

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, December 2, 2013**

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

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

EXCUSED: Dick Marshall (Vice-Chair).

STAFF: Jo Ann Duffy (Town Planner), Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Planner), and Dan Tatem (Stantec).

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 11/18/13

T. Walsh motioned to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2013 meeting. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON CIP PLAN FY 2014-2015

1. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) COMMITTEE 2014-2015

CIP Plan presentation to Planning Board

Marc Miville (Vice Chair of the CIP Committee): Every year the CIP Committee examines a six year plan from this year to the next six years and draws out all of the big ticket items in town. The qualifications and criteria for all of these items are generally anything over \$50,000, any land purchases that are independent of any activities from the Conservation Commission, and any wheeled or motorized vehicles. The intent of the CIP Committee is to accept all presentations from the department heads in town with all of their requests for their items to be considered for the CIP plan which is part of the master plan. The other intention that the CIP Committee followed was the Town Administrator was following instructions from the Town Council to reduce the amount of warrant articles to be placed on the yearly ballot and to reflect that in the CIP plan. With that under consideration, we took the Town Administrator's recommendations and spread out some of these requests. Most of the requests that were made by the department heads were adhered to and we fit them into the overall puzzle of the entire CIP plan, with the objective of the bottom line grand total reflecting a leveling total across the board so there are no tax spikes in any given year. As you can see on the grand totals, we pretty much accomplished that. The first year is the lowest of them all. Under this economy we feel that is an important thing especially with the Town Council's objective to lower the amount of warrant articles. One of the things that came up this year on the CIP Committee deliberations was that some of these items were presented to the Committee with the understanding they will not end up as warrant articles. That potentially some of these items were being adopted into the CIP plan with the understanding they are just listed here for transparency purposes as an overall plan, but ultimately some of these items

would be placed into the operating budgets of the town. This caused some confusion on our end as to whether these items should be on the CIP plan or, if they are not going to be going to warrant articles, why they are on the CIP plan because most CIP plan lines ultimately become warrant articles.

D. Rogers: Could you please point those out.

M. Miville: Under the police department the entire line for all six years is \$66,235.58 across the board. That was a police department request for two vehicles per year. Those items will be going into the operating budget. They felt because it was under the criteria of the CIP for being motorized vehicles, for transparency sake they also had to be on the CIP plan so we put it in there. Because it is level across the board it didn't really affect the grand total. The other one was DPW vehicles. They were going to be placed into the operating budget although they are in the CIP plan again to reflect what they are planning on doing. It is ultimately up to the Town Council, and you as well, because we are a sub-committee of the Planning Board. The first step is to bring this forward to the Planning Board, then it moves to the Town Council, and the Town Council can adopt or edit any of these lines they wish and decide whether something should be on a warrant article or be placed in the operating budget or not at all.

Joanne McHugh (Member of the CIP Committee): The other thing I would add with regard to the Police and DPW vehicles is I think there was consideration given to the fact that they need those vehicles to operate. We asked the Planning Board for their opinion on whether or not it should be strictly in the operating budget or in the CIP and as Marc said it is in there for transparency but it will go into the operating budget because they need it to operate and reduce the number of warrant articles and perhaps we will get a better outcome.

F. Kotowski: Mr. Miville, earlier you said most of the items requested by department heads were granted in this. Were there items requested by department heads that you excluded?

M. Miville: No, we did not remove anything off of the CIP plan. Everything requested is on this plan. If anything, we changed some years to others but we changed very few.

D. Winterton: The vehicles you talked about in the DPW, those are not the reserve funds, are they?

M. Miville: We are talking about the sidewalk plow, the loader, the three-ton pick up for this year for \$34,000. Those items were going to be exclusive. That is up to the Town Council as to what they want to do, but it is my understanding that those vehicles were going to be placed into the operating budgets. The other thing with the DPW, you will see the \$100,000 across the board on the second line for plow dump truck capital reserve fund. What the department and the Town Administrator have requested to do was increase it from an original request of \$80,000 across the board. They have removed some of the items a little lower here that have empty slots, and increased it to \$100,000 to make it an overall capital reserve fund that will include the requests underneath.

T. Walsh: The 14-yard automated collection truck, new to fleet, for \$180,000. I know it has to go to warrant, but is that going to be paid for by the offsetting revenue?

M. Miville: That is correct. She already has funds in her revolving special fund to pay for it as you can see on the balance on the line next to it.

J. McHugh: It is going to end up being a wash.

M. Miville: She said the vehicle is going to be a smaller size automated collection truck to get to smaller roads or smaller places the bigger trucks can't get to.

