

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, August 18, 2014**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:03 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Rogers (Chairman), Dick Marshall (Vice-Chairman), P. Scarpetti, T. Prasol, and Frank Kotowski

ALTERNATES: Muamer Durakovic

EXCUSED: T. Walsh, D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.), and Michael DiBitetto (Alternate)

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 8/4/14

August 4, 2014 Regular Meeting – P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the August 4, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by T. Prasol. D. Marshall abstained due to not being in attendance at the August 4, 2014 meeting. Motion carried.

EXTENSION REQUEST

1. RIDGEBACK SELF-STORAGE (plan #06-33)

Thames Rd & Hooksett Rd, Map 18, Lot 49D

Site plan for a 49,500 sq. ft. metal self-storage unit buildings and an 864 sq. ft. granite block office building. Active & Substantial period expired on 09/22/12. The Planning Board granted a 1 year extension to 9/22/12, a second 1 year extension to 9/22/13, and a third 1 year extension to 9/22/14.

Applicant requesting another 1 year extension per the following:

- **Extension Request** – Development Regulations (6/4/2012) section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions

P. Scarpetti stepped down

Richard Uchida (Hinckley, Allen and Snyder): I am representing Ridgeback Self-Storage, LLC. With me is David Grappone who is a member of that limited liability company. We are here for an extension. There are no plan changes. This was a self-storage project that consists of four buildings on approximately 3.36 acres, a couple of 3-story buildings and a 1-story building for self-storage units, as well as a 1-story office building. The access is off of Rt. 3. We recently extended our driveway permit from NHDOT. This project was originally approved in 2009. Extensions were noted in 2012 and 2013. In 2013, when Mr. Grappone appeared, he indicated he had been working on market studies in

connection with the self-storage facility and things were soft. He thought he might need another year to get it in place. His most recent studies show the market is turning, people are buying things, and need storage. The market is stronger now where he is moving forward with financing proposals, discussing the construction of the facility with a facilities manufacturer as well as site contractors. Our approval expires around the 22nd of September so we would like to extend it another year and see if we can get this built. We hope to be under construction by the end of the year or the beginning of next year.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, do you have any input.

J. Duffy: Everything is as he said it was and we recommend a 1-year extension.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

D. Marshall motioned to grant a 1-year extension for Ridgeback Self-Storage (plan #06-33), Thames Rd. & Hooksett Rd., Map 18, Lot 49D, site plan for a 49,500 sq. ft. metal self-storage unit buildings and an 864 sq. ft. granite block office building. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion granted unanimously.

P. Scarpetti returned to the Board.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING

2. PIKE INDUSTRIES (plan #14-12)

38 Hooksett Rd, Map 12, Lot 11

Amended site plan to add a 40 foot by 80 foot rap shed to an existing pavement plant site.

John Lorden (MSC Engineers): We were before you in January, 2014 for a site plan. We were retiring two old pavement making plants and replacing that with a new, more efficient one. That work has been complete. The new plant is in operation. We are now looking for an amended site plan for a 40' x 80' rap (reclaimed asphalt pavement) shed. They take up old pavement and want to store it in controlled conditions. It is open on the sides but the rain cannot get to it. These are things they can reuse and recycle. We submitted three plans. One was an existing features plan that shows what it looks like today. It has the new plant on it. We also had a site plan that shows the location of the new rap shed. The shed itself is a metal structure with a canvas top. Three walls will be 6' high concrete blocks. There is no increase to impervious pavement. We are putting it on existing pavement. We also supplied the lighting plan that shows the lighting as it is now with the addition of two new lights. One is shining towards the rear of the proposed shed and one at the front towards the main truck access.

J. Duffy: Stantec was questioning the fact that the access road to the building is gravel and not paved which, according to the regulations, would normally be paved. I think the situation is different because it is a gravel pit but he wanted to bring it to your attention to see if anyone had any issues with it.

D. Marshall motioned to find Pike Industries (plan #14-12), 38 Hooksett Rd, Map 12, Lot 11, amended site plan to add a 40 foot by 80 foot rap shed to an existing pavement plant site, complete.

*Seconded by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: Does the snow load effect this?

J. Lorden: It is designed for the snow load. It is a substantial metal structure and is pitched so the snow can fall off.

