

**Official**  
**As of 03/05/12**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING**  
**Monday, February 13, 2012**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

Vice-Chair D. Marshall called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

**ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD**

Vice-Chair Dick Marshall, Town Administrator, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr., Frank Kotowski, Town Council Rep. Susan Lovas Orr, Town Administration Rep. Leo Lessard (DPW Director), Tom Walsh, Martin Cannata, David Rogers, and Robert Duhaime.

Excused: Chair John Gryval

Absent: Yervant Nahikian and Brendan Perry.

**REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT**

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

D. Marshall: David Rogers will be voting tonight in place of Chair John Gryval AND Robert Duhaime will be voting tonight in place of Brendan Perry.

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

J. Duffy: The last time the Pizza Man (All or Nothing, LLC) was here they had only provided verbal information, but no hard copy landscape plan. I received the amended landscape plan late this afternoon. Mr. Cote (south abutter) and Marty (Pizza Man owner) were both in my office today. They discussed the plan and are satisfied with it. The Pizza Man will plant 30 fast growing arverbrite trees along the property line. I recommend you give them a drop-dead deadline date of May 31, 2012, so the completion of the plantings doesn't linger. The engineer's landscape designer said the plantings should not be done in April. Marty and Mr. Cote are OK with the May 31, 2012 deadline.

D. Marshall: Mr. Cote, are you OK with this?

Tom Cote, 246 West River Rd.: It is not the perfect plan, but I am alright with it to meet the needs of both parties.

***M. Cannata motioned to approve the amended landscape plan as presented tonight conditional that the landscaping be completed no later than May 31, 2012. Seconded by F. Kotowski.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

**CEO 2/9/12 Draft Letter – Granite Hill II North**

J. Duffy: Granite Hill 2 north was approved in 1988. In 2002 Ken Andrews, previous CEO, issued a letter they were good to build even though a lot of time had passed. In 2007 developer Steven Blum took over ownership and started building the units. Recently that company went under foreclosure and two banks took over. Enterprise Bank wants to move forward the portion they took over. They would like a letter from Matt Labonte, current CEO, that the project is grandfathered and they are still good to go. 370 units were approved with approximately 1/20<sup>th</sup> having been constructed. 123 units were purchased by Enterprise, and they still have a lot more to go. In 2007 the Planning Board told them they could go forward per their 1988 approval.

M. Cannata: Are the units that have been completed occupied?

J. Duffy: Yes.

M. Cannata: How many are occupied?

J. Duffy: I don't have that folder with me. I would say roughly 20 are occupied. There is another foundation in, and one unit in another building remaining to be checked to go forward. We are asking for them to have a pre-construction meeting and put a bond in place. Tonight we are just need to OK the vesting of the project and density.

*F. Kotowski motioned in favor of the CEO issuing his draft letter to Enterprise Bank and Trust Company dated 2/9/12 for the Granite Hills II North project as presented tonight. Seconded by M. Cannata.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 01/09/12 & 1/23/12**

*M. Cannata motioned to approve the minutes of 01/09/12. Seconded by T. Walsh.  
Vote 8 in favor. R. Duhaime abstains.*

*D. Rogers motioned to approve the minutes of 01/23/12. Seconded by T. Walsh.  
Vote 8 in favor. R. Duhaime abstains.*

**FIRST PUBLIC HEARING FOR PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES 2012**

**ARTICLE 2**

**Amendment No. 1**

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 1, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 3, Section P. General Provisions, to change the reference of Hooksett's Open Space Plan "from June 2004" to "the latest version"?

*The purpose of Amendment No. 1 is to modify the date of the Open Space Plan by updating the reference to the most current version of the Plan.*

D. Marshall: Read amendment No. 1 into the record.

**Open public hearing**

No comments.

**Close public hearing**

*M. Cannata motioned to send Article 2 Amendment No. 1 to the voters. Seconded by S. Lovas Orr.*

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

**Amendment No. 2**

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 2, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 3, Section A., General Provisions, “No permits in any district for any nonresidential or multi-family uses, **nor any change**, or expansion of use, or construction shall be issued prior to site plan approval by the Planning Board per NH RSA 674:43 and as detailed in the Non-Residential Site Plan Review Regulations of the Town of Hooksett as adopted and amended by removing “nor any change”?

*The purpose of Amendment No. 2 is to eliminate the words, “nor any change” from this paragraph because the Town currently has a “Change of Use” process in place to address minor site plan changes.*

D. Marshall: Read amendment No. 2 into the record.

**Open public hearing**

No comments.

**Close public hearing**

*T. Walsh motioned to send Article 2 Amendment No. 2 to the voters. Seconded by D. Rogers.*

D. Shankle: I am opposed to this amendment. To remove “nor any change” is too broad. Change of use is too broad. It opens doors to a lot of possibilities.

T. Walsh: Is there a problem with the system now?

J. Duffy: At the last Planning Board meeting, it was decided to have change of use applicant info. in my staff report and go over it with the Board. Our staff meeting to review these change of use applications is now like a committee. Those that need to go to the Planning Board or ZBA are now listed on your staff report. We want to make the

Board aware of what is going on in Town. We have only had one staff meeting to review change of use, since our last Planning Board meeting.

M. Cannata: How did that work out? Did the staff review fill the need?

J. Duffy: Many applications in this last batch of change of use need to go to the ZBA for a variance. There was one that needs a site plan. We should have fewer change of use as we go along. Example of change of use is a retail business in place or a restaurant in place, and then another similar business comes in. For retail-to-retail we look at the intensity of the use (i.e. is it busier and needing more parking). If there is an issue, it would go to the Planning Board.

D. Shankle: The change of use policy addresses a limited number and scope. Taking out “nor any change”, that suggests no matter how big or small the change is, it doesn’t need to come before the Planning Board. I don’t think that was the intent.

R. Duhaime: Are other towns using this process?

J. Duffy: This is proposed zoning language. In the ordinance now, any change has to come before the Planning Board. The Development Regulations states if the change is less or same intensity, it could be approved by staff. That was the only purpose to take out those three words “nor any change”. I didn’t want the two (ordinance and regulations) to conflict. The Board has a right to deal with Development Regulations, however zoning ordinances are like the bible and you would need a variance. We only have one chance a year to fix the zoning ordinances. We could say staff could determine if a change is less intense.

F. Kotowski: Is this amendment really needed or is there a way to better word it? I would ask the Town Administrator if it is needed to have better wording.

J. Duffy: You can pull it entirely or hold a 2<sup>nd</sup> hearing and reword it.

F. Kotowski: To the Town Administrator, is this needed or will rewording it make it better?

D. Shankle: I agree with Jo Ann that the ordinance and regulation should not conflict. We should more narrowly craft the wording.

D. Marshall: It is the intensity that determines it comes to this Board. If we leave “any change”, then all change of use would be added to our Planning Board agendas.

J. Duffy: We need to decide tenant fit-up and variances. For those change of use, we would get the Planning Board blessing before signing the letter.

D. Marshall: Dean and Jo Ann will craft the wording for this amendment and have a 2<sup>nd</sup> public hearing.

*T. Walsh: I withdraw my previous motion above.*

*F. Kotowski motioned to have Article 2 Amendment No. 2 reworded, reopen the public hearing, and hold a 2<sup>nd</sup> public hearing on March 19, 2012. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote 8 in favor. M. Cannata opposed.*

**Amendment No. 3**

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 3, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 24, Section D. Board of Adjustment, "Before reaching a decision under this Article, three (3) members of the Board shall have viewed jointly the subject property" by replacing **shall** with **may**?

*The purpose of Amendment No 3 is to amend the mandatory requirement of requiring a site walk on all special exception applications.*

D. Marshall: Read amendment No. 3 into the record.

**Open public hearing**

Jason Perry, 5 Mountain View Road: For the Austin Woods development, I like that three people would have to come out for site walks. People can see what is going on first hand.

John Hillis, 19 South Bow Road: I also think site walks are important and should be required.

**Close public hearing**

*R. Duhaime motioned to send Article 2 Amendment No. 3 to the voters.*

*D. Marshall: NO 2<sup>nd</sup> MOTION = Amendment No. 3 is removed.*

**Amendment No. 4**

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 4, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 26, Section 3 Non-Conforming Uses, Lots and Structures, by eliminating the entire chapter requiring the merger of two or more contiguous lots in single ownership?

*The purpose of Amendment No. 4 is to eliminate the involuntary merger requirement, per RSA 674:39-aa.*

D. Marshall: Read amendment No. 4 into the record.

**Open public hearing**

David Hess, 68 Pine Street: I fully support this proposal and applaud the Planning Board acting expeditiously to the July 24, 2011 effective date of RSA 674:39-aa. I was an innocent victim of the involuntary merger process. One question I have is that the statute specified all involuntary mergers that ever occurred could be unwound (reversed). An example is if I applied to the Board in 1999 under the involuntary merger, I can now unwind that merger and restore to the preexisting lots. We should have proposed language to the voters that fully complies with “right to unwind”.

D. Marshall: To do that legally, I would need to publish that entire law on the ballot.

D. Hess: Constitutional amendments have a lead in description for the full text that is made available.

J. Duffy: To amend the language needs a 2<sup>nd</sup> hearing.

R. Duhaime: I am not familiar with this RSA. Does it include non-conforming lots?

D. Hess: It has language for non-conforming lots; refer to legislation for details.

J. Duffy: Our zoning ordinance covers non-conforming. If it has frontage, it is a buildable lot. How does this play into the new legislation?

D. Hess: I don't know.

### **Close public hearing**

***R. Duhaime motioned to send Article 2 Amendment No. 4 to the voters as amended (further defining RSA 674:39-aa – opportunity to reverse involuntary merger).***

***Seconded by T. Walsh.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

### **Amendment No. 5**

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 5, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 22, Definitions, by adding a definition for a buffer – “Whenever a commercial or industrial use abuts a residential use, zone or district, a buffer zone shall be provided subject to the approval of the Planning Board. The buffer is an area within a property or site, generally adjacent to and parallel with the property line, either consisting of natural existing vegetation or created by the use of trees, shrubs, fences and/or berms, designed to limit continuously the view of and/or sound from the site to adjacent sites or properties. The buffer shall be not less than fifty (50) feet in width and shall be planted with a dense screen of shrubbery and trees not less than eight (8) feet in height at the time of planting. The screen shall be at least twenty-five (25) feet in width and shall be permanently maintained suitably by the owner. The buffer shall provide a year-round dense visual screen in order to minimize adverse impacts. In order to maintain dense screen year-round, at least fifty (50) percent of the plantings shall be evergreens. Existing natural growth may be included as part of

the screen. No penetration of this buffer zone shall be allowed. With the approval of the Planning Board, a suitable combination of other elements, such as fencing, berms, boulders, may be incorporated within the buffer zone”?

*The purpose of Amendment No. 5 is to add a definition for buffer zone.*

D. Marshall: Read amendment No. 5 into the record.

### **Open public hearing**

Tom Cote, 246 West River Rd.: I have been going through this process with the Pizza Man. I appreciate and affirm it is a lot better definition, however what good does it do if it is overlooked? In my case, I believe it was overlooked. Are there any mechanisms in this process, so this doesn't happen to someone else?

D. Marshall: Your case with the Pizza Man has eaten up a lot of time before this Board. We are more cognitive of what needs to be done.

T. Cote: It should have been in everyone's mind from the new regulations back then.

### **Close public hearing**

*R. Duhaime motioned to send Article 2 Amendment No.5 to the voters. Seconded by F. Kotowski.*

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

### **Amendment No. 6**

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 6, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend the following articles: Article 11, Industrial, Section D. Buffer Zone; Article 12, Mixed Use 1, Section G. Buffer Zone; Article 13, Mixed Use 2, Section H.G. Buffer Zones; Article 14, Mixed Use 3, Section G. Buffer Zones; Article 15, Mixed Use 4, Section G Buffer Zones, by replacing these Sections with the following language: Buffer Zone – Whenever a commercial or industrial use abuts a residential use, zone or district, a buffer zone shall be provided subject to the approval of the Planning Board. Please see Article 22, Definitions, for details”?

*The purpose of Amendment No. 6 is to amend the requirements of the buffer zone between residential uses or zones and industrial and commercial use.*

D. Marshall: Read amendment No. 5 into the record. This amendment will need to go for a 2<sup>nd</sup> public hearing to add Article 10. Also, after commercial or industrial use “or zone” should be added.

### **Open public hearing**

No comments.

*M. Cannata motioned to have Article 2 Amendment No.6 reworded to add Article 10 & “or zone”, continue the public hearing, and hold a 2<sup>nd</sup> public hearing on March 19, 2012. Seconded by R. Duhaime.*

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

#### **Amendment No. 7**

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 7, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 8, Conservation Subdivision, Section C. Definition of Open Space to change the last sentence to read: “Developable (unconstrained) land excludes jurisdictional wetlands, steep slopes greater than 25 percent or flood hazard areas”?

*The purpose of Amendment No. 7 is to correct a typographical error, changing word “include” to “exclude”.*

D. Marshall: Read amendment No. 7 into the record.

#### **Open public hearing**

No comments.

#### **Close public hearing**

*R. Duhaime motioned to send Article 2 Amendment No. 7 to the voters. Seconded by F. Kotowski.*

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

#### **FIRST PUBLIC HEARING FOR DISCUSSION AND VOTE TO ADOPT PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE HOOKSETT DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS ADOPTED 1/23/12: Section 10. Formal Review Procedures 10.07 Engineering Review Period & Required Information #2 (relevant to submittal for follow-up reviews) AND Part II – Subdivision Regulations 2. Completeness Criteria 2.01 Application Requirements for Subdivision Plans #24 (relevant to fire sprinkler systems).**

D. Marshall: Read proposed changes to Section 10. Formal Review Procedures 10.07 Engineering Review Period & Required Information #2 (relevant to submittal for follow-up reviews adding “. . .seven eleven calendar days (two Thursdays) . . . ) into the record.

#### **Open public hearing**

No comments.

#### **Close public hearing**

*R. Duhaime motioned to adopt the proposed regulation change to Section 10. Formal Review Procedures 10.07 Engineering Review Period & Required Information #2 (relevant to submittal for follow-up reviews) into the Development Regulations. Seconded by T. Walsh.*



*Vote unanimously in favor.*

D. Marshall: Read proposed changes to Part II – Subdivision Regulations 2. Completeness Criteria 2.01 Application Requirements for Subdivision Plans #24 (relevant to fire sprinkler systems removing “. . . sprinklers in accordance with N.F.P.A. standards . . .”) into the record.

### **Open public hearing**

Donald Winterton, 10 Prescott Heights Rd.: I am here to ask you to not require sprinkler systems. Unfortunately I have become an expert on sprinklers. The State of NH has spoken loudly and clearly that single and two family homes should not require sprinklers. Hooksett is one of ten communities that require it. Economically it can cost \$5,000, \$10,000, or \$15,000 or more. Most developments take land out of current use. New houses pay impact fees. There is a good amount of money that goes to Hooksett. All four Hooksett representatives to the House and State Senator voted to remove the sprinkler requirement at all votes. Listen to the people who face the ballot box. If you require sprinkler systems to go in, the day after it is not inspected or have to be maintained. It can be drained, turned off, and not used. There is an annual inspection fee to the Fire Dept. Fire clearly does not want to remove anything that says safety in it. That is their job. The last three people who died in fires were smoking and attached to their oxygen tanks. This is a huge national issue funded by the sprinkler industry. If this industry had their way, every house built would have one. For life safety, whether you have one or don't, you still can't hook-up a hose to a hydrant until the Fire Dept. gets there. The Town of Hooksett should be commended for offering free smoke detectors. The recent Auburn fire did not have smoke detectors in the home and required ten towns for mutual aid. This is an issue between the homeowner and their insurance company. I was told by my insurance company that I would only save \$20.00 per year. The State of NH is “live free or die”. People should decide if they want a sprinkler system or not.

Ann Hill, 10 Mountain View Rd.: I am a life safety specialist. N.F.P.A. consensus as an organization (fire fighters, life safety specialist, and insurance companies) have stated that sprinkler systems in residential homes is proven to save lives. You can vote to remove it, but you should consider where the recommendation is coming from.

D. Winterton: I would agree with the last speaker that sprinkler system have been proven to save lives. However, there is no data on single-family homes. The data from N.F.P.A. combines single-family with apartments. They add that to their data. There is no data on single-family homes that sprinkler systems save lives. You will be told differently.

Mike Horne, 1 Monroe Dr.: I have been a licensed engineer for 18 yrs. I am against sprinklers in residential homes. People can't even change their smoke detectors. They won't do maintenance on their sprinkler systems.

### **Close public hearing**

***D. Shankle motioned to not change the wording as proposed tonight to Part II – Subdivision Regulations 2. Completeness Criteria 2.01 Application Requirements for Subdivision Plans #24 AND keep the sprinkler system requirement language in the Development Regulations. Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

D. Shankle: Whether there is specific data on saving lives for single-family homes or not, it comes down to water and people to move. One thing said was that fire fighters are for it, because it is about safety and safety is their concern. I think safety should be a concern for every government official in Town, not just fire fighters. It is probably better if every house in Town had a sprinkler system and not just those not on Town water. However I think this already is a compromise to have sprinklers and cisterns, because developers didn't want to run miles of water lines. It is a fair and reasonable thing to do. There is no reason to take it (sprinkler system requirement) out. The elected officials in Concord could have required those towns that have it in their regulations to take it out, but they didn't. They gave us the right to keep it in. The majority of Town Council elected officials voted to keep it in. This proposed language was the result of an issue that came up over the last year or so. We have over 500 houses now sprinklered in Town since 1998-1999. People haven't quit building, buying, and moving here because of that. This is a growing community. Hard cases make bad law. The Board was faced with a hard case last year. The State law changes will not allow you to put it (sprinkler system requirement) back in once you take it out.

