

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, April 21, 2014**

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

PRESENT: Dick Marshall (Vice-Chairman), Tom Prasol, Frank Kotowski, and Donald Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Michael DiBitetto and Muamer Durakovic

EXCUSED: D. Rogers, P. Scarpetti, and T. Walsh

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 4/7/14

April 7, 2014 Regular Meeting – *F. Kotowski motioned to approve the April 7, 2014 regular meeting minutes, with amendments. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.*

CONTINUED COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARING

GCD, INC.

1461 & 1465 Hooksett Rd., Map 18, Lots 49 & 49-C (plan #14-05)

Lot Line Adjustment

- **Waiver Request** from the following items on the Lot Line Review Checklist (Development Regulations 6/4/2012)
 - Item #2 Scale is not more than one inch per one-hundred feet.
 - Item #11 Names, addresses and signature of every Engineer, Architect, Land Surveyor, Wetland Scientist, or Soil Scientist whose professional seal appears on any subdivision plan submitted to the Board.
 - Items #13 & 19 Location map (locus) at the scale of municipal base map. Vicinity sketch showing location of site in relation to surrounding public street system, zoning, 100 year flood, etc.
 - Items #24 & 29 Structures, utilities, roads and other paved areas. Location, dimensions, and height of all existing buildings.
 - Item #25 Location of any permanent monuments found, set or proposed.

D. Marshall: Staff, are you recommending we find this complete?

J. Duffy: Yes. Staff recommends that the application is complete. There are also five waivers to act on. Staff is not recommending Waiver No. 5.

F. Kowtowski motioned to find the application complete. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Marshall: We have five waivers and will take them one at a time. Waiver No. 1 is scaling greater than 1" to 100' in order for entire parcel to fit on one page.

D. Winterton motioned to grant the waiver for scaling greater than one inch per one-hundred feet in order for entire parcel to fit on one page. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion granted unanimously.

D. Marshall: Waiver No. 2 is scale of the locus to be 1" to 1000' so entire locus fits in the window.

M. DiBitetto motioned to grant the waiver for scale of the locus to be 1" to 1000' so entire locus fits in the window. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion granted unanimously.

D. Marshall: Waiver No. 3 is to not show the existing utilities. Is Stantec recommending that we go with this one?

J. Duffy: Yes.

F. Kowtowski motioned to grant the waiver to not show existing utilities. Seconded by D. Winterton.

M. DiBitetto: Is there a utility plan anywhere on record on this?

Jennifer McCourt (McCourt Engineering): I submitted an as-built that was done on this property. There is also a site plan on record.

Motion granted unanimously.

D. Marshall: Waiver No. 4 is to not show all existing structures, roads, and paved areas. Stantec objects to granting that?

J. Duffy: Stantec did recommend that because there is nothing in that small area.

D. Marshall: Okay. I was thinking of No. 5.

M. DiBitetto motioned to grant the waiver to not show all existing structures, roads, and paved areas. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Marshall: Waiver No. 5 is to not locate and show all existing and proposed monuments. What is Stantec's view on that?

J. Duffy: We normally don't waive that. It is probably not a good idea to waive it because there is no monumentation shown and it becomes a problem in the future. There is no monumentation with SNHU because it is such a large parcel, as this one. They have only had to show the monumentation in that area, not the entire parcel. That is what the Board has done in the past.

D. Marshall: In the past, we have had some lengthy discussions with a couple of surveying groups that disagree with this, and we have never relented on it. It might be wise to keep it that way.

J. McCourt: I would like some clarification on that with regard to the Stantec letter of April 18, 2014. He specifically says, according to the plan, none of the property corners have monuments. It appears that eleven bounds must be set according to the regulations if the Board agrees to only require monuments to be set on the smaller parcel, Lot 49C. We continue to recommend that the Board deny this waiver and that the monuments be set. If it was the wisdom of the Board to have those monuments set, I would request a partial waiver and just have it be on Lot 49C and not have to monument all of Lot 49. I only counted seven bounds not eleven. This is an existing one that has more easements and the title work on it was incredible. There are a couple of bounds that are out there. It is an existing lot, it has been functioning, and there are no new improvements going to be made. All we are doing is converting an easement area into a fee simple piece. There is absolutely no work going to be done out there. It is an existing lot of record from 1987.

M. DiBietto: There are no bounds at all on this 49C lot now?

J. McCourt: There are bounds.

M. DiBietto: Could you show us where they are.

Joseph Wichert (Joseph M. Wichert, L.L.S., Inc.): On 49C there are none. I can show you our closest. On the subject property there aren't any.

D. Marshall: How many are you asking to have set?

J. Wichert: I counted eight. Somewhere between seven, eight, and eleven.

J. McCourt: I count eight. I don't know where the eleven comes from. We are just asking to do the subject parcel and that is what he states in his letter.

D. Marshall: If the waiver is denied, it simply means you have to set the monumentation and before you get final approvals you will have to show that it has been set.

J. McCourt: I understand that. I would ask for a partial waiver to just show the monuments on 49C and not 49.

M. DiBietto: Which is the overall Granite Hill Village?

J. McCourt: The overall Granite Hill. We would ask for a waiver not to monument the points of 49 that do not intersect 49C. I think that is more accurate.

M. DiBietto: It is a pre-existing lot and just an internal change. I would tend to agree that would seem a little excessive in this situation.

D. Winterton: Was this supposed to be monumented originally when it was just Lot 49?

M. DiBietto: That goes back to the mid 80's and it might have been under different regulations back then.

J. McCourt: I don't have that plan here. All I have is the recorded easement plan. The sub-division plan is upstairs. I have seen it but did not check that.

D. Winterton motioned that monuments be set for 49C only where it intersects with Lot 49.

M. DiBietto: What is required to be bounded, Mr. Chairman? Any change in direction on the property lines and corners?

D. Marshall: Right.

Seconded by M. DiBietto.

D. Marshall: We are avoiding the question. You have a request for a waiver. You have to deny the waiver and then put a condition on the plan that monumentation must be done for 49C. A waiver has been requested. It is either accepted or denied.

J. McCourt: Or you can accept the waiver for 49.

D. Marshall: That isn't what the waiver asks for.

F. Kotowski motioned to vote on the waiver as originally requested, Waiver No. 5. Seconded by D. Winterton.

D. Winterton removed his prior motion for 49C.

M. DiBietto withdrew his second.

Motion opposed unanimously.

D. Winterton motioned that only 49C be bounded with a note shown on the plan stating such. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion granted unanimously.

D. Marshall: Now, we will hold the hearing on the application.

J. McCourt: This project is Granite Hill and Granite Hill shops. The Granite Hill Shops site plan was approved on May 4, 1987. The Granite Hill Shop easement documents were recorded on January 12, 1989. The Granite Hill sub-division easements were approved by the Planning Board as a sub-division in August of 1989. GCD Inc. purchased the property with all of the easement rights in December of 1992 and purchased what is shown with the little blue triangle on the plans from Granite Hill condominiums in 1997. There was a corrective deed in 2003. We are here because it is a lot line adjustment. It was brought to GCD's attention, so we are asking for that to be corrected with this lot

line adjustment. We did submit an as-built plan that was done in 1989. It is a very small piece of land that we are looking to have transferred. The shops are in the performance zone. This small piece of property was an easement for the shops. It was part of the site plan. They have been using it as part of the shops from the beginning. There are additional easements for their use for access to the south and to the east. All those documents were submitted to the town for your records.

J. Duffy: I have one comment from Dan regarding an existing easement. He said it should be labeled and recorded. I guess it was never recorded back in the 80's. Or we should ask for a letter from the NH DOT stating that it is no longer necessary and then it should be removed from the plan.

J. McCourt: That was an easement that is on the original easement plan and states that it is an unrecorded easement. I have spoken with DOT, they have gone through the extensive Granite Hills files for me and they could not find it. That plan that is recorded with the easement on it is the only documentation that DOT has that there is an easement there. I think we should continue it until somebody can find some other reason to say that it isn't there. I asked the attorney's when they did the title work if they had found it and they said no.

