

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, May 19, 2014**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Rogers (Chairman), Dick Marshall (Vice-Chairman), P. Scarpetti, T. Walsh, Frank Kotowski, and Donald Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Muamer Durakovic

EXCUSED: T. Prasol and Michael DiBitetto

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner), Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Planner), and Leo Lessard (Dept. of Public Works)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 4/21/14

April 21, 2014 Regular Meeting – D. Marshall motioned to approve the April 21, 2014 regular meeting minutes, with amendments. Seconded by F. Kotowski. D. Rogers and P. Scarpetti abstained as they were not present at the April 21, 2014 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION

1. PAUL SCARPETTI

Edgewater Dr., Map 1, Lot 4

Discussion of discontinuing a Class VI road.

T. Walsh was not currently present.

D. Marshall and P. Scarpetti stepped down.

Jennifer McCourt (McCourt Engineering): We were here previously to discuss with you Edgewater Drive. At the end of the Class 5 portion of Edgewater Drive there is the Class 6 portion which runs up to to the Bow line. We have a piece that is owned by Jocelyn Scarpetti, Map 1, Lot 4, that is made up of three separate pieces. Also, Map 1, Lot 8 and Map 1, Lot 9. There is Map 1, Lot 6 which Joe Wichert, who is the surveyor on the project has done extensive research to try to find out when Hooksett took possession of that lot and could not find out. That will go farther when Richard comes to speak. We are asking for your input back to Town Council regarding discontinuing the Class 6 road and discontinuing the towns rights, if any, to that parcel. We are looking to construct a cul-de-sac to deed to the Town of

Hooksett, to the Town of Hooksett's requirements, but also adding parking on the interior of the cul-de-sac, which we have talked to Leo Lessard about. From that a private road going down to service one lot in one place and five more lots in another place. There would also be a path that is constructed from the end of this road to the Bow town line. We went to a TRC meeting and spoke to the department heads regarding this. The green area I am showing you would be the recreational easement that we would grant to the town which Richard will go into more detail about. We will be providing a picnic area. The lots would have easements down to the water itself. They would be served by wells and septs. Each of the lots will have docks. I am going to turn it over to Richard to explain more of the agreement that you have in front of you.

Richard Uchida (Attorney with Hinckley Allen): I am representing the Scarpetti's in connection with this transaction. We are not here for sub-division or site plan approval this evening. We are here to tell you about the transactions that we are contemplating with the town and to get the Planning Boards thoughts about those transactions. What Dr. Shankle asked us to do, through Paul, was to put together an agreement that outlined what we are seeking from the town and what we were contemplating providing the town. This document that is in front of you called "Property Exchange Agreement," is a document that I have produced. It got altered a little bit last week when we were in front of the Hooksett Conservation Commission. I will take you through the document so if you have any questions about it you can ask. The first part of the document is a recital of the situation that identifies the Scarpetti's are the owners of the big lot that Jenn showed you on the non-colored map. It identifies that the portion of Edgewater Dr. that is a Class 6 road runs up and down this property. It also identifies that there seems to be this mysterious Tax Map 1, Lot 6, that lies to the east of that old Class 6 road. Most of that land is gone because the river has eroded it. There are small bits and pieces that remain. We have proposed to reach an agreement with the town, where the town would discontinue it's rights in the Class 6, which goes up the shoreline, and would deed over rights, although we don't think there are any, to Tax Map 1, Lot 6. There is no inconveyance anywhere in the records of the Town of Hooksett going back over a couple of hundred years, or in the Registry of Deeds, that shows that lot ever coming into the town. It is a mystery why it is listed as town property. You can see little bits and pieces of it where it jets out past the Class 6 road. What we are proposing is the public rights of that Class 6 road would be discontinued, and Hooksett would convey whatever rights it might have in Lot 6. In exchange for that it would get two things. The first would be an access easement up the new driveway, which is the grayish, bluish line on the plan, and a utility easement. The access easement would allow folks in Hooksett to go up and down the property on foot, bikes, etc. to get to any of that green area that is depicted in the sub-division. There is 3,750 linear feet of shore line along the river. There would be an access easement to get into the property by the residents of Hooksett and their invitees and guests and there would be utility lines for our development in the easement. If, for some reason, Hooksett needed to extend utilities through that lot somewhere further, it could have a utility easement, however, that isn't likely because the Town of Bow is the next lot up at the very far right end. To the extent that represents marked good planning just in case, we were granting a utility easement to the Town of Hooksett. That is embodied in the agreement. In the agreement, where it says "Town Strip" on page 2, would be a deed from the town of whatever rights it might have in Lot 6. In the back of the agreement you will see samples of the access easement as well as a deed from the town to the Scarpetti's. What is also in the document is the actual recreation easement itself. What that embodies is a recreational easement for access to all of that green area, which is far more substantial than the current public rights that exist on that property now. Jenn mentioned a picnic area and access to riverbank. There are some prohibited