P. Scarpetti: The off-set review fire impact fees, \$350,000 for 2015-2016, what is that?

J. McHugh: Those are the impact fees that the town has collected and we are allowed to collect them for fire. They use them as they need them but they can only use them for growth.

P. Scarpetti: So they have that money now?

M. Miville: They have about \$350,000 in it right now. They determined the request is for \$400,000 for a fire engine and by next year they should have the \$400,000 in impact fees.

P. Scarpetti: I was just confused because it was under the next year.

M. Miville: It is under year two which is another point. They are trying to put in a request in for a third fire station and a fire engine to supply that third station but the Town Council has yet to determine whether they want a third fire station. It is forwarded along in years and that is how it is reflected so the Town Council has a couple of years to decide if they want another fire station and vehicle, but that vehicle can only be purchased for growth purposes.

J. McHugh: I believe there are ongoing discussions but there is nothing formal at this point.

M. Miville: The discussion was going to be to go in with the Manchester Fire Department on that new station on Hackett Hill. The other one I wanted to mention was on the school district side; the first line, HVAC upgrades, has \$34,000 on the first year. I don't know how we missed it as a committee. I apologize for me missing it, but \$34,000 does not fit the criteria for a CIP plan. Technically, it should not be on the CIP plan. The school district has the authority to make it a warrant article if they want to. Whether it should be reflected here or not I don't have that knowledge but I wanted to call your attention that. The school department can put it as a warrant article after the fact or put it in their operating budget.

J. McHugh: I think they chose to put on transparency.

M. Miville: They put it on the transparency and said they would rather have it as a warrant article. I thought I would bring it up because somehow we missed it.

D. Rogers: We need to take a vote on this to forward onto the Town Council.

F. Kotowski motioned to approve the CIP Plan as presented and forward it to Town Council for

further action, with recommendation for approval. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. STERLING HOMES, LLC / KEACH-NORDSTROM ASSOCIATES (plan #13-26) Summit View, South Bow Rd, Map 12, Lots 1 & 24

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

➤ Special Use Permit

Peter Julia (Project Manager, Keach Nordstrom Associates): Thank you for allowing me to move up in the agenda. I am here to provide a brief update. We have not yet re-submitted back to the Town of Hooksett nor the Town of Bow. We are still in the midst of our process, municipally as well as with our state agencies. The project, in large, has not changed and the plans that were originally submitted are still greatly the same. To that end, one question asked last time we were here was why you did not receive a complete plan set. It is a plan set that requires greater than 50 sheets and I asked for consideration to submit only what was necessary to clearly demonstrate the intent of the project. It was graciously granted and was a savings of time and resources. Now, you should now have a complete plan set in front of you. I mentioned we are making great strides. That could be measurable in reference to Stantec's letter. There were 77 comments. We believe we have successfully worked through 57 of those comments. That represents roughly 75%. Of the remaining 20 comments, there are eight that are drainage related and we are working on those as we speak. There are five related to the fire cistern locations. We have a meeting next Tuesday, December 10 with the Fire Chief here in Hooksett. We are resolved in Bow but have yet to be resolved in Hooksett. There are two permitting in nature and we are continually working through those. There are another five that are general engineering in nature. One of the five has to do with the project itself submitting a special use permit which coincides with the conservation subdivision. This Board is not able to grant the special use permit because it is a conservation subdivision. Our primary reason for being here is to ask the Board members what your special use criteria is. We are in the process of writing that up and it will be included with the revised plans, reports and response letter to Mr. Tatem. There will be an extensive package coming to you. In that will be the special use criteria. Their criteria ranges are numerated A-F. For example, A) conformance with the master plan; B) conformance with zoning; C) conformance with the rule character and preservation of the land; D) pertains to design and site layout; E) size and scale of the overall development or if it may or may not have adverse impact on adjoining properties; F) open space. May I ask the Board if you are familiar with the special use criteria. Is there any one of these that, in your personal review, you may have a certain feeling that you wish to discuss. I would like to get that aired out now because it will help me prepare this application as I move forward.

D. Rogers: I would like to go to staff and get some input.

J. Duffy: The Board, although they have issued special use permits in the past, were waiting for you to submit your information along with the questions and give them ample time to read it over before they met with you. That is why I asked you if you were going to talk about the special use permit and to

have it submitted at least a week ahead so we could mail it to the Board members. I think it is unfair to ask them to agree or disagree with any of your answers at this point because they don't have anything in front of them and are not familiar with it until you provide the information. When you do that they will read it over at their leisure and come to the meeting prepared for it.

D. Rogers: I would think, for tonight's purposes, we may not have a lot to do given the fact that we don't have that criteria and the proposed permitting in front of us.