M. DiBitetto: What is the nature of the easement?

J. McCourt: It says, easements to state of New Hampshire 3/10/88, unrecorded.

M. DiBitetto: It doesn't say for what purpose?

J. McCourt: No.

D. Marshall: Does it say how wide the easement is?

J. McCourt: It is dimensioned out. It has bearings and distances. It is about 20' wide plus or minus.

D. Marshall: I would assume we are looking at something that would be used as a drainage easement?

J. McCourt: It could be a drainage easement, a slope easement, any kind of maintenance easement along there.

D. Marshall: It has been recorded?

J. McCourt: No. It is unrecorded.

D. Marshall: It is not recorded but on the approved plan?

J. McCourt: It is on the approved plan, on the recorded plan for the as-built, and for the easement plan.

D. Marshall: Does that satisfy DOT that there is an easement there?

J. McCourt: As far as they are concerned, yes. They could not find the actual document for it. We were just bringing it forward through the chain.

D. Marshall: Why don't you create a document for the easement?

J. McCourt: It is an easement between the property owner and NH DOT, and neither one is requesting that it be recorded.

D. Marshall: These are the kind of things that get us in trouble in the future. What happens if they need to do work within that easement. Do they then have to seek the easement because it doesn't exist, except in our imagination, because it is not recorded?

J. McCourt: It is recorded on a plan that there is an easement there.

D. Marshall: Then we need a document that defines it. There needs to be proof. You need a document that says this is an easement. How difficult would that be?

J. McCourt: It could be a process. I would rather take it off the plan and put a note to that affect.

J. Wickert: We are working with Jenn on the subdivision plans. We would prefer to keep it on there other than to continue what has already been shown on the registry. The Chairman had asked what would happen. It is the beneficiary of the easement, in my mind, who is going to have to be the one. They are going to go forward, should they want to do improvements on that section of the road. They are going to go to the landowner and tell them in 30 days we are going to be doing this roadwork, and they will give whatever documentation they may or may not have. I think the only thing that is odd, for what the Board is requesting, is that generally it is not the person who is being imposed on that would write the deed easement to the person who is doing the taking. In my opinion, it would normally come from the DOT to the applicant. That is where Jenn spent a lot of time with Scott, trying to try to get it resolved. He sent us an exhibit, late this afternoon, that I don't think is actually on our property. I think it is there and would not want to take it off in the sense that, should there be a problem down the road, somebody is going to say we eliminated something that we should have carried forward.

D. Marshall: Let me do a scenario. The assumption is that it there because it is on the plan that has been recorded, although the easement itself has not been recorded, it is just shown on the plan. Say the state down the road says it is going to do work on that area shown on the plan. Suddenly the owner says, by the way it is going to cost you to get that easement. The states rebuttal should be, but it's already on the plan. We already have the right to work in there. But do they because it is not a recorded easement?

J. Wickert: There is no separate instrument for the DOT granting them those rights over a specific area. The property, when it was purchased, was purchased with easements showing on it and the deed is subject to all the notes on plan. Is it the best way? No it is not but, generally speaking, it is not going to be the grantee who would grant the easement to the grantor because that is backwards.

J. Duffy: Is that specific easement mentioned in the deed?

J. Wickert: I don't believe it is mentioned specifically. I think it is the standard subject, all matters and easements, etc., shown on the plan.

M. DiBitetto: It is a statement of the facts as they exist. We are not doing a full review of the plan so I suggest that, as much as we would like to see everything dotted and crossed, it probably is beyond the scope of what we need to be looking at for this transaction.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

M. DiBitetto motioned to approve the plan. Seconded D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

SNHU CONNECTOR ROAD (plan #14-04)

East Side Dr., Map 33, Lot 67 and Map 38, Lots 6, 7 & 8-1

Connector road on campus between East Side Drive and West Alice Ave.