activities in the context of that easement, but they are all ones that make sense. No alcoholic beverages or controlled substances, which Paul and Jocelyn Scarpetti have had an issue with before with folks coming into that property and misusing it. It contains a description of the picnic area. If you look on page 11, that recreational easement is outlined in greater length. It allows cross-country skiing, hiking, and fishing from the property. It does prohibit motorized vehicles, although there is an exception at the end of the easement for emergency vehicles that need to get in from the State of NH or the Town of Hooksett or any other law enforcement agency, and the ability to post signs at either end of the property describing the activities that are permitted and asking for people to carry out their trash. You can envision in this area, and some of you may have visited, a recreational easement that allows folks to come in and have much more enhanced access to the riverside than what currently exists today, and have an easier way to get into the property than trying to traverse what is left of that Class 6 road. The Property Exchange Agreement is fashioned more like a purchase and sales agreement. It described what the transactions are that we are contemplating and some of the contingencies that will be needed. Obviously, the town is going to want it's due diligence. We are contemplating this is ultimately part of a site plan and sub-division proposal that we would come in front of you on a formal basis on in the future and we would need those approvals in place to make this all go. That is listed as a contingency in our portion of the agreement. That explains the transactions we are contemplating and we are happy to answer any questions you might have about the document or transactions.

F. Kotowski: The portion that is marked access and utility easement, am I correct in thinking that is going to be a roadway that would service the various lots?

R. Uchida: Yes. It is a driveway into the property.

F. Kotowski: It is a driveway, over which pedestrian and and vehicular traffic would pass?

R. Uchida: Pedestrian traffic, both public and the folks who live in the sub-division.

F. Kotowski: Not a separate sidewalk?

R. Uchida: We haven't talked about the necessity or lack of necessity for a sidewalk, yet, but it is a good question.

D. Rogers: I have one correction. Exhibit C, you maintain a quitclaim deed and I believe that has been changed to warranty?

Tom Walsh joined the meeting.

R. Uchida: I think that is the town conveyance.

D. Rogers: Is that what it is? Okay, I apologize.

R. Uchida: I think the town would make it a quitclaim deed or even a deed with no covenants at all. I wrote it both ways, and I suspect the town would say they are not going to give any warranty, whatsoever, about what it is we think we may or may not have.

D. Rogers: Attorney Buckley may give his input on that. I didn't mean to confuse the issue.

J. Duffy: On page 11, under “Use of Open Space,” does that mean the residents of the sub-division and their guests and invitees or the residents of the town.

R. Uchida: Maybe I should have said by the grantee, the grantees residents, rather than the grantee, it's residents and their guests, but it was intended to be the residents of the Town of Hooksett and the grantee is the Town of Hooksett. I can substitute the word grantees in there.

J. Duffy: Is anywhere in here that says who the grantor and the grantee is?

R. Uchida: Yes, at the very top where it says easement deed it identifies Jocelyn Scarpetti as the grantor and the Town of Hooksett as the grantee.

J. Duffy: Okay.

D. Winterton: Under page 11B, it says that the grantor will be responsible for the maintenance of the open space. How will that be enforced?

R. Uchida: Depending upon how we create that sub-division, whether it is a sub-division with a declaration covenants or a condominium association with a declaration of condominium, I think it will be the later, that section will be built into that document that goes to record.

F. Kotowski: I thought I understood there will be docks adjacent or off of the open area, and now I hear there will be individual docks at each of the lots. Will there be public access via water to the recreation area. In other words, a dock or docks?

Paul Scarpetti: We met with the Town Council and Conservation Commission. When we first came to the Planning Board, in January, it was in its infancy stage as far as how we were going to do this. At first, we were going to do one community dock system for the residents that lived there, but then I felt it would be easier if it was behind their houses and it would make more common area to have shared docks between two houses; two houses would share one dock. We are not sure how we are going to do it and we still have to have approvals for that. At the cul-de-sac, we have had discussions of putting a dock there so people can launch their kayaks. I wasn't planning on doing anything with power boats because there was no discussion about doing something like that. Adjacent from the southern part of our property is the town launch and they have access there to put power boats in. I thought this would be better to have the kayaks and canoes they could launch from this area because it is about an 8' drop into the water.

F. Kotowski: Would you consider a public dock? One dock, so that those who wanted to use that would not have to traverse the road if they happen to put their boat in on the river. Just a thought I would ask you to consider.

P. Scarpetti: So they would put in across the way and be able to motor across and park on that side?

F. Kotowski: Sure.

P. Scarpetti: We were planning on putting one dock in for the kayaks, but that was all I was planning on putting in. I guess someone could tie up there, that would be up to them. We could not put a launch in, because I am sure the state would not let us.

F. Kotowski: I understand that would be out of the question.

P. Scarpetti: We are not going to police who pulls up there whether a motor boat, canoe, or kayak. That is up to them.

T. Walsh: You are doing a dock for kayaks? I am asking because I didn't think kayaks needed a dock.

P. Scarpetti: To launch because you have to come down to the water. I would think they would want to be able to stand on something to be able to get into the kayaks.

