

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, August 17, 2015**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

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

ALTERNATES: Michael DiBitetto and Denise Grafton.

EXCUSED: Muamer Durakovic

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner), Jim Donison (Assistant Director of Public Works/Town Engineer)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 8/3/15

August 3, 2015 Regular Meeting – P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the August 3, 2015 meeting. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

CONTINUED 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).

J. Duffy: The Heritage Commission found no significance to the remains of the foundation, but they had photographed and otherwise documented the site. Kathy Northrup took a look at the old foundation and it was determined that it had been used for a slaughterhouse. They had requested permission to look at the metal pieces to see if they might be able to identify something from the slaughterhouse to make sure there isn't anything of historical significance. The owner is going to be consulted to make sure that is okay. The DOT permit has been issued. There were questions about the driveway crossing over into the new sidewalk as well as the water line connected to the new house location. College Park Drive will need to be dug up in that location and Stantec wants to make sure the state is aware of that.

J. Donison: Regarding the driveway permit, I talked to the Division 5 individual and the person at DOT who is working on the sidewalk. Both are aware of it and they are going to revise the permit to reflect what is proposed. We received a sketch from the surveyor and his engineer provided a cross section and a profile of the proposed driveway. It looks satisfactory to me and it is being reviewed by DOT.

J. Duffy: We also need any of the easements. We have not received the written documents. Those need be reviewed by the town attorney.

Don Duval: I am aware of that. Relative to the foundation, it is not historical. I talked to the heirs and they have no problem with someone taking the metal. As far as the driveway permit, I sent the revised plans to the state and followed up with a letter stating that we would be connecting the water service into College Park Drive. I am waiting to hear if they want to revise the driveway permit further to indicate that or if they can handle it verbally. One of Stantec's comments was to add the owner/applicant's phone number. Traditionally we don't do that and don't understand why it is needed, but the applicant said it is okay. As far as the sewer easement, I can talk to the Sewer Department and they probably have wording that we can cut and paste to make it appropriate.

T. Walsh: Sewer is going to Main Street and water is going to College Park Drive?

D. Duval: Correct.

T. Walsh: Everything will be okay with DOT?

J. Donison: The district engineer was originally okay with the proposal. We told them we wanted to make sure they would be good with what will be happening with the sidewalk. He reviewed it and talked to the other departments and they are making sure the approval language that is part of the permit acknowledges there will be a sidewalk as part of the driveway.

T. Walsh: So they are working with the 100' recommendation as well?

J. Donison: The distance will be less than 100' and they are okay with the proposed location.

D. Duval: They sent an email stating that it appears the driveway will not compromise site distance on traffic on College Park and a proposed pedestrian crossing.

No public comments

Close public hearing.

T. Walsh motioned to conditionally approve the Estate of Joyce Ashley Emerson (plan #15-11), 20 Main St., Map 11, Lot 1, pending remaining comments, DOT permits, and any conditions that are outstanding with staff, and authorize the Chairman to sign once it is complete. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPLETENESS

**WOODSPRING SUITES (plan #15-16)
47 Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lot 58
Site plan for a 124-room hotel**

N. Golon (T.F. Moran): I am here on behalf of Jeff Larrabee and the Lilac Park project team. I am here

for the application acceptance of the first phase.

J. Duffy: The application is complete and we recommend the Board find it complete and schedule a public hearing for September 21, 2015.

T. Prasol motioned to find Woodspring Suites (plan #15-16), 47 Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lot 58 complete. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARINGS

MANCHESTER WATER WORKS & PAUL GODBOUT (plan #15-14)

700 Quality Dr. & 73 Kimball Dr., Map 29, Lots 63 & 64-2

Lot line adjustment between Map 29, Lot 63 and Lot 64-2 whereby 1,097 square feet of Lot 64-2 is to be conveyed to Lot 63. The new area of Lot 64-2 will be 7.14 acres.

J. Duffy: We are missing three items for the plan to find it complete. The location, dimension, and height of the existing building, the recording block and the signature block. Those items are not complete, but if you want to waive that you can.

D. Winterton: Could you please go into more depth on those items.

Jeff Kevan (TF Moran): The signature block for the owner, the recording block in the corner, and the height of the two-story house adjacent to the property line.

J. Duffy: They are minor things and can be added.

J. Kevan: I can add those to the final drawing.

P. Scarpetti motioned to waive the missing items and find the plan complete for Manchester Water Works & Paul Godbout (plan #15-14), 700 Quality Dr. & 73 Kimball Dr., Map 29, Lots 63 & 64-2. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

J. Kevan: When we put in the monument at the property line, the owner was surprised with how close the property line was to his house. To work with him, Manchester Water Works is conveying 1,097 sq. ft. to the abutter, moving the line 7' to the back and 10' to the front. That puts the line where he thought it was. It does not bother the site development or site plan. It is a simple lot-line adjustment and an agreement between owners.

F. Kotowski: Is the owner here tonight?

J. Kevan: He is not.

P. Scarpetti: Is that well on the old property line and is that their well?

J. Kevan: Yes and yes.

T. Walsh: Is Mr. Godbout okay with this?

J. Duffy: Yes. He requested it.

J. Kevan: He also signed the application.

Open public hearing.

J. Duffy: We received an email from an abutter complaining about trash on the property and they asked if Manchester Water Works would clean it up and it has been cleaned up.

Close public hearing.

*P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the lot-line adjustment for Manchester Water Works & Paul Godbout (plan #15-14), 700 Quality Dr. & 73 Kimball Dr., Map 29, Lots 63 & 64-2 subject to the three conditions. Seconded by T. Prasol. **Motion carried unanimously.***

**FRANK GRISKUS/CHRISTOPHER PAYNE (plan #15-15)
128 Chester Tpke., Map 15, Lot 2**

Subdivision of Map 15, Lot 2 to create two new residential building lots. All lots will be serviced by on-site wells and septic systems.

J. Duffy: This is pending comments from engineering. Jim and Joe have been speaking as late as today.

D. Marshall: The signature block needs to be changed?

J. Duffy: Yes and Joe is aware of that and will fix it.

D. Marshall: Other than that it is complete?

J. Duffy: Yes.

P. Scarpetti motioned to find Frank Griskus/Christopher Payne (plan #15-15), 128 Chester Tpke., Map 15, Lot 2, complete. Seconded by T. Walsh.

T. Walsh: There is request from the Conservation Commission for a parking easement, and another easement for a turn around, but I don't see those drawn on the plans I have. Will we talk about those later?

J. Duffy: Yes.

Motion carried unanimously.

Joe Wichert: The proposal is to sub-divide Lot 2 on Tax Map 15. Currently it is just under 12 acres. It

is located on the west side of Chester Turnpike. The proposal is to create two new building lots, three lots total. The most northerly lot, Lot 2, would have 4.37 acres, of which 92,000 sq. ft. is buildable. The middle lot, 2-1, would have 2.7 acres of which 66,460 is buildable, and the most southerly lot is 4.97 acres of which almost 45,000 sq. ft. is buildable. The subject property is serviced by on-site well and septic. State sub-division approval is pending on the test pits that are shown on the plan. Jim's comments state he is requesting a 20'x20' easement around the existing turn-around. The piece is located at the very end of Chester Turnpike. We are treating the asphalt as the end of the Class 6 road. On the west side of that there is a gravel area that has been used as a turn-around. We tried to place a 20'x20' easement there, and it would not fit, so we made it 30'x30' and it has been added. We only became aware of the Conservation Commission comments when we saw one of the last review memos on Friday so we don't know about the scope size, where, or details so we cannot answer that right now. Other than the signature block item, the only other outstanding item I am aware of, on our end, is when we did the pits I forgot we needed two test pits on each lot, so we only dug one. We will go back and dig additional pits.

J. Donison: Fortunately the applicant has agreed to provide a 30'x30' easement and that will allow our plow and garbage trucks a turn around.

F. Kotowski: Would it be helpful to hear from the Chairman of the Conservation Commission because you stated there are things you are not aware of? He is here tonight.

Steve Couture (Chairman of the Hooksett Conservation Commission): We own conservation land beyond this property so we thought this would be a good opportunity to find two locations that could serve one purpose. A turn around in the winter and parking for a trail head. Our request was for it to be considered to allow for parking for access to the conservation land and to put in a kiosk.

D. Marshall: Would they have to designate these parking spaces?

S. Couture: No. It would be a gravel lot and a kiosk would make sense so they people would know what the space is there for and where they want to go on the property.

D. Marshall: Who will own the 30'x30' easement?

S. Couture: It will be owned in fee by the lot owner, but it will be encumbered by an easement for the town for the turn-around.

D. Marshall: If we allow that we need a release from the owner that parking would be allowed.

J. Wichert: Correct. Currently people park on the gravel area. I thought I heard Jim was concerned that parking there would defeat the purpose of the turn-around. We are not sure of the details such as how many cars, the kiosk, where?

D. Marshall: Parking in that area has not created a problem?

J. Wichert: No.

J. Donison: The only concern I had was that if it is designated as a turn-around, and if there are multiple cars parking there, if our trash trucks have to turn around they will not be able to. It might defeat the purpose of having the trail head there. There have been discussions about an alternate idea of negotiating with the property owner across the street, but that is not part of this application.

T. Walsh: What does the garbage truck do now? I don't see how this will change much with the addition of two lots. The same can be said about the parking lot. I would be more comfortable if conservation dealt with the landowner individually and voluntarily.

J. Donison: Presently, we use the gravel area for turning around vehicles. This would formalize it. Once it is approved and becomes a building lot, the owner could say they cannot turn vehicles around.

T. Walsh: I am respectful of people's real estate. If we survived without the turn around until now, I wonder why we have to have one.

D. Marshall: Legally, you are encroaching on his property. This gets rid of that legal problem and doesn't change anything at the same time.

J. Wichert: Lot 2 has 201' of Class 5 frontage in front of the asphalt. If the town were to say we want it in fee to make it part of the right-of-way, on one level I don't think you are opposed. If someone is going to build a house, now is the time to fix it. If it changes our frontage we would prefer to move it further away. If we do it as an easement, I don't think it would affect my frontage. The town would have an easement for the use of 30'x30' and have the ability to maintain it.

T. Walsh: There is a tree line drawn where the edge of the Class 5 is. Is that about where the turn-around will go?

J. Wichert: Yes. It centers around and covers the majority of the little gravel area that sticks out. It goes north of the edge of the asphalt and 5' away from the building setback. The north edge would be the tree line and you would come back 30' to the south.

J. Duffy: Would it be more feasible to put it across the street and would the owner prefer that location? The lot across the street is also vacant and has a lot of wetland.

D. Marshall: Who is the owner of that lot?

J. Wichert: Mr. Griskus is the owner and Mr. Payne has an agreement to purchase both properties. We are willing to talk to the Conservation Commission to get an idea of the scope and size.

D. Marshall: My recommendation would be to give a conditional approval subject to the resolution of both the turn around area and the use for parking as a trail-head. Once that approval has been made by our town engineer then I could sign the plans.

J. Wichert: We can talk to the Conservation Commission tonight.

T. Walsh: We don't know the scope. What if you decide the parking lot is too big for your liking?

D. Marshall: If they cannot resolve that issue it will come back to us. I won't sign any plans until Jim says they are okay.

P. Scarpetti: Is that turn around currently about 30'?

J. Wichert: Yes. The 30' covers more to the west. North and south it is about 30' wide. If we are talking about a two to three car parking area we can fit that in. We just need to go through the details.

T. Walsh: I am concerned it could be more than two or three.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

*P. Scarpetti motioned to approve Frank Griskus/Christopher Payne (plan #15-15), 128 Chester Tpke., Map 15, Lot 2, subject to the conditions being satisfactory to the department heads, staff, applicants, and the Conservation Commission. Seconded by D. Grafton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: 1. AT&T, 200 Quality Drive, Map 29, lot 64-6A. Exit 10 shops, unit of former Gamestop. Proposed use is cell retail store – approved. 2. Association of Bosniaks of NH, 125 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, lot 28. Former use office and previously to that church. Proposed use Cultural Learning Center – approved.

P. Scarpetti: Will that stay on the tax rolls?

J. Duffy: I am not sure because I don't know if they are non-profit.

BOARD DISCUSSION

J. Donison: We have an amended site plan for 1320 Hooksett Road. It is a proposed site plan for Aroma Joes. The plans have been submitted and reviewed and we had some comments. I contacted the design engineer today and responses are being prepared including talking to the Water Precinct and Sewer Commission.

D. Marshall: Is that coming before the Board?

J. Duffy: No. It came before the Board and you were concerned if there was enough cuing space as well as the exiting from the bank. Jim went to look at that.

D. Marshall: You are working out the changes?

J. Donison: Yes. They have room for eight vehicles to cue from the time they get to the drive-up window and exit the site. The recommendation was to put in a double white line so that people pulling out of the bank stay in their lane.

J. Duffy: Final legislative changes were put out for review. One defines phase development. You had a chapter in the zoning ordinance regarding phase development. It has expired and is no longer valid. They are now saying you cannot use phase development to slow down growth which was what yours had been doing, but it was taken out in May, 2015 and this went into effect July, 2015. Also, two medical marijuana facilities have been approved. One in Merrimack on Rt. 3, which would be retail and one in Peterborough which would be for growing. There was another bill that said if either of those facilities did not qualify to pay taxes, in spite of that, they would need to pay a fee equal to the amount they would have been assessed for taxes.

D. Marshall: Regarding the construction at the long curve on Rt. 3 on the west side, what is that for?

J. Duffy: They are building the same type of building as where Giovanni's is located.

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ Approval of Stantec Invoice

T. Prasol motioned to approve the Stantec Invoices. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**