

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, August 4, 2014**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Rogers (Chairman), P. Scarpetti, T. Prasol, T. Walsh, Frank Kotowski, and Donald Winterton (Town Council Rep.) (arrived at 6:10 pm)

ALTERNATES: Muamer Durakovic (arrived at 6:04 pm)

EXCUSED: Dick Marshall (Vice-Chairman) and Michael DiBitetto (Alternate)

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner), Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Planner), and Dean Shankle (Town Administrator).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 7/21/14

July 21, 2014 Regular Meeting – F. Kotowski *motioned to approve the July 21, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. D. Rogers and T. Prasol abstained due to not being in attendance at the July 21, 2014 meeting. Motion carried.*

CONTINUED COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING

KENNEY & BLEVENS (plan #14-09)

22 Coaker Ave. & 27 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.

Joe Wichert: I am here on behalf of Wayne Kenney and Scott and Tracy Blevens. We are proposing two separate actions. Mr. Kenney owns Lot 129 of Tax Map 45. As it is currently configured, it is 25,000 sq. ft. It has 200' of frontage on Coaker Avenue and there is a 50 x 100 strip with 50' of frontage on Francis Ave. that has an existing residence at 22 Coaker Avenue. Regarding the Blevens, Scott owns Lot 130 which is a 100 x 100 lot, with 100' of frontage on Francis Avenue. Scott and Tracy own Lot 128 which is 100 x 100 with another 100' of frontage on Francis Avenue. The intent was to sub-divide the Coaker Avenue frontage and create one new additional building lot and take the 50 x 100 strip of the Kenney property that sits on the southwest end of the Blevens land, remove that dwelling, and add 50' to Lot 130. Where we got into some confusion is there is an interior lot line between 128 and 130 that cuts into an existing garage. Our initial proposal was to make Lot 130 150 x 100. We looked at

moving the lot line between 128 and 130 to eliminate the encroachment of the garage so that lot would be 150 x 100 and have a reconfigured Lot 130 that would be 100 x 100. The property slopes 5 points to the southeasterly corner and pitches to the north/northwest. Lots have a bit of a drop-off from the road but they are more than capable of sustaining new houses. As part of that, when we got one of our Stantec reviews we were asked to speak to the the DPW Director and inquire about any known drainage problems or ways to solve that which we did. Mr. Lessard asked us to have an engineering plan to take care of any new run-off and make sure the pre and post flows equal out. We had Jon Rokeh from Rokeh Consulting prepare the exhibit. What he proposed is each of the new lots on Coaker Avenue will have a 550 sq. ft. rain garden at the northerly corner. They will be in the deed, referenced, and will have to be maintained by the landowners. They cannot be filled in. They were sized to accommodate any of the new run-off that the construction would increase. When dealing with staff on the lot line adjustment there was an issue with the garage so the Blevens obtained a variance from the ZBA in July to allow that garage to stay in its current configuration. That allowed us to move forward with this proposal.

D. Rogers: JoAnn is there anything you would like to raise seeing as Stantec and Mr. Lessard are not here?

J. Duffy: No. Mr. Lessard was all set with the trenching of the roadway for the Wayne Kenney portion. He was also okay with the drainage for the addition of the rain gardens. I heard from the Sewer Dept. and there is ample capacity for the new lot. The only thing they did not explain was whether or not everything was settled with the payment for the Blevens.

F. Kotowski: The issue that was involved with the Sewer Commission has been resolved with an agreement that Mr. and Mrs. Blevens signed. We gave them a plan whereby they will make the apartment that was there a legal apartment. They are paying the connection fee. As of this afternoon, the payment had not been made on the first installment. It was to be done in three installments. I cannot tell you if the payment came in. Other than that we are happy with the arrangement that was made. I believe they even have offered to make the payment in two installments instead of three. Mr. and Mrs. Blevens, have you make that payment?

Tracy Blevens (29 Francis Ave.): I spoke with Linda on Thursday and explained to her that I made the payment through automatic banking and they could not send it out before today.

D. Rogers: When is the second payment due?

T. Blevens: I will be taking care of that before it is due and it will be made prior to the agreement.

D. Rogers: Is it every 30 days?

T. Blevens: Yes.

D. Rogers: So the next one will be September 1?

T. Blevens: Yes.

D. Rogers: Are you making two payments or three?

T. Blevens: I will be making it in two.

D. Rogers: So the first one was for \$1,500?

T. Blevens: Yes. I will be paying the balance with the next payment.

T. Prasol motioned to find the matter of KENNEY & BLEVENS (plan #14-09) 22 Coaker Ave. & 27 Francis Ave., Map 45, Lots 129 & 130, complete. Seconded by T. Walsh. D. Winterton abstained due to not being in attendance for the discussion. Motion carried.

T. Walsh motioned to approve KENNEY & BLEVENS (plan #14-09) 22 Coaker Ave. & 27 Francis Ave., Map 45, Lots 129 & 130, lot line adjustment and subdivision request, as presented and outlined in the plans. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. D. Winterton abstained due to not being in attendance for the discussion. Motion carried.

CHANGE OF USE

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

➤ Recommendation for SNHPC Representative, Jackie Roy

D. Rogers: Ms. Roy is not here tonight, however, she sent in an email this afternoon that stated:

“Dear JoAnn and board members,

I apologize as I am unable to attend the Planning Board meeting personally this evening. You will be considering me for the SNHPC Representative. I have been a Hooksett resident since 2000 and currently serve as an alternate board member for the Zoning Board. I am familiar with some of the current board members from SNHP through my previous employment as co-owner of AJ Roy Excavation LLC. I would be honored to represent the Town of Hooksett on this voluntary board.

Recommendation for SNHPC representative: Jackie Roy was contacted per the Board's consensus. Ms. Roy has agreed to serve and may be in attendance at Monday's meeting.

Please feel free to include this in your scheduled meeting. I look forward to the board's decision.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline D. Roy, CPCU
Account Executive
Davis & Towle Insurance Group
Concord, NH”

F. Kotowski motioned to recommend Jacqueline D. Roy to the Town Council as the SNHPC representative. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

➤ **SNHPC Regional Comprehensive Plan 2015-2035**

J. Duffy: Dick Marshall was the representative. I believe he was appointed by this Board to serve on that committee about a year ago. There have been representatives from the various member communities that are members of the SNHPC. They worked in conjunction with Granite State Futures and put boxes around the towns asking for suggestions on various questions they had of the residents. They have collected that data, put it together, and came forward with this document entitled “Moving Southern New Hampshire Forward, Volume 1. They are distributing it and trying to get input from Board members. There is going to be a hearing before the commission on August 26 and if everything goes favorably they will adopt it.

D. Rogers: What do we need to do?

J. Duffy: You don't need to take any action. It is for informational purposes only or if you had any questions or comments.

D. Rogers: Does anyone have any comments, questions, or concerns with the draft plan that has been provided to us?

T. Walsh: Are we having another meeting before the hearing on August 26?

J. Duffy: Yes. August 18. Do you want me to put it back on the agenda for August 18?

D. Rogers: Yes. I think it might be helpful to have Mr. Marshall here to provide more information.

➤ **Smyth Road Subdivision, Manchester**

D. Rogers: There are Planning Board minutes from the Manchester Planning Board addressing this and the Hooksett Police Department traffic information has been provided on Smyth Rd.

J. Duffy: Councilor Winterton, we did not forward the traffic information to the City of Manchester. We are assuming you are going to address that with them?

D. Winterton: Correct. I met with Chief Bartlett and he walked me through what the data means and ways to use it. I plan to be there Thursday night. I am going to talk about multiple concerns. 1) The traffic study says only 5% of the traffic coming down Smyth Rd. will turn right. I am going to time and measure how far it is from that point to Exit 1 on 101 vs. taking a left and going down Mammoth and up Wellington to the lights. Chief Bartlett pointed out that there will be traffic there because, if you do the Mammoth Rd. section and you are traveling east, there are no gas stations and no place to get coffee which people who commute in the morning tend to do. 2) The posted speed limit is 30mph. and the site lines are based upon a 30mph speed limit. The report says the average speed limit was 36-37

mph. We also can see that about 10% of the traffic was traveling under 15mph because those were people turning and not thru traffic. That would pump the speed of the thru traffic even higher. In the minutes, they talk about the 30' line of site needed and that is based on a 30mph speed limit. The line of site at 40mph would be significantly more so I hope Manchester will address that in their plans. I would be glad to address any concerns that anyone might have.

J. Duffy: Was there anything in the minutes about Southern New Hampshire Planning commenting, because normally they will review the traffic studies.

