

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**

35 Main Street

Monday, March 16, 2015

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:01 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

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

ALTERNATES: Muamer Durakovic (Alternate)

EXCUSED: D. Marshall (Vice-Chairman), P. Scarpetti, D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.), and Michael DiBitetto (Alternate) .

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES 2/23/15 & 3/2/15

February 23, 2015 Regular Meeting – M. Durakovic motioned to approve the minutes of the February 23, 2015 meeting. Seconded by D. Rogers. T. Prasol, T. Walsh, and F. Kotowski abstained due to not being in attendance. Motion carried unanimously.

March 2, 2015 Regular Meeting – T. Prasol motioned to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2015 meeting. Seconded by F. Kotowski. T. Walsh and M. Durakovic abstained due to not being in attendance. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. SJB DEVELOPMENT LLC (plan #15-01)
290 W. River Rd., Map 17, Lot 10**

Amended site plan to expand the building by 640 square feet and add 3 additional parking spaces.

Scott Bussiere (16 Scott Avenue): The building that was approved on my site is 50x160 and I would like to make it 54x160. In doing that, I would gain 640 sq. ft. of building space. It would add 3 parking spaces. Due to the fact that the building is 4' wider, we pushed the driveway back 4'. Nothing else has changed. I can buy a 54' building cheaper than a 50' building and that is why I want to do this.

D. Rogers: Had the building been constructed or the footprint laid?

S. Bussiere: I am buying a Morton building.

F. Kotowski: JoAnn, have they met with you and discussed this? Does this make any change other than the size of the building, such as lot-lines?

J. Duffy: No. Everything else is conforming. We met and went over it and Leo reviewed the plan. Everything looks good except for on sheet 9, the stop sign size should be changed to read 30" x 30" and Note #4 on sheets 1 and 3 should be changed to 8,640 sf.

F. Kotowski motioned to find the application for SJB Development LLC (plan #15-01), 290 W. River Rd., Map 17, Lot 10, complete. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

T. Walsh motioned to approve the amended site plan to expand the building by 640 square feet and add 3 additional parking spaces for SJB Development LLC (plan #15-01), 290 W. River Rd., Map 17, Lot 10. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

2. CHALIFOUX & DESAULNIERS (plan #15-03)

6 Phyllis Dr. & 3A Evelyn St., Map 20, Lots 18 & 19

Lot line adjustment to consolidate 14,987.65 square feet of Lot 18 into Lot 19, and consolidate 19,013.75 square feet of Lot 18 into Lot 19.

- **Waiver Request** from Development Regulations (6/4/12) Part II, Section 2.02
Topographic contours.

D. Rogers: This item will be moved to the April 6, 2014 agenda due to all parties not being present.

3. DIONNE & JK MULLIKIN AND SON (plan #15-04)

249 & 253 Hackett Hill Rd., Map 23, Lots 9 & 10-1

Lot line adjustment to consolidate 2,997 square feet of Lot 9 into Lot 10-1.

D. Rogers: This item will be moved to the April 6, 2014 agenda due to all parties not being present.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. 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): Will Socha is here with me. We presented this plan to you a couple of weeks ago for a driveway permit on Hackett Hill Road associated with this 152-unit townhouse development located in Manchester. We left the public hearing open primarily because we submitted a traffic study that had gone to SNHPC and you were hoping to get input back from them. Today we met with Mr. Lessard and went over his thoughts and comments on the plan. Tonight, we are

asking for any additional input that you have regarding the letter from SNHPC, and then we would like to come back at your next meeting with the final version of our plan. We have a public hearing in Manchester on Thursday of this week. In meeting with Mr. Lessard, it sounds like a good idea if we put together an improvement plan for our driveway on Hackett Hill Road. We would like to have an opportunity over the next couple of weeks to put that together and work with Mr. Lessard on some of the details, and bring that back back to you here in a couple of weeks, as well as address any comments or concerns that you have.

D. Rogers: Are you requesting that this be continued or postponed?

J. Lewis: We are hoping that you don't act on it tonight. I know you were waiting to get that letter before you provided us with more comments. We recognize the need for improvements to be done at the driveway we are proposing. We wanted some feedback from you on the intersection at Countryside Boulevard. We don't feel we are adding any significant traffic to that, therefore we are not proposing to, and hope that you are not looking for us to do any work at that intersection. We are adding traffic to Hackett Hill Road, at our driveway entrance, and recognize we need to do something, at some point, there. We feel that needs to be better defined. We have a recommendation from our traffic consultant. There is a letter back from SNHPC and we have now met with Mr. Lessard. We want to take extra time to focus on coming up with a plan.

D. Rogers: Mr. Lessard, do you have any comments?

L. Lessard: We met today and I am proposing they do a left hand turn lane going into it and put in a road widening coming south so that when they turn into the right the traffic going towards Route 3A can go right by. They can leave it with binder finish until they are ready to top the site. At that point they have to top that area of Hackett Hill Road. They will have a left hand turn lane that will queue at least three cars.

J. Duffy: The last time they were here they brought Steve Pernaw, the traffic engineer, and he recommended they don't do anything until they build the first 40 units and at that time take another look at that entrance way to see if anything would be needed. Leo is recommending they do the work now, prior to the first CO of those first 40 units, versus waiting until the 40 units are in. That is the biggest difference. SNHPC recommended that they produce an off-site improvement plan, which the Planning Board here would sign off on. That would be made part of your conditional approval. We met with them today and they agreed to do that. They are asking for time to work on that amendment and to come back on April 6.

F. Kotowski: I think it is prudent for us to wait until we see what is on paper, prior to approving anything, and make a decision once we see all of it. We only get one shot at this. Once the project is underway, and we have approved it without these driveway or road improvements, then we are out of luck.

Open public hearing.

Richard Germain (409 Hackett Hill Road): I was adamantly opposed to this. I can flip a coin from my driveway to where his driveway is, so I think I am the person who is most impacted by this development. Since that time, I have looked at this a lot closer. First, I was thinking that this person is

not going to pay any taxes in town, and was kind of put out by that. Then I realized that he is going to bring in 152 families that will go to Market Basket and maybe someone will put in a restaurant on the corner of Rt. 93. I see it as a benefit to Hooksett. I see 152 families spending money to live there even though they are not paying taxes in Hooksett. I have looked into his background. He has 190 units in Manchester and I believe I have visited most of them. Everything I have seen is a class act. He is young and I wish I had that kind of focus when I was his age. I ask that this Board look at this with an open mind. I work with engineers everyday and when a project is being engineered you have two ends of the spectrum. One is to make it effective and one is to make it cost effective. There is a big spectrum inside of that. Typically when I engineer something, I go towards the conservative side of that estimate because no one wants it to come back five years down the road and ask why enough jurisprudence was not practiced. Everything that is designed is designed with a safety factor. It is overbuilt and conservative. I ask that you take that into consideration when you are making your decision.

Close public hearing.

D. Rogers: This will be continued on April 6 so that we can get the additional input that is in process.

J. Lewis: When we were here last time there was a question about whether or not you wanted the traffic study to be reviewed by the town's consulting engineer. You opted not to do that. If we prepare a set of plans, is that something you will be looking to send out, or is that something we would be working out with Mr. Lessard.

D. Rogers: I believe Leo will be the contact person. I am not sure if Stantec will be involved.

L. Lessard: I believe this would be the same as when I do things with TF Moran and other engineers in town. Between Jeff and I we can work out all the details.

D. Rogers: You will be here at the next meeting for your input and guidance?

L. Lessard: Yes.

PUBLIC HEARING ON MODIFICATION TO FEE SCHEDULE

Public Hearing on the Addition of Conservation Stewardship Fees to the "Administrative Fee Table" as follows:

Deed Restrictions

- a. 1% of assessed value of protected acreage
- b. Not to exceed \$40,000

Conservation Easements

- a. 3.5% of assessed value of protected acreage
- b. Not to exceed \$40,000

D. Rogers read the amendment for the stewardship fee calculation into the record.

J. Duffy: Previously the applicant would meet with the Conservation Commission and they would set a price based on the acreage. It was between \$5,000 and \$15,000. They have decided it would be better

to put a formula together as we move forward versus making a decision on a case by case basis. This came from the Conservation Commission, through Carolyn, and this is what they are proposing. We met with developer the other day who will have to go through this process. He had a question about his land. It is currently in current use and he is wondering if he has to pay a stewardship fee because he is also paying the penalty to take the land out of current use. The answer is no, you would not be charging him twice. I think questions will come up as we go along, but Steve Couture has a good handle on this and has been able to answer everything thus far.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

*T. Prasol motioned to approve the amendment to the stewardship fee calculation language. Seconded by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried unanimously.***

CHANGE OF USE

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

F. Kotowski: We had a Sewer Commission meeting this morning and we were talking about the fact that the School Board, based on one of the Articles, will transfer a portion of land next to the school by the sewer plant for future expansion. The question came up as to whether or not we had to have a public hearing because it will involve re-establishing the lot-lines. We agreed that we should have to appear. Then they said a public hearing for the lot-line adjustment, but not to approve the transfer of land because that has already been done by the warrant article.

J. Duffy: Have the deeds been prepared?

F. Kotowski: No. That will be happening soon. We are trying to get clarification on what the process is that we have to go through, that is the least time consuming, in order to make this happen? It seems unnecessary to us to go through a public hearing when the people in the town voted and the School Board is going to transfer the property to us.

J. Duffy: We talked with Bruce about this. The plan needs to be recorded because you are changing lot lines. We have to do a lot-line adjustment plan. He said he would be able to get that together. Carolyn is doing the abutter's list for him. We are doing the paperwork end of it. He needs to come in with the plan and we will schedule the hearing. We can't record that plan unless the Planning Board approves it.

F. Kotowski: We are in the process of having that all surveyed and laid out, according to what the request would be. We will bring it in and consider the lot-line adjustment. Once that is done there is no need to call the public in for a public hearing to transfer the land?

J. Duffy: No. They will be invited to the meeting for the lot-line adjustment.

OTHER BUSINESS

J. Duffy: The annual spring Planning and Zoning Conference is scheduled for May 2. We sent out an email to see if anyone was interested in going.

T. Walsh: When we going over the stewardship fee calculation, I heard you say a developer was coming in that might be interested in another conservation sub-division coming in.

J. Duffy: It is one that was already approved and extended a few times. It expired and they are trying to revive it.

➤ **Approval of DPW Director Invoice (Plan Review)**

D. Rogers: This is an invoice amount of \$747.50 for Merrimack Reserve, Edgewater Drive, which is the Scarpetti's development.

F. Kotowski motioned to approve the DPW Director Invoice. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

Recommendation to SNHPC

J. Duffy: Richard Bairam was interested.

F. Kotowski: Wouldn't it be prudent that we appoint someone who really wants to be there.

D. Rogers: I think that is a wise course of action. We will postpone this matter at this time.

Recommendation for Appointment of Full Board Member

J. Duffy: We have two alternates; M. DiBitetto and M. Durakovic.

D. Rogers: M. Durakovic has been here longer. Mr. Durakovic would you be interested in being a full Board member?

M. Durakovic: Yes, until June.

T. Walsh motioned to recommend Muamer Durakovic to be appointed as a full Planning Board member. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Rogers: When will the Town Council meeting be held for consideration of our recommendation?

J. Duffy: Their next meeting is March 25, but I am not sure if it is too late to add this item. If not, it will be in April.

Election of New Chairman

D. Rogers: This matter will be postponed. Mr. Marshall will act as Chairman until a permanent one is elected.

D. Rogers was presented with a plaque showing the Planning Board's appreciation and contribution for his service.

D. Rogers: Thank you. I have enjoyed my time on the Board as an alternate, full member, and then Chairman. This has been a great Board to work with. I think we still have a really good group of people and hope that will continue into the future.

ADJOURNMENT

T. Prasol motioned to adjourn. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**