

Official
As of 12/03/12

HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, November 19, 2012

CALLED TO ORDER

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

ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD

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

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 11/05/12

D. Marshall motioned to approve the minutes of 11/05/12 with edit by T. Walsh.

Seconded by D. Rogers.

Vote unanimously in favor.

DISCUSSION – CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

1. REM CENTRAL, LLC

90 West River Rd., Map 29, Lot 72

Conceptual site plan to modify previously approved site plan for phase 2 to remove fast food restaurant in lieu of a 7,950 sq. ft. retail building and omission of cross-access connection.

Chris Rice, TF Moran: I am here on behalf of REM Central, LLC. Our client is out-of-state and not here to tonight due to the holiday. This is an approved site plan from 2003 and amended in 2004. The plan included a Dunkin Donuts on the right hand side of the parcel and a fast food site next to it, then next to that is the Irving gas station. Kohl's, Staples, and Target are across the street. A condition of phase II for the other restaurant was that a cross-connection be built between our site and the other site. Now we are proposing a smaller scale retail development approximately 8,000 sq. ft. Tonight I wanted to discuss with the Board if we could omit the cross-access. The main reason for this request is cost. Left portion of the site is ledge to the existing grade. There is a hill climbing to a substantial grade. Irving has a riprap slope. I wanted to get the Board's input.

D. Marshall: I am sure your client at the time of their original approval knew the ledge was there and agreed to the cross-over. We had an option for him; don't build the cross-over and instead extend the island.

J. Duffy: He agreed to it; however in the agreement it stated that he would seek permission from the Irving gas station. That never happened. There is no agreement from the Irving side.

D. Marshall: That will require work on Rte. 3A.

C. Rice: So the agreement was to extend the island or have cross-access, one or the other. Did the Board have a preference at that time?

D. Marshall: The Board felt that if he built the connector going through to the traffic light that was a better solution at that time. I understand a fast food restaurant would generate so much traffic, however we don't have a clue what the retail business is. Some retail stores generate a lot of volume, and others don't. There is a turn coming out of the development; a right turn is OK, but a left turn is prohibited and dangerous for traffic coming around the curve. Unless something can control that better, the island should go in.

C. Rice: I saw a letter dated 2003-2004 from Irving saying they were willing to discuss the cross-access. Personnel and company policy could have changed since then. At the Irving site lower corner, we may be able to do something where the ATM machine was supposed to go. This area services the truckers for the back section of the property. A cross-access could kill the proposed project due to cost.

T. Walsh: The agreement said it had to happen with an agreement with Irving. Have they denied that or is that just the next steps?

C. Rice: It is just the next steps to get a letter from Irving once a developer pursues phase II.

R. Duhaime: This site is why I got on the Hooksett Planning Board. The stamped plan for Dunkin Donuts has erosion stone and a 10 ft. tall back wall. The landscaping is inside the retention pond. This is not the most attractive site. This site was blasted, and they knew what they were getting into. This is a dangerous curve. A cross-access would be safer.

S. Lovas Orr: Your suggestion of a connection on the front side of Irving, I am sure you have seen how busy that Irving is. If you put a crossing in front, that will cause Irving traffic problems.

L. Lessard: Come off the hammerhead so cars have to go around vs. going in front of the pumps. Have a berm or island.

C. Rice: You are still concerned with a left out of the site even with a low traffic tenant. If a very low traffic generator, it is case-by-case. Once the tenant is known we can come back?

J. Gryval: At this point it is a traffic issue.

F. Kotowski: Have you done a cost analysis based on the ledge from the original plan?

C. Rice: We have done one for this plan.

F. Kotowski: So going in back where there is ledge would kill your project based on cost?

C. Rice: Yes.

M. Cannata: I am not sure use matters, because use changes.

T. Walsh: As a follow-up to Mr. Kotowski, what is the cost analysis to extend the island vs. having a cross-connection?

C. Rice: To build the rear access would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.

D. Marshall: This isn't the only site in town that has this problem. There is McDonald's, CVS, and others. If you can't stop that, you need to put in something geometrically that a vehicle can't take the wrong way.

C. Rice: Prohibit people traveling north. If the island went down beyond the self-storage facility that restricts their access.

D. Marshall: Then his access would become a 4-way intersection behind Dunkin Donut's to Irving for a relief road.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

2. **CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 17, 2012**
BIELIZNA, DIANE & STANLEY (#12-18)
1266 Smyth Rd., Map 48, Lot 19
Proposal for a 4-lot major subdivision (parent lot + 3 new lots)

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 17, 2012.

