

**Official**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)  
35 Main Street  
Monday, December 1, 2014**

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

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

**PRESENT: D. Rogers (Chairman), P. Scarpetti, T. Walsh, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)**

**ALTERNATES: Muamer Durakovic and Michael DiBitetto**

**EXCUSED: Dick Marshall (Vice-Chairman), T. Prasol, and Frank Kotowski,**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 11/17/14**

**November 17, 2014 Regular Meeting – T. Walsh motioned to approve the November 17, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.**

**DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON CIP PLAN FY 2015-2016**

**1. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)**

CIP Plan review by Planning Board.

D. Shankle: As part of the chart, there are two packets. One is titled Capital Improvement Plan and the other is titled Long-term Budgetary Plan. We organized it so that the things on the CIP are things that relate to issues that would be of interest to the Planning Board. The things we tried to put in the CIP, are things that would logically be issues the Planning Board would be dealing with and are reflected in the Master Plan. We would like to have a discussion of any of the things on the chart that you think are bad or good ideas, how we funded them, and your thoughts on their importance, and I will take those into consideration. The Town Charter says it is the responsibility of the Town Administrator, after consulting with the Planning Board, to come up with a CIP and give it to the Town Council. This is the consultation part of that. I would like to start at the top of the chart and work down.

D. Rogers: That is fine.

D. Shankle: 1) Feasibility Study for the Southern Leg of the Parkway. I understand you had a discussion about the possibility of pulling this off of here. We have money in a trust fund for it. If the discussion is made to pull it off all together, we should pull that money out of the trust fund and put it in a general fund. I am not recommending we do that this year, and I don't think you are either. Is

waiting where you view yourselves at this point?

D. Rogers: Yes. Part of that came up with the General Electric expansion and when Attorney Campbell was here he spoke from the Manchester Sand and Gravel standpoint of that. I think they are coming back to revisit that. There was some discussion on the feasibility of if the land is even available. It seems to be very different from when this was first considered 20 years ago. I think it would be best to leave it in the trust fund for now, and perhaps transfer it down the road, if it comes to that.

D. Shankle: 2) Fire Station #3 at Exit 10. The Fire Department is looking to do something with that sooner rather than later. I put it in as a future consideration because, at this point, I don't think there are any real numbers to put in there and whether something would be done in conjunction with Manchester or by ourselves. I am not sure if there is consensus on this Board. There is not consensus on the Town Council and the survey of public showed this was not a high priority. It might be something that can be done as we continue to develop that area. There has been a discussion of the Town Council. They have a committee and one of the first things they are going to do is look at the structure of the Fire Department, how it is working, and efficiency. At this point, unless you think this is more urgent, I would like to leave it as a future potential project.

M. DiBitetto: Is that item in the impact fee analysis? Is there a 3<sup>rd</sup> station as part of the fire and safety impact fee schedule?

D. Shankle: To the best of my knowledge, there has not been any money allocated to the 3<sup>rd</sup> fire station at this point. I think they have used that to buy equipment for the present station and for the fire trucks.

M. DiBitetto: There was in the growth plans that was the basis of the funding of safety. I know we had a study done for schools and I believe for transport as well.

J. Duffy: There was a plan when the impact fees were first adopted, and then the fire impact fees were adjusted a few years later. I don't know whether that 3<sup>rd</sup> fire station was included in that report, but I can look it up.

M. DiBitetto: I think we should be cognizant of whether that is part of the growth plan and if the money is allocated for certain capital improvements that would be a big one.

D. Shankle: I don't think anyone sees that in the near future. By future, I am saying we are not planning on doing that within the next 6 years at this moment. Of course, year to year, things could change and get readjusted. 3) Public works: Drainage Upgrade Capital Reserve Fund. Public Works is working through that as projects come up for things such as improving roads and drainage. We continue to put \$50,000 per year in that as an on-going process. There is currently \$151,527 in that capital reserve fund. 4) Parks and Recreation Facilities Development Reserve Fund. There is money in that, but not a lot, so they are saving up to do some projects. At the bottom of the chart, in the last block, which is titled "Off-setting Revenues, that shows other monies that are coming to this for things such as the Petersbrook field expansion. 5) Improvements and Infrastructure of Conservation Land CR. That came up last year and it was turned down by the voters. Due to another big project, the Conservation Commission asked that no money go in to that this year. Twenty-five percent of the town

