

**Official**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)  
35 Main Street  
Monday, November 3, 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. Prasol, Frank Kotowski, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)**

**ALTERNATES: Muamer Durakovic and Michael DiBitetto**

**EXCUSED: T. Walsh**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 10/20/14**

**October 20, 2014 Regular Meeting – D. Marshall motioned to approve the October 20, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. THE PARKWAY (HEADS POND/MSG)**  
Parkway Easement Elimination

David Campbell (Attorney for Manchester Sand and Gravel): A year ago we talked about this issue which is the parkway easement that has been bisecting and goes through MSG's property. The agreement that MSG signed and that the Planning Board negotiated is that we would deed this easement over to town for public road only. You extended this to December 31 of this year. If you want us to deed it we will deed it. There is a clause in the original negotiated piece that said if you don't do it within 15 years it reverts to MSG for the southern portion. It also says on the southern portion, if it becomes impossible or unfeasible, prior to that, the Planning Board has the ability to extinguish it. It seems to me it is impossible. Before going through the process and then having to have it reversed, I believe that is already not feasible and impossible on the south end and the north end for different reasons. The problem is this takes up a lot of land and there would need to be some kind of controlled access to get out of the property. In doing that, we are taking a big chunk of industrial land and chopping it up for something that will probably not happen. There are properties that have not been acquired and SNHU has obviated the ability to put a parkway through there with all they have done. We can wait and extend it. It is up to you. We will honor the commitments we made, but I want you to consider the fact that it doesn't seem as if this is going to happen. I don't know who would pay for it or if an easement is even there. This would allow us to put a box out there. We had TJX look at this two

years ago. Over the last year we have not had much activity. Two years ago we had people that were at the point of drawing up plans for a big warehouse. I expect that will happen again. The question is do we want to keep an easement to nowhere on the books. It will chop up an industrial land. Without being burdened by an easement, this is one of the largest contiguous parcels in the I-93 corridor from Massachusetts to Concord. The other area that has big industrial land is Exit 3 in Londonderry and that is being taken right now. When that land is developed this will be a prime piece of land. There will be a lot of costs associated with this, including the traffic light. This is a good thing for the town to develop that. An industrial base is needed in Hooksett. We will wait another year, but I don't think in a year things will change. To the north, we have been deeding over large chunks of this land to conservation interests. A lot of land will be going to Bear Paw and a lot of it already has. They have a right of first refusal on some land and they are negotiating pieces of land with us right now. The town park is 200 acres. There is no place for a roadway to go. Not only would it be going through wetlands it would be going through conservation land as well. Years ago, this roadway seemed like a good idea and we always made provisions for it. Now we know what is out here. Heads Pond is there and most of this land will go to the town, conservation interests like Bear Paw, or the purpose of conservation. We know now what the future is and it doesn't entail something that could pay for a divided four lane roadway. That is our opinion, but it is your decision. I think there is a mutual shared interest on the south part because it cannot go through SNHU, we want to sell that remaining land, you need industrial growth, and that will be a prime parcel.

D. Marshall: If all of that industrial land was to be developed, how do you propose to get anything in and out of there?

D. Campbell: It will all have to come out at a light.

D. Marshall: You will have to include an intersection but you also have Rt. 3. After Campbell Hill it turns into two lanes and then continues in two lanes up to the Granite Hill area. Who will eat that?

D. Campbell: Both sides of the road.

D. Marshall: So what you are saying is you are going to eat it?

D. Campbell: Indirectly, yes. You can extend and bring traffic out other ways. Shutting this down makes this more complicated. When we did the retail on this side we looked at the intersection, and that is why the \$5 million number floats around from 2007. Retail can carry a lot more off-site improvements than an industrial building can because they get more money per square foot. From Legends, over the hill, to The Brick House will have to be widened in order to accommodate the traffic.

D. Marshall: Does it have the same lane configuration as the project on the south by McDonalds?

D. Campbell: Exactly. That is what our plan years ago showed. Then you will have to widen and have extra turn lanes.

D. Marshall: You are still dealing with this last man in theory.

D. Campbell: That is why GE is important.

D. Marshall: You are not even coming close. You are looking at least \$5.5 million worth of work on Rt. 3 and this intersection.

