

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, September 15, 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, T. Walsh (arrived at 6:05pm), Frank Kotowski, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Muamer Durakovic

EXCUSED: Michael DiBitetto (Alternate)

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner) and Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Planner)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 8/18/14

August 18, 2014 Regular Meeting – D. Marshall motioned to approve the August 18, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by F. Kotowski. D. Winterton abstained due to not being in attendance at the August 18, 2014 meeting. Motion carried.

DISCUSSION

**1. GE AVIATION EXPANSION
30 Industrial Park Drive, Map 18, Lot 43**

Doug Folsom (Plant Leader for GE Aviation, Hooksett): We want to update you on things going on at the plant specific to an expansion and give you a background on what we do. We have two facilities behind HK Power Sports. We have been in Plant 1 since 1966. We manufacture product that goes into an aircraft engine. In Plant 2 we manufacture blisks. Plant 2 started off in 1970 with the manufacture of blisks for military product line, specifically T-700 aircraft engines which go on the Blackhawk helicopter. There was a big market for those in the early 1970's and we continue to make engines for those today as well as other associated aircraft. We have about 741 full-time employees, plus another 60-70 part-time temporary employees, so a little over 800 people on the site. We make three main product groups. One is tubes. There are a lot of tubes that carry things such as fuel and oil in and around the engine and we manufacture those in Hooksett. We also manufacture parts that go in the core of the engine. If you look inside the engine you would see varying stages of air foils that the front of the engine compresses. That compressor is where we focus. We make both rotating compressor blisks as well as static compressor blades. In old engines the design was a mechanically assembled rotating blisk. T-700 was the first engine that GE manufactured where this was machined out of one forging.

What that allowed for, by not having the mechanical assembly, is you get a lighter blisk, therefore a lighter engine. Back in the 1970's, T-700 was looking to get more power. Today it is a major component of all the new engines that are coming out because it is lighter and more fuel efficient. It is part of what helps the LEAP engine be about 15 to 20 percent more fuel efficient than the current engines that are on the 737's.

David Coburn (New Product Introduction Leader): I own not only the products that we are shipping to support these new engines that we are talking about, but also making sure the manufacturing processes are developed to meet the rate of these engine lines and the customers ordering them. We are part of a larger supply chain within the Hooksett facility. We receive materials and bring it on to very sophisticated advanced manufacturing pieces of equipment. The facility in our proposal is to meet the rate of what these LEAP engines require which is \$50 million plus of capital investment by the GE, Hooksett site. We are talking about a lot of advanced manufacturing and we are bringing in and replacing good jobs as we advance the technology for these particular blisks. Some of the post processing is currently done at other vendors of ours in the New England and some travel as far away as Ohio. We have people that are supportive of our products in the form of different inspections and coatings we put on these particular products. The take away I leave you with is the advanced manufacturing, the high paying jobs, and the skill set we are looking at to manufacture these parts. As we move forward into the product line, you will hear about LEAP Passport and some military applications that we are building capacity for. In the LEAP programs there are three customers; Air Bus which is out of France and Germany, Comac out of China, and Boeing. These are the buses of the sky that deal with local high volume. We are also getting involved with Bombardier out of Canada who is investing in a new business jet that will have this Passport engine on it. Lastly, the Marines are looking for a new heavy lift helicopter, the CH-53K which we are making the entire compressor for in that product line, which is the GE38. There is a lot of new growth and new products for our customers. We attended a big show overseas in Europe in July, the Farnborough show, where GE came away with \$36 billion in orders. Not exclusively for LEAP and Passport, but a lot is focused on that. With all of this additional business, GE is looking for a lot of additional capacity within their manufacturing shops. Whether GE or a partner shop, there has been a lot of press regarding the facilities we are building. You may have heard about the Safran Composites Shop that has gone up in Rochester. That is a 300,000 plus square foot facility to support the same product lines we are working on in Hooksett. Likewise, we have facilities breaking ground in Lafayette, Indiana to assemble these engines and various sites in North Carolina that are building similar products. GE is investing a lot into getting the components manufactured for these engine lines. With the manufacturing requirements we need people to do that.

