

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, November 18, 2013**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:02 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), Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Planner), Leo Lessard (Dept. of Public Works), Rene LaBranche (Stantec), and Dean Shankle (Town Administrator)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 11/4/13

D. Marshall motioned to approve the minutes of the November 4, 2013 meeting, as amended. Seconded by T. Prasol. D. Winterton abstained due to not being present at the meeting. Motion carried.

DISCUSSION

1. THE PARKWAY

Manchester Sand & Gravel / David Campbell

Discussion of the proposed Parkway project.

David Campbell: With me tonight is Peter Holden from Holden Engineering. The reason we are here is according to our development agreement which was recorded as part of the Head's Pond agreement, we have a date coming up of December 31, 2013. Page 4, Paragraph 7 of the document says that on or before December 31 of this year we are supposed to deed you the 102' wide easement through the property for the purposes of a possible future public road way. (Mr. Holden referenced the map regarding the location). This has been part of the town's master plan for approximately 28 years. During that time we have always included it in all of our discussions when we went to the town to make our proposals and get zoning changes. It has always been part of the plan and we will honor it, but once you deed something over it is hard to get it back or change it. We want you to look at this tonight because this date was an artificial date that was picked 18 months ago but it has a triggering mechanism. One of the things we need to talk about is if this is a feasible roadway given today's conditions. Let's talk about it in two segments: 1) The northern part of the parkway which runs from Rt. 3, basically the old Hall Rd., and circles back onto Rt. 3 up north. 2) The southern portion which runs down from Industrial Drive, through Manchester Sand & Gravel's property and onwards through lands of others, primarily Southern New Hampshire. There are two reasons I want you to think about it as a Board and a town. We have had many discussions in the past year and a half with large box warehouse/industrial users who are looking for a large chunk of land near 93. There aren't many left. If you come out of Boston there is not much within ten minutes of the highway until you get up to Hooksett. We are in play for major industrial warehouse type outfits. Right now, down on Lehoux Dr.,

we have Huttig which is an 150,000 sq. foot warehouse. That has been a very good thing for the Town of Hooksett. It is a good tax base and they employ a lot of people. The traffic is not bad because warehouse distributions happen overnight. There is not even a light there right now. Huttig contributed \$150,000 toward a light. We told everybody this was going to be an off-site improvement of a traffic light necessary at Industrial Drive and Rt. 3. That is going to happen and everybody is prepared for that. (Mr. Holden referenced a map of the area). The problem is, if we put the parkway easement down there you can't do a large 850 million square foot. We did this for some possible clients that have gone elsewhere. Most warehouse operations of this size create 600-700 jobs and a lot of tax base. Traffic has to be worked out but with that parkway, which is only going to be an easement, we can't put a building over an easement. The other part of feasibility is this roadway goes through our property but then it has to go through other properties. Southern New Hampshire has always been one of the big players. They, unlike us, are under no obligations under this agreement. They have decided on their own that this is no longer part of their master plan. They have recently picked up the CB Sullivan property for expansion of their own campus and they want to put a roadway to connect that. Is it worthwhile, on the southern tier, burdening the property with an easement for a roadway which probably will never be built and probably cannot be built? There was language that says if within 15 years it is not feasible you can take it off. I am suggesting why go through with deeding it over to the town if it is not feasible. I don't think it is but it is your decision. We will honor obligations but I think it should be considered given the fact that it chops up that lot so you can't put in the big box which there seems to be a lot of demand for and not a lot of sites for so I think it is a matter of time before we and the town gets something big. With Southern New Hampshire even if we have the easement where is it going to go? How is it going to connect to 93? That is the dilemma we look at and I wanted to bring it to your attention. I don't want to pressure you. This is an arbitrary date. You can, by vote, put this off three or four months and we can discuss it in due time, but there is a clock ticking as it is written right now and I have to do something before December 31. I would ask you to discuss it and act on it. You can vote to delay it if you wish. The northern side has its own issues. If we deed it over or not it won't really matter because it can only be for a public roadway, but again, circumstances have changed dramatically over there. The Heads Pond piece (referred to map) is over 200 acres and that is going to be deeded over within two years because we are going to do our wetlands permit work this summer. You will be getting that property and included in that you are going to get the deed to the school, and up above you are also going to get part of that parkway deeded to the town, however, it ends at the town pond. The rest of it, I don't see where there would be an economic engine to drive it because we just sold a big parcel to Bear Paw; 471 acres. They have right of first refusal on the 378 acres and above that there is about 400 acres as part of the conservation land that was part of Heads Pond. That is very likely to go to Bear Paw. You are looking at 1100-1200 acres that is going to be conservation land, plus there are endangered species there. I am bringing up the feasibility of it, beyond the cost. The cost would be tens of millions and there is no money to fix the existing roads let alone put something like this in a ten-year plan that is not currently in the ten-year plan. Again, I don't see the economic engine that would drive it. At one point we kept it in, especially given the fact that all of blue area was, and still is, undesignated. We thought there could be a casino or something that could justify spending that kind of money. What we know now, since most of it is conservation, that will never happen. Those are the issues on the north side. We spend a lot of time looking at these maps, and you do not, so I wanted to bring to your attention what we have seen here for a while and the Planning Board has to know about. We went to talk to the Economic Development Group at Dick Marshall's suggestion. They did not have a quorum that night. We made the presentation to them and I think they understood the issue.

D. Rogers read into record a letter dated November 18, 2013 from Southern New Hampshire University.

D. Marshall: It is interesting to note that SNHU fails to appear in front of the Planning Board to discuss their future plans considering that we are responsible for that. I understand they bought CB Sullivan and want to increase their development and the only facility servicing them now is North River Rd. and Martin's Ferry Rd. If they keep expanding what we are looking at is a main street of a campus development on both sides of a road with increasing volumes of traffic as they develop. The by-pass was to eliminate that situation. SNHU has know that we have always intended to keep that on the books. If they are proposing, with the purchase of CB Sullivan, to provide an alternate access to their entire campus that is a different story, but I am not going to agree to something like this until they come here and explain what their master plan is and they have not done that yet. I understand your position, in the sense that you are looking at this piece of property with an imaginary building. We have nothing positive that says we should take a critical step and that is going to happen. On the other side of your road, crossing over Rt. 3, we had all of this development planned for Manchester Sand & Gravel, at least that is what you told us. Nothing has come forth on that property either. We have no compelling reason to change yet. If you need an extension on the agreement I can understand that and would be in favor of granting that extension so we can, at least, get more people in here to discuss what the master plans for both ends of that are.

D. Campbell: That is all we want at this point. This has been on books for a long time. I am not saying we are going to go back on what we promised. I am saying there are other considerations that need to be looked at. You are correct. It is an imaginary building but it would radically reduce access roads and probably more than that in terms of a big box.

D. Marshall: I don't doubt that. That is why I think we need more discussion with you and with SNHU, but we also need to allow you the room to do that.

D. Campbell: That is good enough for us. A year would be good and then we could come back and discuss it again. This is all dependent on the economy. All of sudden the phone didn't ring on that from 2007 until a year ago and now it rings seven or eight time with people who have real plans. Things have picked up, but by the extension fact we are still obligated to do it. We are not trying to back out of anything, but there are economic considerations that you need to consider.

F. Kotowski: I would suggest that we invite SNHU here to get a better idea of what their plans are because if they are not planning on doing anything that helps us to make a decision on what we are hearing tonight. I believe that economic development is vitally important. I also believe that a roadway to relieve traffic on Rt. 3 is also vitally important, but before we can make a decision on relieving Manchester Sand & Gravel I think we have to have all of the information, delay for a while, and come back and talk about it when everyone is in the same room.

D. Campbell: We talked about development across the way and hopefully that will still happen. Either that or a major industrial warehouse will trigger the light. Nothing is going to happen here probably until then. What really happened between 2005-2006 when we came in with that plan and now was all

of the retailers went to Exit 10. That is pretty much maxed out now too and at some point they may come back. It is not going to happen right away. It is driven by alternative sites and the overall economy.

D. Marshall: Most of us have noticed that five days per week they have to put a police officer out on Rt. 3 to control the traffic coming out of GE. As that area grows the need for that officer is going to be a lot. That forces the issue of the light being there to control the traffic. As a Planning Board, we have to plan for that and I think we need more discussion with a lot of parties.

D. Campbell: I agree. GE has, in the past, met with us, the planning staff, the Town Administrator, and I think a representative from the Planning Board about wanting to do something out there. Something is going to happen in the valley eventually to trigger it. There is some money put aside towards the light. The light itself will generate not only traffic control on Rt. 3, but economic opportunities for retail on one side of the road and industrial on the other. In the master plan it is all going to work. Whether or not we build a road or it isn't feasible because there is no connection is something that needs to be looked at.

T. Walsh: We had a site walk with Brocks a couple of years ago and they had put forth a master plan. What I learned from that is they were under the impression, and I don't know if you feel the same, that some of these larger boxes would look at Rt. 3, the way it is set up now, as a detriment and not that inviting because of how far it is from the interstate, how many lights there are, etc. They look at their employees before they locate, so they were looking at the parkway as more of an advantage to developing these big boxes. I can see where it is going to hurt this particular piece but there is a whole big area to look at.

D. Campbell: I have heard both, they said that roadway would be great and they also said “if we have to build it or participate in it we can't afford to come here” and that is true. The other thing they hear is it takes seven or eight minutes from the highway in each direction. With the traffic that they look at in Massachusetts that is not a lot. They understand that Rt. 3 is not right off the highway but seven or eight minutes to the highway is not bad and for a warehouse distribution. They don't see that as a detriment. If this was right on the interstate it would have been gone by now. It is in a little bit so it is going to take a little longer to catch, but it will.

D. Marshall motioned to amend the date in Paragraph 7, Page 4 of the Development Agreement concerning Head's Pond, from December 31, 2013 to December 31, 2014. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.

D. Marshall: I would like to encourage that we send out an invitation to both Manchester Sand & Gravel and SNHU to come in and discuss with the Planning Board their master plans for the areas in the near future so we can better address those problems.

D. Rogers: Probably sometime after the first of the year.

Motion carried unanimously.

D. Campbell: Just for a practical way that we will amend this, if you remember we came in and asked for an amendment a few weeks ago on another matter. What I would suggest is that we would do all of these changes at one time and have a new development agreement recorded.

D. Rogers: I think that would make sense.

WAIVER REQUEST

2. AUTO WHOLESALERS / PAUL MILLER

1311 Hooksett Rd, Map 25, Lot 56 (plan #13-34)

Waiver Request – Signage: Applicant is requesting permission to permanently display their website address via sticker letters, measuring a total of 28 inches tall by 68 feet long, across the building canopy. Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 11.16 – Signs.

Paul Miller: The property that we are addressing is the old Mobile gas station on the south side of Auto Wholesalers. John Kelly has recently bought that property and we tried to spruce up and make it look better. In the meantime we have the awning overhead and we are trying to put our website on the front of the awning. It is not opposing, does not light up and there is nothing dramatic. The awning is there. The first few letters are up there so you can see how it will look. I have people who are stopping and asking who is moving in there and they do not realize it is all one. I think this would help to promote my website which would promote business and I would be able to bring my two properties together.

D. Winterton: Do you know how many feet of frontage you purchased?

P. Miller: I don't know the frontage on that property.

T. Walsh: Any future plans with it? Is this all you are planning for the foreseeable future?

P. Miller: For the foreseeable future we want to put the website up there and the next thing we will be coming to Town Hall with is that we would like to empty the old Mobile station and put two garage doors, or one wider one, in for a reconditioning shop to clean cars.

T. Walsh: I notice you cleared off all of the cars on the north side of the lot. Are there future plans for that as well?

P. Miller: That property does not belong to us. We leased it. By expanding south of the property, we got out of the lease on the north side.

D. Winterton motioned to grant a waiver request for a non-lighted sign to permanently display their website address via sticker letters, measuring a total of 28 inches tall by 68 feet long, across the building canopy. Development Regulations (06/04/2012) Section I, 11.16 – Signs. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPLETENESS

3. AUTUMN FROST / DAVID SCARPETTI

Summerfare St, Map 35, Lots 7, 1-8 and 1-9

**18-lot conservation subdivision including two lot line adjustments with lots 1-8 and 1-9.
Discussion of buffer.**

Dick Marshall and Paul Scarpetti stepped down. Five members of the Board remaining.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, we have input from Stantec on this, correct?

J. Duffy: Yes. We are recommending that the plan be found complete.

F. Kotowski motioned that the plan be found complete in that the last thing to be done was for them to go to the Sewer Commission. The Sewer Commission indicated that they have the capacity and should be good to go. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: This will be set for a public hearing December 16, 2013.

J. Duffy: They have a question regarding the buffer area before they go any further.

Doug MacGuire (The Dubay Group): I am here with David Scarpetti. We are not looking to discuss the plans. We will save that for the public hearing. One question came up at TRC and we want to get input from the Board specifically regarding whether or not there would be a need for a buffer. This is an 18-lot conservation subdivision with open space single family lots and is proposed to be a public town roadway with access to water and sewer. The question came up in the zoning ordinance under the conservation subdivision regulations section regarding external and internal design standards. Within that section it states the Planning Board shall work with the developer to determine if a buffer zone will be required between any proposed structure within the development and the perimeter of the tract and, if required, shall determine the depth of the buffer zone. This project is coming off of Summerfare St., an existing residential street. This parcel that we are proposed to be developing is zoned MDR, which is the same zone as the abutting parcels. The area in question would be Autumn Run, which has all single family homes. There is another area that is part of the development that is zoned commercial. The uses are the same. They are similar in lot size. MDR has a .75 acre, 150' frontage requirement. Conservation subdivisions allow a little relief to that. They allow you to go down to half an acre and 50' of frontage. Based on the layout of these lots, we have in excess of 100', most are 125', in frontage. We are very close to the standard MDR. We are also proposing similar house sizes in the 1,800 – 2,500 sq. foot range which is similar and in kind with the properties that are on Autumn Run currently. Based on these items, we feel that a buffer wouldn't necessarily be required. It is my opinion that a buffer in this type of area, as written in the zoning ordinances, would be more applicable to separate uses such as a multi-family against a single family development. There are two items we are proposing. There is about a 8-10 foot drop off of Summerfare St. where we are coming in, and we are grading that road downward and into the site. What that does is puts our proposed lots, on that side of the road, at an elevation of about 390 – 392. The elevation of the lots on Autumn Run, would be closer to 420 elevation. We are looking at a good 30' of vertical separation between our proposal and the existing lots. That is going to provide a natural buffer as is. We are also proposing a voluntary no cut zone along the edge of property which would be 20' feet wide and that would be a deed restriction within these lots that would provide 20' of buffer that would have some maintaining of a tree zone in there to the benefit of both properties along that area. We were hoping to get some feedback and maybe a blessing from the

Board to continue to move forward with the project.

D. Rogers: Is the buffer, as pictured on your drawing, already there?

D. MacGuire: Yes it is. We are showing that to be maintained as a no cut.

D. Rogers: You said voluntary no cut, correct? On your part, not on the homeowner?

D. MacGuire: Correct.

F. Kotowski: Am I correct in thinking that if I lived on Autumn Run and was looking toward the new development, if we were to require a buffer, it would have to grow to be above 60' before it would really provide a buffer?

D. MacGuire: I think you are correct, but the way I am looking at it is that you are really not buffering anything because the roof lines of the houses are actually going to be set.

F. Kotowski: That is my point.

T. Walsh: I am looking at it a little bit differently being a survivor of Berry Hill Rd. I came to Town Hall as an abutter and I listened to a developer tell me they were going to leave all of the existing trees and, like I see here, everybody was happy. Two days later they cut the whole thing down and it is horrible and still is to this day, ten years later. I have no problem with the natural buffer, but if you could show me something to say more than just a voluntary no-cut that we can hold you to it would be much better. I think the 20' natural is fine. I don't see the need to add anything, but leaving some kind of natural vegetation between developments and subdivisions is a respectful thing to do.

D. Winterton: Would any of those lots be too small, if they lost that 20' in the back?

D. MacGuire: Yes. Are you referring to our proposed lots?

D. Winterton: Yes.

D. MacGuire: That is part of the reason why I feel that a buffer between like uses may not necessarily be warranted anyway but, because there is discussion of a buffer, we wanted to voluntarily offer something to be proactive. What we would not want to do is eliminate that area from the parcels because then you would be looking at substandard lots on our property. The layout of this lot is such that there is not a lot of width. It is a longer, more of a bowling alley type lot so it does not allow for large wide buffers on the perimeter.

T. Walsh: Would an included buffer adversely affect some of the lots?

D. MacGuire: Yes. Most of the lots that are along that perimeter line would be affected by that, based on lot sizing.

T. Walsh: If we insisted on a buffer could they still be considered buildable lots if we waived the size restrictions? Is that a possibility?

D. MacGuire: One benefit to this proposed development is because of that grade separation, the area along the perimeter of the property line would not be like flat back yard that you would want to clear-cut and put your shed on. That may help because that is going to be a natural grass slope that is going to naturalize behind these houses. When these lots are graded, and based on the way the grade is, the developer is going to come in and grade these lots while he grades the road. It makes sense to do that. They will be cutting from the high side of the road and filling on the low side of the road. They are going to be doing that lot development as they build the roadway. The elevation of a homeowners house is going to be set. There is not going to be a lot of value to them cutting trees down. They would not be allowed to. It would be a deed restriction. You are saying if, by chance, there is a bigger issue that they wanted to do it?

T. Walsh: The value is in the trees, that is why they do it.

D. MacGuire: It would be a deed restriction. I have talked with Dave about this and he had agreed. There would be no benefit except for, maybe, harvesting the wood.

D. Rogers: We won't do a vote at this stage since it is a completeness hearing tonight. This is set down for December 16 for the public hearing so we will see you back at that point and time.

Dick Marshall and Paul Scarpetti returned

CONTINUED HEARING ON FINAL APPROVAL

4. MIACOMET DEVELOPMENT, LLC (plan #07-37)

Webster Woods, Phase II, Daniel Webster Hwy, Map 6, Lot 114

Final site plan approval.

Sharon Somers: I was not here on November 4, but I know there were several things left to be addressed. As evidenced by the report of JoAnn Duffy and the Stantec report, all but one item has been dealt with. A couple of administrative changes need to be made to the final set of plans, a couple of things were left off. Essentially what has happened since November 4, is that the restoration work was completed and that has been evidenced by correspondence from DES and I think Stantec has agreed that has all been done. A plan was submitted by Miacomet on November 12, and again on November 14 showing the relocated plans. I believe Mike Gospodarek has copies of those and you should all have received them. They pertain to the ones that were under discussion on November 4. In addition to that, the outstanding issue, from my perspective, is that in the report that was issued by Miacomet to the town on November 12, we provided cross section for the units that were an issue relative to the location of the slope. They are Units 1, 3, 5 and 7. That report from Miacomet indicated that the location of those was acceptable, however, it also portrayed the cross section of Units 1 and 3 as being 21' and 23' from the face of the slope to the edge of the footing of those units. Stantec then advised us, last Thursday afternoon, that they would like to have a Geotech engineer weigh in on the location of those two units because they were not certain that was consistent with some of the earlier correspondence from the Geotech and the plans, in general. We contacted Kevin Martin who had done the Geotech

work for Miacomet and he was unable to provide any comments by tonight. From my perspective, I think all of the items have been completed, except that we have to get the final versions of the restoration plans to the town. Mike Gospodarek tells me that can be turned around in a couple of weeks. The only thing that is an outstanding question is the location of Units 1 and 3. We understand and appreciate the towns concern about wanting to have Kevin Martin weigh in and we are agreeable to having him do that, but he just can not do it by tonight. We would ask that the Board review everything but that particular issue, and then we could have him come back and give us an opinion as to whether the current cross-sections are acceptable or not. If they are not then I am going to have to make some recommendations to my client and then we can get it approved with finality.

David Rogers read into record an email received from Jerry Ouellette.

J. Duffy: We have been discussing this for a great deal of time. Last this afternoon we tried to wrap up what was outstanding. The engineer does need to make some changes to the sheets before they get signed. They still owe us the \$1500 for the fencing.

S. Somers: That's been paid.

J. Duffy: It was paid but it was made out to the Town of Hooksett.

S. Somers: We paid it directly to the Association.

J. Duffy: Oh ok. I was not aware of that. There are just a few conditions of approval that should be included. As far as input from the Geotec, Rene can explain that much better than I can. You really have two options. You can wait until you receive the letter from the Geotec engineer and continue this again, or you can make it one of the conditions of approval, that we receive the letter by a week or so from tonight.

Rene LaBranche: The primary issue is that the cross sections we got showed the 21' and 23' dimension from the foundation to the face of slope for Units 1 and 3. What we were concerned about was their own Geotech report that was sent to us years ago, that clearly stated the minimum dimension should be 25' so they are inside of that dimension. That doesn't mean, necessarily, it is a bad thing or it is going to fail, it only means their Geotech should weigh in on this and evaluate this situation.

D. Rogers: Is this the same Geotech who did the original analysis?

Rene LaBranche: Yes. That is why we identified that issue.

T. Walsh: I would not mind waiting to hear on that Geotech only because it has been a major concern of a lot of people; Units 1 and 3. Also, twenty minutes ago, I just received a 40 page read. It would not bother me to see it continued.

D. Rogers: I would agree with that. It seems like it is a potentially significant change. It may turn out to be next to nothing, but given the history of this whole project, Phase I and Phase II, as much as I would like to wrap it up, I think continuing it would be in the best interest of everybody involved,

primarily the residents.

J. Duffy: Our next meeting is December 2.

D. Rogers: Is that enough time or would December 16 be better? I would like to have one whole package by then.

J. Duffy: Would it be better to wait just to be on the safe side?

D. Rogers: I think December 16 might be better.

T. Walsh motioned to continue to December 16, 2013. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

S. Somers: We will get the Geotech report done well before December 16 so that we can circulate it to Stantec and JoAnn and we'll get the revised plans to them as well.

OTHER BUSINESS

Planning Board Rules of Procedure Amendments

D. Rogers read into record the proposed amendments to the Planning Board Rules of Procedure.

J. Duffy read additional comments to the Board and into record.

D. Winterton: The Town Council discussed having an alternate Town Council member because of the potential for lack of quorum, so they have designated an alternate Town Council member.

J. Duffy: I don't think that would affect these rules.

D. Winterton: I don't either. That is why I think designate is a better word than appoint. If I were unable to attend, they would send an alternate for me. The appointed alternate cannot take my place.

APPROVAL OF STANTEC INVOICES

F. Kotowski motioned to approve the Stantec invoices. Seconded by T. Prasol. P. Scarpetti abstained. Motion carried unanimously.

ZBA SPECIAL EXCEPTION

J. Duffy: I sent you all the ZBA minutes today through email. Could you please read them before the December 2 meeting, Carolyn will send you a hard copy if you prefer it that way. They were quite lengthy. There was a lot of discussion about Manchester Water Works putting in a well on Kimball Dr. and there are several concerns. I was talking to the Code Enforcement Officer and am thinking that a buffer is going to have to be put in. It is all zoned residential down there but this is more of a commercial/industrial kind of use, even though it is a public utility. Being that they are abutting

residential use they should be providing the buffer between the two properties of 50'. He is going to contact the engineer. There is a site walk scheduled, I think for December 7. I just want to say this because they are coming in on December 2 to get your opinion and have the letter sent over saying that you recommend it, so I want you to look into it carefully, and make sure you have all of the information. The problem that I saw, reading the minutes, was they don't even know the size of the building at this point.

D. Rogers: Are we going to be ready by December 2 for them to come in and make a presentation?

J. Duffy: You don't have to make the decision that night, however, they are scheduled to go back to the ZBA on December 10. That does not mean the ZBA has to vote that night, they have gone to see them once, they are going to the site walk and they are returning on the 10th which is the normal procedure.

D. Marshall: Does this go back to the discussions we had five years ago when Manchester Water Works wanted to open a plant in that area to extract water and, once treated, would go into their regular line system, most of which would probably end up at the north end of Manchester?

J. Duffy: That is where this may end up at if the water quality meets their standards.

D. Shankle: One of the things that I don't know if anybody on the Board would have recollection or experience with; there are three houses at the far end of Kimball Dr. and I am not sure how they got there. I am just bringing it up so you don't get blindsided. I'm not sure who approved them, or how. It is not clear from the building permits. They were just sort of allowed to go on land where there is no access. There is not really a road or a driveway. Some of you might raise that as an issue and I don't know if anyone has an answer for it but we could not find one. Leo and I spent a lot of time with this and there is no easy answer to it.

D. Marshall: The best I can recollect is they have been there almost forever. It was done, if not in the late 60's the early 70's, when it was considered a private road and had nothing to do with the town, no maintenance or anything. I don't know if that is still the case on maintenance.

D. Shankle: That is true with the first group of them to go on Kimball Dr., but my recollection is those last three have been built in under ten years.

D. Marshall: That I am not sure.

T. Walsh: When it turns to dirt there are more houses beyond there?

D. Shankle: There are three houses back there that are recent since 2003 or 2004.

P. Scarpetti: I did read that article that was sent to us and there was discussion when one of the abutters started talking about the vagueness of the building. Is the land Manchester Water Works owns across the river? They were talking about putting the building on the other side but drawing the water from the Hooksett side. It said that is a possibility and they tried drawing water from the other side and it was contaminated so they came to our side and they were getting good results but they could still put the

building on the other side.

L. Lessard: They may not put a building at all. There may just be a manhole there and they will just be sucking it out and bringing it to their other plant. They are showing a building just in case there is going to be one someday.

F. Kotowski: The Sewer Commission met with Manchester Water Works because if we extend the sewer line from Walmart to go under the river it would come through Manchester Water Works property. We had to sit with them and talk about their plans for that area. At the time they did not talk about a building but they did talk about drilling a well, going under the river with three tentacles, that they would draw water into a pumping station of some sort and move it into their system. That is all I know about it, but I know that they are serious about doing something there simply because all of their prior plans dried up. They own a whole piece of land across from the sewer plant on the other side of the railroad tracks, almost up to the bridge. That line was there and at one time they were going to pump out of the river to somewhere and dump it so it would flow naturally into Tower Hill. I don't know how you would do that but they were going to do the same thing with Head's Pond. I would suggest they would be willing to talk to us and give us an idea of what their plans are.

D. Rogers: My concern, JoAnn, is when I read through the minutes, it seemed that they were not well prepared and I don't want to have us put them on the agenda two weeks from now and have them come in and give us the same presentation without too much substance to it. If they could address some of those concerns that came up because I would assume some of those same concerns would come up here.

J. Duffy: I will speak with them.

L. Lessard: They are proposing to put on the plan a larger size building, just in case, but they are not planning on putting a building there at all. They are hoping to pump it all up to their existing plant.

D. Rogers: From what I gathered from those minutes, there was a lot more engineering and testing that needs to be done so I can understand why they wouldn't commit to it. A couple more weeks will have gone by and maybe they might have a better sense of it.

CHANGE OF USE

1. Melinda and Nicholas Sergi, 1878 Hooksett Road, Map 2, Lot 13. Retail shop in former antique shop. That is the red building as you are driving north on Hooksett Rd. right before you get into Allenstown on the left hand side. It was an antique shop for many years. They closed a few months ago and people want to open a retail gift shop.
2. Merchants Fleet Management, 1275 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 1. They are building on Hooksett Road where the former cigar shop was. They are converting that to space for their IT department and are expanding once again.
3. Fang's Market. The owner is Lucky Fang, 1265 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 2-1. This would

be an Asian Market/Food sales in the former dance/ballet studio located in the RK Plaza building which was approved with conditions that building and fire do some inspections. He said he was planning to open in January.

BOARD DISCUSSION

D. Winterton: I wanted to ask the feeling of the Board about engineering changes. Would it be appropriate to invite Stantec to make a presentation to us whether they are going to continue.

D. Rogers: I think that would be appropriate. JoAnn could you please put that down for December 16.

F. Kotowski motioned to adjourn. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**