

Unofficial

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)  
35 Main Street  
Monday, October 7, 2013**

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 P.M.**

**PRESENT: David Rogers (Chair), Dick Marshall (Vice-Chair), Paul Scarpetti, Tom Prasol, Tom Walsh, Frank Kotowski and Donald Winterton (Town Council Rep.)**

**STAFF: Jo Ann Duffy (Town Planner), Leo Lessard (Dept. of Public Works), Dan Tatem (Stantec) and Dean Shankle (Town Administrator)**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 09/09/13**

*D. Marshall moved to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2013 meeting. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.*

**DISCUSSION**

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Town Administrator discussion about CIP.

Dean Shankle: I know that your normal process has been to put together a CIP committee, it is my job to work with you to make sure we present something to Council. We have started our process and have gotten projects from department heads. We are going to meet with some of the department heads this week and will continue moving through the process. I want to make myself available to you now and in the future so that we can work together on this and come up with something that is in the best interest of the future of the town.

D. Winterton: Do you think it is necessary to have a CIP committee?

D. Shankle: I think that is a call for the Board. It is not required in the Charter, but in the past the Board has decided that it was the best way to go.

D. Marshall: I didn't think that the Charter over-ruled state law. The state statutes say that you can authorize the Planning Board to prepare, amend or recommend a program, or authorize the governing body of a municipality to appoint a CIP Committee. I am not sure what takes precedent.

D. Shankle: I do not know if lawyers have ever been talked to about Capital Improvement Plans. The general rule is that the Charter overrules state law. The reason that towns do charters is because there are things in the state law they want to vary from.

F. Kotowski: What is the benefit to having you prepare the CIP? Could you put a plan together that

comes to us, we approve it, goes back to you, and then Council and yourself could make changes. What is that first step doing, in your view, that impedes your ability to put together a budget effectively and quickly?

D. Shankle: I don't know if anything does. The Finance Director and myself, with department heads are already working on the CIP. We provide something to the CIP Committee to work off of and then they adjust it. After that, both of those end up going to Council and the Budget Committee. Maybe one of the reasons they did what they did is they might have been having problems finding people to sit on the CIP Committee. I know your Committee here puts a lot of time and work into this.

F. Kotowski: The last time you went through this process, did you find areas where you had to make or recommend changes after the work was done?

D. Shankle: My recommendations are there from the beginning. If you look at the draft from last year, you will see in the 4<sup>th</sup> column are projects recommended by the Town Administrator. That goes on through the whole process. What ends up going in there is just those projects for this coming year. The 6 year part of my plan disappears and it becomes the CIP plan. When it goes before the Council and the Budget Committee, and differences are noticed, people ask, and then they resolve the differences.

F. Kotowski: What is your preference?

D. Shankle: My job is to follow the Charter. If you have people willing to spend that kind of time, it never hurts to have more input from the community on developing a budget.

T. Walsh: Having sat on it for the last couple of years do you think there is anything that could have been done differently with what the Committee provided vs. what you think yourself or staff could do?

D. Shankle: Having more people involved can't hurt. Ultimately, what I am recommending for the upcoming budget doesn't disappear. If there are differences, it gives Council and the Budget Committee something to think about. More information cannot hurt and I am doing my job by making sure I consult.

### **WAIVER REQUESTS**

#### **ANYTIME FITNESS (plan #13-28)**

**1292 Hooksett Rd, Map 25, Lot 70**

**Waiver Request** for additional signage on windows. Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 11.16 – Signs.

#### **David Rogers stepped down**

Rhoda Sommer (Owner of Anytime Fitness): I submitted window graphics that tie my space together. They run over the top of the windows. It is part of our brand and I was told that I need to get a variance in order to put these window graphics up.

D. Marshall: Apparently you do not consider this a sign. You already were granted a waiver for a significantly larger sign and now you are bringing this in.

R. Sommer: I would have submitted this all together but was initially told I did not need a permit. The parts of the sign are the guest and member doors. It is marked on the door but there is still confusion, on how to enter my club, especially from those coming from one of the other 2,300 clubs. You have access to all locations with your key fob. People call and question my size as being a small gym and I'm doing all I can to get a store front that shows we are a national chain, have a brand, are recognizable and hopefully will grow in the state.