D. Winterton: On the cul-de-sac, that is where the public would park, correct? That would be parking estimated for how many cars?

P. Scarpetti: Seven.

D. Winterton: If there were an eighth car, where would it go?

P. Scarpetti: Probably on the outside of the cul-de-sac. I am trying to be a good neighbor also. There is a person that lives at the end of the road, and we are trying to keep the green space by his house because he is protective of his privacy. We had some discussion with Town Council about putting parking behind the cul-de-sac, but then you are clearing more trees and we are trying to keep as much green space as possible because it also is shore land protected.

D. Rogers: This is not a formal public hearing but I am going to open it up if anyone would like to be heard.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

D. Rogers: From us, do you need a consensus for the Council or what are you looking for?

P. Scarpetti: We would like it because I am sure they would be asking the Planning Board for their opinion on it.

F. Kotowski motioned that the concept appears to be a good concept, there are still questions to be answered and we will hear more about this when the final plan comes to this Board for approval. Seconded by D. Winterton. T. Walsh abstained as he wasn't present for the first part of the

conversation. **Motion carried.**

D. Marshall and P. Scarpetti returned.

WAIVER REQUESTS

2. KAREN GARVEY (plan #14-06)

Pearl Drive, Map 16, Lot 78-2

- **Waiver Request** – Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section II 2.24 –Residential sprinkler requirement.

Karen Garvey: We are requesting the waiver on the sprinkler system. Currently, this lot sits on the corner of Pearl Drive and Quimby Mountain Road. It is part of the Quimby Mountain Project. There are cisterns on both Pearl Drive and Quimby Mountain Road. We had the fire department there this past week along with the builder and another town employee that was looking at the driveway. Everyone agreed on layout of the driveway and the fire department was happy with the final drawing and the layout of driveway. In August of 2013, you approved the same request from two other owners on the street.

F. Kotowski: JoAnn, what is the fire department's stance on this right now? I think I read they want a sprinkler system. Is that correct or not?

J. Duffy: The Garvey's own both of these lots and when the plan was first approved the driveway was a shared driveway, but the entrance to the driveway was on the other lot. When they went out there, they decided it was better to move that entrance over. The lot that she is asking the waiver for is the lot on the left. From what I understand from Mike Hoisington, he would not be able to recommend a waiver for the lot on the right for the fire sprinkler, the lot where the driveway will be, because of the way the driveway is configured for that lot. They own both lots, they are only here for the lot on the left now, and they are under instructions from Mike Hoisington that a recommendation would not be made for the other lot. Leo just told me he spoke with Mike Hoisington and he thinks both lots need to be sprinkler'd and that is not what I was told, nor was I told that by the builder. Maybe we could table this to get further clarification or I could go make a phone call if you want to take a short break.

F. Kotowski: Can you help us understand this?

J. Duffy: Yes. The bottom would be on the left hand side. There are two lots. The lot on the left hand side is the one she is here for. Up at the top is the proposed location of the house. Initially the driveway was supposed to come in off of this lot and they decided a better location would be off of the other lot. That driveway is curvy and steep and he recommended the fire sprinkler be installed in this house.

K. Garvey: There is Lot 2 and Lot 3. We are looking to build on Lot 2 which is on the corner of both streets, Pearl Drive and Quimby Mountain Road.

P. Scarpetti: As you go up the driveway when it forks off, is it on the right or the left.

K. Garvey: On the left.

P. Scarpetti: That is the one you are proposing to build on?

K. Garvey: Correct.

J. Duffy: I just got clarification and should reword my previous statement. The fire department is opposed to waiving any sprinkler requirement, however, since the driveway has been relocated, they would definitely be opposed to the lot on the right-hand side because it is much steeper, but the driveway on the left has been changed so it is not as bad, but they are opposed to any waivers, period.

D. Winterton: How steep is steep?

J. Duffy: Leo was out there so he could answer that better.

L. Lessard: The old driveway was probably a 10 percent slope. The new layout is probably a 5 to 6 percent on the left.

D. Winterton: How far are the cisterns?

L. Lessard: The first cistern sits around the corner and is probably 1,200' away.

T. Walsh: This drawing isn't scaled. How wide is the driveway going to be?

K. Garvey: I don't have the answer to that. Could you tell me why it was approved for the other homeowners on the street and it wouldn't be applicable to this house as well?

J. Duffy: The fire department is against waiving sprinklers and the fire department did not recommend those either.

D, Rogers: Each lot stands on it's own so we could approve or not approve. It has no impact. It is something we consider but it is not automatic one way or the other.