P. Julia: You don't have the specifics. I don't have the specifics either. I have written it up in general format but have yet to fill in the details. I can only tell you we feel, the design team as well as the owner, it is an appropriate use that fits the area and meets the zoning, and I don't see any red flags. Given what JoAnn has said and what you have said, Mr. Chairman, we will prepare it to the best of our ability and have follow-up conversations after you have reviewed our responses.

D. Rogers: I think that would be the best way to go about it in working with JoAnn and/or Mr. Tatem to produce something that we can look over in advance of our meeting that would be reconvening for the public hearing. JoAnn, are we into January's agenda?

J. Duffy: January 6 would be the next meeting.

P. Julia: The following one after that is the 20th?

D. Rogers: That is a holiday so we would not meet until February.

P. Julia: What is the first one in February?

J. Duffy: We are going to decide later in the meeting how to handle February because that month has a holiday as well.

D. Rogers: Are we looking at the first meeting in February to continue the public hearing?

J. Duffy: We were looking at the first meeting in January which is the 6th.

P. Julia: That comes up quickly and we have the holidays.

J. Duffy: So, the first meeting in February would be fine? We just need to decide what that date will be.

D. Rogers: We have to approve that meeting schedule for next year so it will be the first meeting in February, whatever date we determine that to be.

P. Julia: Moving beyond the special use permit I would like to bring up a few other items. There was some discussion regarding posted speed limit the last time we were here. The road design is going to be based on the 30 mph posted speed limit. Since we were here last we have met with the road agent, Leo Lessard, and discussed many of these items. Posted speed limit, roadway design and other things

pertaining to drainage. One of those items is going to be a waiver that we are going to add because of the nature of the property and the size of the storm water basin. We are going to seek a waiver from 4 to 1 grading to 2 to 1 backslopes and 3 to 1 around the access berm which is 12' wide. I prepared a drawing that I will refer to. At the end of Old Mill Lane is a small cul-de-sac within the project. These are two of the lots that have more steep land on them than any other lot within the proposed conservation subdivision. These driveways and house locations are within the building envelope. This is a reasonable lot development plan. The numbers that coincide with these two plans, for example, Lot 24-10 represents less than 10 percent lot coverage. The zoning district allows 20 percent. Lot 24-11 is less than 10 percent. The undisturbed area on 24-10 is roughly 50 percent of the lot. In light green is lawn and that is roughly 40 percent. On 24-11 the numbers are also similar. 24-10 is just under an acre, about 38,000 sq. feet. 24-11 is just over an acre. Some of the things we talked about when we met with Mr. Lessard was driveways and their regulations and slopes and geometry of that nature. I just prepared this image so I could show the Board that of these lots these are the more non-traditional. We cannot put a 50 foot driveway and a house in front. They have to be situated so it is more of a marriage with the land and not have drastic cuts or fills.

J. Duffy: I would like to bring to the Board's attention to C-2 on the grading plan. The plan that is up there on the board does not show any of the grading. If you can see on Sheet 2, the end of that cul-de-sac has very steep grades before it even goes into those lots.

P. Julia: The next image is similar in terms of a generic lot development plan. The grades were not shown on either plan for clarity but that is the reason these driveways are the lengths they are and the houses are positioned the way they are so that the driveways and the grading can meet the intent of the regulations. The image is designed to show the driveway can work. It is this shape for length as well as working with the contours. There is roadway grading in here and that is what JoAnn pointed out. The band on the drawing is the start of the open space and the houses are still a good 40' to 50' feet and in some places 60'. Although we have the green space that won't be touched, there is still a measure of land that won't be touched. The last image shows similarly the relationship between the back of the houses and the storm water basin. I will have more images that I will show at subsequent meetings that I have done cross-sections that will show you the grade from the road to the house and down to the basin, through the basin and back the other side. There is room to leave an undisturbed green buffer between the homes and the slope grading for this storm water basin. The basin will be surrounded by fencing. We will have more in-depth discussions as we move through the process.

J. Duffy: In my comments I asked, for several of the lots, that the applicants show a grading plan and I would like to add to that request Lots 10 and 11 as well.

D. Rogers: We won't take any action right now but we will see you back at the first meeting in February and you should be notified as to when that will be.

T. Walsh: I am looking over page C-1. Can you show me on the map where you consider the 25 or so acres of the required unconstrained land that goes towards the conservation subdivision formula. I am assuming it is all in Lot 12-1 but I want to see what your interpretation of unconstrained is.

P. Julia: The perimeter is for access, but the entire area of Lot 21.

T. Walsh: So you are calling everything in 21 unconstrained even though it is steep slopes more than 25 percent and wetlands.