T. Prasol: How many other Anytime Fitness's are there in New Hampshire?

R. Sommer: There are 4 in New Hampshire.

T. Prasol: Do they all have these over the door stickers?

R. Sommer: No. I have a Club in Northwood that does not have front windows so I do not have it there. I am not sure about Windham or Lebanon. A number of the Clubs in Massachusetts do.

F. Kotowski: JoAnn, are there specific regulations to applying anything to a store front window?

J. Duffy: There are regulations that limit any signage within a window, and normally those would be for grocery stores. They are permitted for 10 days and then they have to change. For example, meat or grapes on sale. We don't allow normal signs to go in the windows. I think the main reason she is here is because of the sq. footage of the other 2 signs exceeding the regulations and this being added.

F. Kotowski: What would happen if I was a proprietor of a building that had a store front window and I put signs 2 inches back from the window, hanging from the ceiling, as opposed to placing them on the window. Would that be in defiance of the building codes?

J. Duffy: We have never run across that.

P. Scarpetti: Is it because Anytime Fitness is listed on there? What if "Welcome" was on there?

J. Duffy: The definition of a sign is fairly broad and one of the things it says is if it draws attraction to your business it is considered a sign.

D. Marshall: If AnytimeFitness.com was not on there does it fall under the category of being a sign?

J. Duffy: I think that would be a determination of the Planning Board and if you thought those graphics drew attraction to that business.

D. Marshall: Considering the make-up of pictures it should draw attention.

D. Winterton: This businesses items don't change. I would be happy if AnytimeFitness.com were not on there and maybe you could change the pictures form time to time.

R. Sommer: Next to me, there are signs in the windows that have been up for a long time.

D. Winterton: I think this is referring to an auto parts type business. I often go by there and it seems they have been allowed to do it.

***D. Winterton moved to grant a motion for a waiver for additional signage on windows. Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 11.16 – Signs. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.***

**David Rogers returned.**

**CROWN TROPHY (plan #13-30)**

**1 Alice Ave, Map 45, Lot 141**

**Waiver Request** for permanent display of one banner and one yard sign. Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 11.16 – Signs.

Bill Sullivan (Owner of Crown Trophy): We are now doing signs and banners and I would like to put up a permanent banner. You have an allowance for temporary banners, but not permanent. I recently was able to take down the rusty chain link fence that is owned by the state, and put up a nice rail fence. In one bay of the fence I am looking to put up a banner. We had one up temporarily and received a lot of business from people that would not normally stop into a trophy store for a banner. This banner and a small yard sign will allow me to grown my business. It will not be sticking out into the grass so it will not face you when you are coming up Rt. 3. It is in the front of the building.

D. Rogers: What is the sign made of?

B. Sullivan: A 3-year vinyl with grommets.

D. Marshall: On the pictures are signs that say 4x8 two sided pole sign and a 1ft. x 9ft. canopy lettering. Is this what is in existence now?

B. Sullivan: Yes.

D. Marshall: You are only intending to put one banner on one section of this fence?

B. Sullivan: Yes.

D. Marshall: What will that sign say?

B. Sullivan: That is on the paperwork. It will not be sticking out into the greenery and won't be a

nuisance because it will be will be attached to the fence perpendicular to the road.

D. Rogers: You also have a yard sign, 24in. x 36in?

B. Sullivan: Yes. That is a small yard sign, almost like the political signs.

D. Rogers: Will that be attached to the fence the same way the vinyl sign would be?

B. Sullivan: It would be right next to it on stakes. It will be attached to the fence post but will have the stakes on it so you can see it is a yard sign.

T. Walsh: I see no harm in this. I think it is another reason why we are going to be going through our sign ordinance. This property is the first one you see as you enter the Town of Hooksett and the place looks great. Thank you for keeping it up and I think this is a good idea.

### **Open Public Hearing**

### **No Public Comments**

### **Closed Public Hearing**

***F. Kotowski moved to grant a motion for a waiver for permanent display of one banner and one yard sign. Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 11.16 – Signs. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.***

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PAUL, DAVID & KENNETH SCARPETTI (plan #13-13)**

**27 Londonderry Tpke, Map 49, Lot 10-2**

Site plan for a proposed 12,500 sq. ft. medical office building.

### **P. Scarpetti and D. Marshall stepped down.**

Roger Dignard (Dignard Architectural): We did a presentation for the Board at the last meeting we attended and we were following up on Stantec's review items subsequent to that. We did not have time to respond and take care of those things before the last board meeting. We are in good shape in that regard. The boundary issue has been taken care of and I believe those plans have been filed.