D. Winterton: Not that I know, but I will take a look and will ask them.

J. Duffy: You could contact Tim White, their traffic planner at Southern New Hampshire Planning.

D. Shankle: The traffic study and what is generated, is done by a new piece of equipment that the Police Dept. bought that they can put up on a tree and it provides the data. On occasion, Planning Board's are looking for this type of information and their first thought is to go to the Regional Planning Commission, but we can do that ourselves now. We have already done this in several places, but sometimes when you are dealing with issues that you might need traffic counts or speeds, be aware that we own that piece of equipment and it is available to you whenever you need to use it.

D. Rogers: Mr. Winterton, thank you for attending that meeting and we look forward to hearing back from you.

➤ **Hooksett “Conservation Subdivision” Ordinance**

D. Rogers: Carolyn prepared this report. The bottom line of the report is that it is requesting input from the Board as to either forming a sub-committee of land use Board members or to have the staff do that work. Carolyn would you like to make a presentation or do you have any comments?

C. Cronin: We had a few conservation sub-divisions come through at the beginning of the year. There was a lot of discussion and wheels turning and the question arose if this ordinance was still doing what we want it to be doing in Hooksett. The Board recommended that staff look at and see if there are any changes or recommendations that we can make to it. This report is a background on that ordinance, how it came to be, the issues there were at the time, and past and recent questions and concerns. There are a few options. We could do a sub-committee, like we did with the sign ordinance. We could get representatives from Planning Board, ZBA, Conservation Commission, and a Town Council Representative together and do a series of regular meetings and go piecemeal through the ordinance. If you prefer not to do it that way, staff could do more research and possibly get together with SNHPC to see if they have any recommendations. Then we could have a series of workshops with the different representatives from the land use Boards to see if they have questions or input. We could do public hearings. There are a few different options. I am bringing this report to Conservation Commission. They will see and discuss it at their next meeting which is August 11. You do not have to decide anything tonight, it is just to get the thought process going.

D. Rogers: Do you have a time frame when you would like us to make a decision?

C. Cronin: It would be good to have something done by the end of this calendar year.

D. Rogers: So would a decision within the next couple of meetings work?

C. Cronin: Yes.

T. Walsh: Thank you. I have expressed my concerns with the cluster zoning in the past. You can count me in as I would go with a sub-committee.

P. Scarpetti: You can count me in as well.

F. Kotowski: I think Carolyn did a great job with this. It brought to light your review over time as to what has and has not happened. I think we may want to have someone close to the Sewer Department be on that sub-committee also.

D. Rogers: Why don't we put this on the agenda for the next meeting and follow-up with the Board. Carolyn thank you again. Very well written.

D. Rogers: We also have a draft job description for a Town Engineer.

D. Shankle: I want to bring you up to date as far as the Town Engineer. It was passed at the town meeting so we have the money to hire a Town Engineer, however, we were not hiring right away because we knew they were going to need equipment, software and such. The number in the warrant article was going to be the outside cost so therefore it was going to be September or October before we hired someone. We are getting close to that that I would like you to take a look at the job description and if you have any comments, between now and next Wednesday, please get those to me. The next step in the process is that the Town Council needs to approve the job description and that will be going to them at their next meeting which is August 13. If they approve it, we will put something together, advertise it, and get resumes early in September so we are on target with where I wanted to be. If you have any questions feel free to call or email me, individually, with any thoughts or comments you may have.

D. Winterton: At the Town Council meeting it was discussed, and I would like to suggest to this Board that we not have a CIP Committee this year.

D. Shankle: The charter says the Town Administrator is responsible for turning over a Capital Improvement Plan to the Council after consultation with the Planning Board. What they have done in the past is the Planning Board has given that consultation power to the CIP Committee and the Town Council didn't know if that was necessary or not.

D. Winterton: My feeling is that Dr. Shankle meets with all of the department heads. He will bring that back to us and then take it to the Town Council. It isn't really necessary because the Town Administrator is doing his job and it requires a lot of administrative time that is not necessary. Bedford did the same thing this year.

F. Kotowski: I think when we hire administrator's and department heads we need to let them do their job. I think the Planning Board needs to rely on what he brings to us and approve that. I would be in favor of doing away with the CIP Committee.

D. Rogers: We won't do anything with that request right now. Maybe we could put that on the agenda for one of our upcoming meetings and make a decision at that time. The CIP Committee is typically not appointed until October. We will bring it up at a later time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**