D. Marshall: Has the plan already been found complete?

J. Duffy: Yes.

Tucker McCarthy (Engineer with TF Moran): This is a 2,300 linear foot connector road. It is connecting E. Side Drive to W. Alice Avenue. On April 7 we requested thirteen waivers. Twelve of those were granted, one was voted in the positive not to approve. That was a waiver regarding providing a vertical curve at the intersection of E. Side Drive and this proposed connector road. We did provide a vertical curve which we submitted to Stantec. He accepted and approved it. We got a letter from Dan Tatem stating he was all set with everything except for that we have our state permits which are pending and in processing. The other item we discussed is in the emails that I handed you. There was a discussion about extending the water line along the front of the property. The first email is a letter from Manchester Water Works stating that they could provide service to the site, which is just a line that we have stubbed along the road for future development. The second email talks about 38, Lot 8-1, the first lot that the road goes through. He stated a water main extension would not be required for this project. If the University moved ahead and needed some sort of service on that property, they would need to move ahead in providing an extension along the frontage of that property. If there is ever any type of development on this parcel that would require service, they would need to extend the line along the frontage of the property. There had been discussion about the use of this road. We have decided it would be best to do construction from W. Alice in. We believe by doing this it would reduce traffic on Donati and Bicentennial during construction of this road. If there was ever any type of use that they would be proposing to open the gate, or any type of future development, we would be back in front of this Board in order to discuss any change. Since the last meeting, I noted on the cover sheet all the approved waivers. We added a note to the waiver regarding the traffic analysis. If SNHU was ever to amend the gated entrance and open the driveway, they would need to provide a traffic analysis and get approval from this Board in order to do that. Our state permits are in processing. As soon as we have those, we will add the approval numbers and dates to the cover sheet and submit them.

M. DiBietto: Do you have any traffic studies you have done in conjunction with the University development on Bicentennial and Donati?

T. McCarthy: Since I have been with the company, three years, I don't believe we have because our uses that we have done were replacing existing uses on the property so it was not expanding.

M. DiBietto: So we don't know where the heaviest traffic flows to the University?

T. McCarthy: I don't believe so. It doesn't pertain to this project, but I know the Derryfield School has looked at traffic issues. I do not know if they have had any studies done, but I don't believe the University has.

D. Marshall: We have had traffic studies done associated with N. River Road when but they were specific to development that occurred, with the new dorms and such, and we needed to know what that impact was going to be. Those were being added, not replaced. It just went along that section that runs through the campus.

T. McCarthy: I apologize, I have only been with company three years. I know the projects I have worked on we did not do studies because they were just providing parking and were not drawing traffic for any uses.

M. DiBietto: It seems the University has grown and I'm not sure the traffic pattern has been looked at in a significant way, as to minimize the impact on the overall neighborhoods. I thought this might be an opportune time to do that, but since you are not proposing to use this as a collector road and a pipeline into the University it becomes a mute point. The impression I think a lot of folks have was this might become the new entrance into the University, as it is so easily accessible, but to your knowledge there has been no study of traffic patterns of what the best route might be for the future of the University. I don't know at what point we might want to seek that.

D. Marshall: If they ever decide to open the gate we are going to require it.

D. Winterton: Is E. Side Drive a public or private road?

T. McCarthy: I believe it was given a name simply for the fire department to have an address, but it is on private land so it is not a public road. If there was ever a use for this road, I'm sure it would be given a name as well. As there is currently no use we have not gone through that yet.

Open public hearing.

Chelsea Collins (29 Donati Drive): I am representing the neighborhood. We had voiced concerns at the last meeting about sidewalks on W. Alice and Donati as well as a no right turn sign coming from this proposed new road going onto Donati. We are trying to get some clarification and get answers to those requests.

D. Marshall: You mean if this road is opened you want to prohibit right turns onto Donati?

C. Collins: Correct. Coming from E. Side Drive.

T. McCarthy: If they were ever to change this use, they would need to come back in front of this Board. At that time we could probably discuss that but, at this time, that isn't anything the college is considering, and I am not sure that would be appropriate.

D. Marshall: It is only appropriate if the Board determines that is part of this improvement.

M. DiBitetto: This is why I brought up the subject of the traffic study. Ideally, we need to have a view of the traffic pattern and consider the neighbors and towns concerns. We want an efficient flow of traffic with as few impacted people as possible. I don't think at this point, since it is being blocked, that just putting a blanket no right turn when there is no traffic is appropriate, but I would think the University would want to look at this traffic pattern issue as the development is advanced. I know this is going to be basically a dead end street, for the time being, but once any proposals for development are concerned, I think a regional traffic study would be warranted.

