

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, August 3, 2015**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), F. Kotowski, T. Prasol, P. Scarpetti, Muamer Durakovic, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Michael DiBitetto

EXCUSED: Denise Grafton (Alternate)

STAFF: Jim Donison (Assistant Director of Public Works/Town Engineer)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 7/20/15

July 20, 2015 Regular Meeting – *P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the July 20, 2015 meeting, with amendments. Seconded by T. Walsh. M. DiBitetto abstained. Motion carried unanimously.*

PUBLIC HEARING

  **ESTATE OF JOYCE ASHLEY EMERSON (plan #15-11)
20 Main St., Map 11, Lot 1**

Subdivision of Lot 1 (3.056 acres) into two lots (1.002 and 2.054 acres).

- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist items #39 & 42 – Wetlands
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist items #37 & 46 – Topography
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist item #41 – Soils
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist item #54 – Utilities

J. Donison: There are a number of items that are still outstanding. Today, I received a letter from Stantec and I provided the Board with copies as well as copies of a preliminary plan that the CMA engineer is working on to extend the sidewalk along College Park Drive.

J. Donison referenced the general comment letter dated August 3, 2015 from Stantec. He noted that trench patch details should be added and as part of the driveway permit, there is a substantial ditch line going down that side of the roadway, and the culvert should be size to handle the runoff. Page 2 of the letter mentions the waiver requests. Regarding the first waiver they have asked for a waiver request for the 2' contours to not be shown. The second waiver request is to not have a certified wetland scientist stamp the plan. The third waiver request is to not show the proposed sewer service. The plan shows a

proposed 20' wide sewer easement. The sewer line is on Main Street so a proposed house would have to cross over the proposed easement and connect to the existing sewer on Main Street. The standard trench details would cover that. The fourth waiver is regarding the NRCS soil information. That has been added to the plans, so that waiver can be withdrawn. As far as the foundation, I looked at it and it looks like there are vehicle remnants inside the hole. The surveyor can speak to that. The question on Sheet 3 #20 is where the proposed house and tree line would go. The applicant's surveyor said they are not sure at this time. We have one plan by CMA engineers. I talked to the design engineer at DOT today and he said their traffic division is dealing with the concept plan and they would prefer that no driveway be within 100' of that crosswalk where they are going to have the pedestrian activated lights. That may in conflict with where it is showing on the plan. That may be a condition of the plan that the driveway be at least 100' away from the proposed crosswalk, and the proposed driveway be designed to make sure it is coordinated with the future sidewalk which, from what I understand, will be constructed next summer. They are just waiting for the traffic division of DOT to address this.

M. DiBitetto: I am not clear on the issue of the driveway. I understand the driveway is coming out onto Main Street.

Don Duval (Duval Survey, Inc.): It is coming out onto College Park.

T. Walsh: How many feet from this proposed walk is your current proposed driveway?

D. Duval: Approximately 30' or 40'.

T. Walsh: Are there any other options for it or is that where you have to go?

D. Duval: That is where we have to go.

D. Marshall: Regarding your comments on the location of the driveway, is DOT concerned with its proximity to the crosswalk, or are we concerned with it?

J. Donison: They are concerned with it. They have their traffic department reviewing it and their recommendation is to have it further away from the crosswalk.

D. Marshall: I am not going to go against their recommendation. It is their road so they will determine the location, not us.

J. Donison: The District 5 is reviewing it, not in coordination with the other division within DOT. It is a good opportunity for coordination at this point.

D. Marshall: I understand that property was granted an access point at the time of the layout. The specific location at that time was not given. This could be why the department is saying they need it in another location. Mr. Duval, you need to resolve that issue with DOT.

D. Duval: This is the first I have heard of it. We will have to resolve it one way or another. My understanding, with my clients, is they were allowed a driveway. Part of the agreement, allegedly, was

when that road was built the contractors were supposed to put the driveway in but, allegedly, he ran out of money.

D. Marshall: If this was a town road we would have flexibility.

D. Duval: I will have to talk with them, but we are allowed to have it.

F. Kotowski: There is no other spot along College Park Drive that would permit a driveway to enter that property?

D. Duval: No. As you go easterly the slopes increase dramatically.

F. Kotowski: Is it because of the increase in topography?

D. Duval: Yes. I cannot go south because there are granite block walls and there is a currently a sidewalk there. In conjunction with the engineer we picked location we did due to drainage. It leads to a catch basin.

