

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, December 15, 2014**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:02 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Rogers (Chairman), Dick Marshall (Vice-Chairman), T. Prasol (arrived at 6:06pm), Frank Kotowski, P. Scarpetti, T. Walsh, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Muamer Durakovic and Michael DiBitetto

EXCUSED:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 12/1/14

December 1, 2014 Regular Meeting – T. Walsh *motioned to approve the December 1, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. F. Kotowski and D. Marshall abstained. Motion carried.*

COMPLETENESS

- 1. MERRIMACK RESERVE (plan #13-35)
Edgewater Dr., Map 1, Lots 4, 6, 8 & 9**
Conservation subdivision plan to convert the existing property into a 5-unit condominium.

P. Scarpetti stepped down.

Jennifer McCourt from McCourt Engineering and Paul Scarpetti were in attendance.

D. Rogers: We had a revised plan that was submitted. The one that came in our packets was slightly different. It appears the acreage has been revised downward.

J. Duffy: The first plan that you received, the applicant had produced that as their original submittal. Leo and I looked it over and provided Jen with comments. She addressed those comments and that is why you have an amended plan. The application is complete.

D. Marshall motioned to find Merrimack Reserve (plan #13-35), Edgewater Dr., Map 1, Lots 4, 6, 8 & 9, conservation subdivision plan to convert the existing property into a 5-unit condominium, complete. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: The public hearing will be held on February 2, 2015.

P. Scarpetti returned.

COMMENTS TO ZBA

**2. GE AVIATION (ZBA Case #14-15)
30 Industrial Park Dr., Map 18, Lot 43**

Special Exception is requested from Article 18, Section E.1.(a) and G.2.(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to fill approximately 2,453 square feet of wetlands and impact 17,385 square feet of its associated buffer relative to their proposal to discontinue a portion of Industrial Park Drive and expand GE Aviation Building #2.

Dave Colburn (GE Aviation): We have an opportunity to expand our facility for some long term, 30+ year, growth that we have going on in the aviation business. The leadership team of GE Aviation, out of Cincinnati, OH, has given the local team in Hooksett the opportunity to add 55,000 sq. ft. based on a need to produce advanced technology aviation hardware. We are investing quite a bit for the infrastructure along with the equipment that goes inside this facility. Nick Golon from TF Moran and Ron Breton from GZA are here with me, and are team members of mine that are helping with the site plan process for expansion. This is an exciting opportunity for GE Aviation to keep this work in the Hooksett, New Hampshire area for a very long time.

N. Golon (TF Moran): Relative to the graphic before you, we laid out what our impacts are to the wetland area as well as the wetland buffer. To give an overview to the project, the 55,000 sq. ft. will require partial discontinuance of the north leg of Industrial Park Drive. The area that would be discontinued is about an acre and a half. The area of pavement that would be removed is approximately 20,000 sq. ft. The area of pavement, that is delineated on the plan, is the light gray area that cuts through the building. Where we have that leg terminating at Lehoux Drive, you will see a saw cut that will taper back that slope. At the other end, where we are proposing a cul-de-sac for the purposes of emergency vehicle circulation, as well as access to both the GE loading dock and the former Allied Waste facility, and to make sure there is appropriate truck access. Relative to the impacts, we had the opportunity to do a site walk on Saturday, which was done jointly with the Planning Board and ZBA. We looked at the areas and got a feel for what the areas of buffer consist of. This is the area that is regrown after the installation of Industrial Park Drive as well as the 72" culvert that passes underneath Industrial Park Drive. The majority of the area is a paved surface so when you look through the photo key that we have, we can work our way from the top of the page around. The intent with Photo A is to give you an idea of the order of magnitude of ground cover that is there. There is a 4-6" layer that has organic material. You are able to see the spacing of the trees. There are no low lying scrub type of shrub which would help aid in a buffer area adjacent to a stream. Photo B is the 72" culvert and it's discharge. The discharge for that culvert is taking Petersbrook under Industrial Park Drive, it passes through a wetland through the New Hampshire Business Finance Authority land, and into another culvert underneath Industrial Park Drive on the other end. Relative to the wetland impacts that are being proposed, we have just under 2,500 sq. ft. I think it is important to note what wetlands are being impacted. There are two different types. There is the PF1OE, which is the standard wetland component. The wetlands that are associated with Petersbrook, the actual stream portion, is not being impacted. That was a design constraint and, relative to the environmental evaluation that was done, that was an

area that we should try to avoid it at all costs and we designed around that to make sure there are no impacts to the actual stream. In that specific area where the culvert passes underneath Industrial Park Drive, which is near Letter A on the plan, the black line represents the retaining wall that will be installed for the purposes of this cul-de-sac. There is a fair grade change there that ranges from about 12' to 16'. At the end of that retaining wall it gets into the area of that culvert. We have an area of wetland impact that is about 300 sq. ft. It is a temporary wetland impact. It is transitional space. When a retaining wall this size is constructed, you need to make sure there is room to build it, so we have accounted for a certain area of wetland impact to make sure the wall can be properly constructed. They will probably build a bit of an upslope then work the wall from the bottom up. Giving them 10' to 15' at the bottom should give them an adequate distance. Looping around the corner is the other area of impact which is the larger of the two. It is a low lying area relative to vegetative cover. It is a low lying depression and is the overflow from the brook. Photo C is the outfall from the existing rip rap swale. That is where the storm water is presently coming from; the Industrial Park site. There is a culvert that runs under Industrial Park Drive and discharges in this area. The downstream area has experienced some erosion. Relative to our design, the rip rap falls right in the center of that cul-de-sac and we will have the opportunity to fix it, which will be a benefit. Photo D is looking in the opposite direction of the culvert relative to where Photo A was taken. You can see the steepness of the slope which is going to be replaced by a retaining wall. You can see the order of magnitude of the trees and the lack of an understory relative to this buffer area. Up at the top left corner of the page is where it is more industrialized. The area of impact would be to the right. This is for a regrading effort. In order to accommodate the proposed expansion, we need to bring the grade up at that corner of the building. Currently there is about 5' or 6' of that foundation that is exposed. That will be reduced to about 3'. It also provides us the grading that we need within that cul-de-sac, and provides more manageable of an exit door at that corner of the building. It helps us transition the grades with what we are proposing. That area of buffer is all pavement and/or gravel, presently, and will be put back to that same configuration. Photo F is different view looking at the area of impact. It is primarily a paved area. There a couple of taller trees adjacent to the road. Those would be removed. Photo G shows the low lying area, which is the larger wetland impact, which is just over 2,000 sq. ft. Relative to the application before you, for the special exception, some of the criteria that is important for us to meet is to make sure there are no adverse affects to that wetland. There are some functions and values that are being impacted as a part of this work. Those primarily consist of recharge associated with that wetland and the sediment removal that wetland provides. What we are proposing with our drainage design accomplishes both of these. We will have an underground storm water treatment system underneath that cul-de-sac. That will be taking storm water run-off from the roadway as well as the adjacent roof, recharging it, and providing treatment prior to it being recharged. Being that we are recreating those functions, and the aggregate, with the proposed drainage design, we did not feel there would be any adverse impact to that wetland and that those functions would be maintained, which is the way in which your ordinance was written. We had the opportunity to sit with the Conservation Commission and review the proposal. There is also the mitigation fee component that goes along with this, which I believe the Planning Board should have received a copy of. Being that this area of the buffer was previously impacted, and that there would be no long term impact to the wetlands functions and values, we proposed a fee that was just under \$2,500, which accounts for the wetland area itself and discounts the buffer area being that it is not really providing a strategic benefit. The remainder of the information is located within the application, but we would be happy to answer any questions.

D. Rogers: Thank you. JoAnn, is there anything you would like to say about this.

J. Duffy: They went to the Zoning Board last week, they went on a site walk on Saturday, and they are going back to the Zoning Board next month for final approval. They are just waiting for your comments so they can act on this. They already have comments from the Conservation Committee which were favorable.

T. Walsh: I went on the site walk. 2500 sq. ft. isn't much. I didn't see any major impacts and I think, in a lot of ways, it is an improvement to how they did things in the past.

F. Kotowski: We heard a lot of information in the Sewer Commission to consider approval of a new treatment system they are putting in. The Sewer Commission acted favorably and we don't see any problem. They are going to be feeding us, as opposed what they did in the past. They used to collect processed water, hold it for a length of time, remove any of the metals, and then sent it to us off peak. As it is now, we will be receiving about 20 gallons per hour. It isn't much, but it is a better process than they had before, and we are favorable to that.

N. Golon: Relative to the plan we have outlined, I want to show you one additional area that, through the course of our design, we believe may also end up being impacted. On the plan, in the lower left hand corner there is an existing rip rap swale that comes down to the existing wetland channel. It is an area that is about 148 sq. ft. to 150 sq. ft. As part of our grading and drainage evaluation for the site, we investigated it. We originally believed it to be satisfactory for purposes of our discharge. We may want to replace it. For the purposes of this application, I am not sure if that is something we want to have included because we will be putting it back in the same shape it was found. Relative to disclosure, I would envision it would be incorporated in our final application with the ZBA.

D. Marshall: Can you show me on the aerial photograph the section that will be removed/closed?

N. Golon: The existing driveway is where Allied Waste is, in the back. From the bottom up to that driveway is a little less than 20,000 sq. ft. of pavement. The new driveway will provide better lines of site in all directions and, from a grading prospective, it provides a nicer transitional vertical curve up to the entrance.

D. Marshall motioned that we send a comment to the ZBA that we find no reason the special exception from Article 18, Section E.1.(a) and G2.(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to fill approximately 2,453 square feet of wetlands and impact 17,385 square feet of its associated buffer relative to their proposal to discontinue a portion of Industrial Park Drive and expand GE Aviation Building #2, for GE Aviation (ZBA Case #14-15), 30 Industrial Park Dr., Map 18, Lot 43, should not be granted. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: We will report favorable to the ZBA on your special exception request.

N. Golon: Thank you and I believe we will be back here on January 5 with the full site plan application.

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: We had two change of use applications. 1) Darcy Crisp, who is a Chiropractor, moved from Community Plaza to 11 Kimball Drive, Suite 106. That was approved. That was formerly used by the DOT as a temporary office. 2) 7B Eastpoint Drive was an existing vacant unit. Joe Michelin is going to be using it for auto body repair. That was approved.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

J. Duffy: We received an email from the town of Bow regarding the Summit View sub-division. The applicant has gone back to Bow asking that one of lots, which is currently 11.23 acres, be sub-divided again. There would be two lots plus some remaining open space. They are before the Bow Planning Board and they wanted you to know for informational purposes. It is not land that applies to Hooksett.

D. Rogers: It is on the Bow side so we don't have to review that again?

J. Duffy: Correct.

D. Marshall: When is the tentative date for the release of the report for the Community Profile?

J. Duffy: The committee members got the draft report last week. There were corrections to be made that they are currently working on. I would think probably right after Christmas.

T. Walsh: To refresh my memory on Park Place, they were here a couple of years ago. Was that only conceptual at that point?

J. Duffy: Yes. They don't have approval for anything.

T. Walsh: I remember the magnitude of what they were proposing raised some concern with some of us.

J. Duffy: They are taking those buildings down. They were supposed to have them down by July, and then it was extended to December. They are coming down slowly.

T. Walsh: I noticed they are emptying out the garage.

J. Duffy: Yes, that is coming down as well.

D. Rogers: Is there any time frame on that being completed?

J. Duffy: December 1, 2014 was the deadline.

D. Winterton: I would like to congratulate the members of the Board who received a Chairmanship and Vice-chairmanship in the House.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**