

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, February 1, 2016**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Marshall (Chairman), T. Prasol, Muamer Durakovic, F. Kotowski (stepped down at 8:13pm), and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Denise Grafton and Michael DiBitetto

EXCUSED: Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman) and P. Scarpetti

STAFF: Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Town Planner) and Jim Donison (Town Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director)

Both alternates will be voting members of the Board.

DISCUSSION

Planning Board Alternate Application

D. Marshall: We are moving this agenda item to the last item this evening to provide the applicant with an opportunity to sit through a meeting.

SNHU ATHLETIC COMPLEX

East Side Dr. & North River Rd., Map 33, Lot 67

Conceptual discussion of a proposed athletic facility to include sports fields, tennis courts, and associated landscaping, parking and utility improvements.

Monther Mardini (Associate Vice President of Capital Projects for SNHU): We have a new project for SNHU, which is an athletic complex, and we want to let you know what it is about.

Gordon Leedy (Landscape Architect and Planner with VHB): We want to give you a conceptual overview of what we would like to do. We made an application to the TRC and we anticipate moving into site plan process fairly quickly. *Mr. Leedy showed an overview of the campus.* The complex would be to the north and east of East Side Drive, and north and west of the new connector road. The idea is to bring the athletic facilities up to NCAA standards. It will include an NCAA track, turf field, 1,500 seat grandstand, offices, concessions, and locker rooms. Also included are the throws events for javelin and hammer toss. There would be six competition level tennis courts. Additional parking would be

provided convenient to the venue and a landscaped roadway and walkways surrounding the facility. At this time, we are not proposing any direct impacts to wetlands. We will likely have some buffer impacts that we will discuss with the town and Conservation Commission. This is an attractive addition to campus, and a much needed facility based on the success the athletic program SNHU has had.

D. Winterton: What will happen to Larkin Field?

G. Leedy: That will be maintained and used for recreational programs.

D. Winterton: All of the traffic for the back parking lot will be generated on East Side Drive, up to Victory Land, and into that area?

G. Leedy: Yes.

D. Marshall: This is all new and anything being built will not be replacing any existing facility?

G. Leedy: Correct.

D. Marshall: It will be attached to Victory Lane?

G. Leedy: Yes.

D. Marshall: Although it has been said the gate to the connector road will not be opened, if you are attracting NCAA events the traffic will not be handled on North River Road. On any discussions that we have, you need to be prepared to explain to us what you are going to do to Bicentennial Drive to improve it and what mitigating steps you are going to take to avoid any bad traffic situations in that area. Other than that it looks great.

D. Grafton: What was the proposal for the parking situation for the complex?

G. Leedy: Two parking lots are proposed. 160 parking spaces in one location and 140 in another location.

D. Grafton: You have a capacity of 750 cars to take into account.

G. Leedy: There will be a lot of people walking from campus. This is a school facility. The events they have are going to be similar to the events they currently have on campus.

M. Mardini: We expect carpooling, buses, shuttles, and people walking. There will be an accommodation for all of that.

D. Winterton: I think it looks great. I would imagine this will be available for evening events and TRC will set up lighting. You are getting close to the back.

G. Leedy: We were able to use the topography to set the field down into the landscape and that

provides a buffer. We are far from the neighbors on the other side of the brook. There is 500' to 600' of wooded area.

D. Winterton: It also looks nice to have that kind of facility in Hooksett, NH where a lot of youth play soccer. I think it is nice to be good neighbors.

M. DiBietto: When Victory Lane was proposed, it was not going to be an open road. The University is growing and we have not seen an overall traffic plan. We have not addressed the access and understanding of where the traffic is coming from. We have West Alice that is right off the highway going to Victory Lane, and there is a gate there. I thought that would be the primary access into the campus. It is designed to be a collector road. The University said as development came along a traffic study would be warranted. Is that part of the scope of what VHB is going to do?

M. Mardini: We are looking into that now. Respecting this Board, we do not want to open Victory Lane, with the exception of some events, without coming to you.

M. DiBietto: This Board doesn't know what the traffic loads are on any of these roads and what the best avenue might be. I think we ought to address how people will eventually get in and out of the campus as it continues to grow.

D. Marshall: This Board faces the problem of phasing. We reach the point where there are no alternatives. We need to see more of the Master Plan and the build-out and traffic analysis that goes along with that.

F. Kotowski: SNHU has done a wonderful job with the expansion. However, early on, I saw plans that would have diverted traffic in a different way than it is now. North River Road is treacherous. Is there anything in the planning stages looking at traffic?

M. Mardini: Not as of yet.

COMPLETENESS

BLUEBIRD SELF STORAGE (#15-07)

7 College Park Dr., Map 14, Lot 1-10

Site plan for a 2-story, 80,000 square foot storage facility.

C. Cronin: They have two applications. Jim worked with Kent Brown from Brown Engineering on the plan review for the site plan. There is a waiver outstanding for the driveway standard.

M. DiBietto: What is the nature of the waiver on the driveway standard?

J. Donison: The standard they have for the driveway they got from the sub-division regulations. It has 18" of sand, 18" of bank run gravel, 6" of crushed gravel, and 4" of pavement. I asked them to make a proposal for something more suitable for this type of driveway. They are proposing 18" of bank run, 12" of gravel, and 4" of pavement. I think that is acceptable.

D. Marshall: You have no objections on the completeness or waiver?

J. Donison: Correct. I have gone through the plans and had numerous comments. There is nothing that cannot be revised with notes and changes.

*F. Kotowski motioned to find the site plan complete for Bluebird Self Storage (#15-07) 7 College Park Dr., Map 14, Lot 1-10. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

C. Cronin: The public hearing on the site plan will be March 7 at 6:00 p.m.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING

GREENVIEW MANAGEMENT (#16-02)

7 College Park Dr., Map 14, Lot 1-10

Subdivision of parcel 14-1-10 and associated easements on said lot and on parcel 14-1-9.

C. Cronin: The only outstanding items are the final easements for the driveway.

*D. Winterton motioned to find the sub-division plans for Greenview Management (#16-02), 7 College Park Dr., Map 14, Lot 1-10 complete pending the easements and other details as required or suggested by our staff. Seconded by T. Prasol. **Motion carried unanimously.***

Open public hearing.

Kent Brown (Brown Engineering): Jeff Burd is in attendance as the owner's representative on behalf of Greenview Management. This is located at the southeast corner of Rt. 3 and Campus Drive. One of the lots is 11.6 acres and the parcel for the site plan is 12.75 acres. The purpose of the sub-division is for a commercial development of one of the two lots anticipating that the other two, the existing one and the new one created, will ultimately be commercial developments of some kind. Bluebird Self Storage will be the ultimate user of this and the company that will be presenting the site plan. The property is in mixed-use district and has been designated as commercial use. The access and utility easement is a part of the sub-division plan. The purpose of the easement is to allow water to be brought in from Campus Drive at the end of the existing main. The main water line for University Heights came from the water tower. There is a 12" main that goes down Rt. 3, however, through testing done by the Hookett Village Water Precinct, it was determined the pressure is too low to serve a commercial development. The proposed water line extension will also have taps for the remaining two lots. The easement also provides a means of access to all three lots from Campus Drive. During the TRC meetings, there was discussion about our original proposal to utilize the driveway permit that is available to this property which is an access from Rt. 3. We met with the owners and came up with an agreement to do an easement for an access off of Campus Drive which will provide an access for the other two lots which would limit them needing to come off of Rt. 3.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

D. Winterton motioned to approve the sub-division as presented for Greenview Management (#16-

02), 7 College Park Dr., Map 14, Lot 1-10. The Chairman is authorized to sign the plans once all of the paperwork with the easements is finalized. Seconded by M. Durakovic.

J. Donison: Comments staff had was to provide the final version of the access and utility easements. That will have to be finalized and acceptable to the town and town attorney before anything is signed. The other comment was for some adjustments to notes on the plans, but I believe those have been done.

D. Winterton: What will this look like from DW highway?

K. Brown: We will be prepared to discuss that at the site plan meeting.

F. Kotowski: On the cover page of the plan it mentions sub-surface septic. How will that be served?

K. Brown: That will be also be discussed at the site plan meeting.

T. Prasol: How far is the entrance from Rt. 3?

K. Brown: Approximately 500'.

J. Donison: It is directly opposite from the driveway that goes to the library.

Motion carried unanimously.

STEBBINS ASSOCIATES, INC./PRO CON, INC. (#16-01)

1359 Hooksett Rd., Map 19, Lot 2

Amended site plan for a building addition, pavement re-stripping, removal of pavement and installation of landscaping.

➤ **Waiver Request** – from Completeness Checklist.

C. Cronin: Pro Con is doing an addition of their property. Staff is in favor of granting the waiver conditional upon receiving a letter with a PE stamp waiving the drainage plan.

J. Donison: The waiver included reference to a detailed lighting plan and drainage report. As part of their site plan improvements they would not provide a lighting plan.

D. Marshall: Is staff okay with that?

J. Donison: The waiver would include there being no need for a lighting, landscaping plan, or drainage report. One of my responses was to provide a letter that the pipes would be changed, there would be no changes to the pipe size and no increase on run-off, and to have a PE stamp.