D. Folsom: In 2012, we had close to 800 employees. What comes out each year is how many of our employees are hitting retirement age and are eligible to retire. Our average age at the GE Aviation Hooksett plant is about 52 years old. We have a very good benefit package, strong pension, and a 401K program. On average, we have people retiring at age 62. Over the next ten years, about 50 percent of our employees will be retiring. The LEAP work is significant but we have a reduction of our core work, which is the work we have been doing for the U.S. Military for years. This LEAP work will not only fill that in but will give us some modest growth. We may only be up to 850 employees over the next ten years, however, we are going to need to hire about 450 employees, because we are retiring so many. The positive thing for Hooksett and New Hampshire, is there will be a lot of people retiring with good pensions and will hopefully live in the state, and the opportunity to bring 450 people into the work

force in Hooksett, largely working on new products. The problem statement we face is what to do with the current facility we have. The Legacy engine lines, which is all the engine programs that we currently make parts for will be shrinking. Our current square footage in Building 2 is a little over 90,000 square feet. If we were to add nothing on in terms of new work, we have enough space. In 2019, the work goes down significantly. The good news is we have this opportunity to bring in this new engine product line. The challenge is it grows so big that it takes up a lot more room than what we have space for. The Corporation, GE Aviation, which is headquartered out of Cincinnati, Ohio, is looking for someone that can take it all. This is an all or nothing type of thing. We want to pick up all of the LEAP and Passport. These are the buses of the sky and do a lot of flying. The engines last about seven years before things need to be replaced. It is good job security and it adds terrific growth. We are here to talk about how we can add on to ensure we have the ability to bring this work in so that we don't shrink significantly.

D. Coburn: If we can execute on all the plans we are presenting, we have an opportunity to keep that ten year average employment rate where it is today. There are other sources we are competing with indirectly for this work. Hooksett is the original blisk source, however, GE has developed quite a few others, one being in North Carolina, and there are some in our supply base that are not GE companies, but are capable of manufacturing these products. As any global manufacturer, we also expanded into other markets. There are companies we have created joint ventures with in Turkey and France. This is important for us to build a compelling and good story for why the Hooksett site would be a competitive market for these blisk products.

F. Kotowski: Is it true that each of the divisions of GE are individual cost centers and you and Hooksett are competing against other entities to get this work here, as opposed to having it go elsewhere?

D. Folsom: There are 80 plants globally that make product for GE Aviation. The plants Dave mentioned are the ones that make blisks. There are only four plants competing with us that also make blisks. Two are in the United States and two are global. We are competing with them. The one that is most likely to pick up this work, other than us, would be Wilmington, North Carolina.

F. Kotowski: Due to its labor situation?

D. Folsom: Blisks are a very complicated part. You have to use a 5 axis milling machine, which means you are controlling the ability for that part to remove metal in 5 dimensions. You are programming in 5 axis's and have to use special software. The machines have already been purchased. There are going to need to be about \$70 million worth of equipment purchased to put in the building if we are able to find space for it. \$35 million of that is already on order. The cycle time of the machine takes longer than it does to build a building. They are just not sure where they are going to put it and will depend on if we can come up with a plan. If we are unable to come up with a proposal for where to add square footage in Hooksett, or nearby the Hooksett plant, they would likely go to Wilmington, North Carolina.

D. Coburn: 31 Industrial Park Drive is the facility where we make the vane sectors and tubes. The facility we are here to talk about is 30 Industrial Park Drive. This is a series of additions. We started about half of the square feet back in the 1960's or 1970's and we have done a series of additions. We are

used to and have a team that is capable of absorbing the additional volume. We just need the space to execute it. We have assembled a team, both internal to GE and within the state. We have partnered with the Department of Resource and Economic Development and with the Business Finance Authority. They are on our side to help us. We thought hard about where this design fits best. We have a 5+ acre parcel. We have a couple of restrictions that are preventing us from putting it on our own land. We think this is about a \$6 million construction project. We have funding both internally and externally. We are looking to have a building for these machines to be delivered and getting the process up and running by the end of 2015. We are asking to add 55,000 sq. ft. We are 90,000 to 100,000 sq. ft. with our current footprint. We have two separate parking lots with a total of 250 parking spots. We are looking for a recommendation to close down about a half an acre of Industrial Park Drive. We would propose to put in a cul-de-sac on the north end to still maintain right of access to a piece of property behind us. Likewise, at the fork between Industrial Park Drive and Lehoux Drive we would be asking to close down the road there to allow us to put our addition. We would maintain our current parking and driveway access. This would require crossing over Industrial Park Drive. There is a three acre lot across the street that is currently owned by the Business Finance Authority and that is one of our partners in this project. We talked to them about the ability to secure that land. It would be approximately 275 ft. x 200 ft. to get our 55,000 sq. ft. We would add some additional visitor parking. We have worked with an architect to put together what the proposal would look like. It would be primarily manufacturing, but we would need some office space and maintenance which would be about 7,000 to 10,000 sq. ft. As part of this process we have been to a TRC and Town Council meeting and have gotten good feedback on what the requirements would be from the town. We started looking into those things and have collected data. As part of a previous project there was a traffic study performed by the Southern New Hampshire Planning Committee. At that time there was only one warrant that exceeded the requirements which was the peak hours. It passed the test for warranting a light at our southern entrance. We are going to go back and collect more data. At that point the DOT did not feel that it was necessary to add a light, but one of the requirements has been to get our traffic study data updated. There are some utilities underneath this section of roadway. From the water precinct building which is 28 Industrial Park Drive down to the intersection is the half acre parcel. There are some utilities there and we met with the sewer, water, and public works teams to understand the requirement and what we would have to do to reposition those. Tonight, we are looking for a recommendation to move forward. We cannot move forward with our designs until we know we have a viable option for where the location of the facility could be. We are not prepared with a site plan for your approval yet because we are looking for an endorsement to move forward. We have a public hearing scheduled for September 24.

T. Walsh: You mentioned there are other locations you had looked at and they had restrictions. Is it the elevation from behind the building that restricts you from squaring off that building?

D. Folsom: We did a design that would add 55,000 sq. ft. where the upper parking lot is. We brought in some developers for estimates who said it would cost about \$4.5 million to excavate that area. GE might have the funds to do it, but that puts the cost of the project on this facility in a situation where it is not productive to do it in Hooksett.

T. Walsh: As far as parking, even if we go across Industrial Park Drive, will there be enough parking?

D. Folsom: The total number of employees in Hooksett would grow from 800 to 850. We would maintain the current parking lot and have plenty of parking for the additional employees.

F. Kotowski: The way you are going now is the least expensive way that you can get that facility to do the job you need it to do to be competitive with other areas of the country?

D. Folsom: I would not say it is the least cost, but we need to keep our costs competitive. We have the technical advantage of being the first factory that manufactured blisks in GE Aviation, and a lot of the globe, in terms of making that product for an aircraft engine, but we now have others, such as Wilmington, North Carolina, that can also make them. North Carolina also has plenty of square footage to do this. If the premium becomes too great then it makes it easy for them to swing their decision the other way.

J. Duffy: We had a Technical Review Committee meeting and all of the departments were in attendance as well as the utilities. At the conclusion of the meeting everyone agreed this was an important project to move forward with in this community, and it was recommended to move forward with as few problems as possible. They are going back to the Council for a public hearing on September 24 for the discontinuance of the roadway. I understand from Dr. Shankle that the Council can't take a final vote that evening, but they could do a consensus, because it would have to be conditional upon the site plan being approved by this Board, which they would be submitting sometime for the October meeting. They are working out the details as far as the current ownership of the roadway with the attorneys. We should be getting the traffic study back shortly. I am suggesting that this Board vote to send a letter of recommendation to the Council that the Planning Board is in support.

D. Winterton: The Council heard this presentation and was very supportive. Only the Council can discontinue the road, but they cannot legally discontinue it with conditions. They are looking for a feeling of support. If that requires a motion, I would be willing to make a motion to send a letter to the Council in support of this project.

D. Rogers: This is not a formal public hearing, but is there anyone from the public that would like to be heard?

David Campbell (Manchester Sand and Gravel): Manchester Sand and Gravel is in support of this project. However, I don't want to forget about the traffic and that is our only concern. There will be a traffic impact and also a long term effect by closing off the northern entrance. We have 106 acres of industrial land. The land that is available can support up to 900,000 sq. ft. of industrial land. TJX came in a year ago and paid Holden to design an 850,000 sq. ft. warehouse. This requires that we don't have the parkway easement. That is 850,000 sq. ft., and another 50,000 sq. ft. can be supported beyond Huttig. That will create traffic. Our concern is being the last men standing. When we did Glen Crest Estate's we built 90 units, but there a hundred's of units there and Manchester Sand ended up building the light and paid the entire cost of it. Some money has been put aside. Huttig paid \$150,000 towards the light and Blue Ribbon paid roughly \$25,000. Our concern is all the traffic that will be forced out one entrance and we know the southern entrance does not work during rush hour because we have to have a police officer out there to direct traffic. At some point, there is going to be a signal there and we want to make sure we can all work together to make sure the proper mitigation is done for that light.

That has to be done with traffic data. Our traffic engineer did an update of his traffic numbers from a study he did before the recession. We are going to share our old data with GE. We alerted them to a title problem they may have and if there is a problem we will work and cooperate with them. We are not here to rain on the parade, but I hope the Council and Planning Board will look at the traffic impacts carefully. We don't want to act today and find out years down the road that we have done something that will preclude more jobs or square footage of industrial uses from coming in on these large pieces of land.

J. Duffy: I would like to give some history of what happened with the fund for the traffic light. Back when Huttig and Blue Ribbon went in, we did not have roadway impact fees. We had public safety fees and at the time they were very high and are much lower now. The Planning Board knew there were going to be issues at the intersection with Hooksett Road. Manchester Sand came in and, as a condition of approval for those two parcels for the site plan approval, they all agreed that the Town Council would grant a waiver, with approval of the Planning Board, that they would give \$1 per sq. ft of the building square footage and that would go into a fund. That is why Huttig paid \$150,000 and Blue Ribbon roughly \$20,000. That money is still sitting there. If you look at the impact fees, we now have roadway impact fees that we have had for several years. The formula is much different based on the usage, and calculated depending on if it is warehouse, manufacturing, or office space, and how the building is broken down. I don't know what it would come to because I did not get the final number for the floor plan from them, but the per square foot is roughly \$.30 for warehousing and \$1+ for office space. Legally, I don't know if we can charge more now that we have roadway impact fees than what the town requires. If something else is offered we would need a legal opinion.

D. Cambell: The difference is before everyone was paying based on the fact that we had two entrances on Industrial Park Drive. Closing one end off changes the equation. That is why it is not just another building on one side of the road or the other. This becomes not a viable option for traffic. I think there is mitigation that can be had for this beyond what is in your books.

F. Kotowski: Aren't we here tonight just to provide feeling as to whether this project should get further consideration and will we not look very closely and deal with the roadway when we get a complete set of plans in hand?

D. Rogers: Yes. This is a conceptual idea proposal and we are looking to advocate whether or not we move forward. It sounds like in the next couple of meetings, they will be back with a full set of plans, a site plan, traffic studies, and other things. I think Attorney Campbell's points are well taken to the extent that we are contemplating that, but we are not acting on this tonight. Our sole purpose is to get a consensus of the Board as to whether or not these gentlemen should pursue this with the Town Council and continue down the path they have already established.

D. Cambell: We just want to raise the issues that will come up.

P. Scarpetti: When will you hear back from corporate GE on whether you have it or not?

D. Folsom: We have received approval to move forward, so long as we can meet the time-line and cost restraints for the project. Part of that means we need to break ground by April of next year, or close to

that, so we can complete the factory by the end of next year and be ready to have delivery, in 2016, of some of the equipment that has already been ordered. As long as we maintain the costs around what has already been communicated for the project, we have a green light to move forward. If any of that changes, that decision would be revisited.

T. Walsh: You were looking at options. Have you looked at re-routing Industrial Park Drive as opposed to blocking it off?

D. Folsom: Our contention around Industrial Park Drive is that currently there is not high traffic on the north side. We had the Chief of Police here on a previous occasion that attested to that as well, and by blocking it off, currently, we would not be adding significantly to the traffic problem. We need to add to that contention with data from the traffic study. I think Attorney Campbell's perspective isn't necessarily that there is a problem today. Manchester Sand and Gravel wants to build a strip mall and fill all those lots, and when they do that they would like to have an estimated \$4.5 million light to help the flow of traffic in and out of their strip mall and the tenants of the industrial park. Attorney Campbell has an issue with blocking off Industrial Park Drive, not so much as it impacts today, but how it would be impacted in the future.

D. Coburn: The current structure has a lot of traffic flow following the road out to the south bound side and makes a difficult intersection on the north bound side of the property.

D. Marshall: I think the original estimate for a major intersection, including traffic lights, was based on the fact that there would be a by-pass route feeding into that and it looks like the likelihood of that happening is remote. We will need to be looking more at the development on either side of Route 3 in those Industrial Park areas as well as in the commercial area. The Board's role is going to be to determine a fair and equitable share for any improvement that is made. No one person should be bearing the total cost. The question we have had in impact fees before is although we do collect them there is also the possibility that we can negotiate some other arrangement in lieu of impact fees which will satisfy both parties. You should consider that in any of the plans you develop.

D. Folsom: Our perspective is not to have this be a win or lose situation. We aim to have this be a win for us, the state, the community, and our neighbors. I agree it would be reasonable for us to expect to put money toward this future light. I would also agree that there is a fair and equitable number for that and if it is too high it could put this project at risk.

D. Winterton motioned to recommend a consensus vote be taken on the proposal. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers stated that the consensus of the Board is that this is a worthwhile proposal and the Planning Board recommends it to the Town Council.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, should we put a letter together for the Town Council?

J. Duffy: Yes, we can do that.

D. Winterton: September 24 will be the Public Hearing at the Town Council meeting. The Chairman determined to wait for public input until the public hearing so we did not hear from anyone except the people representing GE.

D. Rogers: Thank you for your time tonight. Good luck to you.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING

2. PALMHILL INVESTMENTS, LLC (Plan #14-13)

5 Eastpoint Drive, Map 49, Lot 11-2

Condo conversion to convert the existing 28-bay building(s) and site into a 17-unit condominium. The intent of the plan is to change the form of ownership on the units. No new improvements are proposed.

