will make it a smoother process once the Board discusses them.

Y. Nahikian: Waivers are a big percentage of what comes before us.

M. Cannata: If we decline a waiver, what is the recourse? There is no risk legally.

SNHPC 45th ANNUAL MEETING - SEPT 9TH

J. Duffy: SNHPC annual meeting in on Friday, Sept 9th. Please RSVP Donna by Aug 31st with # of attendees and menu option.

CIP COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS & APPOINTMENTS

J. Duffy: Letters of interest are now being accepted for the annual membership on the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee. CIP Committee meetings are held on the last two Wednesdays in October and then every Tuesday thereafter for the month of November from 6-8pm at Town Hall. Nominations and appointments will be made by the Board at their September 12, 2011 meeting at 6:00pm. Interested individuals are encouraged to attend this meeting. Letters of interest should include your contact information (address, phone, and e-mail) and be submitted by September 6, 2011 to: Town Hall, Attn: Donna Fitzpatrick, Community Development, 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH 03106 or via dfitzpatrick@hooksett.org.

M. Cannata: I am be interested in serving on the CIP Committee conditional that I do not hold the office of Chair/Vice-Chair and that a member representative from the following also serve: Budget Committee, School Board, Town Council, and Conservation Commission.

J. Duffy: At this time the following former CIP Committee members are seeking reappointment: Nancy VanScoy (Town Council), Marc Miville (Budget Committee), Steed Celio (resident), and possibly Martin Cannata (Planning Board).

EXIT 11 STUDY

J. Duffy: We contracted with SNHPC for a mini-master plan of exit 11. Jack Munn @ SNHPC is looking for the Town Council and Planning Board comments to define the boundaries on the map distributed to you tonight. Please contact our department by Sept 2nd via phone or e-mail). The goal is for the package to be complete by the end of December. The stakeholders and parcel owners under consideration in the past will be contacted. Public input will be gathered on what they want to see for exit 11.

PLANNING BOARD FULL MEMBER POSITION

N. VanScoy: Mark Messina has resigned from the Planning Board full member position. Both Brendan Perry and Tom Walsh, now alternates, have been nominated by the Town Council for the position. When one of them gets appointed, that will open an alternate

position. Mark is not interested to be an alternate. Appointment for full member is on the Aug 24th Town Council agenda.

NEW TOWN ADMINISTRATOR

J. Duffy: Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. is the new Town Administrator effective Sept 1st. On Sept 14th 5:30-6:30pm there is a general reception to meet him and Board members are welcome to attend. Additionally, on Sept 17th 8:30-11:30am the Board Chair is invited to participate in a ‘Best Practice’ seminar.

N. VanScoy: The Sept 17th seminar is now open to any board/committee members.

*N. VanScoy motioned to adjourn at 7:45pm. Seconded by D. Marshall.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

ADJOURNMENT

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 7:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,
Planning Coordinator