COMPLETENESS WAIVERS & PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. **CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 3, 2012**
RAVINIA COLD STORAGE, LLC (#12-23)
East Point Dr., Map 49, Lot 4
Amended site plan for a warehouse that will be built all at once. The first section of the building will be 35' tall and the second half will be 45' tall. There is no change in the amount of office space and there is a reduction in the total warehouse square footage to 341,000 sq. ft. due to removal of the freezer storage section.
- **Waiver Request** – Development Regulations Section III Site Plan Checklist – completeness

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 3, 2012.

4. 76-80 TERRACE ROAD LLC (#12-24)

4 Pleasant St., Map 6, Lot 116-1

Amended site plan for the existing structure (formerly used by Caruso landscaping for office/retail space) to be used as retail space for the sale of antiques, collectibles, and consignments. Site to include parking lot improvements.

- **Waiver Request** – Development Regulations Section III Site Plan Checklist – completeness

Alden Beauchemin, Keyland Enterprises: I am representing my client 76-80 Terrace Road LLC. The site was formerly used by Caruso Brothers near the LaValley Farm Stand at the fork on Pleasant Street. There are two sections on the site “A” & “B”. Section B is where we are focusing on tonight where the existing house is located. Section A will stay the same as what it was as a garden center. My client is coming in for a conditional use, because of the change in ownership. We had an approval from 1995 for retail use, and we are slightly modifying. The proposed change is for an antique shop, collectibles, and consignments. We don’t expect a lot of parking, but we do show a couple of improvements out front. Both Leo (DPW Director) & Dan (Stantec) stated to pave the parking areas. We proposed changes to the plan from Leo’s comments and Dan’s comments. Jo Ann thought it was important to get Dan’s comments, because there were drainage issues on the site. We came up with a solution, and I did drop off those changes to Leo today and we did discuss that. For drainage there is the State culvert discharge at our driveway that runs off from Pleasant Street and into Deer Run. The owner thought a berm would solve the problem, but it didn’t. Doing some driveway entrance improvements will help this. We are paving parking spaces and will have a slight impervious increase. On some of the new plans we have an infiltration basin in the bottom to collect any runoff directed to a basin to riprap flow for Deer Run. We will get the runoff to where it should go. I went over Dan’s letter of 11/14/12 with Jo Ann today. Your site plan regulations require all bounds be set. This was an existing site used for years, and our modifications to the site are minimal. I am now submitting a waiver for the requirement of bounds. The project coming in is an antique shop with very little money.

J. Gryval: Jo Ann did you see a problem with the change of use?

J. Duffy: This project initially went to the Change of Use Committee. The barn area in section A is for the sale of consignment furniture. The Fire Dept. said if upholstered furniture being sold, they would need a sprinkler system. The only reason it kicked back over to the Planning Board was that there were changes to the site for parking from gravel to pavement, and that is why we had Stantec review the plan. Stantec came up with a letter of 11/14/12. I feel Stantec’s comments are minimal and could be reviewed by staff. The only one I do have an issue with is the setting of the bounds. A few weeks ago the Board denied the waiver request for bounds for another applicant. Also, we just received the waiver for bounds. It needs to be noticed in abutter letters, and it wasn’t because we just received it tonight. A lot of people are complaining about setting granite bounds on all corners, but that is what our regulations require right now. For the future

maybe we could look at iron pins.

J. Gryval: There is a waiver for the completeness checklist.

J. Duffy: They are asking not to go through the checklist again, because this is a minor modification and not a structural change.

A. Beauchemin: I will withdraw the waiver for bounds that I submitted tonight.

Waiver Request #1 – Development Regulations Section III Site Plan Checklist – completeness

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

*D. Marshall motioned to grant waiver #1 above. Seconded by T. Walsh.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

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

D. Marshall: Why did staff recommend this applicant be continued to 12/3/12?

J. Duffy: I hadn't talked to Alden, but now I am all set.

F. Kotowski: Is it just section A?

A. Beauchemin: Section B is staying the same.

R. Duhaime: It is one lot, so why are we taking sections A & B?

D. Marshall: It is like a two phase development.

A. Beauchemin: The only reason I called it sections A & B was it was two separate lots before and now they are merged.

R. Duhaime: Are the drainage improvements needed on your site?

A. Beauchemin: Yes, on our site.

J. Gryval: Leo are you all set with this applicant?

L. Lessard: Yes.

Open public hearing

Donald Mafera, 5 Pleasant Street: I was looking at the map. I wanted to assure whatever is done on this site pertains to the regulations on what the lot is today. From what I can hear and understand it is going from office space to a retail business for antiques and that type of consignment materials. As far as we are concerned that would be OK with us. What about the other lot/section?

J. Gryval: The other lot/section remains exactly as it is now (landscaping), so no need to come before the Board. If a waiver is required for any of these regulations, you will know about it and be able to speak.

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 11/14/12 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
- Letter from Hooksett Sewer Commission stating they have capacity and approve this project
- Letter from Village Water Precinct stating they have capacity and approve this project
- All waivers noted on plan cover sheet
- At the discretion of the DPW Director, the 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
- Applicant agrees to site plan compliance monitoring at the discretion of the DPW Director
- Prior to issuance of CO, the applicant also agrees to provide Community Development with PDFs of Planning Board signed plan set.

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 M. Cannata
Vote unanimously in favor.***

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PLANNING BOARD RECONSIDERATION OF THE 10/15/12 PLANNING BOARD CONDITIONAL EXTENSION PER DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS (6/4/2012) SECTION 10.03 2) TIME LIMITS FOR FULFILLING CONDITIONS – PER NH SUPREME COURT DECISION 74 COX STREET LLC V. NASHUA, 156 N.H. 228 (2007).

5. MIACOMET DEVELOPMENT, LLC (#07-37)

“WEBSTER WOODS II”, Hooksett Rd., Map 6, Lot 114

Site plan to improve and develop phase II of “Webster Woods” to include 23 duplex ranch style buildings totaling 46 units and 7 single ranch style units for 55 yrs. & older person housing.

- Application conditionally approved on 11/2/2009 and was to expire on 11/2/2012.
- On 10/15/12, the applicant received a one (1) year conditional extension to this approval to 11/2/2013.
- The applicant will not be able to meet the Board’s conditions of 10/15/12 and request the Board: 1) modify its 10/15/12 decision, and 2) extend the application for an additional 60 days to January 9, 2013.

J. Duffy: A few meetings ago the applicant requested an extension for phase II of this development. That extension was approved with several conditions to include posting a surety and beginning work on 10/22/12. They did file for a request for reconsideration. At the last meeting the Board did grant the rehearing for tonight. Jim Gove, Wetland Scientist, came up with a proposal to take care of the ravine. Rather than filling the area he proposes to have pipes with catch basins before it is released into the wetlands. It would have treatment. There was a site walk done with several residents, staff, and John (Planning Board Chair) was there. Everyone talked about the best approach. The applicant agreed to a pre-construction meeting, and that was done last week. Machinery went out a few days ago to stabilize the slopes for the winter season. The picture I sent around earlier tonight is one section. They are asking for an extension. Stantec and the State DES are reviewing the plans for the ravine. Jim has a meeting with Collis Adams at DES in the next few days. Tonight they are here to ask for an extension for the phase II approval. Initially when they submitted their extension request letter they were only asking for a 60-day extension with 15 ft. of fill. My recommendation is a 6 month extension to bring us into May. We will know by then if the ravine is repaired and will stay that way. I did speak with Dean (Town Administrator) a little while ago, and we will do everything we can do for the developer to fix this. If this does go to court, we have done our share and done all we can. Rather than court it is remanded back to the Planning Board. Dean agreed with the 6 month extension.

Sharon Cuddy Somers, Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella, PLLC: I am here tonight representing the interest of Miacomet Development LLC. Our reason to be here tonight is for an extension. We originally requested the extension to January 9, 2013. The Town is amendable to a 6 month extension, and that would be agreeable to us tonight. Since we were here in October, we created a substantial fix on October 22nd. We had a meeting with the Town on October 24th and the Town discussed a phased approach and we followed up on that idea. We have arrived with a plan to stabilize the erosion, and have it all completed except for hydro seeding and matting to be completed tomorrow. It is a collaborative effort with the Town and DES for all aspects of the approval process. In the recent past Jim Gove and Ridge Mauck discussed suggestions and ideas for the ravine

plan. We took their initial ideas and further meet with Jim Gove, DES, and Stantec to come up with a conceptual agreement on how those plans will move forward. Jim Gove is here tonight to talk a little bit about the plan and Steve Height is here from Ed Herbert's office. A meeting is set up with Jim Gove and DES on November 29th after Thanksgiving Day. We need to go to the Conservation Commission again on December 4th. We believe with this conceptual agreement that the review and approval process with the State and Town levels will go quickly. The final plan presented will be no later than December 20th; hopefully before then. Approval and weather permitting, we will be out doing the work based on this plan. I request this Board grant the 6 month approval recommended by staff. I will now turn over to Jim Gove and Miacomet.

J. Duffy: The initial approval you are extending had several conditions and those have not been met. If you are extending, you are also extending those conditions.

D. Marshall: Is the June 1st date for all plantings still valid?

J. Duffy: There are two sets of conditions: 1) October 15, 2012 conditional extension, and 2) November 2, 2009 original conditions of approval

D. Marshall: As far as the 10/15/12 conditional extension:

- 1) \$300,000 Cash escrow account be established with the Town by October 29, 2012 to be used toward the actual work on the project = **This goes away – we were going to take the money and draw down for the contractor to be paid**
- 2) substantial efforts on the erosion problem begin no later than October 22, 2012 = **This goes away.**
- 3) all work except for plantings and vegetation be completed by February 1, 2013 = **This goes away.**
- 4) all plantings and stabilization be completed by June 1, 2013 = **This deadline would now be May 19, 2013.**

D. Marshall: We are not requiring a surety; nothing?

J. Duffy: They were going ahead with the work. If the erosion problem is not fixed, the State is going after them with fines.

J. Gryval: I would like to hear about Stantec's 11/8/12 e-mail "indicates they are not convinced that simply routing the stormwater flow around the ravines will solve the existing slope erosion". That is a big hang up. Make sure Stantec approves it.

Jim Gove, Gove Environmental: The picture just submitted to you shows the area completed with the exception of fabric and hydro seed and that will be done tomorrow to stabilize the area. Stantec, Ridge Mauck (DES), and Collis Adams (DES) have a different plan. It is a redirection inflow in front of the homes to a new channel. The old channel is the perennial portion. They want to get the trees out and create a new stabilized stream channel for a small flow and bypass the plunge pool and go into the wetlands. There will be no pipe all the way around. Stantec wanted to see that happen. We still have the issue of the "mudflat" and pipe still partially buried 4-6 ft. down below the sediment and that area needs to be turned back into the wetland which will polish the

runoff. The question is how to get down there. We could use the old existing road without cutting trees and work along the wetland edge to work on both of the channels. That is the new plan; however we don't have all the details. I want to get input from Collis Adams at DES for comments on the wetland. We will need an amendment to the wetlands permit, because it is different than the original permit.

R. Duhaime: There is a 15 ft. fill area from Stantec's comment letter.

J. Gove: The fill was going to be throughout the entire area. I don't believe Stantec was concerned behind house #4 for the erosion area. Eric Nickerson met with those residents. We will knock down the eroding knoll and stabilize the entire slope as well for a 3:1. We will use just fabric, and other areas use stone.

R. Duhaime: The elevations now, these will be flattened? Is there extreme wetland restoration on the right hand side?

J. Gove: This will be a true stream restoration with plunge pools and cleaning-up trees in this area. We want to restore the perennial stream and armor runoff.

M. Cannata: Will DES get what you noted in shading a staging situation the term you are using in each area for what you have identified?

J. Gove: Yes, they will get a sequencing plan. What (plan) you have in front of you has gone to DES.

J. Gryval: Tonight is a conditional extension rehearing.

Open public hearing

Don Ingalls, 4 Hickory Court: My wife and I have lived here since 2008. We were encouraged by the changes made in the past five (5) days. It went from no work at all to an area that now seems to be stabilized. The erosion over the last 2 yrs. resulted in 8-9 ft. sheer cliffs where the erosion has taken place. Their plan now looks good to me and I am encouraged by the plan changes. A couple of reservations I have are: 1) the plan is not complete in the area behind unit 4, and 2) will the existing drainage swale off Bert and Otterson divert much runoff. I would like to make certain of the volume of water when it meets with the other areas. Dogwood volume shoots out rather than a gradual flow. If you double the volume, the pipes will have to handle that. I recommend the approval of the 6 month extension.