F. Kotowski: I have a different view. I sat in Concord for hours and hours of debate on this. We heard from the foremost experts on fire safety, the need, and so forth. The sprinkler industry is a lucrative part of the home construction industry. Sprinkler systems went off at the State HHS offices, because they froze. It caused a million dollars in damage. 3 out of 4 (300) voted and got it right at the State to take out the requirement. This day & age, and the economy the way it is, to ask someone to involuntarily spend \$5,000 or more because it is mandated is wrong and another case of government interference. I believe we should follow the lead in Concord and do what other towns have done and get rid of this mandate. Recently I wanted to move into Berry Hill, but didn't because it was going to cost \$5,000 more because of sprinklers. I would much rather have granite counter tops, and good smoke detectors. To pay for something that has never gone off in Hooksett, I question the economics of this. We should rescind it.

T. Walsh: We have been talking about it for a couple of months. I would like it removed. There are people's individual homes. The Town Administrator commented this was a compromise. Municipal water covered areas have hydrants. For hydrants I don't care if the water is from Lake Massabesic or a cistern. I read the Town Council minutes when they deliberated. They said the Fire Chief didn't want to see it removed, and if we removed it we could never get it back. The Town Council didn't state any pros or cons. I would still like to see it removed.

R. Duhaime: The Council is elected by the people of this Town. If removed, it can't be reinstated. Firemen and safety, I haven't always been on the firemen's side. Their budget

has grown, but one life lost is one life too many. Sprinklers have gone in the last 12-13 yrs. The Town Council brings up a good point. Berry Hill has hydrants and sprinklers.

D. Marshall: Berry Hill has cisterns and sprinklers.

R. Duhaime: That's right, because they had water issues for hydrants in that development.

S. Lovas Orr: I provide a Planning Board sub-committee update to the Town Council. I mentioned to them that this was brought up for a regulation proposed change. Their question was can we have someone come into the Planning Board and we can waive it. Citizens can still have the opportunity for a waiver if that is something we can do. The Town Council didn't want to eliminate the sprinkler system requirement from the regulations that we can never get back. Why remove it if we can still waive it? We never know what can happen in the future.

M. Cannata: If we remove it and someone dies . . . they could have had the regulation to cover them.

D. Rogers: I agree with Mr. Walsh and Mr. Kotowski. It is the personal responsibility of the homeowner to have the right to spend \$5,000 or \$6,000. As far as not being able to put it back in, you could bring back legislation for it to be put back in.

T. Walsh: I have heard that removing it would be for favoring builders for them to make more money. That is incorrect. They have a flat line percentage that they get down back to the people. The debate is about single-family homes. There is no debate to have the sprinkler system requirement for apartments, commercial, or industrial, because in these structures the actions someone else takes next to you could affect you.

F. Kotowski: If we were not part of the ten towns grandfathered on this, we wouldn't be having this conversation. I agree with safety and not losing a life. We require smoke detectors. How many people have batteries in them, if not hard-wired. People should have a choice to make their own decision provided they comply. Most building materials used today are far better than 25 yrs. ago. Most fires today are not in new construction but in older homes, or poorly maintained homes. You are adding a cost to my home and a mandate. You will have one person after the other requesting a variance. Endless time will be spent before this Board providing variances like in Mr. Winterton's case.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Susan Lovas Orr: Yes

Martin Cannata: Yes

Robert Duhaime: Yes

Tom Walsh: No

David Rogers: No

Dick Marshall: Yes

Leo Lessard: Yes  
Frank Kotowski: No  
Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr.: Yes

*Vote 6 in favor, 3 opposed. Motion carried.*

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- 1. PINNACLE PARK – ACCESS PARKING (#12-02)  
18 Pinnacle St., Map 7, Lot 10**  
Presented by the Hooksett Conservation Commission and  
Parks & Recreation Advisory Board

John Turbyne, Conservation Commission & Mike Horne, Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.

J. Turbyne: Nothing has changed with this concept since the joint meeting with the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board and Conservation Commission. This allows the abutters to have another opportunity to speak. There have been several public informational sessions. Subject to feedback from this review, Mr. Lessard will proceed with doing the work. The money to pay for the project is from impact fees.

D. Shankle: Leo Lessard and I spoke prior to this meeting. We are going to abstain from this item.

**Open public hearing**

Susan Parrenze, 31 Pinnacle St.: I am not aware where the parking lot is located. We just moved into Hooksett and have not received a notice so we are not sure where it will be. Also, what are the hours of operation, etc.

M. Horne: There will be a kiosk and a memorial for Bud Locke and his wife who owned the Pinnacle. The Pinnacle is a historical entity.

S. Parrenze: Are you extending Pinnacle Street for this parking?

J. Turbyne: No, the proposed parking lot is close to Berch Dale St. There are some orange flaggings to delineate where it will be.