D. Campbell: What is the alternative?

D. Marshall: I don't know, but I don't want to shut any doors we have, yet.

D. Campbell: That is your prerogative. I don't see this going anywhere. It can't go through SNHU anymore.

D. Marshall: Of course it can. The right-of-way is still there.

D. Campbell: SNHU has no interest of it going through there.

D. Marshall: I am sure they have no interest in it going there, but the town has an interest.

D. Campbell: I thought there were buildings put up that prohibited this. We still need to generate as much income as we can. We know Rt. 3 fails already.

D. Marshall: If it already fails, any business that comes in has to add the additional lanes so it doesn't go into a level of service F. I am having trouble understanding how you reason with this.

D. Campbell: The parkway configuration, as we agreed to deed over, does it help this whole problem or does it hurt it? I think it hurts it because it takes up more land and makes it harder to develop. You still have to develop the light. One side of the road will never generate enough money to carry the improvements. It will have to come when the retail is done across the way. We had a master plan of up to 300,000 sq. ft. That could generate the kind of money necessary.

D. Marshall: If one more industry came in with the capacity of GE, and there is enough land for it, with the traffic they generate, that business is going to have to pay for \$5 million worth of roadway.

D. Campbell: We will give you the easement. GE may bring in extra businesses and that would be great. I have someone interested who would be a good user and only generates a dozen vehicles per day. If he says he will have 150 employees, what do you do? That is why the GE matter comes back, because they are existing and want to add more traffic. We were the last man standing at the top of Campbell Hill, so we had to pay for the light. That was \$350,000 and we could make the numbers work. That is different than \$5 million. We will have to get a 10-year highway plan and a TIF. There are things that will have to be done to make this happen. When TJX came in, they had a 850,000 sq. ft. footprint. There would not have been able to be a parkway there. However, they generated off peak traffic, similar to Huttig. Could we make something like that work in the town? I will have to say to whoever comes in that there is an easement and let them know I can go to the Planning Board to see if they will take it away. That will probably be enough to discourage most people from coming in to look at this seriously. We are here to discuss if an easement that is probably not feasible is worth keeping on

the books or not.

M. DiBitetto: Is that the optimal location for the easement? Why does it bi-sect the property?

D. Campbell: The engineers say because of the speeds. It is a limited access highway and this is the only place that it works.

M. DiBitetto: It couldn't be run along the lower property line?

D. Campbell: It is wet and there is an embankment. They looked at it in terms of what needed to be done.

F. Kotowski: I think we need a lot more time to look into this and get some feel from the people in town and our Council on what they would like to see done with this. The dream plan was to put in a road. If we are not going to be able to do that, we need to look at the best use of that property. I am not sure we know what that is tonight. I would love to see you bring in a large warehouse, but that still raises the question of who will pay for the improvements that will have to be done on Rt. 3. If you sold that to four different groups, would those four groups be providing us with development fees to help do some of that work up front?

D. Campbell: We had told the Planning Board that, at a minimum, we would do \$1 per sq. ft. and that is not enough. It has to be looked at in terms of what they generate in traffic, not just in terms of square footage. That was a minimum amount that MSG said they would pledge to do. The biggest reason that this is not feasible, beyond the town issues, is there is no money to build it and no economic engine to drive it. There is no money in the town or the state to build it and nobody will be able to buy that land, forget about the intersection, and build a \$10-\$12 million parkway. We have bigger issues beyond this easement, such as how to pay for it, and we will be glad to enter into discussion on how it should be done and paid for so we can sell this land to somebody.

D. Marshall: I find it interesting to say there is no money to build this, there is no money to build Rt. 3 either, which should come first. The only reason you have the project between Dunkin Donuts and McDonald's is there was a special account set up in the last highway act that was passed by Congress. In this case, even if you collected \$2 million in impact fees, there is still \$3 million outstanding. You can't go to the 10-year program, because you will be put in year 25 because of all the projects that are knocked out of the 10-year program and are put in year 11-20.

D. Campbell: I agree. Whether you decide to extinguish it or keep it, I think we need a game plan for how we are going to develop that industrial land. Whether we have to put a TIF together and how we are going to properly assess people coming in. If we just react to things as they come in, in the end we will we have this chunk of land that no can afford to develop.

F. Kotowski: Am I correct in thinking there is an issue with Lot 57, or something with a conservation right-of-way?

D. Campbell: That has nothing to do with this.

F. Kotowski: Are you going to talk about that at all?

D. Campbell: I found out about that on Thursday. It is part of the Carriage Hill sub-division and I don't think we can deed it out. If we legally can do it we would do a 50' right-of-way. It has to be researched more and I am not prepared to talk about it tonight.

J. Duffy: Going back to the parkway, years ago the study of the southern leg of the parkway to determine whether it was feasible was put in CIP. The initial price was roughly \$150,000. So far, \$60,792 has been collected and is sitting in escrow funds. For the remaining funds, every time we would make a request to the CIP it would get pushed out. Currently, for this year and the out years, there is nothing. There is no longer a place holder. I spoke with Dr. Shankle about this the other day, and he didn't seem to have any big concerns about eliminating the parkway that he shared. He just wanted to know, one way or another, which way it was going. They don't even know if it is feasible for the southern end. There still is that right-of-way going through SNHU's property, however, it is getting closer to where the new buildings are being built. They have changed president's over the years and have changed their mind as they have gone along. I spoke with Jeff Kevan and they are not in favor of the parkway any longer. The northern half of that area is known for some environmental concerns. I don't know if anyone thought that would be built out when this agreement was put in place. It was known that was a sensitive area of the town. When the parkway was first proposed years ago, Rt. 3 was having some traffic issues, however, for the immediate future those issues have been rectified. The other problem is, once you put in a by-pass, the robust retail development that had occurred on Rt. 3 has now moved to the other side of the river. Some of the businesses along Rt. 3 are struggling. If you take traffic away from that area it could hurt them, so I am not sure how much those businesses would be in favor of this. That is my opinion on the by-pass. As far as the other issue, Steve and I spoke last week about the possibility of MSG granting either a slice of Lot 75 which abuts Carriage Hill and is part of the open space for the Carriage Hill development, or possibly granting a right-of-way, because a trail runs through that property. Steve can speak more about the location of it. I have looked through the documents and believe the right-of-way can be transferred to the town if it is done prior to the homeowners association in Carriage Hill being established which has not occurred yet. However, Dave said he wants to do that quickly because winter is coming and MSG has been footing the bill for the expenses up there.

D. Campbell: The street has been accepted by the town so that has been turned over.

J. Duffy: Okay. You were having to plow the roads and pay for that.

D. Campbell: Yes. I need to look at this carefully. We haven't set up a homeowners association because we were waiting to get the town road approved and it is now accepted. In the meantime, we need to look at that, because it is not part of MSG, it is now part of Carriage Hill. I think there is a sub-division plat that has been sub-divided. My assurance is, legally, there is a way for us to do it, it is just a matter of if it can be done because homeowners have rights.

**Open public hearing.**

Steve Couture (6 Pleasant Street, Hooksett): This has been an issue we have been aware of for quite some time. If you have been along Heads Pond Trail, where you cut through University Heights, a sliver of that trail is part of the open space for Carriage Hill. Always recognize that as an issue. If legally we are allowed to have a contiguous connector, we would have the right-of-way to go from Heads Pond Trail to the University Heights conservation property which the town has control over. We would like to take care of that issue so we have that legal connection.

D. Campbell: The plat has been recorded for 10 years. Carriage Hill has a plat, however, there is language that says we can change the declaration which probably means we could allow for easements. I don't think think we could deed the fee over, but we probably could give you a permanent conservation easement. I think that is doable, but I am not prepared to talk about it and make commitments because I have not researched it.

D. Rogers: I don't think tonight's discussion is about commitments. This is for discussion.

D. Campbell: We have good relations with the Conservation Commission.

### **Close public hearing.**

D. Campbell: How do you want to proceed on this issue? I wanted to raise this so we have some time to talk about it. Let me know what you want to do through JoAnn. This is the beginning of the conversation that we need to have over the next two months.

D. Rogers: We will discuss this. We can take a consensus vote, but I think it may need to get back on the agenda in the next two months, or so.

### **EXTENSION REQUEST**

#### **2. PRO CON (Plan #13-27)**

##### **1359 Hooksett Rd, Map 19, Lot 2**

Amended Site Plan to reconfigure access and add parking. Conditional approval is valid through October 7, 2014. Applicant is requesting a 1 (one) year extension per the following:

- **Extension Request**—Development Regulations (06/04/2012) section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions.

### ***T. Prasol stepped down***

Kirk Dickison (Property Manager for Pro Con, Inc.): I am here for a one-year extension.

D. Rogers: What is the reason behind the request for the extension?

Kirk Dickison: We are doing some renovations on the interior of the building and had some setbacks that we did not encounter. That pushed the project off. The slab was off by 4" from front to back. Pro Con made the decision to tear up the slab which was 9,500 sq. ft. There was a delay in the curtain rod delivery so we did not attack the exterior work, and thought it would be best to wait for warmer weather.

D. Rogers: You anticipate those set-backs would be resolved and another year will be sufficient?

Kirk Dickison: Yes. The renovations are just about complete. The only thing that hasn't been touched is the additional site plan. We figure by next spring we will start on that.

***D. Marshall motioned to grant a 1 (one) year extension per Development Regulations (06/04/2012) section 10.03, 2), Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions for Pro Con (Plan #13-27), 1359 Hooksett Rd, Map 19, Lot 2, amended site plan to reconfigure access and add parking. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.***

***T. Prasol returned.***

### **WAIVER REQUEST**

#### **3. DEBRA MCCURDY (Plan #14-18)**

**45 Londonderry Tpke., Map 49, Lot 7**

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

***This item has been continued until November 17.***

### **COMMENTS TO ZBA**

#### **4. GILLES & CLAUDETTE CHALIFOUX (ZBA Case #14-09)**

**6 Phyllis Drive, Map 20, Lot 18**

Variance is requested from Article 5, Section C, Article 26, Section B.2.a and Article 3, Section J of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a single family house to be built without further improvements to Phyllis Drive

J. Duffy: This is not a Planning Decision but the ZBA would like to get your opinion.

Andy Sullivan (attorney for the Chalifoux's): I brought a variance request to allow this to be a building lot. After meeting with Town Council, they said we don't need it and it is considered to be a building lot by the Town of Hooksett. Phyllis Lane is undergoing a quiet title action by the Desaulniers. No one else has an interest in that and the Chalifoux's already consented to that. In addition to the variance to have the Chalifoux lot be a building lot, they also requested a variance to allow a lot line adjustment. They want to swap land. Virtually it is close to the same square footage. This will make the Chalifoux lot deep and able to utilize it's full rear yard. It also assures there will be no improvement closer to the Desaulniers lot. To the northwest corner, there is a detached garage that is close to the corner of the Chalifoux lot. Both parties want to do the lot line adjustment. It gives more distance and makes the Chalifoux lot a better lot. They need a variance because this would change a non-conforming, grandfathered lot.

John Roy (Attorney for Mario and Penny Desaulniers): This swap would enable my clients to have greater privacy and increase the area they could use around their home and garage. This would benefit not only both parties, but the town, because it squares off both of those lots.

D. Rogers: Does your client's driveway come off of the end of Phyllis?

J. Roy: Yes. Off of Evelyn.

D. Marshall: In reality isn't this a driveway, not a road.

J. Roy: Yes.

D. Marshall: You are asking to use the driveway for the frontage for the lot?

A. Sullivan: Yes. I brought a variance. Town Council and staff has concluded this is a grandfathered lot and non-conforming. That is why we need a variance to adjust it. Right now, it is a dedicated way on a recorded sub-division plat. It is questionable as to who owns it. The Desaulniers brought a quiet title action to gain title to the fee, reserving out to the Chalifoux's the right to use it, and there is a maintenance agreement between the two parties.

D. Rogers: Who maintains it now?

A. Sullivan: The Desaulniers. They are the only ones who use it right now.

D. Marshall: My signature is on the plan back in 1972. At that time, the Board had every expectation that Phyllis Drive would be brought up to a town road standard and it doesn't come close. Phyllis Drive is a paper street and is not a duly approved road.

J. Duffy: In 1995, Desaulniers came into ZBA and received a variance to build a house on Phyllis Drive. Since then, Mr. Chalifoux has been back and forth into our office trying to get approval to build a house on his lot. When Bart Mayer, from Upton and Hatfield, was the attorney for the town, he said you can't build on that road unless you bring it up to town standards. That is what they were told when they came in again and is why they applied for these variances. That lot is a non-conforming, grandfathered lot. The reason they now need the variance is they want to change the configuration. Once you touch any of the lines on a non-conforming lot it no longer is grandfathered. That is why they need the variance.

D. Marshall: I would think if anything was done, a condition of the variance would be that Phyllis Drive would become a duly appointed town road. Pave it.

J. Duffy: That was our initial reaction, but our attorney says otherwise.

D. Marshall: Who is now the town attorney?

J. Duffy: The firm is Hage Hodes and the attorney is Dan Crean.

J. Roy: Up until now, it has been the sole responsibility of my client to maintain that road. There is an agreement with the Chalifoux's that the obligation would be shared and it is expected that it would be



improved. Not to town road standards, but the property was never conveyed to the town. It is owned by my clients.

