

**Official**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)  
35 Main Street  
Monday, September 21, 2015**

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:05 P.M.**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

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

**ALTERNATES:** Denise Grafton

**EXCUSED:** T. Prasol and Michael DiBitetto

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 8/17/15**

**August 17, 2015 Regular Meeting** – *T. Walsh motioned to approve the minutes of the August 17, 2015 meeting, with amendments. Seconded by D. Winterton. M. Durakovic abstained due to not being in attendance at the August 17, 2015 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.*

**DISCUSSION**

**DAVID CAMPBELL**

Update on Head's Pond vesting

Applicant was not in attendance.

**EXTENSION REQUEST & PUBLIC HEARING**

**RIDGEBACK SELF-STORAGE (plan #06-33)**

**Thames Rd & Hooksett Rd, Map 18, Lot 49D**

Site plan for a 49,500 sq. ft. metal self-storage unit buildings and an 864 sq. ft. granite block office building. Active & Substantial period expired on 9/22/12. The Planning Board granted a 1 year extension to 9/22/12, a second 1-year extension to 9/22/13, a third 1-year extension to 9/22/14, and a fourth 1-year extension to 9/22/15. Applicant requesting another 1-year extension per the following:

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

***P. Scarpetti stepped down.***

Richard Uchida (Attorney, Hinckley Allen): This project is on a 3.36 acre parcel and consists of four buildings. Three of them are self storage buildings and one is an office building. Access is off of Rt. 3. We just got a renewal of the state driveway permit for the project.

David Grappone (Principal of Ridgeback Self-Storage): We are trying to get the cost in alignment to start the project. We are making headway on that and should have it. We have our permits from DES and they are up-to-date and current for the wetlands.

F. Kotowski: Is this the fifth one-year extension?

D. Grappone: Yes.

***D. Winterton motioned to grant a 1-year extension until 9/22/16 per Development Regulations (6/4/2012) section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions for Ridgeback Self-Storage (plan #06-33), Thames Rd & Hooksett Rd, Map 18, Lot 49D. Seconded by M. Durakovic. Motion carried unanimously.***

***P. Scarpetti returned.***

### **COMPLETENESS**

#### **SNHU GUSTAFSON CENTER (plan #15-12)**

**2500 N. River Rd., Map 33, Lot 67**

Proposal to construct a 14,052 sf welcome and career center building.

- **Waiver Request** – from Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section 11.12.1 Rainfall Intensity
- **Waiver Request** – from Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section 11.12.2.(h) Minimum Cover
- **Waiver Request** – from Completeness Checklist #19 Boundary Lines
- **Waiver Request** – from Completeness Checklist #24 Existing Buildings
- **Waiver Request** – from Completeness Checklist #31 Existing Landscaping
- **Waiver Request** – from Completeness Checklist #33 Existing Utilities
- **Waiver Request** – from Completeness Checklist #35 Street Line, lot Line Property Boundary Line

J. Duffy: As of last week, there were a few items missing from the plan; the total acreage of the site, the cover sheet has inaccurate names of department heads, PSNH has changed it's name, and the location of the building setback lines needed to be added. The lighting plan was missing but we received it. I am not sure if the other items have been added to the plan set.

Jeff Kevan (TF Moran): Next to me is Monther Mardini who is in charge of all development projects at Southern New Hampshire University. What is being proposed is on the large track of land on the east side of North River Road. They are proposing to put in a 2-story welcome center building that would be a 14,052 sq. ft. footprint with a gross square area of 25,400 sq. feet. This would house admissions, international admissions, a career development center, marketing and communications, and institutional

advancements. These departments are currently scattered around the campus. This would consolidate them into one location. They finished construction of the quad on the center parking lot across from the dining facility. That is all green. The parking lot that was built a couple of years ago is full because student parking has been shifted. The building would have a drop off area. They would have a bus and a couple of handicapped spaces. An access drive is provided across the back for fire and emergency access. The utilities are in the road so we will bring them up to service the building. Drainage is private. For overall campus parking we need 2,434 spaces and we have 2,532 spaces on campus. There is a parking lot by Martins Ferry Road. That is empty and available to direct student parking. With this application we have the same waivers we had in the past on this parcel. The state changed the rainfall intensities so we are asking to vary slightly from your criteria. We have done a survey on the overall piece, but we have not put it all together. We know where right-of-ways are in the outer perimeter, but we have not done a complete boundary so we asked for a waiver to not do metes and bounds on the 210 acres. Other items are shape, size, location, and buildings within 200' of the property. Around a 200+ acre lot would be significant as well as landscaping and utilities within 100' of the property line.

D. Marshall: The lot nearest the intersection will become a visitors parking lot?

J. Kevan: It will be faculty and visitor parking.

D. Winterton: If I were to park and walk to the building, which way would I go?

J. Kevan: We will have a crosswalk and there is a sidewalk that you would use to come into the building.

D. Marshall: JoAnn, is the additional information enough to find the plan complete?

J. Duffy: The lighting plan was the main item. The other items are just a matter of making a correction.

F. Kotowski: They have already met with the Sewer Commission and we are satisfied they will do the right thing.

***F. Kotowski motioned to find the plan complete for SNHU Gustafson Center (plan #15-12) 2500 N. River Rd., Map 33, Lot 67, proposal to construct a 14,052 sf welcome and career center building. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.***

### **COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **HK POWERSPORTS (plan #15-17)**

**1354 Hooksett Rd., Map 25, Lot 2**

Amended site plan to construct a 50 ft. by 110 ft. warehouse for storage of product.

J. Duffy: Missing for completeness is the use of the abutting properties as well as a waiver that is required for lack of a lighting plan. He is prepared to distribute that waiver this evening.

D. Marshall: Does staff recommend completion?

J. Duffy: Yes.

*T. Walsh motioned to find the amended site plan to construct a 50 ft. by 110 ft. warehouse for storage of product complete for HK Powersports (plan #15-17), 1354 Hooksett Rd., Map 25, Lot 2. Seconded by M. Durakovic. **Motion carried unanimously.***

**Open public hearing.**

Alden Beauchmen (Keyland Enterprises): They have been stockpiling inventory outside and would like to have a building to store inventory. What is being proposed is a 50x110 building. The building is similar to the existing buildings that are there now.

Jim Whalley (one of the owners of HK Powersports): The scope of the products that we are selling has changed. We no longer sell just motorcycles. It has evolved into side by sides and three-wheeled vehicles. The volume of the product is not changing. It is getting larger and doesn't fit the space that we have. We are proposing a new warehouse to store the products inside as opposed to outside.

F. Kotowski: Will there be fuel in any of the products that are stored inside?

J. Whalley: Approximately 25 percent may have a small amount of fuel that comes from the factory to move the vehicles on and off of the truck.

F. Kotowski: What will the floor be made out of?

J. Whalley: Concrete.

P. Scarpetti: Is the lighting still the same as the other buildings?

J. Whalley: If you look at the design it indicates the location.

P. Scarpetti: Is there steel on the outside?

J. Whalley: Yes. Steel sheets on the outside with wooden structure on the inside.

D. Winterton: Do you expect to increase your traffic flow of customers? This would only protect your inventory?

J. Whalley: It will not change the scope of product or increase the flow of customers. It will just relocate the product.

A. Beauchmen: We submitted five waivers, four with the application and a new one: 1) DR Part III, Section 3.05© 7 Unbroken expanses of walls. Proposed building is 110' long painted to match the other two warehouse buildings; 2) DR Part III, Section 3.03 Landscaping; 3) DR Section 11.12 Drainage Design Criteria; 4) Checklist Item 27, Site Specific Mapping.

D. Marshall: Waiver 1 - DR Part III, Section 3.05© 7 Unbroken expanses of walls. Proposed building is 110' long, painted to match the other two warehouse buildings. You are proposing that there be no break, although this length exceeds 100'.

A. Beauchmen: The regulation is 100' and our building is 110' long. We looked at the possibility of making a break. We have two existing buildings there now. One having a break would not look right, and there doesn't seem to be a benefit or value providing a break.

J. Duffy: I drove by and it would not look right if it had a different color. The two other buildings are exactly alike.

***F. Kotowski motioned to grant Waiver 1 - DR Part III, Section 3.05© 7 Unbroken expanses of walls. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: Waiver 2 – Development Regulations Part III, Section 3.03 Landscaping.

A. Beauchmen: We have an existing site with two existing buildings. To provide a third with landscaping would not look right. In the future we might like to do something around the retail section, but to put landscaping around a storage building did not make sense at this time.

***D. Winterton motioned to grant Waiver 2 – Development Regulations Part III, Section 3.03 Landscaping. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: Waiver 3 - Development Regulations Section 11.12 - Drainage Design Criteria.

J. Donison: I would be okay with their waiver request that they not perform a drainage study, as long as their engineer provided a certification statement with a stamp on it stating that there will not be an impact on any abutting properties.

A. Beauchmen: We are okay with that recommendation and we were going to add that note to the plan with the engineer stamp directly on the plan.

D. Marshall: Who is the engineer?

A. Beauchmen: Dick Wood from Wood Engineering.

***P. Scarpetti motioned to grant Waiver 3 - Development Regulations Section 11.12 - Drainage Design Criteria with the condition that there is a statement on the plan with an engineer stamp stating there will not be an impact on any abutting properties. Seconded by D. Grafton. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: Waiver 4 - Checklist Item 27, Site Specific Mapping.

A. Beauchmen: The majority of the site has been developed. It is all sand and gravel. I attached to the waiver the soil map from the NRCS. Any potential drainage issues are being mitigated by the

installation of drip infiltration trenches along the edge of the building. Any additional run-off generated from the roof will go directly into the infiltration trench along the side of the building, so there should be minimal run-off. The soils are capable of handling that.

***D. Winterton motioned to grant Waiver 4 - Checklist Item 27, Site Specific Mapping. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: Waiver 5 - Site plan regulations Part 1, Section 16 - Outdoor site lighting standards.

A. Beauchmen: He is going to duplicate the lighting that is on the existing buildings. It was recommended that we add a note to the plan that the lighting is to conform with town standards. We are in agreement with that.

***F. Kotowski motioned to grant Waiver 5 - Site plan regulations Part 1, Section 16 - Outdoor site lighting standards. Seconded by M. Durakovic. Motion carried unanimously.***

Open for public comments.

Marc Miville (42 Main Street): Is there any impact to the traffic?

J. Whalley: All we are doing is taking existing product and relocating it from outside to inside. There will be no impact to traffic. The number of our employees is not going to change relative to the space and proposed warehouse.

M. Miville: During the construction period will there be any traffic impact?

J. Whalley: We have plenty of room on the property for any construction vehicles that will be needed.

**Close public hearing.**

***T. Walsh motioned to approve the amended site plan to construct a 50 ft. by 110 ft. warehouse for storage of product for HK POWERSPORTS (plan #15-17), 1354 Hooksett Rd., Map 25, Lot 2 with the added notes and review by the fire department. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.***

J. Whalley: Are we able to discuss the impact fees after the approval or does that need to be discussed now?

J. Duffy: The total is \$3,355. If they do not agree they can request a waiver from this Board. I believe it also has to go to the Town Council for review. There is a process within the impact fee ordinance.

D. Marshall: If the Board approves this plan tonight, I still have to sign it. I will not sign the plan until all the notes that we discussed are on the plan and I am told the impact fees have been paid.

A. Beauchmen: It was not just the \$3,355. It looks as if there is another \$4,000 for the roadways. It is a total of \$7,355. I don't understand the logic behind the impact fees since there does not seem to be any

impact to the site, traffic, roadways, or public safety.

F. Kotowski: HK Powersports has been a great business over time, you have been here a lot of years, and you conduct yourselves very well. The concern I have about impact fees is that if we begin to waive them for a large building that someday could serve a different purpose, it is difficult to go to the next owner and collect them. I think impact fees should be standard for everyone as long as they are reasonable.

D. Winterton: We could have a long discussion about economic development and impact fees, but I am not sure this is the right forum. It is, however, an area of discussion.

T. Walsh: I agree. I don't think this is the place however, for discussion in the future, I can see an impact fee being assessed on a new development, but this is an amended site plan.

J. Whalley: I understand this might not be the place to have the conversation, but I am confused. When you look at what we are trying to do, just to move inventory from the outside to the inside, I don't see how the roadways or public safety are affected to the amount we are being charged. We have been a good tenant of the town for 40 years and, based on the scope of the project and what we are spending, \$7,000 is a lot to add to the cost. Our taxes will be affected by the building.

D. Marshall: This Board does not look at what is happening today. We look at the future. You have been a good business, but if you decide to leave, that will get converted into something else and that is when we get hit. You are the one coming in, so you pay the impact fees.

J. Whalley: If there is a change-of-use, wouldn't there be another impact fee?

D. Marshall: Only the difference in the impact. They may pay some impact fee, but not for the entire site. What has been paid is written off and we will not double collect. If we let this slide for a period of time, due to a poor economy, and we have problems with roads, the town is stuck with the problem of money that was not collected and that could impact taxes. We have to look at the future of the town as a whole.

J. Whalley: If a waiver is requested will that delay the project?

J. Duffy: No. The fees are assessed when you apply for your building permit, but are not paid until 10 days prior to your Certificate of Occupancy.

D. Marshall: If we approve the plan, we will approve it on the basis that we know what the impact fees are. A waiver, later on, won't change the approval, only the impact.

J. Whalley: We are trying to get this project done before the weather changes.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

D. Marshall: I will sign the plans once the corrections are made.

**POTENTIAL PROPERTIES (plan #15-19)**

**6 Rowes Corner Ln., Map 15, Lots 72 & 72-1**

Lot line adjustment to annex 0.91 acres from 15-72-1 to 15-72 and annex 1.22 acres from 15-72 to 15-72-1.

Postponed until October 5, 2015.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**WOODSPRING SUITES**

**47 Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lot 58**

Site plan for a 124-room hotel.

J. Duffy: They were found complete at a previous meeting. This is the public hearing. State permits are pending. There is a portion of the landscaping they would like to plant within the town's right-of-way. Jim worked with the town's attorney to come up with an agreement that is satisfactory to the town and the applicant. That would be part of the conditions of approval. The traffic memorandum has been submitted. We met with DOT early on in the project and, as far as Phase 1, they don't see any reason for traffic improvements. They are asking for two waivers: a check-list item regarding existing reclamation contours and for the master plan to do the scale, instead of 1:40, 1:200 showing the entire site. Also Jim and Nick have been going over technical issues.

J. Donison: I have two review letters that I have prepared and submitted. TF Moran has responded to both. A couple of items are still outstanding. All of items are addressable. It is just a matter of time before they have all of the permits.

N. Golon (TF Moran): This site is surrounded by 75 acres that Jeff Larrabee is in ownership of or has development rights for. This area is zoned industrial. What we are proposing as the first phase is a 4-story, 124 room extended stay hotel. It is approximately 11,000 sq. ft. The brand is WoodSpring suites which is new to our area.

J. Larrabee: WoodSpring Suites is an extended stay hotel that is geared for the business traveler. This has been a growing segment in the market. I spent over \$17,000 to have a feasibility study done by HVS and they loved it. It came out well. This will fulfill a niche in the Concord/Manchester market. It will be great for Hooksett and will serve our businesses.

N. Golon: This is the former Hefren gravel pit. It was over-excavated years ago. We have been before the town, over the course of eight years, about how to reclaim the site. The proposal was to do it through development, creating a functioning site. There is the outstanding notice of violation with regard to the slopes and we will have the opportunity to fix those concerns. The hotel is located in the upper right hand corner of the 5.3 acre lot that was subdivided. Our main entrance is located where the existing hall road is today. That hall road is providing access to the rear of the property where there is also reclamation taking place. It is a two lane road for the purposes of exiting the site. It is part of the master plan for the ongoing development of this property. Our traffic study showed there is limited left hand turns coming out during the peak am and pm hours, but we thought it would be appropriate to



provide additional traffic space relative to our entrance knowing that we had another 70+ acres to develop. Working south through the entrance road, the building will sit up approximately 2' above the grade of Hackett Hill Road. As you are coming down our entrance road, you will get a nice view of the front entrance of the hotel. There is complimentary landscaping that surrounds the building. Primarily we are looking at red maples, American elm, or some of the larger trees. Being that this is Lilac Park, we have a nice assortment of lilacs that have been proposed in and around the building. There will also be more typical plantings in and around the building as far as shrubs to break up the 4-story hotel. Relative to the access, on the lower part of the access drive, we have provided adequate que space for people leaving the site so there will not be a conflict with our driveway entrance. That is one of the things we have master planned for and why that driveway entrance is located so far from the primary entrance. Parking is directly against the building facade where there will be a raised concrete curb. Around the perimeter of that 24' drive isle is the remainder of the parking. That area is not curbed due to stormwater. We are relying on overland flow. The radius's around the building have been designed to accommodate emergency service access and that has been approved by the fire department. At the far right side of the site there is an existing Eversource electrical easement. That is the home for our open stormwater infiltration systems. It is a use that is allowable within those areas and being that we have well-draining, naturally occurring soils in that area, it made sense to utilize it for that purpose. We meet the required number of parking spaces which is 124. There are 131 provided. Landscaping in and around the building is located in the right-of-way. It shields some components of the hotel but highlights others. Relative to utilities, there is a water extension that is pending with the village water precinct. We are talking about 3,500 linear feet of pipe to extend to the site. The path will follow the same as what Pike did for their gas line extension. Electrical and telecommunications will be taken off of the adjacent risers. For sewer and septic needs, we will have an on-site septic that is just under 20,000 gallons per day. There is quite a bit of fill at the location and that is not representative of the testing that was done of the native soils. The existing fill not only within the area of the septic, but within a radius of 40' around it, is being removed in it's entirely for the purpose of the septic. We are hoping for municipal connection in the future. We are relying on open infiltration basins for drainage. Stormwater will sheet across the limited area of our parking into those basins. We have two infiltration basins receiving the majority of the flow, that will trickle down into the next set of infiltration basins prior to the discharge to flat areas on the site. We want to keep our stormwater on our parcel knowing that we want to develop the rest. That will drain to an area in which we are going to rise some of the contours so that we provide more of a level plateau so that it has the opportunity to discharge without potential of negatively impacting a steep slope. We wanted to correct that item per the conversation we had with Jim. In regard to the fill section, there is a fair amount of fill that is in the location of the building. It covers about 1/3 of the southerly portion of the building. There are one of two options and that will be decided based upon the direction of the Geo-technical engineer whether or not there is a building design system that we can incorporate to utilize the existing soils in their place. If that is not a cost effective solution, we can remove them and place them elsewhere on the site. As part of the building permit process, that will need to be addressed to make sure the building foundation is designed adequately. DOT has reviewed and agreed with the assessments that are provided within the traffic impact and access study.

D. Marshall: I assume that on a full set of plans there is a landscaping plan in great detail. From this plan it seems peculiar that if we have a rough winter, do you plan to run your snow storage through the landscaping.

N. Golon: As part of this project, we are relocating the hall road servicing the back part of the property. We have another 75 acres to store our snow. For the purposes of showing site plan compliance, we have the opportunity to say we have the option of stockpiling the snow that is not on top of the septic, but also within the notes that acknowledges that there are areas adjacent to this property in which snow can be stock piled.

P. Scarpetti: Is the driveway you have to the hotel going to be a stand-alone or will it be used for other buildings?

N. Golon: It will be used for other buildings as well. We have done a master plan to make sure it can fulfill the needs of those properties in the future.

P. Scarpetti: Are you going to do a future sewer to the road while you are under construction or are you sticking to a septic?

N. Golon: It was not something we evaluated as part of the project being that the reality of a municipal connection at this point seems to be far off. For a municipal connection, we are most apt to feed it from a central location on the site and pump up to where it is needed. That would provide the opportunity to tie into tanks as they leave our site, tie them into a pump system, and pump it up to the road. We need to do that from an elevation standpoint.

D. Winterton: Upon completion, do you expect this to be visible from the highway?

N. Golon: Yes.

D. Winterton: I see a tree in the upper right hand corner that is 20' tall. As far as the other landscape, along the highway, is it bushes or brush?

N. Golon: There are some tall pines, that provide a nice site line. Our sign is located to the northeast most corner where there is less tree cover. We are hopeful there will be some site line.

D. Marshall: Was there a sign package in the plans?

N. Golon: Yes. They are located on sheet 15 of 17. It shows our monument sign as well as directional signs.

D. Marshall: Monument sign?

N. Golon: Monument sign by definition of the regulations which would allow for a free standing sign of the dimensions that we are trying to show.

D. Marshall: How tall?

N. Golon: 20' tall.

**Open public hearing.**

Thomas Thibeault (66 Hackett Hill Road): When they build, will they start before 7:00 am?

N. Golon: We will abide by all town regulations and ordinances as far as start and end times.

Matthew Rainville (10 Cate Rd.): We just bought our property and we were looking to stay close to the city, but have the country feeling. Our neighbors feel the same. We like how our neighborhood is quiet and we are afraid that it will get more commercialized as this goes on. We don't like the commercialism of this.

D. Marshall: The good news is that the intersection of Hackett Hill Road and Route 3A will be improved. The bad news is it depends on what view you take. From an economic view, this is just a piece of what is proposed in the master plan. To develop the lilac property is extensive. They may even have a concert venue. From an economic point of view from the town's aspect it is a boom, from your viewpoint it may not be. They are proposing to use the property for what it is zoned for. The Board is looking forward to having growth in the town, and it is a perfect location having the toll booth there. Jeff has shown he is willing to be a good neighbor. I would encourage the people in that area to meet with Jeff about the plans as they proceed.

M. Rainville: I have talked to a few residents on Hackett Hill Road that are as opposed as I was, and we wanted to voice concern regarding the congestion.

D. Winterton: Is there a way that you and your neighborhood could be put on an abutter list as a courtesy, so that you will know whenever we are having a meeting that discusses this.

M. Rainville: You could put my name and address on an abutter list. How level is the building and the site line going to be from the top of the road?

N. Golon: The finished elevation of the proposed building will be 2' above Hackett Hill Road.

M. Rainville: How far back from Hackett Hill Road?

N. Golon: It will be a sizable right-of-way. The front set-back is 65' from the property line, where 50' is required. The right-of-way that is associated with Hackett Hill Road is about 100' from the roadway.

M. Rainville: Our concern is how much we will be able to see it. The sand pit is an eye sore, but I don't want to see a commercialized building.

T. Walsh: I appreciate your concerns, but I believe that when you see how Jeff works and the quality of this, I could not think of a better transition from commercial to low density residential. It might seem terrifying now, but I think when it is done it won't be an issue.

M. Rainville: We read about the proposal for the Live Nation concert venue. We are wondering how

much is too much. The hotel makes sense economically, but a restaurant, venue, and then it will be like Meadowbrook. I like Meadowbrook, but I would not want to live around the corner from it. How much is too much before I don't want to live in this area anymore.

D. Marshall: We will get you on the list of abutters.

T. Thibeault: We have been there close to 30 years and this pit has been utilized by various construction companies that were going to turn it into something, and it was turned into nothing but a pit. Jeff has made himself accessible. It is my understanding the concert venue will be quite a ways into the future. Am I correct about that?

N. Golon: It would be located in close proximity to Hackett Hill Road. The festival grounds, which are shown on our conceptual master plan, are located in the back two-thirds of the site, not in the immediate area of Hackett Hill Road. The Live Nation theme would be over an expansive area a considerable distance from this and we are not sure if that is going to move forward.

J. Larrabee: The chance of Live Nation happening is about ten percent. If anything, it proved that this location is good for a venue like this. The original concept we had for Lilac Park was to create a venue much like Meijer Garden in Michigan. It is a 1,900 person seat concert venue with a botanical garden that surrounds it. It is an intimate type of concert festival park.

Marc Miville: Regarding concerts and the sound, you might hear it here in the village. The neighbors might be asking for some sound mitigation and privacy.

D. Marshall: That will come up as plans develop over time.

J. Donison: I would like to note that the traffic plan as well as the entrance was reviewed just for this site, not any future development. For any future development a traffic impact study will have to be resubmitted and the entrance will have to be looked at. One of my comments was regarding the sidewalk along the frontage of the property. There is a sidewalk on site and a partial one as you go under the interstate. The site will be interconnected to a future sidewalk which could possibly go to Route 3A. There was a question about the access road. Currently the access road is where the entrance to the hotel is. TF Moran will show where the future access road will be on the revised plans. They will incorporate that into the side slope. The main entrance had a 3:1 slope. That will be revised to 4:1 to address the need to not to have a guardrail. We had some recommendations that there be a guardrail placed around the perimeter of the parking. TF Moran indicated that the design of the stormwater system was not to have posts sticking out. What they are going to propose around the perimeter is a 2' gravel section so that people will hear the gravel when they are driving so they are not driving into a detention pond which is about 3' deep. Outstanding permits include the Alteration of Terrain, groundwater permit, and the subsurface system which TF Moran spoke to earlier. They have to get the approval from the village precinct. That is 3,500 linear feet of roadway impact. That will probably happen as a result of having the water main extending up Hackett Hill Road, although those plans have not been developed yet. We will want to review those to make sure they incorporate any impact to the roadway. Regarding the comment about lighting, they addressed intensity levels. We wanted to make sure the lighting fixtures were in accordance with the town intensity levels. One additional comment

that Nick addressed was to make sure a Geo-technical engineer was involved in the placement of the fill materials. One-third of the building will have 20' of fill material placed underneath it and we want that to be compacted properly.

J. Duffy: There will be impact fees assessed in the amount of \$51,610.

**Close public hearing.**

N. Golon: Waivers we want to include within our site plan our master plan concept are Waiver 1 - 14.02, Checklist (2)(a) Existing reclamation contours. Waiver 2 - Development Regulations require scale not smaller than 1:40. Master plan shows scale of 1:200.

D. Marshall: Who owns the pit?

J. Larrabee: I do.

D. Marshall: Has this pit ever come close to being reclaimed?

J. Duffy: No.

D. Marshall: Who's responsibility if pit reclamation?

J. Duffy: Jeff went to the ZBA and came up with a new plan for the reclamation itself, and they approved it based on the fact that he was coming in for site plan approval.

N. Golon: Jeff also obtained an Alteration of Terrain permit approval for the reclamation process.

J. Larabee: In 2002, the bond expired and something slipped through the cracks. We wanted to solve the process through the development process. When we are able to move the electrical lines which we have been working with Eversource on, that is when we will be able to move the large cones on the southern end which is impossible to put any vegetation on. The relationship between us and Eversource has been good because they have an existing problem as well, being that they cannot access their poles. This solves a lot of problems.

D. Marshall: Waiver 1 - 14.02, Checklist (2)(a) Existing reclamation contours.

J. Donison: The first set of plans that were submitted were confusing. TF Moran added some additional spot elevation around the site to make it easier to follow. I am okay with the revisions they made to the plan.

***P. Scarpetti motioned to grant Waiver 1 - 14.02, Checklist (2)(a) Existing reclamation contours. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: Waiver 2 - Development Regulations require scale not smaller than 1:40. Master plan shows scale of 1:200.