is in conservation land. At some point, in the future, we are thinking they are going to want to do more with trails. If you are going to have all of this land, it needs to be kept in trust of the people to have access to it, and that is the purpose of that money. We pushed it out presuming that over the next few years they will want to come back to that, and we will work with it. 6) Merrimack River Front Trails. This is a \$1 million project. They are applying for and planning on getting grants and other funding. They are applying for \$944,000. The difference between the \$944,000 and the \$1,043,941 is about \$100,000. That is what they are projecting. They are working on a warrant article for that. I did not recommend that, at this point, because one of the guidelines I was given by the Town Council, in terms of putting together the budget this year, was to not level fund the budget, but to keep level services. I think what they are trying to create would increase the service and it did not meet the guidelines I was given. It is quite a project with walkways going over wetlands. They are also working with the Department of Public Works regarding ongoing maintenance, which will happen with a project like this.

D. Rogers: Is that a project they expect to finish this year?

D. Shankle: If they do it, it will be a one year project. I think Carolyn might have more information on that.

C. Cronin: They applied for two different grants. One from the Department of Transportation and one from the Department of Revenue and Economic Development, which the Planning Board did letters of support for. They will be finding out at the beginning of 2015 if they got those grants. The grants are pending, therefore, work has not started on it, but it would be a short process for construction because they would just be constructing trails and boardwalks.

D. Rogers: Do those grants total \$100,000 to make up the difference?

C. Cronin: I am not sure without looking at it.

D. Rogers: Is there a contingency plan if one, or both, of those don't come through?

C. Cronin: Just the warrant article to make up the difference. I believe the grants were an 80/20 match.

D. Winterton: Is it possible to use conservation money that comes from current use funds?

C. Cronin: I believe they can use conservation funds for that. I don't know how much they have. They also use that to fund the engineering for it, studies, and acquisition of land. That is the basis of their funding so it gets spread thin.

T. Walsh: How do they word a warrant article seeking \$1,043,941 before we know we are getting the \$944,000?

D. Shankle: That is one of the things we are working on. The response of the DRA was that they are working on tax rates now, and to ask them later. We don't know at this point, but it is definitely an issue.

T. Walsh: Say we didn't get either one, we can't be held to the \$1 million. I agree with your recommendation.

D. Shankle: 7) Petersbrook Field Expansion. That is an on-going project. They have a lot of work to do over the next couple of years to get that ready for soccer fields. The Council has already set aside the \$161,374. Over the next few years it is \$428,245. It has already been set aside from impact fees. It has no tax impact and it is adding to fields that we need. 8) Sidewalk: College Park Drive. This is a \$370,649 project. We have a combination of a federal grant through the state and impact fees. The money is set aside. That is one of the projects we were planning on doing this coming year, but because of the work on the main street bridge we do not want to tie up more traffic on College Park Drive any more than it will already be tied up, so we pushed that out a year. 9) Rt. 3A Improvement Project: Hackett Hill Section. That is the same situation. The state has the money and the town has it's portion of the money. The Council gave preliminary approval to putting in a round about, but there is still engineering that needs to be done to come back before there is a final decision. We probably would have stated that and finished it next year, but due to what is happening on Main Street, there is no rush so we are working through it.

P. Scarpetti: Are we paying for the engineering to design that on that, or is the state?

D. Shankle: We are. 10) Rt. 3A Improvement Project: Hourglass Section. This has been pushed out. The 3A improvement project has been broken into two sections. Hackett Hill and this project, and the state won't let us start of that until there has been construction on the other part of the project. At this point the present situation seems to be working well. 11) Sidewalk: Main Street. We do not have any dollar figures on that. One of the things we found, when we went through the survey and the village charettes, is people wanted sidewalks. We see that as something we can do with impact fees when the time comes, but we will also only do it if we can get funds from CMAQ. We will apply for that once we get to the point where we know we can do the work. 12) Lilac (Village) Bridge. We are having a public hearing at the next Council meeting on December 10, on the various possibilities regarding what to do with that bridge. Leaving out the complicated factor of the sewer line that is on it, there is the possibility we could tear the bridge down, with the pylons remaining, or renovate it. It would cost under \$2 million to tear it down, not counting what the sewer relocation would cost, and approximately \$8 million to renovate it. What to do once that is gone gets complicated because we have the sewer line to contend with and the Sewer Commission will have to decide what they want to do with it. One of the things we are looking at is tearing down the bridge, but putting a walking bridge across the pylons that are there that could also be used as a utility bridge. That way they would be able to run gravity feed on on the sewer. If they don't want to spend money on the walking bridge, they could just put a utility bridge across for the sewer line, but then you would have giant pylons with one sewer running across the middle of them. We have gone through the state, they were in a big rush to get this done, but they have a deliberate process we have to go through. We have met with the state and gone over all of these options. There are seven options that we will be talking about at the public hearing. It is on the state historic register, and technically eligible for the federal historic register, so there are a lot of people involved in this. I think, if we say the only option is to tear it down, they will go along with it, but the last time we met they were interested in having a public hearing, and giving the public a chance to speak out, and have the Council make a recommendation back to them based on the public hearing. We

don't have a number there, but we know we need to do something.

T. Walsh: You mentioned two sections. Is it \$2 million to take down the two sections or the whole thing?

D. Shankle: The \$2 million was to take down the whole thing. The original was put up in 1907. It fell down so there were two new sections in 1938. The question is if we want to push 1/3 of this problem out 30 years to someone else, unless we are going to spend a lot of money refurbishing it. The steel is rusting away. The new steel is probably rusting away at the same rate as the old steel. Unless we are going to start putting a considerable amount of money into a capital reserve fund to fix it, keeping one section is a possibility, but we would just be pushing the upkeep down the road. It was mentioned because it would leave some semblance of the old bridge. Those are ideas that will be discussed at the public hearing. 13) Old Town Hall. We do not have a lot of money in there right now. There is an Old Town Hall Committee that has been working with an engineer that is supposed to come up with cost estimates by the end of the month. I think there is a feeling that we should make the old town hall usable. We have been trying to get it to where we can open it. We are trying to do that without spending a lot of money on it. We would be working on the second floor this winter, however, this committee and the Heritage Committee put together a grant for moose plate funds to refurbish the tin ceiling. However, once we got that money, which was \$10,000+, it didn't make sense to take down the second floor, because it would have been more expensive to try and fix it from the first floor. They currently left the second floor for staging for the tin ceiling. There are a couple of other problems in there that need to be taken care of as well, and there is someone who is interested in buying the old elevator. That is being worked on little by little. If the number comes in too big, it may not go anywhere right way, but the staff and DPW are committed to working within the money we have in our budgets. Those are the town requests. The next section is our school district requests. There were more last year, but I met with the School Board a couple months ago and they decided these are the two they are going to focus on in the next couple of years. We didn't get anything back from Sewer, Central Water Precinct, or Village Water Precinct. There are things in the Master Plan on the bridge, on the need for doing something with the Old Town Hall, and doing something with recreational facilities. A lot of this is in the 2004 Master Plan and we are continuing on and trying to keep things going as best we can without hitting people's tax rates too hard.

**Open to public.**

No public comments.

**Close to public.**

T. Walsh: In reference to the infrastructure of the Merrimack River, did I hear that the voters turned down a \$10,000 CIP for conservation lands last last year?

D. Rogers: Yes.

T. Walsh: It seems to me that it would make more sense to make that warrant article match what they get for grants. It would make it easier to pass.

D. Rogers: Also, by sending this to the Town Council they review, discuss, and vote on it ultimately. I

would tend to agree having a warrant article without the full picture available is risky.

***M. DiBitetto motioned to send the CIP to the Town Council for their action, with our approval of the CIP concept, and recommend the line items move forward. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.***

**COMMENTS TO ZBA**

**1. SCARPETTI/EDGEWATER (plan #13-35)**

**Edgewater Dr., Map 1, Lot 4**

- **Special Exception** is requested from Article 18, Section E of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a proposed driveway serving the subdivision which will impact approximately 925 SF of wetlands

***P. Scarpetti stepped down.***

Jennifer McCourt (McCourt Engineering): We have been in front of the ZBA for a special exception for wetland impacts. The total wetland impact is 925 sq. ft. It is for the existing driveway. We are expanding it. When we went to TRC, the Fire Chief recommended the road be at least 18' wide because we are looking to encourage pedestrian traffic. We increased the width of the road to 20' except for the section that goes through the wetlands, which is 18', to minimize the impact. We were also in front of the ZBA for a variance. This project is a conservation subdivision that is 13.6 acres and the requirement is a minimum of 20 acres. We are looking at putting a cul-de-sac at the end of Edgewater and a private driveway up to the the five lots that would be limited common area with wells and septics. The rest of the area will be open space which will be privately maintained for the use of the general public. We tried to minimize wetland impact by using the existing driveway and adding on to the existing culverts that are there. They were put in as concrete pipes so we can just add on, and they were sized properly. There is extremely limited wetland impact.

***The criteria for the Zoning Board of Administration was read into record.***

***P. Scarpetti showed where the open space, tree line, and wooded areas would be.***

D. Rogers: This would add to the tax base.

J. McCourt: Absolutely. It would also minimize the problems and vandalism that has been occurring there. Because we have environmental impacts to deal with, doing the development in the field minimizes the trees that need to be cut down, which helps minimize the environmental impact of this whole development on the river. We went to the Conservation Commission and they sent a favorable recommendation to the Zoning Board. We went on a site walk with the Zoning Board on November 29.

P. Scarpetti: We went to the Town Council and they approved this with the six lots. We voluntarily minimized it to five lots, because we were going to have more of an impact on cutting the trees to the north. We wanted to keep the buffer between the Bow line because they clear cut at the Bow line.

D. Winterton: What was the width of the driveway previously?

P. Scarpetti: It was 18' and we chose to go to 20'.

D. Winterton: Fire recommended it be 18' and you took it to 20'?

P. Scarpetti: Yes.

D. Winterton: This is going to be paved and your original proposal was for 18'. Fire mandated 18' and you took it to 20' outside of the wetlands?

J. McCourt: Yes.

D. Winterton: And there isn't going to be any normal traffic on that road. Automobile traffic is only going to be from the residents and their guests?

P. Scarpetti: Yes. We were a little concerned about the public walking on the property and I thought it would be easier if we went to 20'.

T. Walsh: Has it always been gated?

P. Scarpetti: It has. I have always considered that because it is a private driveway.

T. Walsh: By going up to the 20', that will be for anyone who wants to continue using that as a trail?

P. Scarpetti: Yes.

**Open public hearing.**

No public comments.

**Close public hearing.**

M. DiBietto: This is only to ascertain the wetland impact of this development.

D. Rogers: Yes.

***M. DiBietto moved to recommend the wetland impact of this development as shown. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Rogers: We will send a letter to the Zoning Board of Administration.

***P. Scarpetti returned.***

**WAIVER REQUEST**

**2. PAUL MITCHELL OF NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND  
15 Cross Rd., Map 17, Lot 37-1**

- **Waiver Request** from requirements of site plan to operate warehousing and wholesaling of beauty supplies in a building unit currently allowed for warehousing and retail of golf cars.

Keri Sullivan (209 West River Rd.): We would like a waiver because we are not making any changes to the footprint of the building, parking lot, or any access to the building.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, this came up with the Change of Use, correct.

J. Duffy: Yes. Mr. Sullivan came to the Change of Use Committee where he received approval. We thought he should also come to the Planning Board because the site plan for the golf cart business specifically says “for a golf cart business.” Now that the business has changed over, where CB Sullivan is going in there and Mr. Anagnost is also involved and may have a business going there at some point, we thought it was best to have that approval changed from golf cart business to whatever types of businesses are allowed in that district. It looks like he is proposing to have warehousing and retail use for hairdressers only. You have to be licensed to buy from his company. As far as the Anagnost proposal, we have not been privy to that yet, but I understand it may have something to do with freight.

D. Rogers: Would those two businesses take up the entire property?

J. Duffy: The golf cart business will remain in a smaller portion.

D. Rogers: There will be three entities operating out of there?

J. Duffy: Correct.

D. Rogers: Do you have any idea what that will do to the traffic compared to the golf cart business being the exclusive occupant?

J. Duffy: I had concerns in the beginning, but Leo took a look at this. He was part of the decision on the Change of Use, and he did not see any problems.

D. Rogers: What are your hours of operation?

K. Sullivan: Monday through Friday, 8-5 and Saturday, 9- 2.

J. Duffy: Paul Mitchell of Northern New England branched off from CB Sullivan's company. This is Mr. Sullivan's son.

M. DiBietto: I believe the site plan was recently approved.

J. Duffy: It was approved in 2007.

M. DiBietto: Are the parking requirements consistent with the new uses?



J. Duffy: We asked him to stripe the parking lot as part of the Change of Use approval. I am not sure if it has been done yet.

*T. Walsh motioned to grant the waiver request, for Paul Mitchell of Northern New England, 15 Cross Rd., Map 17, Lot 37-1, from requirements of site plan to operate warehousing and wholesaling of beauty supplies in a building unit currently allowed for warehousing and retail of golf cars . Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

### **CHANGE OF USE**

J. Duffy: 1) USA Ninja challenge. They are planning to go into the Giovanni Plaza building that is currently the unit that Paul Mitchell is in. They want to put in a children's fitness center. That was approved with conditions. Based on the Fire and Building Department's reviews they had to do modifications to the floor plan. It is not officially finalized but they are working on it. 2) Onyx Preowned, which is an auto sales business, is going into the old Goulet auto sales site on the south end of Hooksett Rd. That was approved with conditions. 3) Hooka Cigar Lounge. They are going in at 1461 Hooksett Rd., which is the Granite Hill Shops where the tattoo parlor had been. They were approved with conditions. The Police and Fire had some issues with the layout. If they get approved by the state they will also be serving liquor.

D. Rogers: Being approved with conditions, do they have to reappear before the Change of Use Board?

J. Duffy: No. The Police and Fire have to sign off on it. It is mainly having to do with the interior, layout, and sprinklers. Once the conditions have been met, they will get their approval.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

P. Scarpetti: Do we have any restrictions as far as distance between tattoo parlors?

J. Duffy: No. There are no distance requirements. The tattoo ordinance is actually in the other ordinance requirements which is governed by the Town Council. As part of that approval they do have to come before the Planning Board, but there are no distance requirements.

T. Walsh: At one time, we were requiring them to get a site plan.

J. Duffy: They do have to get a site plan. The ones that have been going in lately have been going into existing units so the Board has been waiving that requirement.

T. Walsh: How many do we have now?

J. Duffy: Possibly three.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

➤ **2015 Planning Board Schedule**

J. Duffy: Carolyn put together the meeting schedule for 2015 and we want to make sure you are okay with it.

D. Winterton: From a Town Council point of view, the Council probably should examine when terms are up so that we can be ahead of that.

J. Duffy: They are up at the end of June. I am not sure who they are, but I can check on that.

***D. Winterton moved to approve the meeting schedule as presented. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Rogers: JoAnn, is there any new information on the town engineer?

J. Duffy: You would have to talk to Dr. Shankle. He was handling that. There is nothing to report on my end.

T. Walsh: Did Matt have a chance to look into the clothes dumpsters? I saw someone stop their car on Rt. 3 to get out and put something in there.

J. Duffy: I asked him to take a look at them, and he said they did not have any contact information. I asked him to double check because, if they are going to stay where they are, they need to be pushed back. I told him if they did not have any contact information to find out from the property owner if he can get any information. He was checking into it and I am waiting for an answer.

C. Cronin: JoAnn and I are going to a lecture tomorrow that is open to the public. They encourage Planning Boards and others to go. It is being held at St. Anselm's at 3:00pm and there will be a presentation about "Changing Demographics in New Hampshire; How it Will Affect our State Region. It will be put on by New Hampshire Institute of Politics.

J. Duffy: Muamer has been elected Chairman of the Economic Development Committee.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 pm.**

**Respectfully submitted by,**

**AnnMarie White  
Recording Clerk**