T. McCarthy: I don't think it is any secret traffic is an issue on these roads. The basic idea is that there would be a parking lot at the end of this road that would not have any connection to W. Alice or Donati. It would allow students to drive from the main campus, park there, and walk if and when they proposed a use of the building that they own. We would hope that would reduce traffic along those roads.

M. DiBitetto: When those buildings are going to be used, I suppose we will have an opportunity to get into the traffic. Right now, in theory, this is not altering traffic. Soon you will have proposals and I know myself, as a Board member, would seek to get a handle on what we are going to do to facilitate traffic flow.

T. McCarthy: They are going to build this road and block it at both ends. It is money they have allocated looking ahead for future developments. They have allocated to build this road. As of right now they do own those two buildings, but we have not been given any direction. Any change of use on those buildings would have to come back in front of this Board.

D. Marshall: The question you asked is appropriate, but not at this time. The Board will be watching this area. Any intention of opening that road or expanding the land uses immediately around it will have to be re-examined by the Board.

C. Collins: We will have to be diligent to be here at every meeting.

D. Marshall: You will always be an abutter so you'll always get notified.

C. Collins: It is a big stepping stone to a lot of other things that are going to come. The University is growing. I love the University, it is beautiful and it obviously brings a lot to Hooksett, but it is getting really close to my property. A bigger concern, rather than the right turn sign, is sidewalks. We have admitted there is a ton of traffic. My neighbor has to drive her son to the bus stop which is 200' away

because she doesn't want him walking on the road. SNHU students are currently using it for exercise. They are constantly in front of our house. I know that will probably increase with the new road because it will be gated, but they can cut through and now it will be a loop for them. It will benefit their students as well.

D. Marshall: If the land develops and that road is opened, the necessity for handling all issues involving traffic whether it be turns, number of lanes, the need for sidewalks, or a safe-haven for pedestrians will have to be addressed. The issue of pedestrian safety and sidewalks exists today regardless of whether they do anything. If nothing changed, the only way you are ever going to see sidewalks on Donati, any part of Bicentennial, or W. Alice Ave. is if you can convince the town to have a unique project of it's own because they are town roads and I am not sure the likelihood of that. There are potential projects that could be done with federal funds for sidewalks, but they would have to be on state roads.

F. Kotowski: I hear what you are saying and I think Mr. DiBitetto and the Chairman are correct. It is very good that you came in and told us how you feel. I understand where you are coming from, particularly after hearing that there will be a parking lot inside of the gated road. Even though it is gated, students will be going from that parking lot to whatever uses there are. I think sidewalks are something to think about, not necessarily right now, but I am glad we put it on the record because the minute that gate opens and the minute CB Sullivan has a use, it is automatic that pedestrian traffic will increase dramatically. I think, at that time, we have to pay attention and I hope you are here to remind us again. Thank you for coming in.

D. Winterton: I also thank you for coming in and I appreciate your concern. In the town survey that was just done, one of the highest concerns throughout the town was sidewalks. Over by Prescott Heights and down to Smyth Road, where we have had numbers of developments and more housing, Smyth Road is suicidal and people jog on it all the time. It is in my district and I have talked with public works. Unfortunately there is no money for that now. I sympathize with you completely. We will see when they come back, what they want to do and your concerns will be considered.

T. McCarthy: The University has always done a good job in working with the community. On these future projects, we will certainly have discussions with the abutters and the Board and determine the best way to handle situations.

C. Collins: I know it is a public road but is there no way to ask SNHU for funds to help with putting sidewalks on that road?

D. Marshall: Ask the University to help?

C. Collins: Yes.

D. Marshall: Sure, you can ask.

C. Collins: I mean to make it a requirement if their new road is approved.

D. Marshall: Once that road is opened, in the process of getting it opened, they will have to go through a traffic study. That involves buses, cars, pedestrians, etc. That will all have to be examined. If, as a result of that study, the Board feels that sidewalks in certain areas would be required, we would have to show they are causing an increased need for it. We are looking at a very expensive project to put retrofit sidewalks in that area. The same applies going the other way on W. Alice to Rt. 3. That is why, without the benefit of the study that would be generated if they would want to open the road, we cannot tell yet, what will be needed. There is no question there will be improvements needed, but what the extent of those are and who is responsible will have to be decided.

M. DiBitetto: Are you proposing internal sidewalks?

T. McCarthy: Yes. It is a 26' wide road with vertical granite curbing the whole way. There is a lighted sidewalk and we are putting up emergency call boxes.

D. Marshall: The whole length of that new road?

T. McCarthy: Correct.

Elizabeth Gorham (31 Donati Drive): I have been there for 12 years and the traffic has increased massively over the past four or five years. I used to walk my son to the bus stop but no longer do that. I have had someone take out my whole front lawn, mailbox, everything. Is it possible to have a traffic analysis now?

D. Marshall: With what goal in mind? Unless that road is opened, the University is not proposing any increased traffic. We don't know why the traffic is on W. Alice Avenue and Donati. We don't know what their ultimate destinations are. Derryfield school continually holds events which draws a lot of people. They park along N. River Road and all of their parking lots become full. The question is are they responsible? Until we have something that says we have to have the study. it is impossible to ask SNHU to do a study that is not warranted yet. It will be at some point.

M. DiBitetto: Mr. Chairman, would you suggest that when those buildings are re-adapted, that expansion of the campus might be a triggering point for that study to be done.

D. Marshall: If they came in and said they were going to open a 400 seat theater in one of the buildings that caused a generation of traffic that is not there now, or hasn't been with CB Sullivan, then yes, we could and should require a traffic study.

M. DiBitetto: I suspect that will be looked at fairly soon. I wouldn't think those buildings are going to be left fallow for long by the University. When that happens we will be back discussing it.

C. Collins: Is there a way to request that we get notified? I don't think we are abutters for those two buildings?

D. Marshall: You are abutters. Your land abuts them within 200'. It isn't the building, it is the land that they are sitting on. If any part of that land is within 200' of you, you will be notified.

C. Collins: I thought that was a different lot.

T. McCarthy: She is correct. I don't know if she would be a direct abutter.

J. Duffy: It doesn't go by 200'. It is a direct abutter.

C. Collins: They abut their own land there.

M. DiBitetto: Do we have a mechanism for doing an informal notification?

D. Marshall: JoAnn, could we put something in the file to include them on the abutters list? They have asked to be notified. You are required by law to notify direct abutters, but you have residents of an area requesting to be notified.

J. Duffy: I would make it a condition of this approval. I don't want to leave that on the town, and then it doesn't happen and the town is responsible. We don't have a computer system that keeps track of anything.

D. Marshall: Okay. Whatever the motion is we can put it in the approval.

D. Winterton: Would it be more appropriate that we create a list of all abutters and quasi abutters who have expressed an interest and have them be notified of any changes made by SNHU but not by certified mail. Could they be on an email list?

C. Collins: That would be acceptable.

D. Marshall: Could we do that JoAnn?

J. Duffy: If we were given the information we could, yes.

F. Kotowski: May I suggest that whoever signed the petition, that becomes the list of those we would notify. Personally, I am hesitant to begin going down this path, because anyone at anytime can say they want to be noticed. I certainly understand why the people in the neighborhood would want to be noticed. I think it is incumbent on us to know who wants to be noticed and to limit it to that group of people.

M. DiBitetto: We have someone who has already stepped forward as a representative of the neighborhood. I don't think we have to notice everyone who signed the petition. Since we are addressing the issues they raised, down the road, it would seem incumbent that we show the courtesy. Whether it is our office or the applicant, we are going to find a way to ensure that happens. It could be part of our motion to approve this with the names on record from the minutes of the meeting.

E. Gorham: Would SNHU consider a fence going into the road on the left side? Not the entire road but maybe the first 500' or so, to cut down on the noise level. I walked the road. It is a very nice road. It

dips down to the right. You don't see it that much, but the first, maybe 300' to 500' you do see our homes and I was wondering if they would consider that to help with the noise level of the cars.

T. McCarthy: The issue is that the road is probably 30' below Chelsea's property. I don't know if a 5' or 6' fence would do anything and it would be a significant cost to the University that I don't know would have any benefit to the abutters.