D. Scarpetti: The agreements were recorded last week and the plan was filed.

R. Dignard: One of the other conditions was written approval from the Fire Department. I am not sure if staff has received that or not?

J. Duffy: I do not have that.

R. Dignard: We met with the Fire Department at the TRC meeting and addressed their issues, but that could be a condition of approval. I think all of the other items are minor and could be conditions of approval, most of which are changing some of the notes on the plans. Do you need us to make another presentation to you this evening on the site or the building appearance?

D. Rogers: No, that won't be necessary. So the primary issue that is still outstanding is the written approval from the Fire Department?

R. Dignard: As far as we know, yes.

D. Rogers: Dan is this accurate?

D. Tatem: Yes, the last letter that we issued had 8 or 9 remaining comments and we got an email last week describing how they are going to address those comments. We have no concerns with what they say they are going to do.

D. Rogers: Conditional approval would be acceptable?

D. Tatem: Yes.

R. Dignard: In looking at the site plans, it shows that Phase 1 is 7,000 sq. ft. and subsequent phases leading up to 12,500. The building foot print, Phase 1, is about 7,500 not 7,000 sq. ft. The site has been designed for the ultimate build out of the 12,500.

D. Rogers: Can you change that on plan?

R. Dignard: Yes, I think we should change that on the plan as we resubmit them.

J. Duffy: The only difference that would make is the impact fees would be a bit higher.

**Open Public Hearing**

**No Public Comments**

**Closed Public Hearing**

*F. Kotowski moved to grant a motion to conditionally approve the site plan for a proposed 12,500 sq. ft. medical office building. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.*

**P. Scarpetti and D. Marshall returned.**

**COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**  
**PRO CON / STEBBINS ASSOCIATES (plan #13-27)**

**1359 Hooksett Rd, Map 19, Lot 2**

Amended Site Plan to reconfigure access and add parking.

**Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist.

J. Duffy: This is an amended site plan on an existing building that has been there since the 1940's. They are coming in to do some reconfiguration to their access road, add additional parking to their parking lot and additional green space. They need a waiver for the completeness section of the checklist and are also here for the public hearing.

Stephen Mayer (Allen & Major Associates, Inc.): We are requesting a site plan amendment. The site plan was originally approved in 1997. The current use of the site is a combination of office and warehouse. We are proposing some minor reconfiguration of the parking lot to improve vehicular movement, realigning the driveway entrance, improving site lines and clearing vegetation. We are going to improve the appearance of the property by installing landscaping. There are no proposed footprint changes and no changes to the utilities. There is a minor change to the drainage configuration.

L. Lessard: I reviewed these plans with the Engineer and with Procon. We made a few changes and with the drainage being moved around there is no problem. The added pavement is ok and taking the berm down for sight distance is good. Everything is going to be better about this than what it is now.

D. Rogers: What is your time frame?

Jim Loft (Proconsul): Sometime next year. Late spring, early summer.

***D. Marshall moved to grant a motion for a waiver from completeness checklist. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.***

**Open Public Hearing**

**No Public Comments**

**Closed Public Hearing**

D. Rogers: JoAnn, can we vote on the amended site plan?

J. Duffy: Yes. There is a note in the upper right hand corner that needs to be removed about the 3- year approval because that has changed.

D. Rogers: Is it a different number?

J. Duffy: Yes, it is totally different from what it says now, but I can get that for you.

D. Rogers: Yes, the RSA changed on that.

*T. Walsh moved to grant a motion for an amended site plan to reconfigure access and add parking. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.*

**OSBORNE AGWAY / HOLDEN ENGINEERING (plan #13-29)**

**343 Londonderry Tpke, Map 25, Lot 42**

Site Plan to replace an 8' x 12' shed with a 20' x 40' hay barn.

**Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist.

- **Waiver Request** from Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 6.02 “Conformity with Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance” to exceed setback requirements.
- **Waiver Request** from Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 6.02 “Conformity with Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance” to waive landscape requirements.