P. Julia: That is correct. At that small scale those lines blur very quickly.

D. Rogers: Thank you. We will schedule that for the first meeting in February and you will be notified of that.

ZBA SPECIAL EXCEPTION

3. MANCHESTER WATER WORKS (ZBA Case #13-16)

700 Quality Dr., Map 29, Lot 64-2

- **Special Exception:** A special exception is requested under Article 14, Section B of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the installation of a well/water facility on the property that will draw water from beneath the river for an added water supply to their overall system. A Public Utility Facility is listed under Permitted Uses by Special Exception.

Bob Duval (TF Moran): We are here to discuss a proposal for a water well on Map 29, Lot 64. This is a lot on existing Kimball Dr., to the river side of BJ's and the ice arena. It is a little over seven acre lot that is currently vacant. There is a gravel drive that runs through it which is the portion of Kimball Dr. from the edge of the pavement just at the start of the lot, across this lot, and then serving three houses at the north end of the lot. We have a special exception pending at the ZBA. The special exception is to install a water well. The purpose of the water well is to supplement the Manchester Water Works capacity to draw raw water from their current water source which is Lake Massabesic and to add a well below the Merrimack River as a secondary source of water. The proposal is to install a radio well which is a well that would be installed laterally. It would be located on the inside of the banks of the river. That would be a well which essentially would consist of a 15 foot circular slab of concrete. That would be the structure and then below that well would be a riser and some laterals that would go out about 20' or so below the river bottom. This would be the collection system that would draw water into the well. That would be treated and brought into the Manchester Water Works system. The zoning of the land is mixed use district 3 which does permit public utility uses by special exception. That is why we are before the ZBA seeking that special exception. In discussion with the ZBA, they asked us what is being proposing to be built on this site. At the present time all that is being proposed is a water well. There is also the opportunity to provide some treatment on the site if it proves to be advantageous to do so. Manchester Water Works also has a larger parcel of land on the other side of the I-93 bridge that could also house treatment facilities. It is an engineering question of once we get the well in operation, we get water back from that well, and that water is analyzed, where it makes sense to do the treatment. There is quite a bit of engineering that would have to be done before those questions are answered. Nevertheless, the ZBA pressed us to explain at least what would be the maximum build out possible or likely on this site under any circumstances. This is what the colored up plan represents. The intent is to show the well in the southeast corner of the site and then near to the well would be a treatment facility to the extent it is warranted and if it makes sense to put it on this site. What we drew was the largest reasonably expected treatment facility that might be needed here. The actual amount and size of the

treatment facility depends on the quality of the water that this well produces. Although the Water Works currently has an well engineer under contract, they do not want to start work and incur those expenses until we work our way through the permitting process here at the town and make sure the town and the neighbors are satisfied with what is being proposed. What you have before you is a hypothetical. This is not being proposed. This is just an answer to the ZBA's question. If we were to propose this facility after approvals and after the well is built, we would come back with a formal site plan application and show you exactly what we were proposing to build with all of the engineering studies that go along with it. This is just to show what is likely to happen, to get your input and to get some input back to the ZBA so they can act on whether or not they see fit to allow this well to go into this location. In any event, regardless of whether or not treatment is provided on this site, there are a couple of site changes being proposed: 1) Starting at the south end of site, Kimball Dr. would be terminated in a hammer head situation. This is as a result of discussions with staff and the abutters. The original proposal was to connect Kimball Dr. to Quality Dr. but those closest abutters said they would prefer to have a hammer head to cut down on through traffic and to enable complete screening of the existing ice arena and BJ's from their homes. We are proposing at their request and at the agreement of Leo Lessard and the Fire Chief to put a hammer head there. 2) There would be a second connection at the north end of the lot. You can see that private driveway that would connect just south of the existing turnaround that is just before Amoskeag Beverages. That is an existing connection that angles backwards a little bit to the south and then you would double back to the north to access the last three homes on Kimball Dr. This proposed connection would make it easier to drive, plow, and maintain and to provide more continuous land for Water Works. It would be more of a straight line in, off of Quality Dr., to access those homes. That would be a private driveway serving those three homes at the end. Water Works and Mr. Miller have been in contact with all of these near abutters and many of the other abutters on Kimball Dr. throughout this process to try to keep them informed of what Water Works' plans are. There are some existing town and private right easements that would be extinguished as part of this proposal. Those are enumerated on the application before the ZBA and all of this has been discussed with the affected abutters and landowners and has been worked out to the extent of bringing us where we are tonight. We are asking this Board to consider this connection, ask any questions, and provide recommendations to the ZBA regarding this proposal. I want to emphasize that what is being proposed is a well and this is illustrative of what may turn out to be warranted at this location should the engineering studies so determine and should it make more sense to put some or all of the treatment at this location rather than the Exit 10 location.

D. Winterton: If it were only a well and the water came up like Poland Spring, what would happen then?

David Miller (Manchester Water Works): Because of the way this well is sited and the fact that it is going to be pulling water from the river itself, it would be considered ground water under the influence of surface water so there would be some disinfection treatment required. In a best case scenario, that treatment would only be ph adjustment, maybe fluoride because that is what we do in Manchester, some corrosion control and disinfection and away it goes. It is probably going to require some level of filtration in order to meet or exceed the quality of water that we are now producing from the Lake Massabesic source. We have got some good preliminary data but the treatment will be based on what we find when we do the extended pumping and testing. Ideally it would be the simple chemical treatment and disinfection and no filtration. Essentially we are getting the filtration through the river

bank. That is the beauty of this technology with these laterals being so far beneath the bottom of the river just above bedrock and using all of that natural soil as a pre-filter to provide a very high quality, we hope and believe from that location, to minimize that treatment and therefore the expense of the processes needed to make that water equal or better to what we are producing from Lake Massabesic.

B. Duval: In the packet it shows what the actual well head would look like. The next one shows a wood siding type finish with some gables, that would be a smaller end treatment building, a more likely end. That is probably one half to one third of the size of the rectangle shown on this plan. Again this all depends on the engineering studies and test results, but if everything came out good in the testing and they decided to do some disinfection and ph control and so forth at the site it would be in a facility that looks something like this.

D. Rogers: What is your estimated time frame for the testing and to determine what you would need for a facility?

D. Miller: It is going to depend on what kind of hoops and hurdles NH DES puts us through in terms of the length of the pumping test and the amount of data they want us to collect. We are going to have to go through the large groundwater withdrawal permitting process. If we can get going without too much delay, we would begin constructing this well in the Spring of 2014 and, I would imagine within four to six months, the well would be complete and we would be beginning that testing and permitting process. I would say it would be 24 to 36 months before we would even begin constructing a building.

D. Rogers: So the testing process, analysis, etc. is as much as 18 months?

D. Miller: I think within 18 months we could have a fully developed well and have all of the data we need to provide the engineers with a design criteria for that treatment facility. That would then go into six, eight, or ten months of design, public bidding, and then construction. It takes a lot of time.

T. Walsh: I don't believe there is water on Kimball Dr. Once you get water out of this well, whether you need to treat it on site or not, how does it get to the system?

D. Miller: We have a 20 in. river crossing that goes from the Derryfield School property across the river and then comes up onto our other property just downstream and on the other side of the I-93 interchange. That would be the finished treated water connection point. Whether or not we develop on the treatment facility on this lot or the other lot, we are going need to get water from the well location at this site to the treatment facility on this site or vice versa. There is going to be some pipeline in Kimball Dr. or Quality Dr. crossing over to Kimball.

T. Walsh: That is all determined by the quality of the water and then goes from there?

D. Miller: Exactly.

F. Kotowski: I know that piece of property lies between the river and 3A. Very soon, hopefully, there will be a proposed sewer line coming from Walmart down and going under the river. I am on the Sewer Commission and I believe you have probably had conversations with the Chair of the Sewer

Commission about the possibility of having a right-of-way though that property that would make it mutually beneficial to the town. Will there be consideration for that right-of-way in these plans?

D. Miller: I do recall a discussion a couple of months ago and we did discuss the potential for sewer and a right-of-way and we would certainly listen and be agreeable to any mutually beneficial solution to that problem.

P. Scarpetti: I read that it is six to eight million gallons a day that you will be drawing. Will that be restricted as you draw more water through the river bed or is that going to be consistent?

D. Miller: When we develop that well it will be the most efficient. We feel it will not silt up quickly but over time, and past history, it will require some maintenance to restore it to initial capacity.

P. Scarpetti: In middle of summer have you tested to see how much water flows. Will it give a negative effect to the river?

D. Miller: I don't know in cubic feet per second what the flow of that river is, but it is an enormous amount compared to what we will be withdrawing. We are talking about a fraction of a drop in a very large bucket. It will not impact the flow of the river at all. Plus there is a dam and this location is back-watered. They need that to keep that level for hydroelectric power and other uses. We did have a period a few years ago where they drew the river down to do some work on the dam. Hopefully that would not take place often, but even so we would still have plenty of water.

P. Julia: To put perspective of it, the six to eight million gallons a day they are talking about would be a matter of minutes of river flow.

D. Winterton: If you get approval to drill the well, you will do that first and see what happens because you don't know?

D. Miller: We have invested a fair amount of money to this point already to determine that this is a highly desirable location for this type of well.