F. Kotowski: Given the fact that the DOT insists the driveway needs to be at least 100' away from the crosswalk, how would you suggest we resolve that.

D. Duval: You can't. You will have to leave that to me and the state.

F. Kotowski: Is the foundation considered historic?

D. Duval: I would say it is not. There used to be cars in it and it burned to the ground. It is three sides of old brick foundation with junk cars.

D. Marshall: Have you checked with our historic preservation people?

D. Duval: I have not.

T. Walsh: You are going to resolve this with DOT, however, it is a recommendation they want 100'. It should not be hard to prove that you cannot get 100'.

D. Duval: I know how I will approach them, once I find out who to talk to.

D. Marshall: Stantec takes no exception to the waiver regarding topography.

Alternates will abstain from voting due to enough Board members being present for a quorum.

T. Walsh motioned to approve the waiver request from completeness checklist items #37 & 46 – Topography. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Marshall: On the waiver regarding wetlands, the letter from Stantec states: “We recommend that the

designer discuss the waiver request to not delineate the wetlands on the parcel. We are unaware of any circumstances where the Board has waived this requirement.”

D. Duval: The hardship is that it is at least 20' below any building area. It is narrow, only 10' to 12' across. It would do nothing except cost my client more money.

T. Walsh motioned to approve the waiver request from completeness checklist items #39 & 42 – Wetlands. Seconded by F. Kotowski.

D. Marshall: Be careful we don't set some precedent about wetland delineation.

P. Scarpetti: Could Mr. Duval show us where they are looking for the waiver.

D. Duval: It is a small drainage area. We are showing the 40' setback. It is on a slope and 20' above any wetlands we could locate.

Motion carried unanimously.

D. Marshall: Regarding the proposed sewer service, Stantec discussed this with the Sewer Commission and they approved the application without this information on the plans.

T. Prasol motioned to approve the waiver request from completeness checklist item #54 – Utilities. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Marshall: The waiver request from completeness checklist item #41 – Soils has been removed because the NRCS soil information has been added to the plans. Regarding the other comments, the trench patch detail must be added to the plan.

D. Duval: I have not seen Stantec's latest comments.

D. Marshall provided Mr. Duval with a copy of the letter with Stantec's comments.

D. Marshall: Regarding the driveway permit, you need to notify DOT about revising it to show the water service connection which was not part of the applicant's original submittal to DOT. Comment 13 is that the 40' wetland buffer note was not revised, but that was taken care of with the granting of the waiver. Regarding the foundation, is it the Board's feeling the foundation has no historical significance?

F. Kotowski: I think we need an answer to that from Kathy Northrup.

T. Walsh: I love history and am just curious as to what historic significance three walls of foundation can have in a case like this?

D. Marshall: Normally, if it is declared historically significant before construction starts, someone needs to see if there are any recoverable items.

Eileen Douillette (20 Tilton Hill Road, Pittsfield): It used to be used as a slaughterhouse.

D. Marshall: We need a letter from Kathy and she is very responsive. Stantec is also recommending a conceptual location for a house and tree line which could be shown in dashed lines.

D. Duval: I could show the possible location as long as I am not held to it. My idea is to put it in the low flat area where I show the buildable square.

D. Marshall: You could put down potential buildable area. I don't think the Board is in the position to approve the plan tonight, however, we can address it again on August 17.

D. Duval: My two major issues are the DOT and the historical item?

D. Marshall: Correct.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Public hearing is open until August 17, 2015.

CHANGE OF USE

Jim Donison: 1. Great Exchange Church, 1134 Hooksett Road, Map 39, lot 33-1. Existing use – Dance Studio. Proposed Use – Church. Approved.

2. Brian Bell, 1878 Hooksett Road, Map 2, lot 13. Retail – Shakin It Trading Post. Approved.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Approval of Stantec Invoices

*F. Kotowski motioned to approve the Stantec Invoices. Seconded by D. Winterton. P. Scarpetti abstained. **Motion carried unanimously.***

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk