

Official
As of 03/19/13

HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, March 4, 2013

CALLED TO ORDER

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

ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD

Chair John Gryval, Vice-Chair Dick Marshall and Town Administrator, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr., Town Council Rep. Susan Lovas Orr (arrived 6:30pm), Town Administration Rep. Leo Lessard (DPW Director), David Rogers, Frank Kotowski, Robert Duhaime and Thomas Prasol.

Excused: Donald Winterton and Tom Walsh.

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

Jo Ann Duffy, Town Planner.

J. Gryval: Robert Duhaime and Thomas Prasol will be voting tonight in place of Donald Winterton and Tom Walsh.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 02/11/13

R. Duhaime motioned to approve the minutes of 02/11/13. Seconded by T. Prasol. Vote unanimously in favor.

DISCUSSIONS

1. 37 -LOT CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION
SOUTH BOW ROAD – BUFFER DETERMINATION & WELL RADII
Keith Martel

Todd Connors, Engineer @ Sterling Homes/Long Beach Development Associates, LLC: There are two (2) concept copies. There is the smaller scale of the entire property with 100 acres on two tracts of land. The front abuts So. Bow Rd. and the back abuts the Town of Bow. We propose constructing a new roadway to intersect with So. Bow Rd. that would cut through the development at the Hooksett boundary and a new connector road into Merrill Crossing Rd. in Bow. We met with staff and went out in the field for test pits for the type of soils. We also looked at open space and density calculations. The density in our concept calculates out per Hooksett regulations for the removal of steep slopes and wetlands. The site is over 50% unconstrained by slopes and wetlands. There are overlapping well radii on many of the lots, not consistent with Hooksett regulations,

but consistent with State of NH regulations. On one of the lots it spills over onto the open space. We arranged the lots in a way so that the septic system could not be built in the side setback. Tonight we are in for conceptual format. I am trying to get a feel from the Board if a waiver of this nature would be acceptable to you and to gauge how you see the property. Your regulations are different than DES for the 4,000 sq. ft. septic receiving area. The State adopted a smaller footprint area for about a 1,000 sq. ft. I don't believe we are interested in a waiver of this item, but it may constrict us with the location of the wells. There is the perimeter buffer for the subdivision to neighboring properties and that footage is under the Planning Board's jurisdiction. We looked at the neighboring Austin Woods plans south of our location, and some of their buffers are 50 ft. and some much larger. We propose a 50 ft. wide buffer. The southerly side of our property line follows the stream channel. For requirements for sidewalks, what does the Planning Board want (i.e. grass panel, sidewalk to curb line)? We are at the early stages in our design.

J. Gryval: 1) Well radii, I don't think we have ever given a waiver for this.

L. Lessard: On the well radius, going over other lots, they are staying within the buildable setbacks. The wells will still be protected.

R. Duhaime: What is the line to the right of the conceptual?

T. Connors: It is a dashed tract line.

R. Duhaime: What is the frontage on the two long lots?

T. Connors. 50 ft.

R. Duhaime: If you got rid of a lot on each side of the road, then you wouldn't have the well radius issue.

T. Connors: Our density is 38%. We looked at your subdivision regulations. To get any density, we needed the piece in Bow.

J. Gryval: Other than losing lots, is there any reason why you can't conform to our regulations?

T. Connors: Keith Martel @ Sterling Homes is here tonight. We could pull the road from south to east that we be more slopes, a longer road, and more frontage on those lots. We would need to cross a second wetland. This is an option we would look at.

Keith Martel, Sterling Homes: Reviewed lots 17-21 on the conceptual plan.

J. Gryval: It gets to a point of losing lots to comply with our regulations.

F. Kotowski: The right portion of your conceptual is in Bow and the lot sizes are larger. The other side of the road is in Hooksett with smaller lots. Did you go to Bow and ask

them for a variance for lot sizes to increase density there?

T. Connors: We are using Bow's traditional regulations. Please know that there will be 50+ acres of open space for Hooksett.

J. Gryval: We have regulations. I can see where you can put in a number of homes and still comply with our regulations.

D. Shankle: I would not go along with the well radii waiver.

D. Marshall: Rethink the well radii and don't even bother asking for a waiver. Do we allow frontage to go down to 50 ft.?

J. Duffy: Yes, in Conservation Subdivisions we do allow 50 ft.

R. Duhaime: The first three (3) lots have a 50 ft. buffer at the entrance to subdivision. It would be nice to enter the subdivision with larger lots.

J. Gryval: How do you get frontage on lot 27?

T. Connors: The lot is a long strip.

J. Gryval: 2) And the buffer?

T. Connors: Redesign the road and see how the well radius and buffer will end up being.

T. Connors: 3) Sidewalks?

L. Lessard: I want vertical curbing sidewalks.

J. Duffy: 5 ft. sidewalks.

T. Connors: Thank you.

2. CERTIFIED SITE PROGRAM (*Ready Set Go* Program) Jack Munn, SNHPC & Jeff Burd, University Heights Marketplace

Jack Munn, SNHPC: Presented a slide show on the Certified Site Program. The program is a recommendation in Economic Development (ED) plan. Access Greater Manchester is formerly known as Metro. The program is named "Ready Set Go". DRED, Fairpoint, Centrix Bank and others are partners. We added Windham to our SNHPC region. The ED is a tool. We saw the Saturday Union Leader article on Bass Pro Shop. If both the Town and the developer want to participate in this program then application forms must be submitted. The program

- **Concepts:** 1) recognizes certified sites and buildings within the region and each participating community, 2) promotes collaboration between applicants and

- municipalities in developing certified sites, 3) provides opportunities to market certified sites on a number of commercial and municipal websites, include the “Ready Set Go!” website, and 4) gives property owners more time to market their certified sites, thus reducing pre-development risks and costs.
- **What is a certified site?** 1) a site or building located on a parcel of land greater than one acre in size, 2) a site or building zoned for either industrial, office, mixed-use or a combination of the above, 3) a site with a boundary survey, asking price or rental rate, phase one environmental assessment (at the option of the property owner/Planning Board) and zoning verification and list of approved uses, and 4) optional: the site can be “cleared” and excavated to make it “pad-ready” in accordance with local municipal approvals.
 - **Certification Process Levels:** Level I – minutes of the Planning Board showing completion of a non-binding concept plan or a non-binding design review and a vote of endorsement allowing the applicant to proceed with submittal, Level 2 – minutes of the Planning Board showing site plan or master plan approval from the board., and Level 3 – level 2 certification and a utility plan showing the availability and/or the provision of utilities.

We worked for several years to pull this program director. David Preece, SNHPC Executive Director is here with me tonight. The Town of Goffstown has already designated certified site areas along Rte. 114. There are steps for the Planning Board to include zoning districts, corridors and master plan. At a public hearing the Town would need to make an amendment to the site plan regulations. We feel this is a really good opportunity to reduce costs and have greater exposure and networking of certified sites in our region.

David Preece, SNHPC Executive Director: We have been working on this program for 3 years. It is in the Economic Development (ED) plan. Brought in a national ED consultant for site selection for a cluster analysis for 13 communities. One of his recommendations was to develop the Certified Sites Program and work with communities within our region to adopt this. This is one way to show a community is proactive and is working in a collaborative manner to identify sites for economic development. The program gives the property owners 5 years to market their programs on a national and global basis. Thank you for allowing us to present this program. I know this will be very beneficial for the Town of Hooksett. You understand the importance of economic development (ED). We see this as a very nice complimentary task that goes with ED.

R. Duhaime: It doesn't tie in with State yet, but does in our southern NH region.

D. Preece: In the beginning we made a pitch to DRED, but they didn't have staff to take on this program. SNHPC was the lead and got funding from various sources.

R. Duhaime: What are people looking for? A certified site program would be a great thing for the Town.

L. Lessard: For a level 1 certified site, those people just before us for the 37-lot subdivision concept, would those people be before us for the program?