M. DiBitetto: We don't have any buffering requirements between dormitory buildings or public use facilities to residential? I know we do in commercial but this may be different.

D. Marshall: Buffers usually apply to residential/commercial and residential/industrial.

M. DiBitetto: I guess we can consider the issue of buffering when development comes along. To dictate a fence, at this point, for the road itself isn't necessarily desirable. We don't want to block site distances. I think when a development plan comes along we can address the issue of buffering. It may be a voluntary thing on the part of the University to provide some buffering.

Close public hearing.

M. DiBitetto moved to approve the plan with the provision of giving notice to the members of the neighborhood group that appeared here tonight. Seconded by F. Kotowski.

D. Marshall: Is there anything that needs to be recorded on the plan to indicate that, or do we keep this separate?

J. Duffy: I think we could keep that separate.

F. Kotowski: Mike, would that approval also include upon receipt of favorable action by DES and others and have that noted on the plan. Isn't it conditioned upon? We have not received that.

D. Marshall: The Chairman won't sign the plans without those being in possession.

J. Duffy: That is a boiler plate condition that is always added.

Motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF STANTEC INVOICES

*T. Prasol motioned to approve the Stantec invoices. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: Robies is now open. There is a new breakfast and lunch restaurant, Tuckers, that opened last week.

BOARD DISCUSSION

F. Kotowski: Tomorrow the governor will be at the site of the Merrimack River acquisition between 10:15 and 10:45 in conjunction with an Earth Day celebration and LCHIP's having helped fund the town's purchase of that land. I would suggest, if anyone is available and would like to meet the governor, to attend. It is a photo opportunity and it would also show that we care about our environment and we are proud to have that piece of land from Hooksett to the Allenstown line on the east side of the Merrimack River.

J. Duffy: The governor signed the bill concerning the Walmart sewer. We are hoping that gets moving. We were invited to speak at a forum on May 12 by the Hooksett Chamber. Everyone is invited. It is going to be held at the library. We have been very slow as far as applications. We have not received any applications for the first meeting in May so I do not know if we will have a meeting at this point. We have been working to get volunteers to serve on the Community Profile Steering Committee. We have five or six people that have expressed interest so we are going to get started on that shortly.

F. Kotowski: Todd Rainier, and others, have been looking to work with Parks and Recreation and Leo on an idea to bring a splash pad to Hooksett. A splash pad is an operation that you would see at Disney and other places. When the temperature reaches 80 degrees or higher the towns have a place where children can go and splash in the water and cool off. They are handicapped accessible. This is a result of a Kiwanis community analysis where we went into the community and asked folks what they would like to see for children brought to Hooksett, and that was the number one idea that rose to the top of the list. It is going to be an expensive proposition, however, we know there are funds available for those kinds of things, which if they are not spent in our community, will have to be returned to developers and they think it is incumbent upon us to put that money to good use and do some of the things we do not have in Hooksett.

T. Prasol: We had our last Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Meeting last Tuesday which we held a workshop on setting up the five-year plan moving forward, and the splash pad is part of that. We fully support it.

J. Duffy: What is it made out of?

T. Prasol: It is still in the design process.

J. Duffy: Is it like a mini pool?

T. Prasol: It is kind of like a wading pool, but it has fountains and things like that.

F. Kotowski: There is no end to the configuration. It depends on how much money one has to spend, what kind of filtration system it has, and whether or not you want to be able to use them in the winter. For example, a lot of communities that have them today, have features in them that pop out so they can

build an edging around them, and they have a vinyl cover that goes inside. In the wintertime, they flood it and it becomes a natural skating area. Currently I think they are looking towards Donati Park. Leo has been very much involved and a lot of folks at HYAA are really excited over this. It is a neat thing.

D. Winterton: Todd did come before the Town Council and the Council was very favorable to it. They mentioned probably having it at Donati because, if you have an older child playing little league and a younger sibling that is out in the sun, they will have something to do.

F. Kotowski: The Kids Kaboose is right there too.

D. Winterton: I think it is a great project and I know that Town Council thought so too.

ADJOURNMENT

*D. Winterton motioned to adjourn. Seconded by T. Prasol. **Motion carried unanimously.***

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**