P. Scarpetti: Are you storing the asphalt in that location now?

J. Lorden: I believe there was an existing rap shed that has since been taken down.

Ted Fitzgerald (Pike Industries): We store recycled asphalt pavement on site. We stored it close to the same facility. We had a 40x40 structure to keep the recycled product in. We store it in the same spot now but want to cover it to keep rain water off of it.

Open public hearing.

Marcel Croteau: (Springer Rd.): I would like to see the site plan. Do you own that land? Where do you want to put it?

J. Lorden: We have an existing building. We want to put it against the slope.

M. Croteau: This is all your land?

J. Lorden: Yes.

M. Croteau: Since when?

J. Lorden: This is all Hooksett Crushed Stone.

M. Croteau: Did you get that here from the Board or by the deed? Where did you get that from?

J. Lorden: The company has owned that land for a long time. I have worked there for 28 years and they have owned the land the entire time. It is in the deed.

M. Croteau: Can I see the deed?

J. Lorden: Yes. It is public record, but I do not have it tonight. We bought that land from Audley Construction, I believe in 1985. Hookett Water Precinct has a right-of-way. We have an agreement with them to use some of that land.

M. Croteau: What about Public Service?

J. Lorden: Public Service has an easement through that land. It is on the other side of the property.

M. Croteau: I would like to see the deed.

D. Rogers: Mr. Croteau. do you have an objection to this plan the way it is made. I know you have questions as to the ownership, but do you have an objection to the rap shed?

M. Croteau: Yes, I do have a concern with the easements.

D. Rogers: It is their land to the extent they want to develop it and get permission or approval from the Board and the Town of Hooksett. As far as what they are doing with their land, they do have rights with regard to that.

M. Croteau: It seems okay but I want to see the owner of the land before it is done.

J. Lorden: The owner of the land is a corporation and the deed is public record. The highest you can go here in New Hampshire is the President of Pike Industries.

M. Croteau: I will check that out for myself.

T. Prasol motioned to approve the application for Pike Industries (plan #14-12), 38 Hooksett Rd, Map 12, Lot 1, amended site plan to add a 40 foot by 80 foot rap shed to an existing pavement plant site. Seconded by D. Marshall. Motion carried unanimously.

CHANGE OF USE

- 1.) O'Rourke Clips, LLC: 100 Quality Drive, Units 15 and 17, Map 29, lot 64-4 is moving into the unit that was site of Sprint retail store. Proposed is a hair salon. This has been approved.
- 2.) Empire Beauty School, 1328 Hooksett Road, Map 25, lot 78, will be expanding into the former Payless Shoe and Fashion Bug units in the Shaw's Plaza. The units are currently vacant. They are starting up two new programs. One is for barbering and the other is for aesthetician work. This is the first school in New Hampshire to offer all three services, those two plus hair cutting. They were proud to be able to do that in Hooksett. This has been approved.
- 3.) Williams School for Creative and Performing Arts, 45 Londonderry Tpke, Map 49, lot 7. This is going into the former site of Mont Blanc Academy. They have one student and are hoping to get more. This has been approved.

BOARD DISCUSSION

➤ SNHPC Regional Comprehensive Plan 2015-2035

D. Marshall: This Regional Comprehensive Plan is not unlike all of the others that are ongoing throughout the state. Each of the regional planning commissions has spent the last couple of years developing their regional comprehensive plans. This was done with funding through a granite state futures project, a HUD grant, and a sustainable community grant. They have been working at it for 2 years. My interest and input in the development of the plan was dealing with the transportation end. Volume 1 has 9 chapters and it is a good summary of what the main study was about. It is worth

reading. You can pick up information on the role of Hooksett within the regional area. If you can get Volume 2, it would be good to look at it with a view toward looking in each one of the detailed chapters in the Hooksett portion of it. More of the demographic data is there and it gives a better understanding of the community. The plan was developed with not only the committee, but with staff of the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission and considerable community outreach with the staff going out to talk with groups throughout the region. They also had listening/suggestion boxes that people could drop a card into with comments. The guts of the plan is the goals, objectives, and recommendations which are typical of any of these comprehensive plans, and then it is up to the communities and the region as a whole to implement those recommendations. Some of them involve what communities themselves can specifically do, others would require state assistance. That is what they spent two years doing.

F. Kotowski: I think they did a great job with this piece. If you go through it there are a lot of thoughts about what people want and I think that would be helpful to the planning departments, conservation when they are thinking of projects they want to do, roads, and many other things. Nothing is binding. It is a wish list that if we could have a perfect southern New Hampshire 20 years from now what would we do to make that happen. The hard part is bringing back these ideas and moving forward with those we are able to do. Mr. Marshall you did a good job.

T. Prasol: I wanted to thank Mr. Marshall for serving on the committee on behalf of the town.

D. Marshall: I enjoyed it.

D. Rogers: Mr. Marshall, thank you for your work on that.

➤ **Hooksett “Conservation Subdivision” Ordinance**

J. Duffy: At the last meeting Carolyn provided you with a memorandum as to how we came about with the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance and the changes that have been made over the years. Now it seems like about 99 percent of the people who come in are coming in under conservation subdivision versus a regular conventional subdivision. Therefore, we thought it was time to look at this Article again and see if we could make some improvements. The question was if you want the staff to do this or do you want to form a committee like we did with the Sign Ordinance. This is something that will need to go to the voters to be adopted. At the last meeting it seemed like most people were favoring a committee. I heard from Tom Walsh and he wanted to let you know he was favoring a committee and would volunteer to serve on it. We would need a few more people from Conservation and a few Planning Board members.

D. Rogers: How many members are you looking for?

J. Duffy: When we did the Sign Committee we had two staff people, two people from Planning, a ZBA member, and someone from Conservation. Roughly five to seven.

P. Scarpetti: I mentioned I would be willing to be on that committee also. I think we should have a committee. It is an important issue.

D. Rogers: So the committee is the preference as opposed to having staff work on this?

D. Marshall: The committee is only as good as the staff that are involved. In most of these cases the staff does the base work, getting model ordinances and such. The role of the committee is to be the devils advocate in the sense they have to be able to live with that ordinance within the community, to take it apart, find that it is what they were looking for, tweak it beyond what the staff is recommending, or add to it. The staff is an integral part of the committee, although they do not have a vote.

F. Kotowski: At the last Conservation Commission meeting they discussed that at length. Carolyn was there and talked about this. They are excited about seeing this happen but they are not excited about having a committee. They went on record saying they feel the staff should do that work and the various boards and committees should be reviewing that work and tweaking it. The reason is that there are very few active members in Conservation Commission and they are out straight. They do a lot.

D. Marshall: When we say we want to redo a section of the Zoning Ordinance, very often we ask the staff if they will present us with a model article and the Planning Board as a whole takes it from there. That may be the best approach, because as a Planning Board we would then ask the Conservation and ZBA to review that as well.

J. Duffy: It is sometimes hard to bring forward a lengthy document to the full Board and try to get comments. If Tom and Paul are willing to serve, maybe that could be the Committee and the staff could meet with them and then they could bring it to the full Board as we work on it for updates each time you have a meeting so that ultimately you will have the final document.

D. Rogers: So, you are proposing as a sub-committee of the Planning Board?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. Rogers: The question that has been presented by staff in regard to the “Conservation Subdivision” Ordinance and proposal of reworking that ordinance is if a committee is preferable to having the staff work on it and then report back to the Planning Board.

F. Kotowski motioned that those members of the Planning Board, ZBA, Conservation Commission, and anyone else who wants to work with staff on developing a proposal be allowed to do so, with the primary work being the responsibility of staff, with assistance and guidance from these other individuals. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

➤ CIP Committee

J. Duffy: At the last meeting Dr. Shankle stated there had been some discussion about the CIP Committee, how it is hard to find volunteers and that the charter says that the Town Administrator will work on the CIP and then present to the Planning Board. I believe Councilor Winterton stated there is no longer a need for the actual committee although there would still be a CIP and the follow-up. Everything would be the same except for the committee itself. The department heads would bring their

requests to the Town Administrator, which we do now. He would make whatever changes, and instead of giving it to the committee, he would give it directly to the Planning Board, and then it could go to Town Council for consideration. I think, because it is a sub-committee of the Planning Board, he is looking for your approval to go forward with this.

D. Rogers: This would essentially dissolve the CIP as it has been constituted, as least until now?

J. Duffy: Correct.

D. Rogers: Is he thinking of doing this on a permanent basis as opposed to just this next year?

J. Duffy: That is my understanding. You would not be doing away with the CIP, just the committee itself.

D. Rogers: Or the way it is structured and formatted right now.

J. Duffy: You would be reverting to the charter process.

D. Marshall: I have no objections to doing that. The original concept was to have a grass roots type of thing developing this program but over time this has become so political. By the time the Town Administrator gets done with it, and then the Budget Committee works with it, what comes out the other end does not resemble what they originally started with. As far as I was concerned, I would not serve on the CIP Committee because I did not want to get involved in the politics. In my opinion, the best route to go is to leave it to the administrators and politicians.

J. Duffy: When I first started working here, the CIP was a few Planning Board members who got together before a Planning Board meeting with the Town Administrator and they put the CIP together. It was always based on you can't spend more than whatever the demolition dump was taking in. They would get that number from Transfer Station and that was the number CIP was given. You could not go over that. There was no impact on tax rate but over the years it has become more involved and less people want to spend the time on it. The meetings are weekly and it is hard to find people that can meet that often.

F. Kotowski: Over the years, I have seen the CIP Committee almost working to set up a contract for the next year. I think the Administrator's job is to administrate the affairs of the town. He has looked at the charter, it is his responsibility to do it, and I think we ought to let him do his job.

T. Prasol motioned to dissolve the CIP Committee and transfer those responsibilities to the Town Administrator to consult with the Board. Seconded by D. Marshall. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Stantec Invoice

P. Scarpetti stepped down

D. Rogers: The invoice total is \$1,239.27. Of that, \$1,089.00 is being billed to the applicant and

\$150.27 is being paid by the town. JoAnn, if I understand that correctly, there was a dispute raised by the applicant so this was a compromise position?

J. Duffy: Yes. David is here if he would like to speak. This is on the Autumn Frost subdivision and there was a lot of back and forth about whether the town would support lowering the speed limits. There were more issues that came up from the town side and David was disputing that he should not have to pay for that because the Town Council agreed to lower the speed limit and mostly everyone was on board with it. We looked at the last invoice and took out the amount of time Stantec spent dealing with that which was the \$150.27. David agreed and has paid the difference. Dr. Shankle wanted you to be aware of it instead of just signing off on it.

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

P. Scarpetti returned to the Board.

J. Duffy: Jackie Roy was appointed by the Town Council. I sent her an email and told her there was a meeting next week.

F. Kotowski: The Conservation Commission has applied to the Department of Transportation for a grant. There is 1,000' of a walkway going over marshlands approaching two miles of trails along the river. They are prepared to match some of the funds, if they get it, to the tune of about \$350,000 to develop that. It is going to be a really great thing. They will be looking for private-public partnerships to help fund this endeavor.

D. Marshall: Is this part of the Heritage Trail?

F. Kotowski: It is a small piece of the Heritage Trail. The Heritage Trail is missing between Concord and North River Rd. in Manchester. This will be a part of that. What it will do is allow us to try to hook up to the Heads Pond Trail. If Manchester Sand and Gravel and Cement, probably years from now, develop that 400+ units around the lake, turn that land over to the town, and maybe deed us more land heading south, we can continue to fulfill that dream. Steve Couture is to be thanked for what he has done. He has done a great job as Chairman of the Conservation Commission.

J. Duffy: The Town Council was supposed to approve the job description for the town engineer last week and they did not have time to get to it so they are putting it on their next agenda. Also, I think Carolyn sent you an email about the SNHPC. If you have not gotten back to her, please respond to that as soon as possible and we will make sure that is taken care of. It is September 12th.

D. Marshall: I submitted a comment to Carolyn on the engineer. In the qualifications it says whoever they hire would be eligible for their registration, if they didn't already have it, within a year. You cannot practice engineering without that stamp. For a year, who would be covering anything that might require a stamp? The argument against that was Dan doesn't have a stamp, but the company he works for does, so he worked under the company stamp. It is important that does not slip through.

J. Duffy: It has not gone out yet so changes can be made.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**