J. Munn: Do you have a concept review in your regulations?

J. Duffy: It doesn't apply to residential subdivisions.

L. Lessard: For a conceptual site plan drawing, would that be a level 1?

J. Munn: It could go through the level 1 and the Planning Board just provides comments, if you feel that review is a finished area suitable for certified sites.

D. Preece: The first level is on the Planning Board to identify sites and then if the property owner wants to participate in the program.

J. Munn: There is no such thing as an approved concept plan. There would be approved uses with a concept plan and a level 1 certification.

S. Lovas Orr: How are certain Towns selected?

D. Preece: SNHPC covers all municipalities within the southern region. We are the pilot program, before it is moved statewide.

S. Lovas Orr: Are you at the same stage with Hooksett as the other southern Towns?

J. Munn: You are the fifth presentation we have made. We will present to all 14 communities.

S. Lovas Orr: Is this a Federal program?

D. Preece: It is a National "optional" program.

J. Munn: Visit [US certified sites.com](http://UScertifiedsites.com) for all the states with certified sites. The closest is the State of NY. We have a website for this program and it is in test mode. Once it is live we will be linked to DRED, NH CYBOR and New England database, Greater Alliance, SNHPC, and PSNH.

D. Preece: There is a national site selector so you know the collaboration with municipalities and property owners.

F. Kotowski: How many states are doing this already?

D. Preece: All southern states have this program in place.

J. Munn: Also the Midwest, southern states, and NY.

F. Kotowski: It is one stop shopping to attract businesses to our State. Would you agree having something like this in place, gets rid of a lot of uncertainty for a developer?

R. Duhaime: It is still a conceptual with a DOT application for a driveway.

S. Lovas Orr: How is this funded?

J. Munn: Private.

S. Lovas Orr: Is there a cost to apply?

D. Preece: Yes for property owners, but no cost to municipalities. The cost is to cover staff time and to maintain the website.

J. Duffy: A few years ago we were told we would need a zoning change for this program. I recently spoke with Jack Munn, SNHPC, and a zoning change is no longer needed. We would say it in our regulations.

D. Preece: The program is for existing zoning or master plan for industrial, office, mixed-use or a combination. We are not asking you to rezone.

J. Duffy: Under level 1, what are they gaining for a certified conceptual?

J. Munn: The right to submit an application for a level 1 certification.

D. Preece: They still have to come back to meet your requirements. Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING – ADOPT EDC INTO MASTER PLAN

3. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CHAPTER (EDC) DISCUSSION AND VOTE TO ADOPT INTO THE MASTER PLAN Jack Munn, SNHPC

Jack Munn, SNHPC: I was here last in December 2012. At the Economic Development Committee meeting in November 2012 I received their changes and they endorsed it to make recommendation to you. Then I presented to you and then you wanted a couple of changes. We have made the public advertising for tonight's meeting.

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

*D. Marshall motioned to adopt the Economic Development (ED) Plan into the Master Plan. Seconded by D. Rogers.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

J. Duffy: This will replace the current ED chapter in the 2004 Master Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING AND WAIVER REQUESTS

4. CONTINUED TO MARCH 18, 2013

Southern New Hampshire University (SNHU) (plan#12-26) North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67 & Map 38, Lot 38-1

Site plan for the construction of a proposed 3-story Library Learning Commons (with partial basement) and associated access. Basement footprint is 4,575 sq. ft., 1st floor footprint is 18,570 sq. ft. and the 2nd & 3rd floor footprint is 11,150 sq. ft.

- Waiver Requests – Development Regulations Part III – site plan completeness 19, 24, 31, 33, 35, 40
- Waiver Request – Development Regulations 11.12.1 Rainfall Intensity
- Waiver Request – Development Regulations 11.12.2.t minimum flow velocity
- Voluntary Merger – Map 33, Lot 67 & Map 38, Lot 38-1

D. Marshall motioned to continue this application to March 18, 2013. Seconded by T. Prasol.

Vote unanimously in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING MARCH 18, 2013.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – WAIVER REQUESTS

5. SGB & RGB VENTURES, LLC (plan#13-01)

“GERBER DENTAL GROUP”, 1106 Hooksett Rd., Map 41, Lot 87

- Waiver Request #1 – Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A I.3.d = building sign size
- Waiver Request #2 - Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A I.3.d = additional building sign

Louise (present) & Jeff Tuttle (via speaker phone), The Sign Gallery.

J. Tuttle: Thank you for letting me do a conference call tonight. We propose nice looking channel letters without being too big or bright. At night we bring the blue color out with a halo look. Both materials will be translucent. There will be 24 volts of penetration to the building. A 16 sq. ft. building sign is allowed, however you won't be able to see it from the road. We have increased the signage to 36.8 sq. ft.

J. Gryval: On the existing pylon sign, are you using the space for the old Teach & Learn?

J. Tuttle: Yes, we already have a Building Dept. permit for the pylon signage.

D. Marshall: If you already have the pylon sign, why do you need a larger sign on the building?

J. Tuttle: The other tenants have it on the building. We do not have signage on the building on the non-street side. They are allowed a sign on their building. We are just asking for a little larger sign on our building. The State placed a divider on the roadway

and since then people pass right by this building. They want to make sure people coming south on Hooksett Rd. are able to see the sign on the building. We are allowed a 16 sq. ft. sign on that building.

D. Marshall: Yes the island may have caused some problems, however you still can see the pylon sign and the customers will be pulling into that parking lot. I assume you would have a sign on the front entrance. I don't see why your unit is any different than any other unit in that strip mall.

J. Tuttle: We don't have a door to put a sign over. If we put a 16 sq. ft. sign on the building it is way too small and a waste of money. The halo is needed to create some type of lighting for that area as opposed to adding lighting (which we would need to come back to the Planning Board for the lighting design).

J. Duffy: Matt Labonte, CEO, is here. Where the Teach & Learn entrance was it is no longer. You now enter through a lobby.

Matt Labonte, CEO: It is a common entrance for multiple companies.

D. Marshall: The other tenants have signs.

J. Duffy: The others may have their own sign above their entrance.

M. Labonte: I have been at the site a few times for inspections. The front of the building has a low eave, a common vestibule, and then the Gerber Dental entrance is to the right.

S. Lovas Orr: The argument or reasoning you gave for having a sign on the side of the building is because there is no real entrance strictly for Gerber Dental. By putting a sign on the side of the building won't solve the problem of customers identifying where Gerber Dental is located. You will have signage on the pylon from both sides of the road, but your building sign along the roadway won't tell people where you are. It makes more sense to me to have signage at the door you go into or above the windows of Gerber Dental. This proposal doesn't solve your problem.

J. Tuttle: I understand, but it doesn't make much sense to put the signage on the parking lot side when they have no entrance. They want to get lighting and signage on the building side. It is a weird place to have signage over the windows. The main entrance is for two different companies.

S. Lovas Orr: Having a sign on the side of the building still won't help people find the entrance door to your location.

D. Shankle: Is there going to be an identifying sign by the entrance door to the dental practice?

J. Tuttle: No.

D. Shankle: If I pull in to the parking lot for the dentist, how do I know where to park?

J. Tuttle: They probably will not know where to go.

D. Shankle: I can't believe somebody won't be back here later for signage on that entrance door.

J. Gryval: There used to be sign over the window for the financial business. They just did the building over and it is yellow and they changed the entrance. There should be some type of kiosk there.

D. Shankle: At this site there are some individual doors with individual businesses, plus there is a common door for the multiple businesses. It makes no sense not to have a sign at the entrance door.

R. Duhaime: The old site for the Teach & Learn, was there a sign on the parking lot side?

J. Duffy: They are allowed a 16 sq. ft. sign on the building.

R. Duhaime: This site is in the Performance Zone (PZ) and must meet the PZ criteria to include trim line streets, monument signs, and a 16 sq. ft. building sign.

D. Rogers: Why two waivers and not having the "G" first?

J. Duffy: They have their main Gerber Dental sign and then their "G" (logo).

D. Rogers: If we grant this then what are the other tenants going to want on this side of the building?

D. Marshall: On the pylon will it have both the "Gerber Dental" and "G"? If yes, then why is it necessary for a larger sign on the building? Just have the "G" that is 16 sq. ft. on the side of building facing the roadway. But still once you turn into lot, where do you go? Someone could drive all the way to the end of the strip mall and not find the dentist.

J. Gryval: They all had signage before above their own entrance door. I don't know how they are going to use their allowed 16 sq. ft. Once you get into the common center door, you need signage where they are going. And he mentions lighting on that side of the building, but why is lighting there needed? There is no one on that side of the building.

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

F. Kotowski motioned to deny waiver requests #1 & #2 above based on:

Waiver Request #1 – Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A I.3.d = building sign size for “Gerber Dental Group” is allowed one 16 sq. ft. sign but applicant is requesting a 36.8 sq. ft. sign on the Hooksett Road building side AND **Waiver Request #2** - Zoning Ordinance Article 10-A I.3.d = additional building sign size “G” is 9 sq. ft. and is allowed one 16 sq. ft. sign. A logo is considered signage because it identifies the business and thus becomes an additional signage request.

Denied based on: 1) applicant having a 64 sq. ft. sign on the existing pylon visible in both the south and northbound lanes of Hooksett Road, and 2) signage on the building will not direct customers to locate this business, because there is no signage at the common multi-tenant main entrance.

Seconded by D. Marshall.

Vote unanimously in favor.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

6. APPROVAL OF STANTEC INVOICES

R. Duhaime motioned to authorize the Planning Board Chair to review and approve the Stantec SPR invoices as of 03/04/13. Seconded by T. Prasol.

Vote unanimously in favor.

7. CHANGE OF USE - APPLICANTS

- 1) 1348 Hooksett Rd. used car dealership – previous and new sites owned by John Kelly
- 2) 1 Silver Avenue, old convenience store gas station – someone now running that store

D. Marshall: They are not pumping gas there are they?

M. Labonte: The tanks are good until 2015.

J. Duffy: The man is leasing from Mr. Longfellow.

CHANGE OF USE – PROCESS & FORMS

J. Duffy: Reviewed the proposed Change of Use checklist with the Board. These are the things we would go over as a committee. The items on here the committee has already been looking at, but they weren't necessarily on the application.

R. Duhaime: The committee should review drainage, wetlands and maintenance of the retention ponds to determine if they are still functioning. There should be a way to see if the Town drainage pipe is there, and if the loaming and seeding requirement is stable.

F. Kotowski: I attended the Sewer Commission meeting this morning and those folks are pleased that when these things are filled-out for Change of Use applications that they are copied. In the past someone came in and sewer was not contacted and there could have been a bathroom added to a business. A recent example is a baker is working out of a

house and there was a question on grease traps with the Sewer Commission. This checklist is a great help.

S. Lovas Orr: Let's say it was a book store before and now it is being converted to hair salon and they are adding sinks, would this scenario fall into a change of use?

F. Kotowski: The baker did not need grease traps, and it should be the decision of the Sewer Commission.

S. Lovas Orr: So this goes before the Sewer Commission, before the Change of Use Committee?

J. Duffy: The Change of Use process falls under Leo's department.

S. Lovas Orr: For traffic the committee should consider if it will create more when entering and exiting.

J. Duffy: If the Change of use application would need a traffic report, then it would go before the Planning Board for review.

J. Gryval: Does Gerber Dental need more water?

M. Labonte: The water district was notified.

HB 617

L. Lessard: HB 617 is for an increase in the fuel tax for funds for improvements of roadways.

F. Kotowski: It is a stretch to think people will pay an additional 4 cents a gallon. A penny this year maybe, but 4 cents a gallon is a lot of money.

D. Marshall: The legislative representatives need to tighten the law up a bit. Only 73 cents per dollar is sent to highways. There is a list of red bridges and some bad highways. What is a problem today, if not taken care of, will be horrendous in 5 years.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,
Planning Coordinator