D. Winterton: Can you explain the process of drilling that well. I have lived next to houses where they have drilled a well next to me and it is a couple of days of pretty loud banging.

P. Julia: This type of well is very different from the pounding steel casing into the ground. Picture that 12' or 15' diameter concrete cylinder maybe 6' or 8' high brought in on a truck or cast in place on site, depending on the method the contractor chooses, sitting on the surface of the ground. They would use a crane with a clam shell excavator and excavate the inside of that out and basically get it to sink right to grade. They would build the next circle and keep clamming it out. They would get down to bedrock with this concrete cylinder. When they get to the bottom and they place a concrete floor down, on the bottom there is an array of penetrations in that first or second ring they put in 70' to 80' down at the bottom. They will lower a hydraulic machine down there and will hydraulically jack the casing through the soil, wash out the soil as it is being jacked through, put another piece in and keep going 150' to 200', or maybe more, horizontally out underneath the river. Once that casing is in there, they install the

well screen and some gravel pack before they remove that casing and expose the screen to the river bottom. Then they go through a hydraulic surging development process to get the well up to production levels. There is not that pounding activity that you are referring to.

P. Scarpetti: If you built the building on this site, would you be agreeable to put it more towards the center of the property to give the people more of a buffer?

D. Miller: I have hopefully indicated to the neighbors that we want to be good neighbors and we can do a lot of things to alleviate their concerns. One of them was to eliminate the planned access at the southern end. We don't need to have that access but we thought they may want it. We can and we will work with abutters to make it as pleasing as we can and address all of the concerns that we can. So I guess the answer is yes.

F. Kotowski: Hypothetically, the well is drilled, you find that you need to have some treatment there, you build a building. Obviously there are pumps necessary to pump this volume of water. What is the decibel level that one can expect to hear in that area if you were going by?

D. Miller: I could not give you an actual decibel level but I can tell you that the building envelope can be designed to minimize or completely eliminate any noise that would come from a pumping facility and it is possible that the pumps selected by the engineer would be submersible pumps. They could be down 80' below the ground and you would never hear them except for water rushing.

J. Duffy: At the ZBA meeting there was discussion from the residents about concerns with their wells and I believe there was one person who had a dug well. What do you anticipate on doing if these wells are affected?

D. Miller: If they are impacted, I think it is reasonable for us to provide a connection to our system. There is an active main in that vicinity that we could easily make a connection to if there is any kind of impact at all or if they just want to connect for other reasons.

D. Rogers: I believe the residents will have an opportunity to be heard at the ZBA meeting. If anyone from public would like to make any kind of comment or ask questions I will open it up to that.

Open to Public

Edward Valade (87 Kimball Drive): One of the concerns my wife and I have is that our utilities presently come up the existing driveway. Our power, telephone and cable are on this portion of the dirt road. We have to discuss what will happen with the utilities in that area. We have some other things that are an issue to us such as trash collection and having the mailing address changed. I think my main point is we have to discuss the utilities at a future date.

Paul Godbout (73 Kimball Drive): We all have concerns with the aesthetics of the building, if there is going to be a building, what the setbacks are going to be, if there is there going to be sound or odor, will there be lighting 24/7, etc. The biggest thing is how it is going to affect our property values. I guess we are working though it. I don't have any specific questions today because this week my wife, Dave

and I had a meeting about it. We are just looking for more concrete answers as we go forward so there are no surprises in the in end and then what kind of recourse do we have after it is built. The big concern I have is during the build out, I know it is not going to have big drilling, but during the build-out I guess that makes my house unmarketable for 12-18 months, not that I am planning on selling it, but just in case I had to for some reason.

Cathy Barlette (89 Kimball Drive): I have concerns about mail, garbage, electric, smell, and noise, but more importantly this is a big project and everything is still vague There is nothing concrete. I feel, as a resident of that area, there should be more concrete information so that we can make an intelligent decision. You had stated there had been multiple conversations with the abutters. I have not had multiple conversations. I am not familiar of what is going on. In the picture it is pretty, but I don't know that it really represents anything. We have a building but we don't know what size it is. We have trees that can't possibly be in that area because of the size of the area. It is not going to look that pretty. There are a lot of questions in my head that are saying it looks great on paper and a lot of what you are saying sounds great, but it still vague and I think we deserve more concrete answers.

Closed to Public

D. Rogers: JoAnn, at this point we are to make a recommendation to the ZBA?

J. Duffy: Yes. The ZBA is meeting on December 10. I am not sure if they are ready to act on the special exemption request at that time, but they are looking for your comments.

D. Miller: There is also a site walk this Saturday at 9:00 am with the ZBA.

D. Rogers: Is there any motion that any Board member would like to put forward at this time concerning this project?

P. Scarpetti: If the building is that much of a concern to the residents, and you are willing to put in down on the other side of 93, I would say we would recommend the building goes down there.

B. Duval: There is a big investment, Water Works owns the property already, but there is still a big investment to come. Although it would be nice to come in with all of the answers in one neat package where everything can be addressed, we can't. There is no way to be there until you take the first step which is invest a lot of money in drilling a well, the testing, and the engineering that comes along with it. We are not in a position to address the questions about noise and light levels, and aesthetics of the building. We are in a position to address utility connections of the property and, yes, those will be preserved on the site. They may be relocated but they will be preserved on the site. There is no water or sewer on Kimball Dr. now so the only utilities are power and communications. When the time comes to make the next set of decisions, we will be back here. That may be the time when restrictions on the buildings are more appropriate. Obviously, at this point, we would like to keep as many options on the table as possible, wait to see what the well comes back showing us, and then if there is a compelling reason to make for having treatment at this site we could make those arguments and we would, at that point, have all the answers to abutter questions about the size and shape of the building, noise, etc. If we could ask the Board to not put any restrictions on the site at this point, allow us to drill this well,

knowing that we will be back before this Board with more details in the future, if warranted, that would be the best that we could hope for.

T. Walsh: What are you going to do if you put all of this money into your well and you come back and we refuse your site plan at a later date? That is risky too, isn't it?

B. Duval: At that point, we would have no choice but to get you to approve it.

T. Walsh: I do feel for what they are saying. We usually don't approve anything until we know what is happening.

B. Duval: That is why we are not asking for any approval. We are just answering the question in the spirit of full disclosure that we may be coming back with more facilities on this site just so the Board has that as background, but that is not being proposed at this point.

D. Rogers: Also, our role tonight is not on any site plan approvals or any sort of site plan review. It is a special exception advisory as required under the ordinance to go to the Zoning Board. Our role here is fairly limited in terms of if we are ok with this moving forward with the ZBA and then they address a lot of the questions that have come up. As you have pointed out, 12 or 18 months down the road you may be back with a site plan saying the size of the building and the results of the testing and more concrete information which is not available right now.

B. Duval: It could well be in 12 to 18 months we could come back and say all we need is a residential scale building. So we wouldn't like not to have those options foreclosed to us.

F. Kotowski: I think we should send this to the ZBA saying that we have heard their proposal. The proposal has merits, the Board has concerns with them, and we leave the issue of the special exception to the ZBA. There are a lot of hurdles here that you folks have to get through. One of them is the Department of Environmental Services. A great deal goes on in what state and federal regulations have to do with water sheds and rivers. I would refer this to ZBA, let them take the action necessary, and we will deal at a time that it comes back to us in some other form.

F. Kotowski motioned to refer this to the ZBA with some concerns as to the ultimate outcome of the physical plant, but for the time being we are not taking a position to oppose the request. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPLETENESS

4. PIKE INDUSTRIES (plan #13-36)

38 Hackett Hill Rd, Map 12, Lot 11

Site plan to replace two existing plants with one new asphalt plant

- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist

Corey Colwell (MSC Civil Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc.): The applicants own and maintain an asphalt plant at 38 Hackett Hill Rd. located on the north side of Hackett Hill Rd. just to the west of Rt.

93. At that facility, there are two existing pavement plants. One plant was erected in approximately 1967, the second was erected in 1972. Both plants have reached their life expectancy. Our proposal is to replace these two plants with one new plant which would be quieter, more efficient, less energy, to produce roughly the same amount of asphalt. I have a couple of photos that demonstrate the differences between the two plants I would like to show you. The new plant is a little less, it is cleaner, there would be a lot less steel with one plant replacing the two. Also, in your packets are plans with five sheets that demonstrate the existing characteristics of the site. Sheet C-1 is what we call an existing features plan. The gray hatched area represents pavement. The existing plants and topographical relief are shown. Behind those plants is gravel that is used to help manufacture the asphalt. This plan also shows the various components of the plant. There are various underground utilities running throughout the site. The proposal is simple in that it is two plants to be removed, various components of those plants would be utilized on other Pike facilities, the remainder would be recycled and one plant would come in its place. Because the site is completely disturbed and it is going on top of asphalt, we have asked for a waiver to the checklist of the site review regulations. In that checklist, there are items such as topography of the entire site, soil characteristics, test pits, and percolation tests, which we don't think are relevant to the replacement of a plant. We think those items are more relevant to a subdivision or a larger commercial development. There is no change in impervious surfaces. The plan is not proposed within 100' of any wetlands. It is a new plant replacing one on almost an entirely paved surface. Sheet C-2 shows those existing plants. The hatched items shown are the buildings that would be removed, the unhatched items are the buildings that would remain as part of a new plant. The two plants take up a large area and sheet C-3 shows the new plant which takes up much less of an area. It also shows its relationship with the existing plant. There would have to be some pavement restored. Sheet C-4 is some details of various components necessary for the construction. Where there are buildings to be removed there will be pavement that has to be restored. We have added some utility trenches for utilities. We are proposing Filtrex filter socks for erosion control around the entire site, inlet protections for catch basins that we propose to have installed during construction. The last sheet is more detail of the proposed plant. We understand this is a completeness hearing and the plan set shows you what we are trying to accomplish.

D. Rogers: If this waiver is granted and you proceed with the new plant arrangement is that going to have any change in the activity level of the site in terms of vehicle traffic, output, noise, etc.?

Jonathan Oakes (Vice President of Pike Industries, Inc.): There will be no increase in business, truck traffic, employees, or anything like that. The intent is to put a new, modern facility up to replace the older one.

D. Rogers: I presume it will be more efficient, state of the art and so on.

J. Oakes: Correct.

F. Kotowski: I would like to hear from staff as to their view of this.

J. Duffy: The applicant is here to ask for a waiver for the completeness portion of the application. If you agree with that they will move on to the public hearing next month. They are scheduled for a TRC meeting this Thursday so we have not heard the details yet of the plan. We agree with the completeness

since they are just replacing existing equipment.

F. Kotowski: That would have no further impact as far as we know on the site?

J. Duffy: Correct.

T. Walsh motioned to grant the waiver request from completeness checklist to not require the full checklist. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

5. Planning Board Rules of Procedure Amendments

D. Rogers read the second reading of the changed sections of the Planning Board Rules of Procedure Amendments into record.

6. 2014 Planning Board Schedule

J. Duffy: We have scheduled the regular meeting for January 6 and the workshop for the zoning changes for the 13th. That is just the workshop, not a hearing. In February, normally we just have one meeting because of the holiday, so I did not know if you wanted to February 3rd and then do the 10th as a regular meeting and the first public hearing for zoning. We have included a snow date. The options are to do the 3rd and the 10th or just the 10th.

T. Walsh: I think the 10th would be sufficient and eliminate the 3rd.

J. Duffy: The same holds true for March. We have the 3rd and then the 17th would will be a regular meeting and the 2nd zoning public hearing. The other option is to do the 3rd and 17th as regular meetings and add a meeting for the 10th for the zoning hearing. Sometimes people don't like to have a regular meeting and the zoning at the same time. This year we expect about three or four zoning changes plus the sign ordinance if we get there in time.

D. Rogers: That would be the 2nd meeting right?

J. Duffy: You have to hold at least one zoning hearing, but if you make any changes to what it presented then you hold a second, but it doesn't mean that you can't have other new things at that second hearing. The only problem with that is if you make any changes that is it, you can't change it at all. If you change it you have to have a second hearing. The deadline per the RSA for any of the zoning is the 18th of March. If we have the first hearing on February 10th we could have the next hearing on March 10th or we could wait until the 17th which would give more time for the sign ordinance, however, then you couldn't make any changes to the sign ordinance. If you are planning on having the Board look the sign ordinance over and possibly make some changes than we could bring it to you on the 10th as well as one of the hearings in March. I have also scheduled the 13th for the workshop, hoping we have everything done by then, but I can't promise what will happen with the sign ordinance for the 13th.

D. Rogers: How is the Sign Ordinance Committee progressing? Do you have any idea?

J. Duffy: They are progressing fairly well but now the question was on what the size of the building signs should be. I talked to Barlo Signs last week and they are going to help us out and take pictures and superimpose them for you so you can get an idea of the sizes and what they would look like on the buildings. They have assigned a staff member to do this for us. I told them we were in a hurry, but I don't have any guarantees.

T. Walsh: We have created our own list of things to reach a consensus on. For the most part most of them will be an up and down vote. That is the last hard thing to figure out the best way to do it. After the next meeting we have it will be very close.

D. Rogers: When is your next meeting?

T. Walsh: We are still trying to figure that out to see what works for everybody.

D. Rogers: We could schedule the extra meeting in March and cancel if we need to. That may be the more conservative approach.

J. Duffy: Leave March the way it is?

D. Rogers: Yes. Keep the 3rd, 10th and 17th, with the idea being we may not need the 10th if we can work it all into the 17th. The balance of the schedule for the rest of the year appears to be the same format we have been following.

D. Winterton motioned to accept the 2014 Planning Board meeting schedule, with amendments. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**