D. Winterton: JoAnn, we are only considering this because the sub-division was before the change of the ordinance.

J. Duffy: Correct.

D Winterton motioned to approve the waiver request from Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section II 2.24 – Residential sprinkler requirement. T. Walsh seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: The last agenda item, listed at Item 6, KENNEY & BLEVENS (plan #14-09), 22 Coaker Ave. & 29 Francis Ave., Map 45, Lots 129 & 130, Lot line adjustment and subdivision to annex a 50' by 100' portion of Lot 129 with frontage on Francis Ave. into Lot 130. The applicant proposes to subdivide the remaining land on Coaker Ave. to create one new building lot, has been continued

until the next Planning Board meeting which is June 2.

3. SNHU (plan #14-07)

15 West Alice Ave., Map 41, Lot 94

- **Waiver Request** from site plan requirement for temporary use (1 year) of existing building for office space for IT and online staff.

4. SNHU (plan #14-08)

19 West Alice Ave. (16 Leonard Ave.), Map 38, Lots 8-1 & 8-2

- **Waiver Request** from site plan requirement for temporary use (1 year) of existing building for band and music practice space for students.

Items 3 and 4 were discussed simultaneously.

Jeff Kevan (TF Moran): SNHU owns two buildings on W. Alice Ave., up by the corner of Donati Dr. Their tenants are moved out, they have cleaned out the buildings, and they were thinking of temporary uses for them. They have not come up with what a permanent use in the facility would be. They seem to be enhancing or improving facilities; the dining hall was constructed, the former space of the dining hall was renovated, the student center was improved, they are building the library now. Their on-line program is growing. They have significant space at the mill building in Manchester. As that program grows their need to supply services as far as IT and processing paperwork grows. They are proposing that 15 W. Alice, which is the former CB Sullivan building, be used as office space. Right now there is a fair amount of office space and there is a showroom type area in which they are requesting to put up some cubicles. If they could put in office space it would serve some of the IT and on-line staff. I told them I believe the Board would want this to be limited or have a trigger on it so if you are calling it temporary, how long would that time frame be. I put in a request for a one-year and if they felt they wanted to continue that they would come back to this Board for an extension. The first one is for the first building. The second building, up on the corner, they are looking to use as practice space for their music program. They would utilize that existing space for a variety of music programs, band and chorus and that type of thing. It would be practice space, not for performances.

D. Rogers: The music is the second waiver request?

J. Kevan: Yes. That is for 19 W. Alice which is the corner lot which is Map 38, Lot 8-1 and 8-2.

D. Marshall: I am assuming the people that will be using these buildings have their communication with the main campus so what kind of increase in traffic are you going to have along Donati Dr. leading to Bicentennial with the commuting back and forth? They will not be walking that distance to practice their music.

J. Kevan: I don't know that I can give you a specific answer. The office use, I would say there would not be a big change in traffic associated with the CB Sullivan building. There was a business there and traffic was coming in from Rt. 3. There would be a little bit of traffic that may go from that building out but mainly it will be arriving in the morning and leaving at the end of the day. As far as the music program, there will be traffic. Students will need to get to that facility and then get back to campus.

There is a fair amount of participants but I could not give you a specific breakdown of how many live on campus and how many do not. They were looking to get a temporary use out there and use the facilities while they develop their ideas on what the permanent or long-term use will be for them.

D. Winterton: I agree with your thought process that the IT people will come and go but the students won't. Would there be a potential to have a shuttle service from the main campus to the parking lot and require students to go that way rather than allow them to park in that parking lot?

J. Kevan: I can discuss that with the college.

D. Winterton: Would they be giving lessons to the public in that building or only to registered students at SNHU?

J. Kevan: I think it is only people in those band programs, it is not to the public, but I understand they have a wind ensemble that there are some people from the public that participate in so they would come to that as well. I can check on the shuttle and get back to you.

D. Winterton: If you could do a shuttle, and if you could give parking passes to those non-student people so they would come up W. Alice, that might make it more attractive.

D. Rogers: Do you have hours of operation for that music building in mind?

J. Kevan: I don't, but I would believe they would probably go to 7:00 pm, 8:00 pm or 9:00 pm because some of the people participating are not full-time students.

D. Rogers: If people are coming to practice, they may practice at hours other than when the ensembles are together. It would be open and available to those individuals?

J. Kevan: Correct. I am guessing there would be normal student hours and then my guess is in the evening they may go until 9:00 pm.

F. Kotowski: Do we have any idea how many offices will be occupied or how cubicles will be put in the office portion of that building?

J. Kevan: I looked at the layout of the bottom floor and there are offices set up around the perimeter and if they filled in the showroom type space it could 100 people in that space and there are offices on the second floor as well.

F. Kotowski: Is it conceivable that there will be foot traffic by students coming off campus using E. Side Dr. walking to practice music?

J. Kevan: I would say not until that connector road has been constructed. We are hoping to start construction next week and they should be finished by August or September.

F. Kotowski: As originally planned, that gate will be kept closed?

J. Kevan: That is correct.

T. Walsh: The gate will be closed, but is it your hope they will use the on-campus parking and use the access road to these two unknown use buildings?

J. Kevan: You mean pedestrian?

T. Walsh: Or driving.

J. Kevan: We won't be driving. Right now they have agreed that, until I have a parking lot designed and built at the end of that road, they would not be using the connector. The plan would be that I will be coming back shortly to put a parking lot on the college campus side of the gate for students. We have said we would barrier off both ends of this road until that has been made available. I would expect pedestrians to be walking out there. I understand they are moving into this step-by-step process and this is as much information as I have. I am sorry if I don't have everything complete.

T. Walsh: It is confusing me to see this kind of expense on a road without some kind of master plan. Was the plan to have a driveway off the access road to these buildings. I understand you are going to gate it to W. Alice Ave., but on the campus side are you going to have a driveway to that building, especially the one in the back so it is accessible from campus?

J. Kevan: They do have a plan. They are implementing it one step at a time. The proposal is the new road would come down and connect at the corner. The master plan is to build a parking lot that would not have vehicular connection between the parking lot and the facility. They do not want people to sneak around to Rt. 3. People coming from the outside would come to those two buildings, come from the opposite side, and use the existing parking lots at those facilities.

D. Marshall: In planning and my years experience with DOT, the word I think that shutters though a planner is segmentation. That is what we are going through here. We are getting a little piece at a time. Suddenly one day we say what happened because of the cumulative effect. The problem is we don't have enough information to make a really good judgment about what the ultimate impact is going to be because we are getting it in little dribs and drabs. One day we are going to have to put the brakes on when it is too late.

J. Kevan: We are trying not to do that. Their plan on campus is to put up some additional housing. The housing that is very old and needs to be replaced will be taken down. They were also talking about a building on the corner as you come into N. River Rd. This connection road is proposed and being built because they purchased those two buildings. They know they will have a specific use. They have talked about a number of different things but have not gotten to determining what those uses will be and funding that. Until they do, we said we will barrier off each end of that road and that can be used for pedestrian traffic. Once we know what these uses will be permanently, we will come back to you with a site plan and traffic study if warranted and go from there. They are looking at it right now and saying they have these two buildings, they have a need for some office space, and they could use the other one for the band practice area. They are just trying to get some temporary use out of them at this point.

P. Scarpetti: On the building for the band, what size is the building and how many people occupy that?

J. Kevan: I don't have a specific size. I think their largest orchestra is 130 people total.

P. Scarpetti: What size is that building?

J. Kevan: Around 30,000 sq. ft.

T. Walsh: My concern is for the residents on Donati Dr. and the traffic and I don't see anything here that is going to alleviate any of that traffic. I only see that what is before us is going to make it a lot worse. I wish I saw more working with that issue in this plan but I don't.

J. Kevan: I understand you needing more detailed information on this music program, hours of operation, and if we can shuttle the people who are going to participate as far as limiting traffic. Would you consider approving the temporary office use by the college of 15 W. Alice Ave., since there is office use there currently?

D. Rogers: They are two separate waiver requests so we will have to deal with them separately.

J. Kevan: If you want, if you think it is worth considering, I could go back to the college and come back to you with additional information on the music program.

D. Rogers: Are you proposing to temporarily withdraw your request on 19 W. Alice Ave.?

J. Kevan: You mean continue it?

D. Rogers: Yes, for tonight's purposes and put it off until the next agenda or the one after that.

J. Kevan: Correct.

D. Rogers: How much time do you need? Is 30 days okay? JoAnn, do we have any available slots?

J. Duffy: We do have available slots at the next meeting which is June 2.

D. Rogers: Or the next one, which would be June 16.

J. Kevan: I would like June 16.

D. Rogers: We will continue Agenda Item 4, SNHU (plan #14-08), 19 West Alice Ave. (16 Leonard Ave.), Map 38, Lots 8-1 & 8-2, Waiver Request from site plan requirement for temporary use (1 year) of existing building for band and music practice space for students, until June 16, 2014.

F. Kotowski: Regarding the offices, I am hung up on how many people are coming into that area, are these 100 people being removed from the millyard to here or are we adding 100 more people. Is it

growing to the extent that is what they are using this for?

J. Kevan: It is growing.

F. Kotowski: Growing numbers, not existing.

J. Kevan: Correct. They are expanding at the millyard now.

Open public hearing.

Chelsea Collins (29 Donati Drive): Is there ample parking currently for the 100+ people?

J. Kevan: Yes, there are ample spaces.

C. Collins: I disagree that people will just come to work and go home. The campus has a really nice cafeteria and they will be going over there for lunch which will cause increased traffic. Maybe the shuttle should be considered for the office staff as well. Also, do they have a marching band?

J. Kevan: Not that I am aware of.

C. Collins: Can we clarify that because I know they would maybe practice outside and that would be a huge concern for me.

D. Rogers: I don't think they do as they don't have a football team or anything like that.

C. Collins: Or just make sure they would not be practicing outside for anything.

D. Rogers: 30,000 sq. ft. should be ample space for them to practice inside.

C. Collins: They are keeping the on-line location in Manchester, correct?

J. Kevan: Correct.

D. Marshall: How soundproof is that building? The neighbors might not appreciate hearing the practicing.

J. Kevan: I will check. My guess is there isn't any specific soundproofing, but I will find out the type of construction.