Tom Keach: 29 Pinnacle St.: I pay attention to open space and use. I appreciate the efforts of the Conservation Commission to keep open areas of Hooksett. This area has not been properly studied and addressed. The impact to the neighborhood is tremendous. There has been increased activity since the Town purchased the Pinnacle property. There are more vehicles parking, and more garbage in the woods. This is counterproductive for conservation of the Town itself. You need open space and that is very important, but you need to study an area before you initiate the plans. Survey the area, survey residents, and

conduct some type of impact study. They haven't created a partnership with the neighborhood. There are two sides to the Pinnacle; Pinnacle St. and Pine St. There is no impact to Pine St. for access on Ardon Dr. The Town pursued toward the Pinnacle St. side for access. Rte. 3A has grown in traffic. SNHPC data has 22,000 vehicles that cross Pinnacle St. and Rte. 3A on a daily basis. To add more vehicles is a hardship for everyone. This is a negative impact to this area and not particularly accessible. The access area also falls within the watershed. For Pinnacle St. and Pine St., I have concerns with contamination. Today people are ice fishing up there. To bring in a larger crowd would bring in more contaminants. The proposal is not to pave the area. There will be more contaminants with motor vehicles parked there. There are endangered species native to that area. Has that been looked at? Will bringing in vehicles and pollution affect that? This is not to the benefit of the Town. There should be alternatives. The old Town Hall is not being used and people could park their vehicles there. There could be crosswalks to Rte. 3A. Use impact fees for a walkway to the Pinnacle off Rte. 3A. Keep the vehicles down by the Village for economic development to foster businesses in that area (i.e. Robie's store).

J. Turbyne: For public input, we sent out notices to area residences at least twice, held a public hearing with the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board and Conservation Commission. We will never get 100% buy-in on any project but I feel we made a serious effort to hear, and where possible, address neighborhood concerns. Access from Ardon Dr. is not possible, because the road put in is at a cul-de-sac and does not go to the property line. Other people own the strip of land between the end of pavement and the Pinnacle property. Village Water Precinct has a ROW to access their pump station, but it is not a ROW the rest of the Town can access. As to the litter concern, the rules of the park will be posted and require, among other things, that all material carried-in to the area be carried-out. There will be normal policing activity. During our review process, we made every attempt to address the open space and recreation needs of the citizens of Hooksett.

M. Horne: We did explore Pine St. and the Ardon Dr. section of one of the pump houses. There could be side of street parking on Pinnacle St., however the big concern is that the road is narrow for emergency vehicles. This then pushed us to creating an access parking lot similar to the Head's Pond trail. The Pinnacle will be cleaned-up and policed much more than now.

John Hillis, 19 South Bow Rd.: Who is going to pay for the policing?

M. Horne: There will be less policing, because we are opening up the area more than now.

J. Turbyne: The park will be open during daylight hours only. The police drive in there all the time now, because of all the houses. As the parking lot will be visible from the street, we do not anticipate that there will be additional cost of policing because of Pinnacle Park. The officers will find it no more difficult than it is now to see if there is a reason to act.

**Close public hearing**

D. Marshall: Under RSA 674:54 Governmental Land Uses, we (Planning Board) don't vote to accept or approve or deny this proposed access parking lot. We are allowed to issue non-binding written comments for conformity or non-conformity. We have up to 30 days from closing tonight's hearing to issue the non-binding comments to the Conservation Commission.

**CONTINUED DISCUSSION**

**2. ENERGY COMMITTEE ETAP (Energy Technical Assistance & Planning)  
AND NEW ENERGY CHAPTER IN THE MASTER PLAN**

Presenter, Jack Munn, SNHPC

Jack Munn, SNHPC: There is no cost to the Town of Hooksett to develop this plan. The Energy Chapter is to be included in the Town's Master Plan. The body of the presentation includes what other cities and towns are doing. It asks you for changes, and recommendations to incorporate into your plan. Set a public hearing date in March for public comment and consider it from there. Goals and general ideas are on pg. 4 to include setting targets, and exploring grants and funding. Hooksett has a good solar orientation, therefore future solar systems should be put in. Recommendations are on pg. 24 include having a formalized Energy Advisory Committee that would report back to the Town Administrator and Town Council and Budget Committee. They would keep track of energy use in Town buildings. Look at web pages and other energy efficiencies to include the Hooksett Banner. Look at regulations and zoning for builders to use LED lighting. Have complete streets for safe routes to school by extending sidewalks and pathways. Cut down on your carbon footprints. One last section is to update the action plan. I have left it as an example now for what has been done with other towns. When you are comfortable with recommendations and goals, then I will update the action plan specific to Hooksett.

D. Marshall: The table-of-content numbers have changed.

R. Duhaime: Great job Jack. The SNHPC has a broader picture of government to make communities sustainable (i.e. solar energy on Town buildings). Last year was the first year I was not on the CIP (Capital Improvement Program) Committee. This is a capital expenditure.

J. Munn: We make the recommendation the Town look at these as CIP items in the future.

***R. Duhaime motioned to send the Energy Chapter to a public hearing on March 19, 2012 for public input, discussion and vote to adopt in the Master Plan. Seconded by S. Lovas Orr.***

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

**COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING**

3. **RICHARD & SMALL (#12-01)**  
**9 Farr wood Dr., Map 15, Lot 86-11 & 11 Farrwood Dr., Map 15, Lot 86-12**  
Lot line adjustment

D. Marshall: Staff any issues?

J. Duffy: I recommend you find the application complete.

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

J. Duffy: Stantec has one outstanding comment. The parcels of land were previously part of a cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac is gone and Farrwood Dr. continued on. That land at lots 11 and 12 were never transferred. The surveyor will provide language, and we will take care of this. This does not need to be a condition of this application.

D. Tatem: The drainage and slope easements on the lot should be treated the same and recorded in the same manner as this lot line adjustment.

J. Duffy: The drainage and slope easements are existing, but there is no record at the registry of the actual easements being recorded. There is only a reference on the plan itself. Is that sufficient to the Planning Board? Stantec is now asking for the easement documents to be prepared by the applicant and to be recorded.

Peter Stoddard, S&H Land Services: Each owner's deed references the subject easements on record. We have a recorded deed from each lot owner. We are feeling those documents are sufficient.

D. Marshall: The easements are shown on the plan?

P. Stoddard: We show what was existing. We couldn't find the separate recorded documents. The owners' deeds, are recorded and reference the recorded document. It is not necessary to create and record another document.

D. Tatem: Your regulations require that late 1990s records to date have the easement plan and easement document recorded. This is an existing easement. It is the Planning Board's choice.