Bernie Temple (Holden Engineering & Surveying, Inc.): We are looking at a site that is wooded and undeveloped. The existing 13,000 sq. ft. building won't change. Currently there is a shed on the north end of the parking lot and we are hauling hay to keep it stocked for sales. We are proposing to remove that shed and put in a 20x40 hay barn in the same location. It will be placed on the pavement and probably will be put on sonner tubes. There will be no increase in pavement and no change in circulation. It will be a little farther way from the boundary line. We are looking for some waivers, particularly for the set backs. The existing shed is within the set backs and currently is paved almost to the boundary. The display is done in the front and it is well landscaped. If we went with the Performance Zone requirements it would reduce all the paving in the front. The checklist item is a survey of 2 ½ acres plus 200 feet around the perimeter of the site and we are requesting waivers for the surveying of the land.

D. Rogers: Would the new barn be used to contain hay?

B. Temple: Yes.

D. Rogers: There is a lot of stacked product outside. Is that going into the proposed barn?

T. Osborne (Osborne's Agway): The peat moss, bark mulch, soils and that type of product will stay outside, but we often have to have stacks of hay and shavings outside on pallets, sometimes under an tarp, when there is overflow. This will neaten up the space by getting that under cover.

D. Rogers: The bagged products, in plastic, would stay outside?

T. Osborne: Yes.

D. Marshall: Due to the fact that the shed will be bigger, will the location of the stacked items change?

T. Osborne: Yes. At the moment we are using a 16 ft. trailer. We pick up our shavings, park it on the site, and load customers out of that trailer. That trailer will disappear and that will give us extra space



where we can move some of the other bagged product.

D. Marshall: JoAnn, if the waiver request from the completeness checklist is granted, that is the same as the plan being complete?

J. Duffy: Correct.

T. Walsh: Is there going to be a foundation under this?

T. Osborne: We will hopefully pour some sonner tubes, shim up with some pavement to bring it up to grade, and anchor the building to the sonner tubes. The building could be moved if it needed to be.

T. Walsh: I saw in the notes there might have been a conflict with the leech bed.

B. Temple: It is an underground drainage system. We are going to be about 6 feet away from it and above ground.

P. Scarpetti: What will be used for siding and roofing?

T. Osborne: The plan is to use white vinyl siding and asphalt shingles to match the main building.

### **Open Public Hearing**

### **No Public Comments**

### **Closed Public Hearing**

*D. Marshall moved to grant a motion for a waiver request from completeness checklist. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.*

*D. Marshall moved to grant a motion for a waiver request from Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 6.02 “Conformity with Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance” to exceed setback requirements. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.*

*T. Prasol moved to grant a motion for a waiver request from Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 6.02 “Conformity with Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance” to waive landscape requirements. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.*

*D. Marshall moved to grant a motion to approve the site plan to replace an 8’ x 12’ shed with a 20’ x 40’ hay barn. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.*

### **COMPLETENESS**

**STERLING HOMES, LLC / KEACH-NORDSTROM ASSOCIATES (plan #13-26)**

**South Bow Rd, Map 12, Lots 1 & 24**

Proposed 38-lot subdivision and roadway access off South Bow Rd.

J. Duffy: This applicant is here for completeness only. The application is complete, and we recommend the Board approve the completeness and schedule the public hearing for November 4, 2013.

*D. Marshall moved to grant a motion for completeness of a proposed 38-lot subdivision and roadway access off South Bow Rd. and the public hearing to be held on November 4, 2013. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

**CONTINUED HEARING ON FINAL APPROVAL**

**MIACOMET DEVELOPMENT, LLC (plan #07-37)**

**Daniel Webster Hwy, Map 6, Lot 114**

Final site plan approval.

Sharon Summers (Attorney Rep. for Miacomet Development): Many of the board members were at the site walk on October 4. Subsequent to that a staff report was created by JoAnn Duffy. We had an opportunity to look at that report and are amenable to the requests in terms of a contribution in the amount of \$1,500 towards the Association and work on the redesign of the units that are located in Phase II. We have been in discussion with Mr. Tatem about the likely increase in the escrow amount that is going to be posted. I have discussed all of these factors with the client and he is amenable. My request is that this Board entertain a motion to grant the 30-day extension in accordance with the staff report. Today, Steve Height, the project engineer was in touch with DES regarding design changes that were made in the field on Friday afternoon and those changes have been approved by DES. That is the final piece of the work that needs to be done. For those who were not present on Friday, Steve Height presented a detailed status report. I asked him to put together a written version of those comments and I have submitted those to the record. Tokie, the excavator, is here to answer any technical questions. I would say the work is 95% done and the stabilization is complete. The only remaining item that requires some work is the wetlands restoration.

J. Duffy: Dan advised me that there was an email sent this morning, but I had not received it, so he just sent it over. Otherwise, I would have advised you about that. You do have copies of the report that was submitted by Steve Height. As most of you were at the site walk, you can attest to the fact that they are 95% complete. I do not think it would be wise to shut things down as they are so close to getting to the end. It would be reasonable to give them a 30-day extension and within that time frame we would be asking for the \$1,500 to go towards the fence and the plantings behind the units on Dogwood. It is my understanding that there are additional plantings that have been agreed upon with the plan that was approved by the state that would go along perimeter of slope. The drainage structure that was sitting out in the field still needs to be installed. That would give them an additional 30 days to get that completed. The report that was submitted with the changes that were made in Ravine B still needs to be reviewed by Stantec.

D. Tatem: There were some changes in the field and the process in town is to have the engineer provide what they are changing so the town knows what has been built. They will be submitting that to us, for review, and DES said that they want to get copies of that as well. The email that we got from DES was on one specific aspect and there have been 6-8 changes so that is still pending. Phase II has multiple units that are close to these Ravines, and now that we understand more about these slopes and

how difficult they are to work with, we recommended that their engineer takes a 2nd look at those which he agreed to do. The Phase II plan, within the 30 days, may show some of those houses shifting away from those ravines so we do not run into the same problem again.

S. Summers: In the field we spoke about submitting some as built plans and we will be doing that to show the changes that were actually made in the field.

D. Rogers: Where did the \$1,500 come from?

J. Duffy: The Association received an estimate for the installation of the fence. The cost of the fence was \$800 and the Association will install it. The remainder of the money would be for additional plantings along the same area behind Dogwood.

D. Rogers: With regard to the 30 day request, our 1st meeting in November is the 4th which is less than 30 days. Would it be the 4th as opposed to the 6th or 7th?

T. Prasol: If we were to not grant the 30-day extension, they would still be required to complete the work, correct?

J. Duffy: Correct. DES has stated that they will require them to do the work, regardless.

T. Prasol: That would not affect the \$1,500?

J. Duffy: That was an agreement that the town is making with the applicant.

T. Prasol: Conditional of the 30-day extension?

J. Duffy: Yes. The work they are doing for the state does not include the fence or the additional plantings.

### **Open Public Hearing**

Jerry Ouellette (11 Dogwood Drive, Webster Woods): The Phase II plans indicate that the road would be made of porous asphalt. A porous asphalt system can double the cost of roadwork for the developer and is a high maintenance material. Maintenance recommendations are to vacuum sweep every 3-4 months and then follow that by high pressure jet hosing to keep the pores open, if needed. No sand should be used and standard salting is not recommended. A special de-icing composition should be used. Also, some failure has supposedly been know to happen. All of this means additional expenses to the residents. Phase 1 has a standard drainage system with catch basins that are periodically cleaned and, to my knowledge, there have not been any problems. I would urge the Board and the Developer to consider reverting to a standard catch basin system. We do need on-going additional expenses.

Don Ingalls (4 Hickory Court, Webster Woods): I did not hear anything about the catch basin that was to be installed at the end of Hickory Court. The developer/contractor was there this past Friday, did some excavation, and found that utility lines in this stress block were in the way so they could not

install a larger catch basin. According to the engineer they were going to discuss it but we haven't heard anything. There are some minor items that were discussed during the site walk on October 4. One involved clay water deposits that were bubbling up in Ravine A. They talked about covering this with erosion cloth and adding more stone. Another was a tree in Ravine B and the plantings which we did hear about this evening. I would like those items addressed.

D. Tatem: We have been on site during the process of all the construction and, prior to that 30-day extension, I would assume the work will be done. I am aware of all the concerns mentioned, and we will issue a letter that states they have addressed all of them. We will create a punch list, as if it was a road construction job, to make sure all of those items are taken care of to the satisfaction of the town, us and all of the residents.

Bob Schmidt (10 Dogwood Drive, Webster Woods): In all of the conversations I have heard with regard to the ravine, the slopes are virtually bare and they are going to erode. There is nothing there to hold the dirt together. Has any consideration been given to some kind of ground cover to prevent that. Crown vetch is a good ground cover. All I see is that dirt eroding down into the rock and gravel in the bottom of the ravine.

D. Tatem: It is on the list to stabilize with some sort of stabilizing feature.

**Public hearing will remain open during the 30-day extension.**

*D. Marshall moved to grant a motion for final site plan approval until November 4, 2013. Motion seconded by D. Winterton. Opposed by T. Prasol, T. Walsh and F. Kotowski. Motion carried.*

### **APPROVAL OF STANTEC INVOICES**

*D. Marshall moved to approve the Stantec invoices. Seconded by T. Prasol. P. Scarpetti abstained. Motion carried unanimously.*

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **➤ Appointment of Sign Committee**

- Leslie Boswak (EDC)
- Dick Marshall
- Matt Mercier (EDC)
- Mark Sanborn (EDC)
- David Scarpetti (EDC)
- Tom Walsh
- ZBA TBD

D. Rogers: Has anyone stepped forward from the ZBA?

J. Duffy: No. I sent out a request to them twice and have not heard back.

D. Winterton: I would be willing to serve on the Committee.

D. Rogers: In lieu of ZBA, Don Winterton will serve as Town Council Rep.

J. Duffy: The 1st meeting of the Committee is October 8 at 5:30 pm in Room 204.

***F. Kotowski moved to grant a motion to appointment the Sign Committee. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: There was no Sign Committee until this action was taken by the Planning Board.

D. Rogers: Correct, there was no Sign Committee until it was just appointed now and there has been no business conducted by that Committee.

➤ **Appointment of CIP Committee**

J. Duffy: We have only had two people interested and they are both members of the Budget Committee. We sent it out to various boards asking for volunteers.

D. Rogers: Historically there have been 3 members of the Committee?

J. Duffy: In the past there have been 4 or 5.

T. Walsh: Last year we had 5 with 3 that made it each week.

D. Marshall: The minimum is 3, but one has to be a Planning Board member.

D. Rogers: Is there anyone on the Planning Board that would be interested in serving on the CIP Committee?

J. Duffy: Unless you decide to not do it and have Dr. Shankle take care of it.

T. Walsh: I cannot do it this year but I think it is a great effort which I enjoyed doing for 2 years. I agree with Dr. Shankle that the more people involved the better. We have had a lot of civilians that served on the Committee, as well, and their input was great. It is unfortunate that we don't have the participation but do we have to decide tonight? Maybe we can try again to get some participation.

J. Duffy: Everyone that served in the past was notified. As department heads, we just had to submit everything to Dr. Shankle. The 1st meeting of CIP is supposed to occur within the next few weeks.

D. Rogers: If we postpone to our next meeting does that give us enough time?

J. Duffy: I think the meeting might be the 22nd but am not positive.

T. Walsh: For anyone that hasn't served on it, it is interesting and the budget process is valuable. If I had the time I would gladly do it again, but would still like to have it done as a committee.

D. Winterton: I agree with Tom. It was worthwhile for me last year to interact with all of the department heads and hear what they had to say, but I just don't have the time this year.

T. Walsh: It is only 6 nights, and some meetings are quick.

D. Rogers: Let's continue to the next Planning Board meeting.

### ➤ Engineering Services

J. Duffy: At a September 25 Town Council meeting, there was a motion made to direct the Town Administrator to look at different ways of using our engineering review and see whether we should go out to bid, stay the same as we are or go with an in-house engineer. Leo and I met with the Council and we presented the potential cost for hiring an in-house engineer and the Council seemed receptive but asked for additional information. They have asked Dr. Shankle to draft a job description and provide accurate costs on salary and benefits. I brought up to them that there is an RSA that states the Planning Board can hire their own consultant so I suggested that the Planning Board have some input. They agreed and said they would like to receive feedback from the Planning Board.

D. Marshall: There are advantages and disadvantages. The town needs a civil engineer. Anyone who registers as an engineer has to do so by category and they are expected to practice within that field. When it comes to municipal work, you have the need, at times, for different types of engineers. 80% of the time your in-house engineer will be able to handle those things, but there will be times when that person will have to hire a specialist. The Planning Board would have to have it clear that engineer is available to us at all times because we need the reviews. Under the state law, the Planning Board can require any studies, survey's or anything that it needs and the cost of doing that is put on the developer. The advantage of an in-house engineer is that he is there and available. If you hire consulting firms to do your reviews, which we have done 90% of the time, it can get confusing. In the past, we did not require that those engineers could not do work within the community so there were conflicts of interest. The biggest advantage of hiring a firm is it allows you to draw on a lot of expertise and you usually don't get that from your own engineer. You have to be careful about hiring a consultant and make sure there is a firm understanding about what their responsibilities are and their fee schedules so the developer would know what they are facing as far as cost. You could put it out to competitive bidding in selecting a firm, but the condition would be that you cannot do work for anyone else in the town to avoid a conflict of interest.

D. Rogers: Is there a consensus on the Board between hiring for in-house employee status vs. maintaining the outside consultant contract relationship?

T. Walsh: At the last Council meeting they were looking for a cost analysis on the two options but I am

not sure if that has been done yet. That would help me to make a decision.

D. Rogers: I would like to know what the numbers are and what the breakdown would be as well.

L. Lessard: An in-house engineer would be about \$60,000, with benefits about \$120,000. Over the past 5 or 6 years, builders with the Town have given Stantec about \$300,000 per year.

D. Rogers: During your presentation at Town Council you also talked about oversight.

L. Lessard: This person would also be chasing grants, doing the MS4 and construction monitoring, but the main thing would be plan reviews.

P. Scarpetti: How does that work? Are you billing for inspections that you are performing?

L. Lessard: Yes. We bill the contractor \$65 per hour vs \$113. We are on the one site approximately 2-3 hours. We only go when needed.

F. Kotowski: The only advantage I see is control. There is a lot of work that is going to be done in this town going forward and a civil engineer is going to be needed. I think it would be more cost effective for us to utilize an in-house engineer. I believe Stantec has done a marvelous job, but the fact remains that we don't have the control over how fast we could get someone here.

L. Lessard: If we are doing work and there is a design change it doesn't have to go back to the drawing board. We can do field changes and make decisions on the spot. You can check with contractors that we have worked with and see what their thoughts are.

D. Winterton: As the representative of the Town Council, is it necessary to have a report from the Chairman or from me to report, in my sub-committee report on Wednesday, what the feelings of this Board are.

F. Kotowski: We still don't know enough about the cost and there are a lot of things that have not been vetted yet. My personal feeling is I would vote to have an in-house engineer.

T. Walsh: I say the same, although more information would be good.

D. Rogers: As preliminary discussion, there seems to be significant interest about an in-house position but, without further data, we are not in a position to make anything final. We will hold off on making a final recommendation until we get further data. At some point, I will go back to Council and make a presentation.

### **Change of Use**

1. John Kelly is going to be incorporating the old gas station canopy at 1311 Hooksett Road, Map 25, lot 56 with his site. He has asked to not use the building but to put motorcycles and cars underneath.

The Code Enforcement Officer and the Fire Department are supposed to be doing a walk through before any permission is granted.

2. M & G Auto, LLC, 1348 Hooksett Road, Map 25, lot 5, is currently being used for used car sales. They have ask that they be allowed to repair automobiles. That is in the groundwater district so in order for them to be able to do that they need to get a variance which they are not sure they want to do.

3. Hooksett Rent A Tool, LLC, 197 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 36, lot 42-5 moved into the former site of Woodmaster and they are now relocating to 197 Londonderry Turnpike. The Code Enforcement Officer and Fire Department had to do a final walk through.

D. Winterton: With regard to the new acquisition of Auto Wholesalers, if you go to the Barber Shop or the Dry Cleaners, you are directed to exit around the back and go through that parking lot to leave. Is there a right of way there?

J. Duffy: I am not sure. That site was initially all one. The site where the gas station is was a lease. The business that used to be there owned the whole thing so they had permission to exit out of that driveway onto Hooksett Road. A representative of Auto Wholesalers contacted me and said they had purchased this site. According to our records it was a sub-division by lease. The tax records have it down as two separate lots with two separate numbers. I gave them the information I had and he is looking into it. I am waiting for them to get back to me.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

D. Rogers: There is a gathering at The Common Man, Concord, on October 17 at 5:30 to discuss the new visitor center on I-93. The Greater Manchester Economic Development Summit will be held on October 9. Please talk to JoAnn if you would like to attend.

L. Lessard: I had mentioned at a previous meeting that Stantec developed a drainage system at a property on Smyth Road that was changed from a high tech system to a regular system. Stantec did not develop that system.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 pm.**

**Respectfully submitted by,**

**AnnMarie White  
Recording Clerk**