Elizabeth Gorham (31 Donati Drive): I have a question about the traffic. I believe that was CB Sullivan at one point and I don't believe they had 100 staff members at that location, so I believe the traffic will pick up a lot. I would like that to be considered, even if we could do a traffic analysis. It is a busy road now and it will get worse. A shuttle was also a great idea. Obviously, we want to work with SNHU, it is a beautiful school, but I want to protect the neighborhood as well. If that could be considered that would be good.

D. Winterton: I know that SNHU wants to be good neighbors and I feel confident that if a caravan is going out of that office building to go over to the cafeteria to get lunch, they might consider a couple of shuttles.

E. Gorham: Would they consider a sign in that parking lot to only take a left hand turn out to the main road to help cut down on traffic?

J. Kevan: You can put a sign, but they may not follow.

Bob McGuinness (18 W. Alice Ave.) Noise is a concern as well as the times they will stop.

J. Kevan: We will provide that information.

D. Rogers: That one is continued until June 16 so you can come back and reiterate your concerns for that.

T. Walsh: That was designed as warehouse. How many people used to work at that building?

D. Marshall: That was their marketing space and warehouse.

T. Walsh: So it is comparable.

J. Kevan: There was about 15 and it was a warehouse and showroom but I don't know how many.

T. Walsh: How many parking spots are there?

J. Kevan: There are 101.

C. Collins: Can I ask a question?

D. Rogers: Yes. Please come back to the microphone.

C. Collins: So there are 101 spaces, 100 people going in there. Say there are over 100. Where do the overflow cars go?

J. Kevan: There is plenty of pavement space, but I don't believe there will be more than 100 people.

C. Collins: Can we get answers to those questions before it is approved. Also, the question about the shuttle.

D. Rogers: We could put a condition on the waiver.

C. Collins: That is a concern because obviously they will have to go back to the campus to work.

D. Rogers: We are not talking about the band people, this is for office workers.

C. Collins: So it is strictly office IT, it is not campus IT?

J. Kevan: I am not going to say there is not going to be traffic from this to the campus. Those people may have been driving that road to begin with if they were coming from Rt. 3 to get to work.

C. Collins: Correct, but we are talking about 100 additional people.

J. Kevan: It is growth in this office so I would have to say yes, it is new employees to the college and would be a combination from campus or from the warehouse space.

C. Collins: And they will be going to the campus, in some cases. It could happen daily for people who eat lunch over there.

D. Winterton: For clarification, these are not students these are all professor types teaching on-line classes?

J. Kevan: Either that or processing student paperwork or IT type of office space.

D. Winterton: What is your time frame if we were to approve it for occupying and what is the drop dead date for the end of a one-year extension?

J. Kevan: What I was looking for is to get through next school year so they could occupy the space through next May.

D. Rogers: Granting a waiver for one year would be from the date of granting the waiver regardless of their school calendar.

J. Kevan: As far as timing, my guess is Bob Vachon is looking for enough time that he could fit some of it up during the summertime and get people in there for the next school year.

L. Lessard: How many spots is in the parking lot that is going to be at the end of the new road?

J. Kevan: We were targeting in the range of 100, but that has not been nailed down.

L. Lessard: So when that road is done and the band members go down there, they could park there and walk right to that building. The other people that are going to be temporary in this, if that road is going to get done this year, they could use the access road to park there also.

J. Kevan: Correct.

D. Winterton motioned to grant the waiver request for Map 41, Lot 94, site plan requirement for temporary use (1 year) of existing building for office space for IT and online staff for 1 year from today. Seconded by D. Marshall.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Durakovic: Yes

P. Scarpetti: No

D. Winterton: Yes

D. Rogers: No

D. Marshall: Yes

T. Walsh: No

F. Kotowski: No

Motion Denied.

J. Kevan: Is there some additional information we could provide.

D. Rogers: You can refile your waiver request, and I think, given the conversation tonight, you could get some additional information and bring it back on June 16, with the music building. I think some of the concerns, like the shuttle, are applicable to both of the buildings.

D. Marshall: Based on that vote, the University would be smart to make a traffic study on both of these buildings together. Where the people are coming from, what the amount of traffic is going to be. It would put a lot of these questions to rest if you can show how these people are getting there and what the numbers are supposed to be.

J. Kevan: I think what they were looking at is solely getting a temporary use in there. We know we are going to end up doing a traffic study for a permanent function in that space. It will be difficult to pick a distribution and pick a point where they would be coming from. I don't know if anybody, other than the college, is going to be able to predict how much traffic between the two there would be.

D. Marshall: SNHU has used a firm several times in the past to do their traffic work.

J. Kevan: This is unique in that it is different than a destination type of business to say how many times somebody is going to drive back and forth to a band practice and where they would be coming from. It will be the College giving that person that traffic information.