Joe Wichert: I am here on behalf of Palmhill Investments. The subject lot currently has 4.4 acres. As configured by the current tenants we have 17 units. They front to the south and have a door and windows, and to the north side most of units have garage bay doors. The subject property is serviced by municipal water and on site septic. The septic was rebuilt in 2011 with state and local approval. Palmhill Investments, which is the owner of the property, wishes to convert it to a condominium to sell the individual units. We would have seventeen units should the Board approve the application. We have submitted the legal documents to the town attorney for review. Our attorney sent the documents to me late Friday and we forwarded them to JoAnn and Carolyn this morning. We have made one resubmission to DES in order to obtain our state sub-division approval.

D. Marshall moved to find Palmhill Investments, LLC (Plan #14-13), 5 Eastpoint Drive, Map 49, Lot 11-2, condo conversion to convert the existing 28-bay building(s) and site into a 17-unit condominium, complete. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, is there anything you would like to add?

J. Duffy: No. This is cut and dry, just a change of ownership.

Open public hearing.

Michael Dunican (owner of Map 49, Lot 13 in Hooksett and Map 18, Lot 6 in Auburn): I own the two adjoining lots. I have pictures where they have done modifications over the last couple of years. They have encroached on my property boundary and they are discharging water onto my property that I am taking into my water system that I had to design and put in to prevent toxins from going into the pond located in Auburn. They have debris and garbage which I did not notice because there are trees between us, but when I saw all of the water coming onto our property I went and investigated. I have reported this to the EPA and the Town of Auburn to try to get this corrected. I am asking that you do not approve this because it will give me seventeen companies to go after instead of one. There was a fence from the WWII days when they had the machine gun range. The fence was my boundary and that no longer exists on parts of my property where they bulldozed rocks and debris. I came to the town once to complain and they told me they were understaffed and did not have anyone who could go out and look

at it, so I had my own people clean it up. I also have two other sites that have been dumping tires and other garbage. I asking that you don't pass this until I can get a ruling from the EPA.

F. Kotowski: Are you contemplating litigation against the current owner?

M. Dunican: I am.

D. Rogers: Is there any town input?

J. Duffy: This is the first I have heard of this. We have not received any information from this landowner.

D. Winterton: Can you reference on the site plan where your property is located.

M. Dunican: Yes. Everything being collected is being discharged onto my property. I am a Hooksett taxpayer as well because some of my property is in Hooksett.

Close public hearing.

J. Wichert: I was talking to Traci Palmeri who is one of the principles of Palmhill Investments. We hadn't heard anything about this either. We are asking for a simple conversion as far as ownership. I believe the statute allows for that. Should there be a complaint that an abutter feels is justified, although there will be 17 parties it is one Association. There is a legal document that we will provide for that and we can go from there. Had we known beforehand, we would have had a more prepared response, but we were not aware of the complaint, and we would like to not have this project delayed on a complaint we just heard.

D. Rogers: Is the Association already in place?

J. Wichert: No. The Association can't be in place until this were to be approved and we record the condominium documents. Your town attorney has reviewed the condominium documents, and I believe, short of 3 or 4 minor comments, felt the documents were fine.

D. Marshall: Right now the 28-bay buildings are all in one ownership?

J. Wichert: Yes. They exist and they were built with site plan approval.

D. Marshall: So we, as a Board, are getting thrown into the middle of a controversy; prolonging things if we say you can go ahead and form this Association and if we take no action it impels the current owners to resolve the issues before we make a decision.

J. Wichert: We don't know what the complaints are. If we are going to address it we are going to address it. Should the Board approve it, you could approve it conditional to and we could try to resolve the complaint or do what the Board decides. We have a site that received state approval on the sub-division, there is a site plan approval on an existing site, and we haven't heard anything about this. The

building has been there since 1998. I don't believe there has been any substantive change to the property in over 10 years.

M. Dunican: That is incorrect.

D. Marshall: How long will this take to resolve?

J. Wichert: Without knowing what the complaint is it is hard for me to say.

D. Marshall motioned to table any decision on Palmhill Investments, LLC (Plan #14-13), 5 Eastpoint Drive, Map 49, Lot 11-2, condo conversion to convert the existing 28-bay building(s) and site into a 17-unit condominium, until the October 6 Planning Board meeting. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

WAIVER REQUESTS

**3. GARY HARGIS (Plan #14-15) – APPLICATION WITHDRAWN
1160 Hooksett Rd, Map 39, Lot 36**

- **Waiver Request** From Other Ordinances (06/12) requirement for site plan for tattoo studio. Ordinance #OO-19, Section 2-1, B.

**4. COLORFUL APPLES LEARNING CENTER (Plan #14-14)
149 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, Lot 19**

- **Waiver Request** from site plan requirement to operate a day care center in a multi-family home located in the Commercial Zone.

D. Rogers and F. Kotowski stepped down.

Nicole Darwish (Applicant): We are currently working at 1249 Hooksett Road. We are looking to expand our business from 38 to between 50-56 children and families. We were told we would need to come to this meeting due to lighting and parking. We will need to add one employee. There is lighting located at every entrance and exit and a flood light on top of the garage. It is hard to tell how many families will be in the parking lot at once. Currently, we have approximately five families dropping off or picking up at one. Our drop off time is 7am-9am and pick up is 2:30pm-6pm. There is never an influx of people coming and going at once. I had the DOT come by and we need to apply for a driveway permit which we were granted. The parking at 149 Londonderry Turnpike is comparable to our 1249 Hooksett Road. We will move with our current families and expand.

D. Marshall: Have they seen a copy of the letter from Kelly Kelly?

J. Duffy: No and I have not seen the driveway permit.

D. Marshall: Who are your abutters?

Nicole Darwish: Our neighbor is Tic Tac Tots and a residence.

T. Walsh: Is this the Dubois old home?

Nicole Darwish: Yes.

J. Duffy: They came initially to do a Change-of-Use, and we realized this was a four family home and had never been used as a business so it did not qualify. We recommended they go to the Planning Board. They are here to ask for a waiver of the site plan review. I went to the site with Carolyn. The plan that was submitted as part of this application shows a sketch of how they would enter. They are showing two-way traffic but it is very narrow. The pavement was not in the greatest shape. It appears on the plan they are showing some additional staff parking that looks as if that is currently woods. I think part of what they are showing as pavement is additional pavement, which normally would require a drainage study.

Nicole Darwish: We are not adding anything. There is paving currently there.

J. Duffy: The abutter, Tic Tac Tots, sent an email.

Nicole Darwish: We called and introduced ourselves as the potential neighbor, and she said “best of luck,” so I am surprised by the letter.

J. Duffy: Her two biggest concerns are the traffic during pick-up and drop-off with the two sites next to each other, and where their sign would be located which might block vision even more. With the site down so low, I am not sure how coming in and out of the driveway would work out.

D. Winterton: I went to the site today and drove through the property. My concern also is the driveway. There is a barrel half way up the hill for sand or salt in the winter. That tells me historically that driveway has been a problem for people. For safety, I want to make sure our staff in Hooksett who is expert in that says that driveway is safe. I think you have a perfect spot for a daycare center, but my concern is the driveway.

Dawn Curtis (Applicant): I have been getting estimates on improving the driveway, the steepness, some frost heaves. I don't know if it will make it less steep but that was one of the things we looked at. Economically, we would like to start with improving the top section, and if we have the funds down the road finish it off, but it is a large parking lot.

D. Winterton: I appreciate your efforts to bring a larger business to Hooksett, but we are not the Economic Development Committee we are the Planning Board.

T. Walsh: In all fairness, I am not sure how much the driveway was maintained during storms, but the barrel could have been there for emergencies.

D. Marshall: Our decision tonight is whether to require a full site plan for the proposed use for that property. I am assuming you all read the memorandum, most of which centers around the traffic. The issue of the number of day cares in the immediate area is not relevant to the Board because that is what competition is about, but there are concerns about the traffic and the driveway. I assume you have to be

state approved? Is your water supply adequate?

D. Curtis: We worked with the EPA and they said the well is fine.

P. Scarpetti: Have you looked into the leach field to see if that would be in capacity for the day care? How many children have you listed to be at that site?

N. Darwish: We won't know exactly until licensing comes in to measure the space. I estimate between 50-56.

P. Scarpetti: Who checked the leach field that was certified for that?

N. Darwish: We had two inspectors.

P. Scarpetti: That is fine. I am just asking so you don't go through all of this and find out you have to put in a very expensive leach field also.

D. Curtis: We wanted to check the well and septic to make sure if it could accommodate the families, and that has been okay'd. This is now our hurdle.

T. Walsh: Does the state look at things such as the driveway?

D. Curtis: I don't believe so. We had to do such things per state licensing such as a pathway in the front of our driveway for walking so that it is roped off for the children and things for the fire alarm and sprinkler system.

Stephen Hicks (16 Joanne Drive): We abut directly behind and have seen the things you have spoken about and the reason for the sand.

Sabrina Hicks (16 Joanne Drive): There are people who cannot get up that driveway. We abut directly behind it. We can see and hear all activity. We hear all of the sound produced by Tic Tac Tots. With the vehicles coming and going we will see all of that. We were concerned knowing what that area looks like and don't believe that traffic can come and go at the same time and provide for all of that parking that is shown in the site plan. If there are cars parked closest to our property line and where the deck is, we cannot see that vehicles will be able to turn around and drive back out. There will be a back up of traffic. We see headlights shine into the back of the house. The waiver in question would provide that they did not have to provide a formal site plan. That concerns us. A formal site plan might also include the buffer zone and that might make somewhat of a difference as far as the activity this might produce.

Stephen Hicks: We object to issuing a waiver without a formal site plan to include the buffer zone.

Sabrina Hicks: We see the entire back of this house. There is still trash in the woods from the previous homeowner. We are concerned for the value of our property. With there already being noise for the existing preschool, we are very concerned with the noise of this going in there.

Roland Crete (155 Londonderry Turnpike): I have been there 50 years. That building was put up before the building code was adopted, in Hooksett, and there a lot of things that don't meet code. It is a shallow well and picks up a lot of surface water. I am not sure how the septic system was approved. When they had four families we could smell it at our house. As far as the parking lot, when they tore down the old automotive shop that is where all of that went.

P. Scarpetti motioned to require a complete site plan for Colorful Apples Learning Center (Plan #14-14), 149 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, Lot 19. Seconded by T Prasol.

T. Walsh: Does a site plan end this project for you?

Nicole Darwish: I am not sure. What does that mean?

D. Marshall: You would need to hire an engineer, surveyor or both to draw out a complete site plan showing the parking, the location of the buildings, where the well and septic system is. You would have to show where your buffer is between the back of the property on Joanne Drive and the beginning of your parking lot. There needs to be a green buffer. You need a 50' buffer zone from the edge of your parking lot to the back of their property line. That all has to be shown on the plan. Once you have submitted that, the other things we require is you will have to show us that the well has been tested and is adequate and the state has examined your septic and it is adequate for that number of people. Under normal circumstances we would like to know the distribution of traffic but you don't have the clients yet so we won't know how much of it goes north or south bound. That may prove to be an important factor in how traffic operates in and out of that facility. You will have to demonstrate on the site plan that you can move a vehicle in and out of that driveway at the same time. That is what is involved and you will have to make the decision on whether or not you want to proceed. It will be expensive, but it is necessary.

T. Walsh: That is why I asked because of what it involves.

Nicole Darwish: We are not a corporation so I am not sure. We are supposed to close on the property Thursday.

D. Marshall: If you close on it you are at risk.

Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers and F. Kotowski returned.

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy reported:

1. Paradigm Plumbing: 8 Industrial Park Drive, Units 13, Map 29, lot 25-1-13: Proposed expansion of plumbing business into adjacent unit – approval is pending a site visit.

2. Tina McCown/Wicked Franks: 1130 Hooksett Road, Map 41, lot 7: Hotdog cart located at Faulkner's Landscaping – approved.

D. Marshall: Once this is granted, can they continue this year after year?

J. Duffy: Yes. It was approved with no time restriction.

D. Winterton: Is there a definition for a hot dog cart versus a restaurant?

J. Duffy: We have a hawkers and peddlers license which means if someone had a hot dog cart they were moving around, it would require the hawkers and peddlers license. In this case they are staying at Faulkner's so it is a change-of-use to the site plan itself.

3. Musilu Ogunbayo/Kowope Auto Dealership: 1160 Hooksett Road, Map 39, lot 36: Existing use is office space. Proposed use internet car sales – approved. No sales allowed on site.
4. Robert Read: 1558 Hooksett Road, Unit C1, Map 13, lot 47-C1: Existing use office space. Proposed use accounting office. – approved.
5. Kevin Lamontagne/Skin Deep Tribal Tattoo: 11 Kimball Drive, Unit #120, Map 37, lot 13: Existing use Day Care Center. Proposed Use Tattoo Studio. Current business is located at Granite Hill Shops. – approved.
6. Crown Trophy: 1 Alice Avenue, Map 45, lot 141. Proposed use residential rental unit. Proposed storage and assembly. – approved.

BOARD DISCUSSION

D. Rogers: One item to discuss is a letter of support from the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP).

C. Cronin: The Conservation Commission is applying for funds, DOT under the Transportation Alternative Program and they are looking to build new trails on the property they own at the Merrimack Riverfront. They are looking to put in three miles of trails and an elevated boardwalk over wetlands. You have a copy of their letter of interest which is their preliminary submittal for their application. This has the project information and as part of their application they are requesting letters of support from various Boards and organizations that have to do with land use or trails. I believe Town Council is writing a letter, they are asking Kiwanis, and they were wondering if the Planning Board would write a letter of support to state they are in support of this project. It is a great program if they get the funds. It is an 80/20 match. The program will give them 80 percent of the funds and the Conservation Commission with match 20 percent.

D. Marshall: Please define an elevated walkway.

F. Kotowski: Any time you are dealing with designated wetlands and you want to encroach in that area, with special permitting the EPA will allow you to build if you provide the right plans, use the right materials. and assure them you will not destroy wetlands. They would like to give the public an

opportunity to go across wetlands to let people see the ecology there, get onto the island, and get a view up and down the river. If you don't have the elevation, the trails will be restricted to the dry portion and it will keep people away from the river and that is one of our biggest attractions. It is a great project and I would recommend highly that we provide that letter of support.

T. Prasol: We have discussed this a lot at the Parks and Rec. Advisory Board meetings and are fully in support of the project.

D. Marshall motioned to send a letter to the Department of Transportation in support of this project. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: With regard to the Chalifoux issue, would JoAnn or Carolyn please speak to that.

J. Duffy: Back in the 1970's, there was a sub-division approved for Ralph St. Laurent and part of that included a road called Phyllis Drive which was never build and was considered a paper road. In 1995, the Desaulniers came before the Zoning Board and asked for a variance to build a house at the end of Phyllis Drive. They received the variance and building permit and built their house and used Phyllis Drive as their driveway. Another family, the Chalifoux's also had property back there, but their property had no frontage or access. They went to the Zoning Board around 2005. The town attorney, at the time, advised that the first variance should not have been approved because you are not allowed to build a house on a Class 6 road or right-of-way, and if Mr. Chalifoux wanted to build a house he needed to build a road into that property which would give him frontage. Approximately a month ago, we received paperwork that Desaulniers has submitted paperwork to quiet the title because he is claiming ownership of Phyllis Drive. Now Desaulniers and Chalifoux want to do a lot line adjustment. They want to give Mr. Chalifoux an easement to access his property so he can build a home. He still lacks frontage on the road so he hired an attorney and went to the Zoning Board to request a variance. The Zoning Board decided they wanted to get the Planning Boards opinion. We contacted the town attorney and he will be reviewing all of the information and will be speaking with the applicant's attorney and then we will have a meeting. At this point I advised the applicant' attorney we are not doing anything until we get legal advice.

D. Marshall: If you all look at the map, that is a map of what the subdivision was supposed to look like and was approved. Do either of the two lots that are at the corner of Phyllis and Evelyn have a home on them?

J. Duffy: I believe so.

D. Marshall: The next two lots back.

J. Duffy: They have an address of Evelyn.

D. Marshall: That's okay. Do they have homes on them?

J. Duffy: I don't think there is a house on 17 or 18. Across the way is part of the Desaulniers piece.

D. Marshall: The last house that was built was Chalifoux?

J. Duffy: No. He doesn't have a house. The last house that was built was Desaulniers and that was in 1995. Chalifoux has been trying to build for years.

D. Marshall: The sub-division has never been withdrawn. There is a paper street called Phyllis Drive.

J. Duffy: Correct and we told him if wants to build a house he needs to build a street and he will have the frontage for his home. He is saying he doesn't want to do that because Desaulniers did not have to do it. Desaulniers was able to get a variance. At the time, maybe the variance should not have been approved.

D. Marshall: What Desaulniers got was a variance for 50' of frontage. That frontage piece on Evelyn.

J. Duffy: I don't believe it was determined that he even owned Phyllis.

D. Marshall: If you can find the wording of the variance that was given, it is going to involve 50' of something.

J. Duffy: If he claiming that 50' then Chalifoux would have 125'.

D. Marshall: If he claims that and the 50'.

J. Duffy: The problem is paper roads aren't any good until someone builds them.

D. Marshall: That is why I am saying forget the 50' at the end by Chalifoux. It is the 50' on Evelyn that gave him the variance.

J. Duffy: I see.

D. Marshall: Chalifoux should not have been granted.

J. Duffy: It hasn't been.

D. Marshall: It shouldn't be.

J. Duffy: It is before the Zoning Board now and they don't know what to do so they are looking for your advice. I am saying this Board has nothing to do with this.

D. Marshall: It does in the sense it is an approved sub-division.

J. Duffy: The reason the attorney tried to get the Planning Board involved was because if you want to build on a Class 6 road you have to go to Town Council for approval and Planning Board has to comment. He is saying he wants the Planning Board to comment on building on a Class 6 road and I told him he hasn't gotten his variance yet and you can't bypass that and come to the Planning Board and

ask for a recommendation.

D. Marshall: The obvious solution is to build the road.

J. Duffy: He was told that years ago and told us it was too expensive.

D. Rogers: At this point we will take no action on that and we will do so when there is something we need to take action on.

D. Rogers: Marc Miville dropped of postcard notices regarding a community event being held on Friday, November 7 and Saturday, November 8 to get the input of residents on what they would like to see for the future of Hookett. I will leave it up to you to determine if you would like to attend. It is important for planning the future of Hooksett.

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ Approval of Stantec Invoices

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**