D. Marshall: I don't disagree that it is owned by your client. Should Desaulniers choose to sub-divide that property, he will make Phyllis Drive a duly approved town road.

J. Roy: Correct, but there is no intention to do that.

D. Marshall: Desaulniers currently owns the property. We don't know what will happen in the future.

J. Roy: My understanding is the building permit granted to my clients limits that property forever to one building lot.

D. Marshall: Under today's regulations, that road can be extended and he could probably get four house lots in there.

J. Roy: There is a lot of wet area there so it is not highly desirable for sub-division.

J. Duffy: The only reason they are here is to get your opinion on if you have any issues with changing a grandfathered lot to a different configuration. Only that subject.

D. Marshall: The subject would be if this is a change in the sub-division plan. That isn't even a question of a variance.

J. Duffy: If they get the variance, they would come back for a lot line adjustment.

D. Marshall: If we are told they don't need a variance, we don't need to send an opinion.

J. Duffy: They need a variance for this issue. They don't need one for the other issue.

J. Roy: Part of the land owned by the Desaulniers would become part of the Chalifoux lot and part of the area owned by the Chalifoux's would become part of Desaulniers lot.

D. Marshall: I understand the trade, but the question is what is the variance. Are they making a non-conforming lot more non-conforming?

J. Duffy: No. They are changing the bounds of a non-conforming lot. Our ordinance says you can't make any changes at all.

D. Rogers: Otherwise the grandfathering element is extinguished.

J. Duffy: Correct.

P. Scarpetti: What is the width of the front of the lot that you are proposing on Phyllis Drive now?

J. Roy: It is 300 now and it would become 200.

D. Rogers: We are just providing comment to the ZBA, correct?

J. Duffy: Yes.

***D. Marshall motioned that the Planning Board recommend to the ZBA to grant the variance with the condition that any other further modification to the original sub-division plan involved with Phyllis Drive, beyond this, would require Phyllis Drive to be laid out as a duly laid out town road. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.***

Penny Desaulniers (3A Evelyn Street) The Goldner lot was another lot on the sub-division plan. Is that now a buildable lot as well?

D. Rogers: No. We are not dealing with that lot tonight and is not affected by our decision tonight. If they want something on that lot they will need to come before us.

J. Roy: Does that mean her address changes.

J. Duffy: You would have to talk to the building department about the addresses for 911 purposes.

D. Rogers: The post office is also involved with redesignating addresses.

### **CHANGE OF USE**

J. Duffy: Paul Mitchell of Northern New England is currently located in the plaza where Giovanni's Pizza is. They have run out of space so they are going to be leasing a space in the MTS building on Cross Road. MTS will still be a tenant. Paul Mitchell will have the front portion and there will be another tenant in the rear by the warehouse section. Based on our research, I understand that Dick Anagnost has purchased the mortgage on that property. I have been told that he is going to be purchasing it in the future, but I don't have any direct knowledge of that as far as the records. Currently it is still owned by the same people who own MTS.

D. Rogers: Wasn't there a bankruptcy involved with that?

J. Duffy: There was a bankruptcy. It went up for auction and then the owner filed for bankruptcy and they stopped the auction. A few other things have happened but somehow Dick Anagnost Company came into the picture and purchased the mortgage.

D. Rogers: They may have purchased it through the bankruptcy court.

J. Duffy: They may have. I am not sure. The records still show it is still under the same ownership.

D. Rogers: Has the walk through with building and fire been scheduled?

J. Duffy: It has been scheduled but I don't know if it has happened yet. They had to come in with further plans that building and fire wanted to see and I don't believe that has been completed yet.

D. Winterton: How many retailers will there be, or are they all warehouse?

J. Duffy: Paul Mitchell is retail wholesale. I don't know if MTS has much walk in business. I think it is more wholesale. There is another business that is owned by the Anagnost Corporation and I am not sure about that one because they are not asking about that one.

D. Winterton: The Paul Mitchell company is asking?

J. Duffy: Yes. Paul Mitchell came in and gave a presentation. Both Dick Anagnost and MTS signed off so they both know about it.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

D. Rogers: Do we want to talk about the easement Attorney Campbell presented?

D. Winterton: It is apparent that we we are not going to have a road built. I would hesitate to be in the way of major development that might be an advantage to the town. Clearly any developer that would come in would have to consider and come before this Board in terms of traffic hitting DW highway. I would hope we could get ourselves out of the way of a road that is never going to be built and the best way we could do that to protect the town is what I would be in favor of.

F. Kotowski: I concur with Mr. Winterton. When you look at the overall picture of the future, the more industrial/commercial development that we can get in this town the better off we will be. When they come before this Board, the traffic issues will be considered. After talking with people from SNHU, they are no longer interested in a road of any kind. Why would we, as a town, turn our backs on development that could occur if a large enough piece of land existed.

P. Scarpetti: I agree, but as far as money to pay for the improvements on the road, GE is paying \$50,000 a year currently for the police to be there. I think we need to work on how to get money. If they put \$50,000 towards a loan, what does that equal in dollars. I am sure they would rather be locked into something right now where they pay \$50,000 per year, than 10 years from now they may be paying \$80,000 per year to have police there and it is still a band-aid. I think we need to come up with a plan. Maybe it is a good idea to do something like we did at Exit 10. It would be good to have a plan so if he does come in with a big box they know how much they have to pay instead of the \$1 per square foot, because it will never get to where it needs to be. That might be more important to do than extend the roadway out because they are going to want to come out onto Rt. 3.

F. Kotowski: I hear what you are saying and agree. Some years ago when Council did Exit 10 that opened up what we see there now. I think Council ought to be talking about those pieces of land in this community that could be turned into construction ready zones, and that would be one of them.

M. DiBitto: Back when we set up that fund to do the feasibility on the extension on the roadway it

became clear the town wasn't behind that parkway. The consensus seemed to be that we should marshal our forces and invest in the Rt. 3 upgrades, and create a thoroughfare there that could handle the load. Our master plan still calls for that. We are going into a new master plan revision. Before we commit to anything, we ought to air this through the master plan process, either up or down on the by-pass, and commit to a course going forward. I think we need another year before we commit to eliminating that and get to air it out with Council and the planning process. It is a line on paper that goes back 30 years. It was well conceived, but it doesn't seem the resources are available to implement it. I think we out to extend the date for transfer for another year, during with time we hold some workshops and address this matter, and come up with a new plan or decide to double down on the old plan.

D. Marshall: I agree with Mike, hold off for another year, and use that year to have some group discussions. I think the Board needs to look carefully at Rt. 3, because there are key decisions that are going to have to be made on certain properties. If Pork Chop Hill, across from Cinemagic, develops, whoever wants to do that will get stuck with the improvement from Mammoth to the job that is being completed by McDonald's. Rt. 3 is at capacity now, so anything that comes in is going to require additional lanes. Dave Campbell keeps referring to the traffic light. The traffic light is critical, but it is everything else associated with it, north and south that needs to be taken care of. The Brox property comes out to a set of traffic lights. When we talk industry we are talking trucks. Originally, when the master plan for the entire region was done by SNHPC, it called for having four lanes on Rt. 3, from the Manchester line to the Allentown line. We are beginning to see that is what will probably have to be done in the future. We can't let it get segmented. When you start adding things together the impact is severe. To develop a plan for what we are going to do is critical.

D. Roger: JoAnn, does that help you in your conversations?

J. Duffy: Yes. I think he has been trying to market that property and has having problems with it. I think he is figuring that the by-pass in the center of the property is something no one will bother to even look at, and that is why he wanted to get this removed as soon as possible. You are saying a year, but it may not take a year to figure out the best way to go with this.

D. Rogers: Our extensions are one year in duration, but we may be able to resolve it sooner.

J. Duffy: The master plan efforts won't start up until sometime next year. The first part it is the Community Profile which is happening next weekend.

P. Scarpetti: Even if you do eliminate the road, if they can't get in and out of there why would they want to buy the land. The road that goes through SNHU, I believe, will connect to the road they are building now so all of the trucks would go through there. How close is that to the buildings now and how much push back will you get from them?

D. Marshall: In the past when we discussed this with SNHU, we kept warning them they can't keep pushing this issue. Now North River Road acts as SNHU's main road. That will always be a town road and something that separates that campus. If they had moved everything over to one side or the other it would not have been a problem. Sooner than we probably anticipated, that road that they are building will be open onto Bicentennial.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*D. Marshall motioned to adjourn. Seconded by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried unanimously.***

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:11 pm.**

**Respectfully submitted by,**

**AnnMarie White  
Recording Clerk**