D. Marshall: The University is going to have to do something if they want both of the waivers granted.

T. Walsh: I think the traffic impact would be negligible if the road, when completed, doesn't have a gate on it. That is my biggest concern and the reason for my vote. I don't see any help in reducing traffic, I see an increase in traffic, and that connector road could make the difference.

J. Kevan: When they build the parking lot at the end, the traffic will be negligible. As far as opening the gate, security will be reduced on that campus and it would be opened up for a whole different type of traffic going through your property and intermixing with the students.

T. Walsh: I can't see how anyone would think of using that as a shortcut to N. River Rd.

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

5. RUMSON & SHAW (plan #14-10)

7 & 9 Laurel Rd., Map 20, Lots 7-6 & 7-25

Lot line adjustment to adjust the boundary line between the two properties, but not to create any new lots nor change the lot sizes.

D. Rogers: We have a letter from Stantec. The comment is the Board should discuss the existing patio that is located approximately 4' from the delineated wetland boundary and it shall be allowed to remain in a no-disturb wetland buffer. If you could give an brief overview and comment specifically on the patio issue.

Joe Wichert: I am the surveyor that prepared the plan that is in front of the Board this evening. Mr. Shaw is with me at the table. The Rumson's and the Shaw's are the original owners of the house. The intent is to adjust the common line between the two properties. There is no change in acreage, no increase in the number of building lots, no creation of non-compliance or any other substantive changes. The reason that is driving this change is Mr. Shaw would like to put an addition on to the north side of his house and this would allow him more room for both the addition and the relocation of the septic tank and still maintain the existing leach field. Lot 6 was the last lot on the west side of the road in the first phase of the sub-division. That is why you have that little return that comes in. What used to happen was the road came in, there was a hammerhead that existed, that land was done in 1996 and in 1998 they went all the way through, tied it into Evelyn and came out onto Rt. 27. We are moving the frontage point between 25 and 6 up to the old beginning of the curve for the hammerhead. We are swapping 1,995 sq. ft. We don't need sub-division approval from DES. In regard to Stantec's comments, we did the resubmission on Thursday. He commented that the initial plan had the actual cistern outside the limits of the easements. Mr. and Mrs. Shaw have agreed to a reconfigured easement and we are under the understanding that the town will cover the expense of those deeds. The latest plans that were submitted will ensure that all the improvements for the existing cistern are now located inside. Dan had talked about relocating the new lot line to get it off of the utility pads, but we went out there today and I think we can make it work on the pad. It will be a 1' offset but it still stays on the concrete pad. The last issue is the existing patio. The patio is a fire pit. It is a patio block set on sand with a fire area in the middle. It has been there for 8 or 9 years. It is in an area that the Shaw's had used as lawn, historically. They would prefer to keep it there, but if it becomes an issue for approval we can look to remove it.

Gregory Shaw (9 Laurel Road): The blocks around the fire pit were a safety precaution. They are set in sand.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, is there any staff input?

J. Duffy: No, we are all set with this.

D. Marshall motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

*F. Kotowski motioned for approval of Map 20, Lots 7-6 & 7-25, lot line adjustment to adjust the boundary line between the two properties, but not to create any new lots nor change the lot sizes. T. Walsh. **Motion carried unanimously.***

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ **APPROVAL OF STANTEC INVOICES**

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

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: We had four change of use applications since your last meeting. 1. Jeff Larrabee for 3 Cate Rd. That is the Belletete lumber building that he is leasing. He is planning to do a summer, weekends only, indoor/outdoor sale of goods which was approved. The second was for 4 Pleasant Street which was the old Caruso Brothers site. This person wanted to rent out the old house for residential and put in a pawn shop, car towing and storage with a dealership and we told him he would have to come to the Planning Board with site plan. 3. Kimball Drive, the building down in the hole that you don't really see, someone is going in there to put in an adult day care center. That was approved. 4. The last one is on Londonderry turnpike for an auto repair shop which was in one of those industrial buildings which has had auto repair in there previously. That was approved.

Tomorrow we have another meeting. We have had a lot of change of use application in the last month or so. A lot of businesses are changing hands quickly.

BOARD DISCUSSION

J. Duffy: The city of Manchester has a sub-division going in and they have declared it has regional impact. They notified the Town of Hooksett. They haven't scheduled a hearing yet but they wanted to know if the town had any comments or wanted to attend the meeting. By declaring it has regional impact means you are now an abutter and have abutter status.

D. Marshall: Is this the property that is at the intersection of Smyth and Mammoth. I thought there were homes in there already?

J. Duffy: There are condominiums there and it is next to those.

D. Winterton: If we are abutters, would this be a way for us to potentially get some sidewalks on

Smyth Rd. If you look at the traffic today, and look at adding those houses, and you add that with the development coming down Jacob Dr. I have referred to it as a suicide place to jog. Do you think this might be a place for us to get some sidewalks?

P. Scarpetti: I think we should ask to have them redo the road. Hooksett is beautiful all the way up to the town line and then it is a mess in Manchester.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, that would be something we could propose, bring up as an abutter, and convey to the City of Manchester.

D. Winterton: I would like to bring up that the sign ordinance was passed and I would like to thank all of the members of the Sign Committee for all the work they did. The town voters chose to hire a town engineer. That won't happen for a while but just to be aware.

J. Duffy: We have a meeting Thursday evening at 6:00pm in this room for the Community Profile. The woman from UNH Cooperative Extension is coming down to give an overview of what is involved. We have about six people interested and we are hoping to get a few more.

T. Walsh: As far as the sign ordinance, it has been said before when we were doing our presentation and I asked the Union Leader to make sure they put it in the paper when I was interviewed, but it was to thank staff for all the work they did. Without them we would never have gotten it done.

D. Winterton: For those interested, tomorrow at the Manchester Chamber of Commerce building at 3:00 there is a panel discussion about public and private partnerships with a panel of Dick Anagnost from Manchester, Steve Duprey from Concord, and Senator Boutin. I am hoping to attend.

F. Kotowski: They are going to give an extensive report on Senate Bill 233.

L. Lessard: As far as SNHU, I would like some clarification. I thought that was a no brainer. It is an existing building that had probably 50-60 people in there to begin with. Traffic isn't going in and out of there all day. These are only going to be people that are going to work. It probably would have brought in 60 jobs for the town. When that other road is built and the parking lot is there for 100 cars, people from the campus will be parking in the parking lot and walking over there. Donati, W. Donati and that other road is 36' wide. They are the widest roads in town. The traffic study will get blown out because of the width of that road because it can handle a lot of traffic. They are going to build a road that is to spec; a state road. They do excellent work but I can see why they don't want civilians on their property. It is their road and they have to maintain it. They take great care of their roads.

T. Walsh: The only thing that bothers me is that gate. I get that they don't want civilians on their road. That is why I asked if they were going to build a driveway to their connector road from the parking lots of those two buildings so at least the people that are using those two buildings don't need to use a Hooksett road to get to the cafeteria. In other words, traveling within your own property. They are not even planning on doing that. The parking lot at the end of the street with a connector road is only if you were in the campus and wanted to get to those buildings. If you in those buildings, the only way to get to campus is to drive down Donati, up Bicentennial, and up N. River Rd.

L. Lessard: I didn't think of that but I wish I did because I would have said it. If they got access and built a road behind their parking lots to go to that access road so that could happen, they could put a gate there too and open it during working hours for the employees.

T. Walsh: That is what I was getting at and my point that they don't seem to have any concern about the traffic on our roads. It is all them. Doing something like that and allowing them to travel within their own property would do a lot of good.

F. Kotowski: I voted the way I did because I think whatever they have done they have done well, but I don't think they have an handle on this. It seemed like they thought to bring the presentation and see what would happen. They didn't have answers as to how many cars, what kind of people, when they would be there. We didn't get that information. I need to hear more about how that building is going to be used, the number of people coming in and out, and the frequency. The people in that area deserve the best that SNHU is going to be able to do for them. I think they have to mitigate whatever unreasonable impact they might have. One of those unreasonable impacts could be traffic.

D. Winterton: On the parking lot issue, I don't disagree, but they have not come before us with that.

T. Walsh: The parking lot that was on their master plan. That was on the gated side. I thought I had seen it on a prior drawing. I will look through them for a possible driveway coming from the connector road onto the warehouse properties. You can still gate the road so most people would still take a left on Donati, but you could have the people in those two buildings access the connector road.

D. Winterton: I think it is appropriate that when they come back to us for that parking lot that is one of the things we can ask them to do. They haven't asked us to do that. They have only asked us to open up this building to put 100 people, probably with Master's and PhD's, because they would be working in that building. I agree with Leo. It is 60 jobs.

P. Scarpetti: I voted the way I did because it was so open-ended. I was waiting for them to ask for reconsideration and to put a limit on the number of people and having the shuttle service. We also have to think that this is only temporary and we can revisit it in a year, but I think a year is a long time if you are an abutter. If he just would have asked to reconsider to put a limitation on these and have a shuttle for a year. By then the road will be built and we can address the concerns at that time if there are any. I would have voted for it if he put those limitations.

F. Kotowski: He can't. He is the engineering messenger.

D. Winterton: The other thing that we don't know is, unlike students who need to shuttle back and forth to where they live and eat, people with Master's and Ph'd's may not want to walk around a cafeteria at noon when it is full of kids. I think we have this empty building, I don't think the traffic from that building would be significant, and I could not think of a better business to fill up the space.

D. Rogers: As much as we denied that waiver they are coming back on June 16 and I suspect they will be better prepared and have answers to the questions that were brought up. We are not precluding them

or saying it will never happen. We are saying wait a little while and get your ducks in a row. I suspect the next time Jeff is here, the presentation will be much more thorough and we will probably be done in 15 minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

*D. Marshall motioned to adjourn. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk