

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)  
35 Main Street  
Monday, December 7, 2015**

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

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

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

**ALTERNATES: Denise Grafton**

**EXCUSED: Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman) and Michael DiBitetto (Alternate)**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 11/16/15**

**November 16, 2015 Regular Meeting – P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2015 meeting. Seconded by M. Durakovic. Motion carried unanimously.**

**VOTE ON CIP PLAN FY 2017-2022**

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)**

CIP Plan review and vote by Planning Board

Dean Shankle (Town Administrator): I am here to get feedback or suggestions on the CIP that Christine Soucie, the Finance Director, went over with you at your last meeting.

D. Marshall: She did a thorough job when she made the presentation.

D. Shankle: She said that you mentioned the feasibility of the southern leg of the parkway and whether or not you would like to keep that in. If you are amenable to taking that out, the next step would be to put together a warrant article to take that \$61,913 that is in the trust fund and put it back in the general fund. We don't want to do that until the Planning Board indicates that is their wish because that is your project.

D. Marshall: My view is that once you give it up you are done, but it is up to the Board.

F. Kotowski: I believe we ought to engage SNHU in the process and get them to commit one way or the other that they are interested in moving forward at some point or not. If they are not, that would be

an indicator to us to move in the direction to put that money to better use.

P. Scarpetti: At the same time we could find out what the true intention of the road is that they just built.

D. Marshall: Traffic is not becoming lighter and they keep expanding. They are not facing the issue of traffic circulation knowing that North River Road is a public highway. It is not going to get turned over to them as their main street. I believe we need to have a discussion with SNHU, possibly do away with the by-pass, and address the fact that circulation issues need to be addressed.

***F. Kotowski motioned to have the Town Administrator contact SNHU on behalf of the town to put together a meeting to discuss their intentions moving forward. The meeting should include the Planning Board, Town Council members, and anyone else with an interest in bringing this matter to a conclusion. Seconded by D. Winterton.***

D. Winterton: Whether this be directed by the Town Administrator or the Town Planner, all relevant departments within the town should be involved.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

***D. Winterton motioned to approve the CIP as presented by the Town Administration. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.***

## **CONTINUED COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING**

### **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.

J. Duffy: They submitted their application and had several things missing which we informed them about. They argued that this was a lot-line adjustment and they didn't need to submit certain items based on the lot-line adjustment check list. It is a front lot with frontage on Rowes Corner and there is a back lot with no frontage. They asked for a variance to take 50' of frontage from the front lot to give to the back lot. The Zoning Board approved it. They came to the Planning Board to do the lot-line adjustment and the Planning Board asked for someone from the Zoning Board to attend. Mr. Bairam came, however, they canceled that evening and the hearing did not take place. They are back before the Planning Board trying to go through the motions. They are saying this is a lot-line adjustment because it started out as two lots. It is still two lots, but one of the lots is unbuildable because of the lack of frontage. This is going back and forth as to the necessity of having a wetland scientist. They did not show any of the wetlands that were on the original plan. They have now shown some of them, but not all. The front lot has wetlands covering most of the front area of the lot. There are several issues with the plan. 1) ZBA approval required for wetland impact for driveway crossing. 2) Staff recommends plans are stamped by a wetlands scientist. 3) Wetland 40 buffer zones not shown on each lot. 4) Missing the 100'x75' buildable area.

D. Marshall: Can they make that a buildable area?

J. Duffy: It looks like they can not, and they have not applied for a waiver. 5) Well radius for both parcels A and B overlap onto lots 15/73 and 15/58. An easement has not been provided. 6) Lot 7201 shows the house located within the proposed wetland setback. 7) Leach field requires 25' setback from lot line. This has not been provided for both lots. 8) Additional wetlands on lot 72 have not been shown. 9) What is the size of the proposed structures shown? 10) Owners names for abutting properties and use of lots have not been noted. 11) What is the proposed grade of the shared driveway? 12) Septic tank requires a 50' setback and leach field requires a 75' setback from the well radius. This requirement has not been met for lot 72-1. Based on those items, I would recommend the Board find the plan incomplete and deny the application.

***D. Grafton motioned to deny the plans. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.***

### **COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **ENTERPRISE HOLDINGS (plan #15-23)**

##### **1093 Hooksett Rd., Map 41, Lot 76**

Amended site plan to convert the existing building, formerly occupied as a gas station, to a rental car facility.

- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist #10 Surveyor name, address & signature
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist #26 Wetlands delineation
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist #27 Site specific soil mapping
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist #47 Landscaping plan
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist #48 Exterior lighting plan
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist #49 Storm drainage plan
- **Waiver Request** from Zoning Ordinance (Performance Zone) Section F, Figure 10-A (1), Footnote #3 “Automotive service bay doors may not be positioned on the façade of any building facing a public street or Residential District boundary located within 200 feet”

D. Marshall: Is the plan complete?

J. Duffy: Yes.

***F. Kotowski motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.***

J. Duffy: We were recommending all of the waivers. There was discussion on the lighting, the storm drainage plan, and the landscaping plan between the applicants and Jim.

J. Donison: Regarding the lighting plan, it was agreed that a note was going to be added onto the plan. As far as the storm drainage plan, a note was going to be added onto the plan indicating maintenance would be performed on an annual basis.

D. Marshall: If those two have been agreed to by the applicant, there is no need for a waiver?

J. Donison: The waivers would all be required. They are not providing a storm management report nor an exterior lighting plan. They are looking to use the existing lights and the lighting plan doesn't meet the ordinance.

F. Kotowski: How does it not meet the lighting ordinance?

Brian Pratt (CLD Engineering): The former gas station is going to be reoccupied with an Enterprise Rent- A-Car. They removed the canopies and underground storage tanks. We are doing little changes to the site except the building facade will be painted and given new doors, and the sidewalks. The waiver for the lighting is to keep the existing lighting as they have been for 30 years. They will replace the fixtures with LED lights when they blow out. There is some light spillage in a couple of areas. We now have a lighting plan which we did not have when we submitted the waiver. After doing the lighting intensity plan there are no dark spots. The light at the corner of Alice Ave. and our site entrance has some spillage. We are replacing with similar fixtures so the spillage will be minor.

D. Marshall: Once the property has been vacant for over a year all of the new ordinances apply, therefore, you need the waiver.

B. Pratt: The waiver is to use the existing lighting as it has been.

D. Marshall: Does staff agree to grant the waiver?

J. Donison: Based on the lighting plan I saw, it seems like a reasonable request.

D. Marshall: Okay. Could you please explain the issue with the storm drainage.

J. Donison: The original plan submitted indicated an underwater storm water retention tank. The applicants engineer stated that a maintenance plan will be developed in which there will be maintenance on it once a year.

B. Pratt: I provided a note to the plan indicating the purpose of the tank and the maintenance plan. There are some retention tanks that have been installed to slow down the storm water that is leaving the site. Everything is functioning properly. The waiver is to not do a full storm water analysis because we are using the site as it has been used.

J. Donison: I agree with the request for a waiver.

P. Scarpetti: As far as the lighting plan, it is based on the new LED lights. What about the existing lights?

B. Pratt: There was a plan submitted in 1986 that I can show you, but it doesn't show what is there now.

P. Scarpetti: Could the new lights all be put in now so they look the same?

J. Donison: It seems reasonable that all of the lights be changed to LED before occupancy.

B. Pratt: We can do that.

*P. Scarpetti motioned to approve all of the waivers for Enterprise Holdings (plan #15-23), 1093 Hooksett Rd., Map 41, Lot 76, with the exception of putting in all of the LED lights before occupancy. Seconded by Don Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.*

**Open public hearing.**

B. Pratt: Enterprise Rent-A-Car does not intend to change anything on site. The minimal changes to the site are the building facade. They will be adding a garage door to the front of the building in order to hand wash vehicles. We met with the Sewer Commission and they approved our plan and signed a letter. They are going to send an email that we will forward to Planning. We will re-stripe the pavement. There will be six parking spaces along the front of the building and an additional 42 vehicle storage spaces. The curb lines are not changing. The property owner improved the landscaping by adding pear trees and evergreen shrubs. As far as traffic, we did a trip generation letter. There will be a significant decrease in traffic from the gas station to this.

D. Marshall: Will there be any impact fees?

J. Duffy: No, because it is an existing building.

B. Pratt: Manchester Water Works has no issues with the proposed change and we submitted a DOT driveway permit about a month ago.

D. Marshall: Are you modifying the driveway?

B. Pratt: No. They will eventually replace the sign with a new sign, but they will come in for a sign permit. The signage on the building meets the ordinance.

D. Winterton: What is the timing on the major sign?

Bill Fridlington (Enterprise Holdings): The sign company is still working on it and we will submit a separate application for that.

**Open to abutters.**

No abutter or public comments.

**Close public hearing.**

*F. Kotowski motioned to approve the plan for Enterprise Holdings (plan #15-23), 1093 Hooksett Rd., Map 41, Lot 76 with the conditions that, before the plans are signed, the NH DOT driveway permit and the email from the Sewer Department are received, and the two comments regarding the storm water drainage and the lighting be changed on the plan set. Seconded by D. Grafton. Motion carried unanimously.*

**RECOMMENDATION TO THE ZBA**

**HARMONY PLACE, LLC (ZBA Case #15-14)**

**1621 Hooksett Rd., Map 14, Lot 27**

- **Variance Request** from Article 5, Section C.3.b of the Zoning Ordinance to permit 63 two-bedroom units in 3 buildings of multi-family housing.

J. Duffy: In 2009, Harmony Place was approved by the Planning Board for use for 55+ housing. Part of the approval included contribution towards drainage improvement and other off-site improvements on Hooksett Road, consisting of adding a left hand turn lane both ways and a d-cell lane into the property. The property owner has not been able to develop the property due to financing constraints of the 55+ federal monies that have been available. A few years ago they came back to the Zoning Board looking to change to regular multi-family housing and withdrew the application. They are now back looking to remove the requirement of 55+ and have conventional multi-family housing. This requires a Zoning Board variance and the Zoning Board would like the Planning Board's opinion before they take their vote, which is scheduled for tomorrow evening.

D. Marshall: Does staff have an opinion?

J. Duffy: Based on reading and listening to other people there is a shortage of apartments. We have been receiving comments from an abutter concerning traffic and Jennifer McCourt had an idea to ease those issues.

D. Marshall: Why are there left hand turn lanes in both directions?

J. McCourt (McCourt Engineering): There is a driveway across the street from us and the left hand turn northbound goes into their driveway. It will help the driveways north and south.

J. Duffy: If the Zoning Board approves this, they have to come back to the Planning Board for an amended site plan.

D. Marshall: Please explain the concerns with the traffic.

J. McCourt: The abutter to the south, Chris Lampron, has no site distance at his driveway. I looked at the elevations and where their driveway is, and we can create a driveway for them onto the new private driveway so they can have full access of the entire intersection instead.

D. Marshall: Mr. Lampron, would you be willing to close the Rt. 3 driveway?

Chris Lampron (1617 Hooksett Rd.): It is a shared driveway with my neighbor.

D. Marshall: Would the shared driveway be sharing this access?

J. McCourt: I did not know it was a shared driveway.

D. Marshall: It is possible to provide this so both those driveways are going onto that road.

C. Lampron: It comes up from Hooksett Road and splits off.

J. Donison: Does your neighbor have to go across your property in order to have access to the site?

J. McCourt: They would have to cross his property. They would have to get an access easement.

Sonny Sell (Owner): To us it wouldn't matter. Chris and his neighbor would have to discuss this.

D. Marshall: Who would build the crossroad?

S. Sell: We would.

D. Marshall: So you would have to have an agreement to build the driveway so you are not too close to the house. Is it possible to work that out?

C. Lampron: I haven't talked to my neighbor.

J. McCourt: We are also negating the easement for the water tower. They will go through our property to get to it.

D. Marshall: That is only for maintenance.

J. McCourt: Yes. The Lampron's will be able to have that access easement removed.

D. Marshall: Will you give up access to Rt. 3 if you are provided access to the other road?

C. Lampron: I will still need the driveway to get my trash barrel's to the road, but I would not use it to get on and off of my property.

D. Marshall: Chris's house is taken care off and has access. The other property would be at risk.

D. Winterton: You are proposing a private road that your neighbor might access. This would be privately plowed where his access now is state plowed?

J. McCourt: Rt. 3 is, but he has to plow his own driveway now.

D. Winterton: If you haven't plowed your private road yet, what is his alternative.

J. McCourt: This will have to be plowed because people from 63 units will need to get out. I think Chris and his wife need to talk with their neighbor.

P. Scarpetti: Where you are proposing to go over to the private driveway, is that in the shared portion?

J. McCourt: No, we would be going into the Lamprons' backyard. I don't know exactly where the shared part is.

S. Sell: I know we can come to an agreement. It is just what they can work out.

D. Marshall: The Planning Board wants a recommendation by tomorrow night, however, these two parties will not have an agreement by then. If we send a recommendation to the ZBA to grant this request and they grant it, then these two parties are at your mercy.

J. McCourt: We have to come back here as well. The ZBA and you can put conditions on it. The concern was with property values and the additional traffic we would be adding and traffic safety. The original traffic report showed a left hand turn lane and d-cell lane was not warranted, but because of the amount of traffic, my client agreed to do the full improvement. When people are going northbound they will slow down because people will be turning into that road.

D. Marshall: If we send a recommendation that we have no objection to this, it would be in your best interest to have an agreement by all parties before you come back to us.

S. Sell: Up until this meeting, we did not realize there were two other parties involved.

C. Lampron: I have been pursuing this for years, but my neighbor has not voiced his concerns to anyone. I would like his issue to be addressed, but I don't want to pave a road through my backyard for him. He could swing around the shared driveway. I would also not want him to park on our driveway.

J. McCourt: I can understand where the Board is coming from. I will look into this and try to come up with a resolution for everyone.

D. Marshall: What is the recommendation of the Board regarding changing this from 55+ housing to standard apartments?

D. Grafton: Would these be apartments or condominiums?

S. Sell: They are currently apartment rentals, but they could become condominiums.

D. Marshall: There would be little difference between the two.

F. Kotowski: 55+ and apartments are different.

D. Marshall: The major difference would be the increase in traffic. Have you indicated what the percentage in traffic increase would be?

J. McCourt: I submitted Steve Pernaw's letter regarding that as part of the ZBA application. We will be having it redone. According to the report, there would be an additional 28 am and 33 pm on an average weekday basis during peak ours. This represents approximately the same volume of traffic as the original development proposal. There are five additional trips during peak hours going from the elderly housing to the apartments. We will be keeping the two bedrooms and increasing the parking up top from the elderly housing.

D. Marshall: With 55+ we were not dealing with children. This will add impact fees.



P. Scarpetti: Were concessions make at the time when the 55+ was agreed to?

D. Marshall: No. They came in requesting a 55+ development and they met the guidelines.

J. Duffy: The only item that went back and forth was the drainage.

J. McCourt: We are still donating \$150,000 to repair that drainage system.

***D. Winterton motioned to send a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Administration stating the Planning Board has no objection to the granting of a variance to allow this to change from 55+ housing to standard apartment/condominium housing. Seconded by M. Durakovic.***

D. Winterton: Since this will come back and our positive action here will allow the applicant and the neighbors to have a discussion, my motion would allow them to continue forward and we still have an opportunity to discuss this when it comes back.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

D. Marshall: If the ZBA approves this, what is your plan on coming back to us.

J. McCourt: We are still waiting on our state approvals, so not until next year.

**CHANGE OF USE**

J. Duffy: Macy Industries, 5 Lehoux Drive, Map 24, lot 35-2 – existing use is warehousing. Proposed use is multi-unit warehousing – approved.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

➤ **SNHU Surety**

J. Donison: We had a pre pre-construction meeting with SNHU about the requirements they would need before this went to a construction phase which included 30% of what the on-site improvements would be. We also discussed the amount of the bond that would cover the landscaping. It was requested that the \$286,327 be reduced to the cost of the reclamation bond. If they decided to start site improvements, and didn't proceed with the project, the reclamation bond would be able to cover the cost of the restoration.

***P. Scarpetti motioned to reduce the surety amount. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

➤ **2016 Planning Board Schedule**

***There was a consensus to accept the 2016 Planning Board Schedule.***

D. Marshall: Are we proposing any zoning amendments?

J. Duffy: There are six proposed zoning changes.

C. Cronin: There has also been an interest in discussing the conservation sub-division ordinance. The conservation sub-division is an article of the zoning ordinance.

J. Duffy: We don't have any applications for the December 21, 2015 meeting.

D. Marshall: There will be no meeting on December 21, 2015.

P. Scarpetti: I will not be here for the workshop on February 25 and would like to work with you on that.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm.**

**Respectfully submitted by,**

**AnnMarie White  
Recording Clerk**