***D. Winterton motioned to grant Waiver 2 - Development Regulations require scale not smaller than 1:40. Master plan shows scale of 1:200. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: With the outstanding items, is this plan ready to be approved, or do we have a list of conditions?

J. Duffy: We can list those conditions in the letter of approval and will not call you to come to sign them until they are complete.

***P. Scarpetti motioned to find the site plan for a 124-room hotel for WoodSpring Suites, 47 Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lot 58, complete, with conditions. Seconded by T. Walsh.***

F. Kotowski: Do you have a name for the road?

N. Golon: We do not. We need to provide three suggestions to the Town Council, which we will do in the future.

P. Scarpetti: If this gets approved, when do you plan on starting?

N. Golon: We are trying for November and would like to get the roof on by winter.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

### **CHANGE OF USE**

J. Duffy: Savic Auto Brokers, LLC, 1176 Hooksett Road, Map 39, lot 3. Existing use car dealership. Proposed use car dealership. – Approved.

J. Duffy: Matt received an email from the owner of Park Place regarding an article in the Union Leader about the need for apartments. He said that if the Town of Hooksett would like to reconsider multi-family housing for Park Place he would be willing to make an investment in a good project and mentioned hurdles with the town involved with the developing the site including: 1) The ZBA's conditional approval of a mixed-use project requiring a commercial property be developed in advance of the housing. 2) Density limitations by the zoning ordinance. 3) Hooksett's parking requirements for multi-family properties. 4) Water and sewer impact fees. The ZBA approved the variance but said they had to build commercial out front first. They wanted to go ahead but they needed to get more density in their project and they wanted it to be for extended stay, not for apartments. The town did not care for that. They went back to the ZBA a few years later and asked if they would reconsider the approval and the ZBA said no.

D. Marshall: This is in the performance zone. Unless you change the zoning, I don't see anything going forward unless it is strictly commercial.

F. Kotowski: When they originally came in they wanted to build residential to the degree they had

taken out the old units and more.

J. Duffy: They also didn't have enough parking.

T. Walsh: They wanted a lot to happen on that small piece of property.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

None

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **➤ Approval of Stantec Invoices**

None

#### **➤ Merrimack Reserve Lot Merger**

The Chairman signed off on the merger.

#### **➤ Master Plan Update**

J. Duffy: Staff met with a representative from Southern New Hampshire Planning to talk about going over what we would like to do for the master plan update. We only have \$22,000 so we thought it might be best to do sections at a time. The economic development chapter was updated two years ago. We put in a new chapter for energy and looked at the chapters to determine what needed to be updated and what items had been accomplished. Could you look at the master plan and the previous recommendations from 2004 to see which chapters you would like to see updated. We can schedule a workshop meeting to go into the details of it.

D. Marshall: At our next meeting we can set up a workshop for the end of October or the first of November.

J. Donison: One of the items to discuss would be what your feelings are for the chapters that should be updated as part of the money that is available.

J. Duffy: We also had the Community Profile so we have already gotten input and ideas from the public.

D. Winterton: Is there a process that Jim is doing for the reviews as far as billing and applicants? Will those come to us for approval?

J. Donison: It is open to any approach. That plan was that we were going to submit my invoices for any of the time that I am involved in reviewing or inspecting projects and not request the approval of the Planning Board. If you would like to change that we can.

D. Marshall: It depends on what view you are taking. The concept of bringing on a town engineer was that it would be paid for out of fees, which is not going to happen in this economy, versus the old system that didn't cost the town anything because the developers paid for the cost. I believe that is now an administrative decision except that the Board is responsible, under state law, for determining how the process will be carried. So far it has worked out well. Jim has proven to be an asset, and I think we are running smoothly.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*D. Winterton motioned to adjourn. Seconded by T. Walsh. **Motion carried unanimously.***

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 pm.**

**Respectfully submitted by,**

**AnnMarie White  
Recording Clerk**