

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, March 2, 2015**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:06 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Rogers (Chairman), P. Scarpetti, T. Prasol, and F. Kotowski.

ALTERNATES: Michael DiBitetto (Alternate) (arrived at 6:25).

EXCUSED: D. Marshall (Vice-Chairman), T. Walsh, D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.), and Muamer Durakovic (Alternate).

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES 2/18/15 & 2/23/15

February 18, 2015 Regular Meeting – F. Kotowski motioned to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2015 meeting. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

February 23, 2015 Regular Meeting – Approval of the February 23, 2015 minutes will be done at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

EXTENSION REQUESTS & PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. HARMONY PLACE, LLC (plan #08-31)

1621 Hooksett Rd., Map 14, Lot 27

63-unit 55-year and older person housing. Application conditionally approved on 3/16/2009 and expired on 3/16/2012. Applicant received the 1st 1 yr. extension to 3/16/2013 on 4/16/2012. Applicant received a 2nd 1 yr. extension to 3/16/2014 on 4/1/2013. Applicant received a 3rd 1 yr. extension to 3/15/2015 on 3/3/2014. Applicant is requesting a 4th 1 yr. extension.

- **Extension Request** – Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions.

Jennifer McCourt (McCourt Engineering Associates): The reasons for the extension still remain the same. Due to the national and local economic hard times, the project has not proceeded. The project is viable and with the extension could be completed. The housing market has not rebounded to the point to support such a large development. In addition, this being a 55+ and, according to the approval of the plan, there is a substantial up front capital improvement that needs to be done on the roadway and on the drainage system downhill from the development. The project is within the spirit and intent of the

regulations, especially with the public good that would be provided by the off-site and public improvements.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

P. Scarpetti motioned to grant the extension request for Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions for Harmony Place, LLC (plan #08-31), 1621 Hooksett Rd., Map 14, Lot 27. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: We will now move to Item 3, Completeness and Public Hearing for Hidden Oak Way (plan #15-02), in hopes that another board member will arrive to have a quorum for when we address Item 2, Autumn Frost (plan #13-20). One of our board members will be stepping down for that matter.

COMPLETNESS & PUBLIC HEARING

3. HIDDEN OAK WAY (plan #15-02)

Hackett Hill Rd. & Countryside Blvd, Map 37 (Hooksett) & Map 766, Lots 15J & 15L (Manchester)

152-unit townhouse development and site improvements in Manchester with a proposed driveway on Hackett Hill Rd., Hooksett.

Jeff Lewis (Northpoint Engineering): Here with me is Stephen Pernaw, the traffic consultant, Will Socha, the developer for the applicant, and Matt Routhier, project manager from Northpoint Engineering. Matt and myself were before you in January for a conceptual meeting. We are currently in the process, in Manchester, for a site plan application. We have our first public hearing on March 19th in Manchester for the full development. Manchester has identified this as having regional impact and I believe the town of Hooksett has been noticed of that meeting. We also have a driveway entrance on Hackett Hill Road that is in the town of Hooksett. Hackett Hill Road, north of Poore Road, is located within the town of Hooksett. Our driveway entrance requires permitting in the town. We have submitted a site plan application to you, as we were advised to do. We submitted a set of our site improvement plans that are also before the Manchester Planning Board. We are here to focus on the driveway entrance and are seeking approval for that because we will need a driveway permit for the 152 units. We can discuss the development if you would like. We have a main access coming out onto Hackett Hill Road and a secondary access onto Countryside Boulevard, which dumps back down onto Hackett Hill Road. The majority of the traffic will be coming onto Hackett Hill Road. The plan is to construct this in phases. Phase 1 would be around 40 units. Phase 2 and beyond would be the remainder of the development. It will be done in phases due to traffic considerations and impacts.

Stephen Pernaw (Pernaw and Company): Our office prepared the traffic impact study, dated January 28, 2015, that has been submitted to the Town of Hooksett and City of Manchester. I brought along flip charts to show you. We had a meeting about the scope of the traffic study with the City of Manchester and, in terms of your input, the SNHPC. As a result of that meeting, we had our study area defined. The SNHPC and the city wanted us to look at the signalized intersection at Rt. 3A, Poore Road, and Countryside Boulevard at Hackett Hill Road and the proposed Phase 2 location. We are also indicating

where we found some automatic traffic recorder data. The State of NH has conducted a short term count on 3A, to the north, and Hackett Hill Road, by the proposed site driveway. On any study we want to research what is available for traffic data and then we go to the site and document existing conditions; roadways, lanes, signals, phasing, etc. The next major portion of the study would be to do traffic data collection. We had people stationed at all four existing intersections at the same time. We did our traffic counts during the morning peak period and afternoon peak period. Those were the two analysis periods we were asked to look at. That is standard for residential developments. We were also asked to do a 10-year projection. We did projections for the year 2016 and 2026. The existing volumes we counted are base year conditions. Then we estimate how much traffic the development will generate. This being residential it is based on the number of units. Then we can do our future projections with and without the development traffic. That is how you can identify the impact. Based on our 2026 projections, we can come up with recommendations on how we feel the intersection should be designed. This is the DOT data on page 6 of the report. They had the 3A count done in April, 2012. The Hackett Hill Road count was done in June, 2013. This is for illustration purposes only. Weekday volumes are higher than weekend. There are typically 18,000 to 19,000 cars per day on Rt. 3A. Hackett Hill Road has 8,000 cars per day. In terms of daily numbers, that number is meaningless to a traffic engineer. We are interested in the rate of traffic flow. The historical data is telling us there is a peak in the morning and then again in the afternoon. This research was done before we went to the scope meeting. Based on this we recommended doing a two hour count in the morning and afternoon. Looking in the report you will find figures for the peak am and pm data. The morning peak happened from 7:30-8:30. On Hackett Hill Road going by the proposed site driveway, there were 502 cars in that one-hour period. In the morning most people were heading toward Rt. 3A. In the evening peak hour there were 627 cars, and the majority were heading in the northbound direction. The highest volume recorded was the pm peak hour on Rt. 3A north, heading toward Hooksett with 1,554 vehicles. These are hourly volumes and the numbers we use to analyze things such as capacity, intersection capacity, level of service, etc. The data is collected in January. We know that January is a low month so we do future projections. 2016 is our opening year. The no-build traffic numbers have been factored up to reflect a peak month condition. This is standard practice in New Hampshire. We also accounted for build-out of another development, Evergreen Way, on Hackett Hill Road, plus the city gave us full build-out of The Neighborhoods at Woodland Pond. There are quite a few undeveloped sites there. These numbers include that build-out. We also estimated how many trips this development will generate. Phase 1 will be 40 units. We then looked at a full build-out which would be 152. As far as the full build-out, we are expecting these apartments to generate 77 trips during the morning peak hour and 94 trips during the evening peak hour. In the morning, most people will be leaving the site, in the evening most will be arriving at the site. These numbers come from the ITE Trip Generation Manual. In terms of residential uses, the manual does a good job at estimating trips. In New Hampshire our trip generation rates are consistently lower than what is in the manual. We consider these to be conservative estimates. After we find out how many trips there will be, we need to determine which direction they will go in. We observed Countryside Boulevard. Approximately 93% of the traffic from Countryside is to and from Rt. 3A. Briar Court is almost the same percentage. Therefore we know that, at this proposed site, we will primarily have right turn departures and left turn arrivals. Referring to the 2016 build, it shows that there is site traffic, only 40 apartments, and the number of trips is small. The numbers are higher with the full build-out. In terms of the intersection that is in Hooksett, we are expecting that site driveway will handle 74 when everything is built out and 90 at this location. The secondary drive up in Countryside Boulevard will not handle a lot. They are single digit projections

because most people will want to travel to and from the south. This driveway is what we use for design purposes. In the morning peak hour 58 will be taking a right and 14 will be taking a left. During the evening when traffic volumes are higher, there will be 30 right hand departures and 57 left turn arrivals. These in effect are design volumes. Figure 7 in the report talks about percent change and what the impact of this development is. We have identified several check points and intersections. As an example, the peak at the signalized intersection at Rt. 3A will have a 4% increase in traffic and the pm peak hour will have a 3% increase. If you look historically at traffic volume data published by the DOT, random traffic flow each day changes as much as 10% to 15%. The kind of impact here is measurable, but nothing greater than that happens on a day-to-day basis. As far as the technical analysis, we looked at capacity and level of service of unsignalized intersections. We know the report card grades A-F. A level of service F for a stop sign controlled intersection does not mean failure. It means a delay is over 50 seconds. Level of service is categorizing delay. For the Hackett Hill proposed site driveway, it is a level of service of A or B. Those are the best levels. Primarily right turns out so you only have to look in one direction. Left turn arrivals is level of service A which means minimal delay. We also have que estimates and they are less than 1 or 0. We are not expecting any stacking at the intersection and the delays will be short. For the Countryside Boulevard driveway intersection it is level of service A's and B's. At the existing intersection at Hackett Hill Road, Countryside, and Briar Court, there are levels of service of D and E. Those pertain to Briar Court. Coming out of Countryside is level B. The left turn movements are all Level A's. Site traffic will not be enough to make any measurable change in level of service. The intersection of Hackett Hill Road and Poore Road has one departure in the morning peak hour and one departure in the evening peak hour. There will be no change to level of service. When looking at the signalized intersection, the level of service F is rated differently. At a signalized intersection, if you have to wait over 80 seconds you are at a level of service F. The break down is a bit different and is a national rating system. When we look at the 2026 no-build and build, in the morning the overall intersection is operating below capacity. Without site traffic, the glass is 80% full. With site traffic it is 82% full. The level of service is B and stays at a B. There is no change. In 2026, the pm peak hour in a peak month, the numbers are showing that it will be operating over capacity with or without this development. That has a level of service of D and remains at D. This intersection has been upgraded. You have all of the lanes that you can fit there and the signal is operating well. Regarding the design of the intersections, we did a left turn lane warrants analysis. We can look at an intersection, and given volumes, speeds, and turning movement, we can tell if there should be an exclusive left hand turn lane, a by-pass lane, or nothing. As far as Hackett Hill Road at the proposed site driveway, during the morning peak hour there is no treatment necessary. In the pm peak hour, in the year 2026, the numbers say there should be some sort of left hand treatment installed. That is so thru traffic going past the site will not be delayed. This criteria that the DOT has asked us to use is easy to satisfy. During the initial opening year we don't have to do anything. When there are 152 apartments, it is worth looking at again and we have a recommendation. Coming out of the development, we looked at how many approach lanes we need to Hackett Hill Road. There doesn't need to be anything other than a shared left/right lane. That is because this lane will be most people turning right. There is no special treatment needed. In terms of our recommendation, there is nothing that has to be done at the signalization at Rt. 3A. That intersection is operated by a demand responsive controller. In 2026, the signal will be re-timed. In terms of the site driveway, where we had the recommendation, left hand treatment might be warranted. This is all based on projections, so we are suggesting that when there are 100 units, we go back and observe traffic operations at that intersection, run the analysis, and come up with a recommendation. Knowing the analysis and criteria, we are suggesting that the post

development monitoring be done.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, do you have anything to add?

J. Duffy: The DPW Director has reviewed this plan. When this plan came in and we met with the developer prior to submittal, we agreed the only thing we would be looking at is the driveway and traffic, since all of the construction of the buildings will be in Manchester. Leo has reviewed the traffic report, as well as the plan, and his suggestion is that a left hand turn lane, at least 70' long, be installed into the site and that shoulder widening heading south for a right hand turn into the site be looked at. I spoke with Tim White, who is the Chief Traffic Engineer at SNHPC, and he advised me that he is reviewing Mr. Pernaw's traffic study for Manchester and he would take Leo's comments into consideration and pass them on to the City of Manchester. Manchester has not met with the applicant. They are due to meet March 19. I am recommending we continue the public meeting to wait until we get the review from SNHPC on the traffic study. I wasn't sure if this Board wanted to have their own traffic engineer review the traffic study as well to see if they concurred with Leo's recommendations on the left hand turn lane, or you wanted to wait to see what Tim White had to say.

F. Kotowski: I can not see spending the money to have another traffic engineer come in and replicate what has already been done. I am concerned that if 100 units are built and we don't get the left hand turn initially, we will be left with a situation that requires work to be done and no way to get it done.

J. Duffy: Since this town will not be issuing the building permits, we would not have any control of what happens after 40 units are installed. That would have to be something that is relayed to the city to make sure they agreed with that and made it a condition of approval.

D. Rogers: So the only input we have is on the driveway construction, and once the project commences and the driveway is cut, we are done?

J. Duffy: Because a portion of this plan is in Hooksett, you are acting and approving the plan as well as signing it. It will be recorded at the Merrimack County Registry as well as the Hillsboro County Registry. Normally a condition like that would be held with the release of either the building permits or the Certificate of Occupancies and we are not issuing any of those.

F. Kotowski: Then why are we here?

J. Duffy: State law requires they go to both municipalities for something that is over the line on both the town and the city line.

D. Rogers: I don't think we need to incur the expense of having our own traffic engineer do a study. With a traffic study being done by SNHPC, we could piggy back off of that and have the ability to review and analyze that with Leo. One concern I have is that the traffic studies were done in January and you talked about extrapolating that over a peak month and then into 2016 and 2026. Does that take into the account the college traffic and the students who commute down to Manchester Community College?

J. Lewis: Indirectly. We increased the morning data by 12% and the evening data by 13% to account for things like that.

D. Rogers: What do you consider a peak month during a year for this project?

J. Lewis: I will look that up but, regardless of what month it is, we are looking for the highest month on record. We used three years of data. In 2013 the peak month for the morning was October and the evening was June. In 2012, it was September in the morning and June in the afternoon. 2011 was the same as 2013. We are looking at this data and trying to come up with the biggest adjustment factor we can.

M. DiBietto: What portion of this is in Hooksett, just the roadway? I believe the town line runs along the edge of the right-of-way?

J. Lewis: That is correct.

M. DiBietto: We are responsible for maintaining and presumably making any improvements in the future and we won't be getting any traffic impact fees since they run with the building permits? We incur all of the maintenance and responsibility to maintain Hackett Hill Road. This has been an on-going issue, especially in this area. As far as any improvements that need to be done, this is the only occasion we will have to exert any influence.

D. Rogers: The SNHPC analysis that is going on, is that going on in preparation for the March 19 meeting with the City of Manchester?

J. Duffy: Yes. He is analyzing Mr. Pernaw's study and it should be ready in another day or so.

F. Kotowski motioned to find the application complete for Hidden Oak Way (plan #15-02), Hackett Hill Rd. & Countryside Blvd, Map 37 (Hooksett) & Map 766, Lots 15J & 15L (Manchester), 152-unit townhouse development and site improvements in Manchester with a proposed driveway on Hackett Hill Rd., Hooksett. Seconded by T. Prasol. M. DiBietto abstained due to not being present for the entire discussion. Motion carried.

Open public hearing.

Keith Hirschmann (Alderman for the City of Manchester): I am pleased to come here to relay that this is a mutually beneficial project. The City of Manchester, on Hackett Hill Road, acquired through the state of New Hampshire, 800 acres which we renamed the Northwest Business Park. We rezoned this in 1999 for this to become a research park for commercial use. We envisioned a vibrant park in that northwest corridor which I represent. Within the past 90 days we rezoned the two parcels that we are discussing to residential because the properties in the area are all residential. We had a public hearing on the rezoning. Some of your residents came to our public hearing and were in favor of the residential use of these two parcels. They were frightened that, if the rezoning had not gone through, that a Walmart could put in a distribution center or major warehouses could move in. Approximately five of your residents spoke and were in favor of that rezoning. The Aldermen voted 14-0 to proceed with this,

but we realize we need your input. We have investments to try to get that area going. In 1999, we put the lights in at Rt. 3A and Hackett Hill and that cost \$480,000. The fire station that was just built was \$2,000,000. We have been working with executive councilor, Chris Pappas. DOT made a design that is called Rt.293planningstudy.com. There will be a ramp for all of the commercial parcels so that will not be a concern. There will be a new exit ramp. There are 12 lots called the Northwest Business Park that is in the 10-year plan. Water and sewer has been factored, and we are hoping this becomes a residential development.

M. DiBietto: Alderman, is the development of those 12 lots conditional on that ramp going in first?

K. Hirschmann: Is is not conditional. Rt. 293 is going to be expanding in the next 10 years to 3 lanes north and 3 lanes south and will include a ramp.

M. DiBietto: Is Manchester willing to entertain cost sharing if any improvements need to be made to the road?

K. Hirschmann: There are a lot of improvements that need to be done in Manchester. Resurfacing, not reconstruction, will happen.

Richard Germain (409 Hackett Hill Road) (via telephone): Who is responsible for up keep and maintenance of Hackett Hill Road?

J. Duffy: Both Hooksett and Manchester depending on where you are.

R. Germain: Hooksett doesn't benefit from the taxation of this development. Who is going to pay to keep the road up? What would it cost us to keep this road up? There will be 152 units and potentially 250 cars traveling up and down that road every day. How does that balance and benefit myself and my neighbors?

D. Rogers: I don't know the answer to that. That is what the traffic study is about and is still under evaluation and open to discussion.

R. Germain: The traffic study identifies the traffic issue, but it does not identify the financial or quality of life issues. How will this will benefit the Town of Hooksett? I can see it costing us.

D. Rogers: That is why we have these public hearings and why we take a vote. We have not made a decision yet. We appreciate your input.

M. Stewart (351 Hackett Hill Road): We would rather see that land go residential than commercial. We would lend our support to the project.

D. Rogers: It has been rezoned to residential.

Close public hearing.

*F. Kotowski motioned to continue the public hearing for Hidden Oak Way (plan #15-02), Hackett Hill Rd. & Countryside Blvd, Map 37 (Hooksett) & Map 766, Lots 15J & 15L (Manchester), 152-unit townhouse development and site improvements in Manchester with a proposed driveway on Hackett Hill Rd., Hooksett, until March 16, 2015. Seconded by T. Prasol. M. DiBitto abstained due to not being present for the entire discussion. **Motion carried.***

2. AUTUMN FROST (plan #13-20)

Summerfare St., Map 35, Lots 1-8, 1-9 & 7

18-lot residential subdivision with lot line adjustments to lots 1-8 and 1-9.

- **Extension Request** – Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions.
- **Waiver Request** – from Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Part I, Section 6.04 Approval Required Before Work Begins. Request to begin blasting of site prior to recording of plan.

P. Scarpetti stepped down.

Doug MacGuire: We have made significant progress to the notice of decision. All of the permits have been acquired and Stantec's comments have been addressed. Dave is finalizing financing and final construction for the road. We are asking for an extension to allow us to get into the construction season.

Open to Public.

No public input.

Close to Public.

*T. Prasol motioned to grant the extension for development regulations (6/4/2012) Section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions for Autumn Frost (plan #13-20), Summerfare St., Map 35, Lots 1-8, 1-9 & 7, 18-lot residential subdivision with lot line adjustments to lots 1-8 and 1-9. Seconded by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried unanimously.***

D. MacGuire: We were going to be doing some excavation on the commercial portion of the property and that was going to allow us to get gravel selects. Dave has been working with a blaster/crusher to get that started and they wanted to get that moving due to a disturbance of land standpoint. With regard to that portion of the project, we received our Alternation of Terrain permit. We discussed that with Leo and understand we have to do a reclamation bond as part of that. We will put that together in a phased approach. We are hoping to work with Leo on that and get it started.

M. DiBitto: The waiver is to the provision that no site work shall be completed until there is a full approval?

D. MacGuire: That is correct.

M. DiBitto: You are not looking for excavation?

D. MacGuire: That is what we are here for.

Dave Scarpetti: The land has been partially rezoned. Part is residential and part is commercial, but it has not been sub-divided yet. The front portion is where the rock formation is that we will be able to use for the formation of this road.

M. DiBietto: All of the materials will be used on the residential portion?

D. Scarpetti: Yes, but there will be excess.

D. MacGuire: My understanding is that we were going to be removing material in that area. It does fall under the Alteration of Terrain permit.

M. DiBietto: Is it incidental to the development?

D. MacGuire: Yes.

J. Duffy: Leo is in favor of this.

D. Rogers: With the reclamation bond being part of the plan?

J. Duffy: Yes.

Open public hearing.

No public input.

Close public hearing.

*F. Kotowski motioned to grant the waiver request from Development Regulations (6/4/2012), Part I, Section 6.04, approval required before work begins, and request to begin blasting of site prior to recording of plan, for the Autumn Frost sub-division, (plan #13-20), Summerfare St., Map 35, Lots 1-8, 1-9 & 7, subject to working with the DPW Director to get an acceptable reclamation bond. Seconded by M. DiBietto. **Motion carried unanimously.***

P. Scarpetti returned.

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: I have two for the building where Sherwin Williams paint is. Fittrax is using a section of the building for the warehousing of exercising equipment and another section to warehouse some furniture.

D. Rogers: Fittrax is already there as a retail store, correct?

J. Duffy: Yes. They want to use the warehouse to store some equipment.

BOARD DISCUSSION

➤ **SNHPC Certified Sites Program**

Approximately 2-3 years ago SNHPC had begun to look at a program called Ready-Set-Go which allows developers to go by a different set of guidelines. It is for commercial and industrial type projects. At the time it was supposed to give developers a method where they could not spend as much money, but get an approval that creates this certified site so they could put it up on the Ready-Set-Go website where possible developers were looking to build something. It has been around for a while and they have been trying to work with communities to get things going. There are three level's and they are trying to get as many towns to participate as possible. So far the towns of Bedford, Raymond, Wyndham, and the City of Manchester have adopted these regulations. If you were to agree with them you would have to hold a public hearing and amend your development regulations to include this process. I would like to hear from people who have developed to see if they would be willing to go through these steps. I am not sure they would be with the paperwork involved. You would receive your approval from the Planning Board, then go to SNHPC and be heard by an advisory committee who would then accept your project. It then would be listed on their Ready-Set-Go website. In addition to that there would be a yearly fee and they would need to update their plan yearly through this advisory committee to make sure nothing has changed and make sure they still wanted to continue.

Jack Munn: This is mainly a marketing tool. Developers and builders still have to pay the same amount of money they would normally have to pay to develop the site. There is a fee that comes to SNHPC. We would take it like a real estate agent, pull together a package of information on the property, and turn it over to New Hampshire Siborg who operates the New England commercial data base. The site would then be flagged on the New England commercial database site so that realtors, national site selectors, and people outside of the region all over the country would be able to see that these sites have gone through some form of review with the Planning Boards. There are three different levels; Concept plan review, site plan review, and a site that is ready to be built on. If you allow a certified site application in an industrial zone within your community, the developer can submit an application to the SNHPC. You would approve their site plan or concept plan. For a site plan you would allow them five years to be able to market that plan. That has been the hold-up with a lot of Planning Board's. They do not want to give a five-year plan approval. They would rather give a one or two year plan approval and make the developer come back to justify why they need extra time. Attorney's and other communities see this as a way to allow for economic growth in a community, by giving developers more time to market their sites. Several years ago, the state of Massachusetts put in place a five-year planning statute state wide that Planning Boards needed to grant five-year approvals. That has not come to New Hampshire yet, but a lot of towns are in support of it. Wyndham and Raymond were the first two communities to come on board. Manchester was a little slow because they have a lot of lots that are less than one acre, but we allowed them to go down to less than an acre, plus they wanted to focus on the design review and not the site plan review. Bedford recently adopted this and Goffstown is currently developing an ordinance and that is before their Planning Board. The Town of Londonderry will be next. We were hoping that we would get the larger communities of the region, and then we would go back to the New England Commercial and Industrial database, work with New Hampshire Siborg, have the changes to the software package that runs that program put in place, and then the property owners and real estate agents who are marketing those sites would be able to click on buttons that give information and that is now a marketing tool. If there is a change to a plan, everything has to come back to the Planning Board. We do not do any review of any changes. It is the property owners responsibility to come back to the Planning Board. The SNHPC has no involvement other than to facilitate this. It is a program that is available in 20 other states.

F. Kotowski: You have probably talked with DRED. How excited are they about this concept?

J. Munn: DRED is very excited about it. They would love to do this state wide, but do not have the money or resources. They asked SNHPC if we could carry the ball in our region and work with New Hampshire Siborg and get something in place.

M. DiBitetto: Does this require a legislative change?

J. Munn: No. The only a change that would have to be made is a change to your site plan regulations, or in your case unified development regulations.

M. DiBitetto: Our concept plan is not a binding plan.

J. Munn: Nothing is binding on the concept plan. The concept plan would be reviewed, and yay or nay would not be said on the concept plan. The process would be followed, and abutter notifications would be sent. If it is in a zone where you would like to see certified sites, you would let the property owner know it meets the certified site zoning area and the site application requirements. You would be acknowledging that property owner can then seek an application.

M. DiBitetto: Do you have a draft we could review?

J. Munn: I have a copy of the regulations.

M. DiBitetto: This is not subject to getting on the warrant this June?

J. Munn: No. This does not require any town vote or warrant article. No changes are required to your zoning ordinance. Just a simple change to your site plan ordinance.

F. Kotowski: This sounds like a marketing effort through SNHPC to make available for people at a distance, looking inward, to what kind of parcels are available in a particular community? Would the contact come to SNHPC or the Planning Board?

J. Munn: They would come to us.

F. Kotowski: That means one more stop?

J. Munn: Yes.

F. Kotowski: How is SNHPC compensated for that effort?

J. Munn: We would set a one-time application fee to pull together arial photos, photographs, plans of the property, pull it together in a .pdf, send it over to New Hampshire Siborg, and then work with the New England commercial database to get it up on the site.

F. Kotowski: We would pay that fee?

J. Munn: No. There is no cost to the towns. The applicant would pay.

F. Kotowski: It is another fee to the applicant.

J. Munn: Yes. It is elective to the property owner, or the applicant, if they want to do this. No one can make or not make them do it. It is an option. If they want pay extra to get their property recognized on the real estate listings as being certified it is to their advantage.

J. Duffy: I will go over the difference in the levels. Level 1 certification must complete a preliminary application and come in to have a discussion with the Board. They would not be vested, it would only be on the site. Level 2 must obtain final site plan approval. This gives them five years of approval. Hooksett currently gives a five-year approval, but they have to do active and substantial development within 24 months, and they have to meet the conditions of approval within one year. All of the extensions that the Planning Board has been granting in the past few years are because they are conditional approvals. It does not have anything to do with the five-year vesting. They just have not met the conditions yet. Level 3 must obtain final site plan approval and shall provide evidence to the Planning Board from applicable public utilities that the site, and/or building, is served by or has the availability to be directly connected to public water and sewer, telephone, electric, broadband, natural gas, etc. We require that now before the plan gets signed. All of the permits must be in hand and they have approval from the utilities as well as all state permits. I think, if you were to entertain adopting this, there would have to be some tweaks make. One of the things it requires is it has to be at least one acre in size for the parcel to be considered. In your commercial district, you allow half an acre and in your mixed-use districts, that don't allow residential, those require two acres to develop the parcel. That one-acre language would not work for how your zoning is set up. Once they receive that approval they would go to SNHPC, get their approval, and then it would go on the site. I would like to know how important it is for developers to want this marketing. That is the only thing I question besides the changes that would need to be made. I looked on the site and did not currently see any parcels on there, but it sounds like it has not been set up yet.

J. Munn: We are waiting to get the seven bigger towns in the region put into place before we do anything on the website or with New Hampshire Siborg. Those changes could be made. There are no restrictions and they can be whatever fits your zoning. We are not asking you do anything out of the norm than you currently have. The only thing would be the five-year plan of approval for the site plans. We have had many meetings with developers throughout the region and they are all on board. Primarily those developers that have vacant, sub-dividable tracks of land, tracks of land that have been sub-divided, or buildings that are vacant that they would like to market. You could look to see where in the community this might work best. I would suggest a focus on industrial. That is the primary point to how this got started. It should not be an issue because all of the lots and land in industrial areas are going to be industrial zoned or used. I don't think you will find you are granting privileges to one set of property owners versus another. You will be granting the ability and option for someone that wants to go through the additional expense and cost to market their property on national real estate listings. I will leave you a copy of Wyndham's regulations and would encourage you to contact the town of Goffstown, and look at the site plan regulations they come up with.

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ **Recommendation for appointment to SNHPC**

J. Duffy: I thought R. Bairam was interested, but has not said anything.

M. DiBitetto: I believe he is interested and was planning to attend the last meeting as an observer.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, could you contact him and determine what level of interest he has and when he is available to come to a Planning Board meeting?

J. Duffy: Yes.

J. Duffy: Is this certified site something you may be interested in? Would you like to see it on a future agenda?

D. Rogers: I think it might be beneficial to put it on a future agenda to have more of the Board members have input as we only have five in attendance. It would also be beneficial to have Leo Lessard's input. To the extent that it pertains to industrial sites, I think it might make it more palatable as opposed to influencing commercial or residential zones.

P. Scarpetti: The only benefit for the five years would be they would have an idea of what they could do.

M. DiBitetto: I don't fully understand the implications. The concept sounds good, I just don't follow what legal rights the property owner has in a certified concept plan. It seems to be a plan that could be approved, that is not approved.

P. Scarpetti: We do that now anyway. When they come in to the Planning Department or they go before the TRC they can set up one of those meetings.

M. DiBitetto: I think they want to fit into a certain format for listing it on New Hampshire Siborg.

J. Duffy: It think when the market was busy and people were spending money on engineering and concept this might have been ideal, but they are not spending money right now.

M. DiBitetto: It would be their option, and would not be a concern to us, if they want to use that as a promotional piece. I am sure the Economic Development Committee might like to have any tools possible. I would need to see it because I am not fully clear on it. Is it possible to get a scan of it emailed to us?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. Rogers: JoAnn, could you reach out to Wyndham and Goffstown to see what their experience has been.

J. Duffy: Goffstown has not adopted it yet. They went through their review for about two years and had the Economic Development Committee pushing for it. The longer they worked on it the longer the document got. Recently, they decided to go with the template that was provided by SNHPC, and they are planning to bring it to their Planning Board in April to see if they would be willing to adopt it.

D. Rogers: We will discuss it at a future meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**