

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, February 23, 2015**

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), and P. Scarpetti.

EXCUSED: F. Kotowski, T. Prasol, T. Walsh, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Michael DiBitetto and Muamer Durakovic.

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner), Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Town Planner), and Leo Lessard (Dept. of Public Works).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 2/18/15

February 18, 2015 Regular Meeting – Minutes to be approved at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

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 (McCourt Engineering Associates): The location of this project is between the end of the Class 5 portion of Edgewater Drive, along the Merrimack River, and the Bow town line. The plan shows how long and skinny the project is. It is a challenging site. It is zoned MDR and has 13.55 acres. That includes the Class 6 portion of Edgewater Drive that we have gone before Town Council to ask them to discontinue, and also give up their rights to Lot 6 which is between the Class 6 portion of Edgewater Drive and the Merrimack River. It amounts to small pieces of peninsula going out into the river. The Scarpetti's own Lot 9 that is at the northern end which also has only small pieces remaining. The lot is about 3,600' from north to south and about 230' wide. It quickly narrows down to about 90' and widens out to over 160'. On the north end, where we are planning on putting the units, there is a large field. The rest of the lot is wooded. The Class 5 portion of Edgewater Drive ends just at the southern end, and there is a gravel hammerhead turn around that Mr. Scarpetti built for the DPW workers to turn around. We are encumbered by the shoreland protection with a 50' waterfront buffer and a 150' woodland buffer. The existing Class 6 portion of Edgewater Drive is within the waterfront

buffer, as well as parts of the existing gravel access to get from the Class 5 portion of Edgewater up to the field area that runs on the Scarpetti's land. There is a 100-year flood plain which, at the narrowest point, comes into the lot and crosses under the two culverts that are in the middle of parcel. On December 9, 2014, the ZBA granted a variance because there are 13.5 acres and the requirement is for 20 acres. We are proposing a 0 lot line and 100' of frontage is required. We are going to provide a cul-de-sac to Hooksett standards which will give us 491.77' of frontage. At the center of the cul-de-sac, we put in eight spaces to provide for the public to park because the Scarpetti's will be allowing pedestrian traffic to use the open space. They are not asking for the Conservation Commission to take over the open space. They are keeping it private and will keep those rights. They will also be providing a picnic area closer to the cul-de-sac. Proposed are five single family homes on the north end. They are served by wells and septic. The northern woodland buffer provides a buffer to the industrial area in Bow. With a conservation sub-division, it allows us to minimize the alteration of terrain. I designed the roadway so all of the road sheets to the west so it can be treated mainly through vegetative buffers before it gets to the wetlands. I put in a drainage ditch between the houses and the river and it goes down into a retention/detention pond that is 2' deep, which also provides for flood mitigation and then overflows into the river where it flows now. It would be constructed within the field area so we will not be cutting any trees. We are only cutting trees to the south end and that is up for discussion. We are working with Fish and Game on the eagles because they have been known to roost in that area by the cul-de-sac. I should have an answer from them whether we need to move that or not. If we don't we will probably be planting some pine trees where the existing road is. If we do we would be shifting the road just where it bubbles over to the cul-de-sac towards the east to avoid the pine trees. Each of the houses will have sprinkler systems, underground utilities from the cul-de-sac to the houses, the houses will be a maximum height of 35', and the minimum lot size is 21,780'. These are 0 lot lines, but I tried to go with the spirit, and the smallest limited common area around each of the units is 25,300 sq. ft. They are 160' wide so that we could contain the well radius on each of the sites. The septic systems would be between the house and driveway access. We will have a gate at the cul-de-sac with pedestrian access through there. When we went to TRC they said they would allow the 18' wide drive access to the houses. We decided that, except where we have the wetland impacts, we would put 20' wide, especially from the cul-de-sac up to the wetland impact, to provide more room for pedestrian access through there. Being that close to the river we did not want to pave it anymore than we had to. The open space requirement is 50% at 6.775 acres. We provided 71.6% at 9.7 acres. It will be private and professionally protect the waterfront buffer. The way the road is designed will help with the erosion on the banks that is caused by the site itself. The wetland impacts are minimized at 925 sq. ft. and we got a special exception for that. Where the existing gravel access drive crosses the wetlands, we are expanding to between 2' and 5' to accommodate the access drive. Each of the units will have two outside parking spaces. Most of the units are proposed to have garages. The minimum separation between them is 60'. Most are more than that and the requirement is 40'. The density allowed is for six homes and we are proposing 5 due to the environmental sensitivity and the way the project was coming together. We had another unit by the cul-de-sac, but the Scarpetti's decided not to go forward with that unit to make a better development.

J. McCourt read the criteria for the special use permit into record.

J. Duffy: Regarding the realignment of the roadway, both Leo and I looked at the new alignment and there is not much of a difference. I was not sure if you could approve the plan tonight and, if Fish and

Game want the trees preserved they would go with this new alignment, and if not they would stay with what they have, or if the applicant has to come back one more time.

D. Rogers: The new alignment would straighten the road?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. Rogers: That does not interfere with the existing pine trees that Fish and Game is concerned about?

J. Duffy: Correct. Right now the roadway goes through that group of pine trees.

J. McCourt: I got an email from Fish and Game late Friday saying not to realign the driveway because they may want us to leave it the way it is and plant pines where the existing driveway is instead. A concern was brought up by the engineers that, even though it has never been shown that light traffic bothers eagles, they may want to have the road farther away from the river and have pines planted in that area so the road doesn't bisect between the pines and the river. I am not sure which way they are going to go, but it is a minor change. I can meet all of the regulations so I would be asking for conditional approval and have both Leo and JoAnn review. It will be dictated by Fish and Game. Right now I have the Wetlands Bureau, Alteration of Terrain, Shoreland, and Sub-Surface Sub-division waiting for Fish and Game to tell me which way to go.

D. Marshall: How long before they make a decision?

J. McCourt: They promised me the beginning of this week. I have to answer the Wetlands Bureau by the 11th.

D. Marshall: The Chairman cannot sign the plans until the conditions are met, if we approve with conditions.

J. McCourt: I understand he cannot sign the plan until this is resolved.

D. Rogers: How tall are the pines that would be potentially removed?

J. McCourt: The diameter is approximately 4' above the ground, and that was measured in the snow.

D. Rogers: How tall is a tree with a 20" diameter?

J. McCourt: Approximately 50' or 60'.

D. Rogers: I assume any pines that would be planted would not be that tall at the outset.

J. McCourt: Correct.

Open public hearing.

No public comments

Close public comments.

D. Marshall motioned that the Chairman approve 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, conditionally, awaiting the decision by Fish and Game as to the location of the proposed roadway.

D. Rogers: Is that the only thing that is outstanding? Is the Town Council okay with everything?

J. McCourt: No. We had to get your approval first and we have to go to the Conservation Commission one last time to get their comments on this. Then we need to go back to the Town Council.

D. Rogers: That will all happen before I would sign anything?

J. McCourt: Correct.

*Seconded by M. Durakovic. **Motion carried unanimously.***

P. Scarpetti returned.

2. GE AVIATION (plan #14-16)

21 & 30 Industrial Park Dr., Map 18, Lot 43 & Map 24, Lot 34

Amended site plan for a 55,000 square foot addition to GE Aviation Plant #2.

➤ **Waiver Request** from the following:

Part I General Development Regulations

11.01 Easements – To provide utility easements as a subsequent condition of approval for utilities relocated as part of the partial discontinuance of Industrial Park Dr.

11.08 Driveways, Entrances & Exits – To allow the DPW Director or designee to approve a driveway to slope towards the road at 2% for the first 10 ft. and then transition to a vertical curve versus 2% for the first 20 ft. as stated in the regulations.

11.09 Legal Documents – To provide easement deeds for the proposed cul-de-sac as a subsequent condition of approval.

11.12.1 Drainage Design Criteria, Rainfall Intensity – To use the NRCC rainfall intensity rates as required by NHDES Alteration of Terrain.

11.12.1 2) (t) Drainage Design Criteria – To allow less than 2 fps minimum velocity during the 2-year storm event for 4 pipes.

11.18 Wetland Buffer Delineation Markers – To provide wetland conservation type markers every 50 ft. on wetland buffers in areas outside the limits of work.

15.01 Parking – To permit a 21-space visitor parking lot without further calculation of additional parking needed.

Part III Site Plan Regulations

3.08 Wetlands – To allow wetland and wetland buffer impacts in accordance with submittals made to the ZBA and pending submittals to NHDES Wetland Bureau.

Dave Colburn (Project Manager at GE Aviation): We are here regarding a project to add 55,000 sq. ft.

of additional manufacturing space to our current Building 2 facility. This expansion is important for GE Aviation due to the fact that it will allow us to continue our employment and manufacturing in the state of New Hampshire and in the town of Hooksett. We are proposing this expansion for us to grow into a new product line that will carry us out 20+ years. It allows us to continue the expertise that the local community has developed in manufacturing these components for GE aircraft engines. I have a team with me that includes N. Golon from TF Moran, Bob Duval, the chief engineer and head traffic engineer from TF Moran, and Ron Breton from GZA.

N. Golon (TF Moran): This process started, as far as Planning Board involvement, this past summer. It has been advanced as various portions of the application have come before you. A large part of this project is the discontinuance of a portion of Industrial Park Drive. The location of the GE Aviation lot is 30 Industrial Park Drive, Tax Map 18, Lot 43. Map 24, Lot 34 is the New Hampshire Business Finance Authority lot, and a portion of this project is on town-owned land which is the discontinuance of a portion of Industrial Park Drive. The gray area on the graphic, that shows cutting through the building, is the existing portion of Industrial Park Drive that would be discontinued. It is about 550 linear feet. This Board acted on that in January relative to the approval of the discontinuance of that road. That evening we had the opportunity to have the site plan deemed complete and now we can expand upon the layout and the project as a whole. The project is an expansion of the existing building by 55,000 sq. ft. They are proposing a 20 space visitor parking lot, which would be the new curb cut for this off of Lehoux Drive which is the extension of Industrial Park Drive. We have accounted for all of the parking that exists there now, which is 242 spaces. We are maintaining that and adding 20 visitor parking spaces. At the terminus of Industrial Park Drive, where we are discontinuing it, there is a redesigned component of the road, which is a cul-de-sac, that has been designed to accommodate emergency vehicles as well as oversized tractor trailers to access the rear of GE's existing building and the adjacent parcel which was formerly the Allied Waste building. We have master planned so there is appropriate access for both those lots as they have an easement for access to the GE land. In order to accommodate that cul-de-sac, we are proposing a retaining wall because there is an adjacent wetland that will be impacted by this project. That retaining wall varies in height from 2' to 20'. The design of the cul-de-sac accommodates turning movements, but also in an effort to limit impacts to the adjacent wetland, that component of the design was taken in as well. That was a 2,453 sq. ft. wetland impact which had been accompanying just under a 20,000 wetland buffer impact. That was the special exception that preciously went through the ZBA and this Board also had the opportunity to rule on that. As far as other impacts in that vicinity, we are also within a portion of the flood plain. There is just over a half an acre of flood plain impact in this area. It is allowed to impact flood plain and was reviewed as part of our Alteration of Terrain permit and deemed to be appropriate given the site circumstances. Prior to starting this project, we had opportunity to meet with town staff to devise what the most appropriate means for treating storm water for this site would be. Being that is an existing lot of record, the majority of the drainage, if not all, that is currently provided on the site, although may be in keeping with the spirit of the regulations, does not meet verbatim. Within our waiver requests there are a couple of items that we are requesting. We are proposing that the roof run-off will be directed to the subsurface chambers for the purposes of treatment. The existing drainage infrastructure will be routed around the building and then discharged to the adjacent wetland. A portion of it will go underneath the building and the remainder will go around the southern-most portion of the building. With the discontinuance of Industrial Park Drive, we also have a few utilities that will require relocation, mainly the water and sewer line and the gas service. We have identified, on the plan, where those easements will be. We have

coordinated with all of the applicable agencies. The Sewer Commission has provided a letter of approval for the design, the Central Hooksett Water Precinct has provided a letter approving the design, and Liberty Utilities, who is the gas provider, has provided a letter stating that service is available, will continue to be available, and is pending their final review. They are looking for what the load of the building is going to be to complete their evaluation. That should be available in the near future once the remainder of the design teams is brought on. As far as the traffic, Bob Duval is here if we need to elaborate on any portions of our traffic impact and access study. We had the opportunity to sit with town staff and the DOT to have a scoping meeting to evaluate what parts of these intersections should best be evaluated. It was agreed to do a full analysis of southern leg and we needed to count the northern leg so we could figure out how many trips would need to be displaced from the northern leg to the southern leg with the portion of Industrial Park Drive that would be closing. All of the people that are closest to Rt. 3, relative to Industrial Park Drive, will continue to access this the way they do now. We are trying to evaluate the people that are further down Lehoux Drive, who may have used that northern leg to make sure that southerly intersection will continue to work the way it is supposed to. As part of the scoping meeting with DOT, we evaluated what those peak hours needed to be. We evaluated both the peak morning and evening hours for the town, as far as your regulations are written, and the peak generator being that this is shift work. The peak of the facility falls outside of the evening peak of what the town requires. The town is 4-6, in this case our project stated from 3:15-4:15. Once we had the opportunity to count the trips and complete that portion of the study, during the morning we had about 35-40 trips that will be displaced and similarly in the evening. During the peak generator of the facility it is about 10. As part of the analysis, there was a signal warrant completed. That analysis showed that a signal would not be warranted at this time. Relative to the displacement of those trips, it showed that there could be an impact to that southerly intersection. There is a form of mitigation that is being proposed for this project. That would be a 75' right hand turn lane on the southern leg of Industrial Park Drive. That would allow additional que space and anyone trying to make a left hand turn the opportunity to que up while people trying to make the right hand turn can continue unimpeded. This traffic study was provided to DOT for the purposes of review. They provided us with a memorandum as to the review of the traffic impact and access study. I would like to read two excerpts from Mike Dugas, the Chief of Preliminary Design.

“The proposed changes of Industrial Park Drive and the expansion of the facility will not adversely impact the level of service of US 3 in the build or design years. We concur with the addition of a 75' right turn lane on Industrial Park Drive.”

“Ultimately based on our analysis of the data provided we concur that signalization of the intersection is not warranted at this time.”

At some of our initial conceptual meetings, there was a great deal of concern from a traffic standpoint for this project, and we have had the opportunity to put together a report, have DOT review it, and provided confirmation that the study was compiled correctly.

D. Marshall: What happens if we approve this and there is no provision made for a contribution by GE toward improving the intersection? We keep hearing that there is no need for signalization at the intersection at this time. What we are leading toward is the last man in theory. At one point in time, someone is going to want to put a business in that area and they are going to be the one that breaks that

intersection down and gets left with the entire cost which will probably be \$1.5 million worth of work. When we first started with all of the development in this area, we tried to set up some sort of fund. Someone is going to have to pay for that intersection at some point. It will not be the town of Hooksett because they cannot afford to do it and it will not be the State of New Hampshire because they do not have the funds. Unless the developers are willing to contribute something toward that intersection, we are being short sited in our approvals. Even now there is a police officer there in the evening when the plant gets out. There is a need for a police officer because the intersection cannot handle it or there will be an increase in accidents. When it comes down to a vote, you are meeting all of the requirements under our regulations and I have never been one to deny an application based on those facts. If you meet all of the requirements you are entitled to an approval, but it is not helping this community in the long run. We gain taxes for a short period of time, the next guy in contributes more taxes and more weight on this intersection, and finally something has to be done. Who will pay for that? I do not have an answer to that unless the developers step up to the plate and say that they have an obligation to contribute a portion. The impact fee that you pay for the roadway, \$37,741, is a drop in the bucket when it comes down to what it will cost to do that intersection. That, unfortunately, has a six year life. If we don't do something in 6 years, you are entitled to get that money back. We have not gained anything. In my opinion, I think we are doing the town a disservice.

J. Duffy: It boils down to what is legal now that we have roadway impact fees, and what the statutes allow us to do as far as collecting money. If they wanted to offer money to go into an escrow account that would be one thing, but I don't believe legally we could make them do that. Unfortunately, Huddig is now asking for their money back because they are saying that it was an impact fee even though they agreed to pay the money specifically for that fund which has been held separately from impact fee money. The money that Blue Ribbon Fence was supposed to have paid to go into that fund, went into impact fees and the money has now been spent. Currently, there is the Huddig money, but we are not sure what will happen in the future with that.

D. Marshall: I agree that we cannot add a fee. We cannot charge you specifically for that intersection. The developers will have to step up voluntarily and contribute to this fund or your company, at some point, will be upset because you cannot function because the intersection will break down. At that point there is nothing we can do. This is a big area that has the potential to develop and somebody will have to step up to the plate.

J. Duffy: I think Manchester Sand and Gravel was willing to put together an agreement, however, for some reason it did not happen. As far as the formula for the amount that everyone would pay, I am not sure if it would work at this time because I suspect the numbers for the improvements at that intersection have escalated since the time this was talked about in the past. I know Manchester Sand and Gravel is still looking at the possibility of getting all of the businesses together and putting together an agreement.

D. Marshall: I would hope they would do that. Down the road someone will be upset saying this is segmentation.

D. Rogers: I think when Attorney Campbell was here on behalf of Manchester Sand and Gravel, he alluded to the idea of further development and that this is prime land on the Rt. 3 corridor. I would be

curious to know what his approach has been, if any, thus far to establishing some sort of fund and pulling in the other business, both current and future. Mr. Golon, was there any discussion with your client about the possibility of a contribution or a fund being established for future lights and traffic issues?

D. Colburn: From the onset we have been willing to give our fair share to what the improvements should be at that intersection. The traffic officer that we hire as a detail officer for the last three years, since the current leadership team has been involved with the plant, was a request from our employees. We stagger shifts, we try to make the impact to that intersection as low as possible, and they asked for some support. We have always been open to guidance as to what that fair share contribution would be. After the study that was performed by TF Moran, they came up with the right turn lane and we agree to that. We are looking for guidance on this and we are willing to talk further about what the correct dollar number is. We have heard \$1 per sq. ft. and we are in that range. We would look for the town to help us understand more about what would be involved.

D. Rogers: A lot of that depends on timing and when this project would be undertaken because costs change. There has been compliance, and it seems you have done the right things, but there is a concern of this being a problem down the road. As long as you are aware of that, perhaps something can be put together with Manchester Sand and Gravel.

N. Golon: We should point out what is being added for new traffic. We have five new employees that will be starting.

D. Rogers: The analysis that has been done has been based on this project without considering if any other businesses would be going in there. We are hard pressed to hold you to something additional when legally it doesn't appear we are able to do that.

N. Golon: As far as the architecture of building, there a few different conceptals that you have seen. Elevation was included in the site plan package. It provides for a flat roof with alternating panels of color that were reviewed with staff; sandstone and a regal blue. It also includes aluminum storefront windows and doors. The size is indicated on the plan. The community will be proud of this building. I noted some items that are going to require waivers. These items have been reviewed by Stantec as well as staff. They are indicated on the waiver request provided.

N. Golon read the waiver requests into record.

J. Duffy: We are all set with all of the waivers.

D. Rogers: Stantec was all set with this?

J. Duffy: Yes.

N. Golon: I would like to thank Stantec relative to the quickness with which they were able to review this and turn it around and help move this project along.

M. DiBititto: Could you show us what public utilities are in the discontinued portion of the roadway and what the plan is for relocating.

N. Golon: There is an existing sewer line that runs through Industrial Park Drive then terminates at two sewer structures. That sewer line will be run through an easement along the side of the building and back to tie into that structure. Water also runs through the roadway and T's off into a service that serves Lehoux Drive and continues along Industrial Park Drive. We have worked with Central Hooksett Water Precinct to relocate that line off the side of this building. It will T down in so that we still have three valves as exist today. They will have the opportunity to turn on and off the water, as necessary, and it should be more improved. We are going to replace a 10" line with a 12" line. 10" lines are not as readily available so it is cost prohibitive. We will be able to provide a larger water service. That 12" line will continue down to the terminus of the property where it will be reduced to an 8" pipe which continues down Lehoux Drive. We also have our gas service. The gas valve which T's into the building continues down Industrial Park Drive where it T's and splits in either direction. Again, we have a corridor of utilities that will run along the side of the building and T back into the existing service.

M. DiBititto: Ultimately you will be preparing an easement plan?

N. Golon: Yes. As part of the consolidation easement plan, that the Planning Board approved in January, we denoted areas that would be reserved for those easements which will be the responsibility of the developer to consummate, but will be directly tied to the previous approval, to make sure it takes place.

M. DiBititto: On the traffic issues, has there been an analysis of the increase in intensity since we are going to discontinue the north part?

N. Golon: We counted the number of trips at both intersections. That allowed us to reallocate what trips are going to be redistributed to the southern leg. We added the amount of trips going from the northern leg to the southern leg for our traffic study to figure out what the impact on the southerly intersection would be. There was no evaluation of the northern intersection.

M. DiBititto: That is what generated the proposal to put a turning lane in?

N. Golon: The intersection is not working that well now. Our efforts are to make sure the southerly intersection is acting at least to the same level of service and, in the case of the proposed mitigation, improve the level of service.

M. DiBititto: Will the officer be maintained at that intersection?

N. Golon: Yes. As part of the traffic study, we did note that the uniformed officer would continue to act in that capacity.

P. Scarpetti: You are paying a uniformed officer now and there is no end in site. If we were to put together a TIF District in that area, instead of having one lump sum, there could be a monthly payment toward the TIF District, then there is a sunset clause that will end up paid at some point, instead of

having to have to keep paying for an officer. Is that something that we could entertain?

D. Colburn: Something that would be important for us is to maintain the function of the officer. As far as the funding, it is part of our operating budget now to make sure that they are paid for and funded to do the shift overlap to make sure our employees can exit. If there is some way we can get the same service and contribute we would be willing to do that.

P. Scarpetti: We are going to have to do some kind of a bond to do something like this or we will never have the money to do it. If we could try to put something like that together, it might be more of a reachable goal.

J. Duffy: A TIF District has to be approved by the town meeting. With a TIF District the additional taxes, based on the increase in the assessment, would then go to pay off the TIF, but the voters have to vote it because ultimately, if it fails, the town is responsible for that bond. It is something to look into, but would take a while.

P. Scarpetti: Right now having a police officer there is more of a band-aid. If a light can be put there, it is done and no longer something to be worried about.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

D. Marshall motioned to approve all of the above waiver requests for GE Aviation (plan #14-16), 21 & 30 Industrial Park Dr., Map 18, Lot 43 & Map 24, Lot 34. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: Is there anything else we need to discuss?

J. Duffy: The final approval of the plan itself. They are going to the Town Council Wednesday evening to get final acceptance on the discontinuation of a portion of Industrial Park Drive. After that happens, we need to look into the renaming of the northern portion of that roadway. Otherwise, they are looking for final approval this evening.

D. Rogers: Will they need to come back to us after the Town Council takes action?

J. Duffy: No.

P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the amended site plan for a 55,000 square foot addition to GE Aviation Plant #2, for GE Aviation (plan #14-16), 21 & 30 Industrial Park Dr., Map 18, Lot 43 & Map 24, Lot 34. Seconded by M. Durakovic. Motion carried unanimously.

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy:

1. North East Freightways, 15 Cross Road, Map 17, lot 37-1 – current MTS Golf Cart building – They were proposing to use the property for a freight terminal/repair facility/office. Initially the application was denied. They came back in, after talking with legal, and it was determined that the variance that was granted for MTS was also carried over for this type of business, so we had no choice but to approve it.
2. D La Pooch Hotel, LLC, 21 Londonderry Turnpike, Unit 1, Map 49, lot 45 – Daycare and Boarding for dogs and cats – This is an existing business and they will be adding grooming services. Approved.
3. Damon Blust/FCSA Xtreme, 78 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 49, lot 56-D-6 – Fitness Gym. Approved.
4. GCI Benefits Group, 171 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, lot 15-1 – They are already occupying the building and are adding an addition into another section of two conference rooms and three other offices in basement level. Approved.

M. DiBitetto: What is the procedure for approving these changes?

J. Duffy: We have a meeting typically with Community Development, Building, DPW, and the Fire Department. It is only for an existing building, not new construction, and they are changing the use, but not changing drastically enough that they would require a site plan. It is similar type uses.

M. DiBitetto: So ultimately the Code Enforcement Officer signs off on the permit.

J. Duffy: Yes. Fire and Code Enforcement do an inspection of the site to make sure it meets code.

BOARD DISCUSSION

J. Duffy: The Carrington Farms apartments were being evacuated. I am not sure of the update, but I heard all of the buildings may have to be evacuated because they were constructed similarly. Davod R. Cawley Middle School is being used as a shelter.

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ SNHU: The Quad parking lot replacement – Update from DPW Director

Leo Lessard: I have been working with TF Moran and SNHU. The plan is done. I approved it as far as I can. They have a good infiltration system for the drainage. All the questions I had were answered. The only question I have for the Board is it was stated to give permission for me to do the reviewing of this because it was just taking out a parking lot and putting in grass. Shouldn't the plan come back here for the Chairman to sign it?

D. Marshall: Yes, with your recommendations.

L. Lessard: Okay. When I was going over it, TF Moran was under the understanding that it would not have to be signed and I think it should be signed because that way the Board knows about it and it would go on record.

D. Rogers: You are correct that it should be signed by the Chairman.

L. Lessard: Okay. Everything is done and the only thing they will have to do is bring it back for you to sign it. They did a really nice job in designing that and it is going to be a nice addition.

D. Rogers: That will start in the spring?

L. Lessard: Yes.

J. Duffy: The next thing they are coming in for is the welcome center.

➤ **Stantec Invoice Approval**

*D. Marshall made a motion to approve the Stantec invoices. Seconded by M. Durakovic. **Motion carried unanimously.***

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**