Close public hearing

*F. Kotowski motioned to reconsider the 10/15/12 Planning Board conditional extension per Development Regulations (6/4/2012) section 10.03 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions – per NH Supreme Court decision 74 Cox Street LLC v. Nashua, 156 N.H. 228 (2007). Seconded by M. Cannata.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

D. Marshall motioned to withdraw the notification of denial (letter dated 10/24/12), modify the previous conditional extension (letter dated 10/17/12), and grant an extension to the time limits for fulfilling the 11/02/2009 conditions for 6 months to May 19, 2013 subject to the following conditions:

1. Original 11/2/2009 conditions of approval (see letter dated 11/9/2009)
2. Conceptual drainage improvement plan (see attached plan dated 11/19/2012). This plan is to be completed to the satisfaction of NHDES and Stantec to include modifications as appropriate.
3. All outstanding comments from Stantec are addressed to Stantec's satisfaction to include the slope erosion pre-construction meeting comments (see e-mail with attachment dated 11/14/12)

*Seconded by D. Rogers.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

M. Cannata: How will the Planning Board know if the DES conditions have been met?

J. Gryval: 6 months is a good start. Then we can take a good look at it and see where it stands.

OTHER BUSINESS

6. PLANNING BOARD PACKETS – ELECTRONIC VS. HARD COPIES

D. Marshall: If you are asking me to print the Board packet I get in the mail that is not going to happen. Once sent electronically, I will read it, but I do need a hard copy when I get here. If an application is continued, it is our responsibility to bring back the previously submitted documents to the continued date.

J. Gryval: You have to print the agenda, because it came out six (6) times. You have to print the Town Planner comments; because that is the only way you get them. You don't have to print the minutes. Just make a notation of a page if you need to edit it. It is whatever the Board decides on receiving the documentation for the meetings.

D. Winterton: I would echo Dick's comments. If there are pages sent electronically, you can choose what pages you want to print.

D. Marshall: We are an all-volunteer Board. If he (Town Administrator) wants to provide me with paper and cartridges, but if not then asking me to print is not going to happen.

J. Duffy: We are in a default budget and have \$900.00 budgeted for printing this year. As of September, we have already used \$600.00. If you can bring back the repeat application documents that will help us out.

S. Lovas Orr: Less paper the better, if we could get to a point for the letters from Stantec to have via e-mail so we could just pull it up on a laptop at the meeting. We get plan sets now, and then another plan set because of one page that changed. I don't like having that much paper. If it were up to me, I would say no paper. We should have tablets available to each of us to be able to bring up data electronically. This would save on paper, printing, and staff time to copy. However until we have that technology available, we will have to copy.

D. Marshall: We should limit it to new copies only. If something is continued and we already have the paperwork, we bring it to the continued date.

D. Winterton: Like Susan I can opt out of receiving paper copies if I choose.

S. Lovas Orr: The Town Council packets have a number assigned to them. Maybe we can do that for our packets.

J. Duffy: Referred to the agenda; there is already a number assigned to each application. We can make sure future documents have that number on them.

J. Gryval: In 6 months we can recheck how we are doing with this process.

7. CIP COMMITTEE MEMBER ATTENDANCE – DANA ARGO

J. Gryval: Any member of the CIP Committee missing two (2) meetings should not vote on the CIP plan.

J. Duffy: A request was made by this year's CIP Committee for the Planning Board to make one of their members a non-voting status. One member has missed two (2) meetings, since the Planning Board adopted the CIP Committee attendance policy in the CIP Handbook on 11/5/12.

T. Walsh: The member has missed all but one meeting since the start of this year's CIP Committee.

S. Lovas Orr motioned to make Dana Argo, CIP Committee member, a non-voting status for the FY 2013-14 committee per the attendance policy in the CIP Handbook. Seconded by M. Cannata.

M. Cannata: Is there a consensus from the CIP Committee on how they want this to be handled (vacancy and/or non-voting status)?

T. Walsh: We (CIP Committee) talked about it at length and that was the consensus to have the member be a non-voting status.

S. Lovas Orr: I don't know him (Dana). It is not personal. To be active you have to be present at the meetings. How can he intelligently vote on anything? It is logistics.

T. Walsh: That is why we wanted to recommend Dana have a non-voting status. He has other things to do on those nights.

J. Gryval: We had another individual who wanted to come on the CIP Committee and he said that he would miss the first two meetings. The Planning Board did not appoint that individual.

F. Kotowski: Would you rather have a member be removed (vacancy) and replaced vs. a non-voting member?

T. Walsh: We only have one more meeting left. This year's self-audit we will make our comments for appointments next year.

R. Duhaim: At the CIP Committee, we always wanted a council member.

Vote unanimously in favor.

8. APPROVAL OF STANTEC INVOICES

F. Kotowski motioned to authorize the Planning Board Chair to review and approve the Stantec SPR & SPC invoices as of 11/19/12. Seconded by D. Marshall.

Vote unanimously in favor.

9. CHANGE OF USE

NEW APPLICATIONS

1. Hooksett Tool Rental, 1368 Hooksett Road, Map 18, lot 41

Use existing vacant space for wholesale equipment rental

D. Marshall: Where is NH Tool Rental?

J. Duffy: Behind Woodmaster. Hooksett Tool Rental was continued to another change of use meeting date, because the applicant couldn't be there.

2. Christine Duggan, 1261 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 93

Occupy existing retail space in the Supreme Pizza building currently used by Tri-Town Cabinetry for retail store. Type of store unknown.

S. Lovas Orr: We should consider the volume of traffic at the Supreme Pizza building, because the parking is tight.

T. Walsh: Which spot are they looking at the Supreme Pizza building?

J. Duffy: The strip mall out front.

3. *Natural Choice Market, 270 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 31, Lot 34-1*

Expansion of use with outdoor storage and construction of greenhouse as well as the sale of Christmas trees.

J. Duffy: An owner of a landscape company wants permission for selling Christmas trees at this site. He also wants to have a greenhouse area in the building setback. There is a note on the plan that any further changes or improvements will need Planning Board approval.

4. *Sparklyn Pools, 1100 Hooksett Road, Map 41, Lot 86*

Relocate retail pool business to Unit #8. Current use as a spa and massage salon. Requesting outdoor storage of sand and chemicals.

J. Duffy: Sparklyn Pools is relocating and going into the building next to Bull Run. The only concern is storage of chlorine and salt. We want them to put this storage in the back with a stockade fence. The Fire Dept. needs to do an inspection.

T. Walsh: Which spot is Sparklyn going into?

J. Duffy: Smaller unit #8 next to the large unit.

5. *Vasily Fedorov, 1346 Hooksett Road, Map25, Lot 6*

Relocate existing auto sales business from "AMATI'S" from 1348 Hooksett Road

J. Duffy: Amati's is in the building across from Lindsay Rd. and wants to move next door to the larger site where the golf carts were located. The variance to do auto repairs would carry over to this new tenant.

WEBSTER WOODS

R. Duhaime: We should pat ourselves on the back for holding Miacomet to the hot seat. Sometimes you sit on a Board and bang your head against wall. The abutters seemed happy.

J. Duffy: This application has taken up a tremendous amount of staff time.

RILEY'S SIGNAGE

D. Rogers: The Riley's sign, the Planning Board didn't approve it, but they are putting up a new sign?

J. Duffy: They went to the Building Dept. for a permit, because they designed it to meet the requirements.

M. Cannata: Riley wanted to include 3 tenants.

J. Duffy: The Building Inspector approved 2 tenants, and said the third was not valid.

VIDEO TAPING OF TONIGHT'S MEETING

M. Miville: Mr. Chair, the video for tonight's meeting is not working, but the audio is OK.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (EDC)

J. Gryval: Don Winterton asked to be on that committee (EDC) and they didn't know if could be on multiple committees.

D. Winterton: My concern is if you are on the Planning Board and the EDC. On the EDC you sell Hooksett and someone comes in here (Planning Board), where is the conflict? When do you start and when do you stop?

J. Gryval: I would have the same problem, because I am on the EDC now.

S. Lovas Orr: It would be like someone trying to sell something and be in collections too.

R. Duhaime: You are only one vote. You are supposed to be representing the residents of Hooksett.

M. Cannata: Where you are slanting the discussion, you can ask the Board if you should recuse yourself.

J. Gryval: We should let the Town Council decide on this item.

S. Lovas Orr: The Council would have to appoint you to the EDC anyway. It is a great opportunity for discussion.

J. Gryval: I don't know if the Council told me I could be on there (EDC) or not.

S. Lovas Orr: Do you want me to have this item put on the Town Council agenda?

D. Winterton: Yes, I would suggest you put it on the Town Council agenda.

***D. Marshall motioned to adjourn at 7:45pm. Seconded by S. Lovas Orr.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,
Planning Coordinator