P. Stoddard: If it was an ownership issue vs. easement that would be different. It is just a right of use for the Town to maintain it.

D. Shankle: Why don't you want to do it?

P. Stoddard: We could do it if the Planning Board wants us to do it. It just seems unnecessary.

M. Cannata: What is the type of easement? Drainage is on the plan.

P. Stoddard: It is a slope and another drainage easement that is already referenced.

R. Duhaime: Is the purpose of this lot line adjustment for the rotation of the house?

P. Stoddard: The lot 12 owner would like to see their line more perpendicular, so the house has a better orientation. Additionally the lot owner wants more frontage on Dube Pond and better access to the pond for recreation.

S. Lovas Orr: We can say we know what is happening now with the easements, but in 50 yrs. from now that may not be the case. If it is in our regulations, they should do it.

### **Open public hearing**

No comments.

### **Close public hearing**

*S. Lovas Orr motioned for applicant to provide drainage and slope easements for Town attorney review and approval. Seconded by R. Duhaime.*

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

*R. Duhaime 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 02/09/12 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
- Drainage and Slope Easements to be submitted to Community Development Dept. for Town Attorney review and approval
- Signed Drainage and Slope Easements to be submitted to Community Development Dept. for recording with plan set
- Applicant agrees to relocate shed that is currently encroaching the southern lot line side of lot 11
- All waivers noted on plan cover sheet



- 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 F. Kotowski.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

#### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**4. GREENVIEW MANAGEMENT LLC (#11-12)  
“University Heights Apartments”  
6 Blackwater Rd., Map 14, Lot 1-12**

Amended site plan to show the site design for map 14, lot 1-12 in accordance with the revised 2004 master plan for Southern NH University (SNHU) Rte. 3 & 28

J. Duffy: The applicant was last before the Board for a parking waiver that the Board denied. He is now providing the parking needed (421 parking spaces). They will take away dumpsters and go back to their original idea for a trash compactor and recycling on site. 21.09 of Development Regulations requires all site improvements be completed prior to issuance of a CO. Waiver requested is from paving final top wearing coarse until all buldings within the development are fully completed. They don’t want their construction vehicles to tear up the final top. Staff is in favor of this waiver request with the following condition: Appropriate surety for finish pavement course will be in place. Final top coat will be paved prior to issuance of CO for the final building or within one year from issuance of the first CO, whichever comes first.

**Waiver #1 to Development Regulations section 21.09 requires all site improvements be completed prior to issuance of a CO (request from paving final top wearing coarse until all buldings within the development are fully completed.)**

D. Marshall: None of the units are built yet. If approved, when will you start construction?

J. Burd: This spring.

D. Marshall: First CO?

J. Burd: We will start the two buildings closest to Blackwater Rd. Those will take about 9 months to complete, then every month thereafter another building will be done.

D. Marshall: It will be one year before you top coat.

J. Burd: We will finish the project in that one year.

***L. Lessard motion to grant waiver #1 above conditional that appropriate surety for finish pavement course will be in place and final top coat will be paved prior to issuance of CO for the final building or within one year from issuance of the first CO, whichever comes first. Seconded by T. Walsh.***

D. Shankle: Will it be a Town road?

J. Burd: No, private.

M. Cannata: Is the road bonded?

J. Burd: Yes.

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

***Waiver above per RSA 674:44 (III) (e).***

**Open public hearing**

No comments.

**Close public hearing**

***M. Cannata 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 02/09/12 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
- All waivers noted on plan
- Waiver granted to Development Regulations section 21.09 for request of paving of final top wearing coarse until all buildings within the development are fully completed is granted conditional that appropriate surety for finish pavement course will be in place and final top coat will be paved prior to issuance of CO for the final building or within one year from issuance of the first CO, whichever comes first.
- 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, (d) contractors schedule of work is submitted, and

- (e) if applicable, retaining wall shop drawings are submitted
- Applicant agrees to site plan compliance monitoring
- Note on plan “Approval of this plan shall expire 6/21/13 as recorded in the Planning Board Minutes, unless the right to develop has vested.”
- Applicant agrees to remit \$\* in impact fees 10 days prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy subject to NHRSA 674:39 (Public Safety \$\*, Roadway \$\*, Schools \$\* and Recreation \$\*) \* to be assessed by Town Planner
- Prior to issuance of CO, the applicant also agrees to provide: 1) original approved and stamped as-built to DPW-Building, 2) 2 yr. landscape surety from date of plantings, and 3) Community Development with PDFs of Planning Board signed plan set and approved as-built plan

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 R. Duhaime.*

R. Duhaime: They want 90% one-bedroom.

J. Burd: SFC Partners, LLC has the unit distribution market as single-bedroom need vs. two-bedroom.

R. Duhaime: What is the difference in building size?

J. Burd: We reduced the building size by 20% in size; however they are still 3 stories.

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

**5. AUSTIN WOODS (#08-02)  
South Bow Rd. & Mountain View Rd., Map 12, Lots 13 & 14-4 AND  
Map 16, Lot 53**

- proposal to subdivide Map 12, Lot 14-4 into a 6-lot conventional subdivision, consolidate Map 16, Lot 53, and Map 12, Lot 13 into one lot, and simultaneously subdivide it into 37 residential lots and 2 open space parcels/conservation open space subdivision.
- proposal for lot line adjustment to provide for the transfer of parcel “A” (15,130 sq. ft.) from Map 16, Lot 53 to Map 16, Lot 53-1
- Special Use Permit for Conservation Subdivision – Zoning Article 8, Sec. K

J. Duffy: I recommend this application be continued to March 19, 2012.

D. Marshall: We can’t take action tonight, and would just be listening tonight. You keep eating up this Board’s time. You have documents missing, and others not approved.

Nate Chamberlin, Eric Mitchell & Assoc.: We thought we were all set.

J. Duffy: This applicant has been continued since 2008. The current 65-day deadline expired on January 27, 2012.

Bruce Fillmore, Homes for a Life Time: We had two meetings with the Conservation Commission; first week in December and January. On January 4<sup>th</sup> I submitted comments. Three weeks ago Donna called Jodi for a status when I was in her office, and Jodi said she would be sending a letter of support or approval. We have not received that letter. A couple of commission members made recommendations.

N. Chamberlin: At the Conservation Commission meeting of January 3<sup>rd</sup>, they approved our documents.

J. Turbyne: At the January Conservation Commission meeting, we reviewed the easement and other documents and made some recommendations for changes and acknowledged them. The commission gave me the task to review changes. One line, two places, it was worded "shall or shall not" and the commission wanted shall. The conservation documents should include trail improvements for a town-wide trail system. I didn't receive any knowledge that these changes were made until 3:00pm today. The January Conservation Commission minutes were not clear what was done.

J. Duffy: The Conservation Commission item is one item out of a small list. This afternoon I went looking for documents. The list of items includes:

- 1) MOU – improvements to So. Bow Rd.; to pay per lot as lots are developed was not the intent of a discussion we had.
- 2) Conservation Homeowner's document - still includes the 6-lot conventional subdivision and need to be removed from this document. Mr. Fillmore said he would take that out.
- 3) Conservation Easement – there were several Conservation Commission e-mails, however there was never the final document. The document I have still says "shall or shall not".
- 4) Special Use Permit – needs action by the Board
- 5) timber rights – applicant needs to extinguish those rights.
- 6) waivers - 1) site specific soil mapping AND 2) location of preservable trees in areas where no construction is proposed – need action by the Board

J. Duffy: We also had a special meeting with Mr. Hillis and his wife. The applicant agreed to provide well testing for Mr. Hillis, before they get started and to relocate the 2<sup>nd</sup> driveway. There is also a modified landscape plan. There is nothing in writing to Mr. Hillis to make it part of the record. This application is not ready to be voted on this evening.

N. Chamberlin: There is just the waivers and Special Use Permit outstanding. We provided the Hillis' with something and didn't hear from them.

J. Duffy: We received additional comments from the Hillis' tonight (distributed to Board).

J. Duffy: I recommend we continued this application to March 19<sup>th</sup> and have them appear before the Conservation Commission on March 6<sup>th</sup>.

D. Shankle: I feel bad for the abutters showing up tonight, but we want to assure the applicant is ready before we act on this.

F. Kotowski: I would recommend that you get in touch with Jo Ann's office about a week before the meeting and make sure there are no outstanding issues. Your due diligence must be done or the Planning Board cannot act on this. I also feel bad for the folks in the audience.

### **Continued public hearing**

Jason Perry, 5 Mountain View Rd.: This application has been going on since 2008. The last time at sat in on this in 2009 was for a 90-day extension. There were multiple issues back then outstanding, and now in 2012 those same issues exist. I recommend the Planning Board vote to send the application back and have them start over. Maybe that is something not allowable per the procedures. It is a waste of the communities' time, and the Planning Board's time to have incomplete plans.

D. Marshall: Having the applicant start over again resolves nothing. They will have the same set of plans and same issues. It is best to continue it.

Ann Hill, 10 Mountain View Rd.: In 2005, this was originally a 6-lot subdivision. It was changed several times, and now it has been added to another subdivision to make one development. Was there ever an original approval on Mountain View Rd.?

J. Duffy: There was no original approval for the 5-lot Labonville subdivision.

***D. Shankle motioned to continue the application to March 19, 2012. Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **6. ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS: 1) RTE. 3A HOURGLASS AND 2) RTE. 3A & HACKETT HILL RD. INTERSECTION**

Dan Tatem: Here with me tonight is Jerry Fortin, Principal at Stantec.

D. Tatem: There are a lot of new Board members here tonight. Quick summary for proposed roadway improvements on Rte. 3A:

1) hourglass - Rte. 3A Market Basket and Walmart; move Goonan Rd. entrance. Hourglass goes from 4 lanes then 2 lanes and back to 4 lanes. The roadway would be widened for 4 lanes. There have been studies with DOT and SNHPC.

2) Hackett Hill Rd. and Rte. 3A intersection - There is some highway money from the Cabellas project; \$3.2 million for exit 11 improvements. Cabellas is gone but the money stayed.

We met with the State a couple of months ago. To use some of \$3 million and municipally managed, it would be 1/3 town funds. The State wanted to take all the Hackett Hill funds and use on the hourglass. The hourglass is not enough of a project to use all \$3 million and the State would take back \$2 million. Dean and Leo started meeting with us (Dan, Dick, and Jo Ann). Dean made it clear that intersection project at Hackett Hill Rd. (Hooksett) is where most residents drive-thru and traffic backups and there are accidents. The concept plan includes a turning lane and traffic signals. We convinced the State that there should be a Rte. 3A corridor phased project to include both the hourglass and Hackett Hill Rd. The State verbally approved this concept phased plan. The State wants the Planning Board to determine which project we want phased first. The State approves permits and bids. When the bid is awarded and construction is eminent, then we will start the 2<sup>nd</sup> design. It will take 5-6 yrs. out to get them both built. We would fund the project with 90% impact fees. Lowes & Walmart gave significant impact fees and if not used within 10 yrs. must be returned to the developer. The State also collected \$480,000 for the hourglass only with no timeline. We received \$260,000 from Market Basket as a gift to the Town as long as it is used at their front door; no timeline. There is current legislation to use town impact fees on State roads.

J. Duffy: It doesn't help us to use impact fee monies on Hackett Hill Rd. If we talked to Lowes and Walmart and they agreed, we would still be able to use their funds on the hourglass. We are \$158,000 short on Hackett Hill Rd. and would need to find Town funding or other developer funding.

D. Tatem: The hourglass is for thru traffic and realigning Goonan Rd, for a 4-way intersection. Signaling is not included. To widen the Brickyard Brook culvert will cost \$300,000. There will be a signal and another lane on Central Park Dr. The hourglass would require land acquisitions. The Irving Station has 15 ft. wide ROW that would need to be widened and is a Town responsibility; State said they wouldn't do that. There are slope easements in the back of Goonan Rd. along Rte. 3A.

M. Cannata: Now that Lowes is closed, are they still in the game?

D. Marshall: Yes.

J. Turbyne: I live on Hackett Hill Rd. I recommend Hackett Hill Rd. and Rte. 3A improvements as phase I; this area would be the one with the most severe accidents.

D. Marshall: This all hinges on very critical legislation. Jo Ann and I have been at the State testimony. There is pretty good support from NH builders, however realtors have concerns. Hooksett keeps good bookkeeping of these fees; what is collected and what it is spent on. There is a need created by development that created the impact fees; Market Basket, Walmart, and Lowes. Moving from where we collected them to Hackett Hill intersection – we collect based on corridors – won't sit well with Walmart and Lowes

using impact fees north on Hackett Hill intersection. We think bill will pass the senate, but the house will be more difficult – realtors. How to appease the realtors? We can't use funds collected on south bow road on Rte. 3A corridor. Unless we resolve, certain funds from Walmart and Lowes if law doesn't pass couldn't use. Hackett Hill Rte. 3A to State sheds is a State highway. Can't use impact fees now on State highways.

F. Kotowski: The original bill for town impacts fees to be used on State roads was filed by Senator Boutin. This would allow us to use fees anywhere in the corridor. Hooksett, unlike a lot of other communities, as State road for their major roadway. Have they changed the bill?

D. Marshall: The bill has changed in wording. Phase I should be Hackett Hill Rd. because of safety issues, and phase II should be the hourglass for traffic flow. When Manchester develops their side of Hackett Hill Rd., those people will use our roads for Walmart, Market Basket, and other businesses.

R. Duhaime: We have collected impact fees. There are three highway exits in Town. It is hard not to collect impact fees and spend them on State roads in our Town.

M. Cannata: We should have an action plan on what we know now and where we are going.

D. Marshall: We need to explain to the State in writing the overall Rte. 3A phasing; phase I Hackett Hill Rd. and phase II hourglass. Make impact fees into gifts.

M. Cannata: Can Lowes and Walmart rescind their gift?

D. Marshall: No they can't do that. We have it for 10 yrs. There is a concerted effort to get the law to be able to use those funds.

D. Tatem: For money released from Walmart and Lowes as a gift they will want used for their doorstep and anything left use up at Hackett Hill Rd.

J. Duffy: The Planning Board needs to make a recommendation which project you would like to go forward, and then motion to forward to the Town Council for their recommendation.

M. Cannata: Should we wait until we know the outcome from Lowes and Walmart?

D. Marshall: We should motion to go forward to Town Council first for their recommendation, then go to Lowes and Walmart.

D. Tatem: Town Council recommendation, then Lowes and Walmart, and then a letter from the Town to the State.

D. Shankle: When we approach Lowes and Walmart and the State, we should show our

excitement with getting the Rte. 3A corridor done within 5-6 yrs.

S. Lovas Orr: They (Walmart) don't want extended construction in front of their business.

D. Shankle: Are there traffic counts?

XXX: I live in that area and there are multiple projects on the Manchester Hackett Hill Rd. side. Traffic cuts through Hackett Hill Rd. to the Hooksett side to by-pass Rte. 3A.

S. Lovas Orr: Are there accident reports?

D. Tatem: If the State said we need accident reports to show needed improvements to Hackett Hill Rd. and Rte. 3A intersection, then I would get accident reports. But the State has agreed it needs improvements.

D. Shankle: If legislation passes, can we make a case that the impact fees we collected down where the hourglass is have impacted the traffic up at the Hackett Hill Rd. & Rte. 3A intersection?

D. Marshall: For traffic signals, it takes injuries, accidents, and over time deaths before the State will OK them. An example is Whitehall Rd. and Rte. 28; three deaths then traffic lights.

J. Fortin: For engineering studies, the format gets reviewed by the State. We will follow all procedures before final design.

***F. Kotowski motioned in favor on the conceptual Rte. 3A improvements plans as presented conditional it is one phased plan: phase I – Hackett Hill Rd. and Rte. 3A intersection, and phase II – Rte. 3A hourglass. The Board is favor of moving this phased plan forward to the Town Council for their review. Seconded M. Cannata. Vote unanimously in favor.***

## **7. CHANGE OF USE**

Veano's Restaurant, 1328 Hooksett Road, Map 25, lot 78 – addition of patio area. Previously discussed with the PB on 6/22/11. They had approved request, but requested Stantec to review drainage. Stantec ok with plan. Staff decided this should be treated as a tenant fit-up.

Colorful Apples Daycare, 1249 Hooksett Road, Map 31, lot 94 – being handled by Bldg.

Manchester Animal Hospital/Roy Ball, 1129 Hooksett Road, Map 41, lot 11 – request for addition of apartment in Performance Zone – referred to ZBA – needs variance.



Wicked Weaponry/Ben Beauchemin, 114 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, lot 33-2 – gunsmithing, sales – former gymnastic facility – tenant fit-up.

Daniel Lagueux – White Birch Brewing – addition of restaurant/pub, 1339 Hooksett Road, Map 25, lot 10 – will be referred to PB for site plan review.

Corriveau Drive – elderly housing request with one full-time caretaker– 6-8 residents – not permitted in LDR – referred to ZBA for variance.

M. Cannata: Adding the change of use notes in your staff report is very helpful.

J. Duffy: The new CEO, Matt Labonte, is very good at judging tenant fit up vs. more needed.

**Petersbrook 2-lot Voluntary Merger – Map 24, Lots 35-9 & 35-10**

D. Marshall: Signed the merger documents on behalf of the Planning Board for recording at the M.C.R.D.

***R. Duhaime motioned to adjourn at 9:05pm. Seconded by T. Walsh.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

Vice-Chair D. Marshall declared the meeting adjourned at 9:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,  
Planning Coordinator