D. Marshall: Did we get a letter with your review?

J. Donison: I do have a letter that I can provide to you.

Michael Malynowski (Allen & Major): This is an amendment to an existing approved site plan. A portion of parking lot was approved last year. Pro Con did the modifications to the site plan as part of that. Lighting was installed and approved last year. The one light we are adding is to replace a pole mounted light that was on a utility pole that was taken down. The pole will match the poles currently on site. They are adding minimal landscaping to the front. We had approximately 6,000 sq. ft. of pavement that we are removing as part of the previously approved plan. We are at a net decrease in our overall pavement. The small amount of drainage we are doing is the addition of two catch basins. The existing parking lot ramps up to what was an old loading dock that is part of the old building. That loading dock and piece of the building will be taken down so that entire area can be depressed and there won't be such a severe grade in that area. The catch basins are to keep the water away from the front of the building and we are tying into an existing well. All the contributing area went through that existing system before. We are just relocating a small piece of that.

M. DiBitetto: That plan came to the Planning Board last year?

M. Malynowski: In 2013.

M. DiBitetto: Does this require an approval on the Alteration of Terrain?

M. Malynowski: We are below the requirements. The only DES permit we will have to do is amend a sub-surface approval for one of the systems.

M. DiBitetto: This Board will be the only reviewing Board?

M. Malynowski: Correct.

M. DiBitetto: What is the amount of expansion on the building?

Matt Wirth (Vice-President of Architecture for Pro Con): The area we are expanding is approximately 6,000 sq. ft. of additional footprint over the existing footprint.

M. DiBitetto: You are renovating some of the space?

M. Wirth: Yes, internally. It is expansion of our own office. We are adding employees and need more space. The existing part that is being torn down is currently storage. We are adding two stories of office space with a new entrance.

D. Winterton: Are you going to replace the storage area someplace on site?

M. Wirth: That was our document archives and we are now storing that off-site. We are taking the building down. It is simpler to build something new and clean.

D. Winterton: I would like to hear more about lighting and landscape.

M. Wirth: We are adding one light pole to replace a light that was originally mounted on a telephone

pole that was outside the front of the building. That light pole is in the same space as what is there and the light will be LED. As far as landscape, the area is currently loam, seed or gravel. It is in the middle of a gravel pit. We will be enhancing the new main entrance to provide the corporate image we are going for. We have not yet determined what that will consist of. There is one tree existing and we are planning to save that. Everything else will be enhanced to what we think is a good corporate image for our company.

D. Winterton: I can understand the waiver for the landscape and am okay with that. My concern on the lighting is that you are changing the height on some of buildings. I am relying on staff to make sure the lighting plan would reflect the additional size and the change in scope of the building.

M. Wirth: The lighting we have proposed is within the parking lot and the parking configuration is not changing except to add a couple of new spaces. The only lighting that is on the two-story addition is at the entrances.

M. DiBitetto: Do you have night visitation or operation at night?

M. Wirth: Office hours are 8 to 5. The parking lot is lit for employees and the new light will be for the visitor parking area which is where our new entrance is.

M. DiBitetto: What is the pole height?

M. Wirth: It is a 20' pole which is the same as all of the others.

*D. Winterton motioned to grant the waivers for drainage, lighting and landscape for Stebbins Associates, Inc./Pro Con, Inc. (#16-01), 1359 Hooksett Rd., Map 19, Lot 2. Seconded by M. DiBitetto. **Motion carried unanimously.***

*D. Grafton motioned to find the plans complete for Stebbins Associates, Inc./Pro Con, Inc. (#16-01), 1359 Hooksett Rd., Map 19, Lot 2. Seconded by M. DiBitetto. **Motion carried unanimously.***

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

*M. DiBitetto motioned to approve the site plan revision for Stebbins Associates, Inc./Pro Con, Inc. (#16-01), 1359 Hooksett Rd., Map 19, Lot 2. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

EXTENSION REQUEST & PUBLIC HEARING

WALMART (WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT) (#08-37)

3 Commerce Dr., Map 37, Lot 43

Site plan for the proposed addition of a 249 sq. ft. wastewater treatment plant. The Active & Substantial period expired on 02/03/12. On 08/06/12 the Planning Board granted a 1-year extension to 02/03/13. On 01/07/13 the Planning Board granted a 2nd 1-year extension to 02/03/14. On

12/16/13 the Planning Board granted a 3rd 1-year extension to 02/03/15. On 01/05/2015 the Planning Board granted a 4th 1-year extension to 02/03/16. The applicant is seeking a 5th 1-year extension to 02/03/17.

- **Extension Request** - Development Regulations (06/04/12) Section 22. Legal Provisions 22.02 Five-Year Vesting Period “The Board may grant extensions, upon written request filed with the Board at least thirty (30) days prior to expiration of the Vesting Period, stating the requested length of extension and the extenuating circumstances justifying an extension.”

F. Kotowski and T. Prasol stepped down.

Jay Surdukowski (Sulloway & Hollis): The waivers were requested in enough time to have consideration before the extension expired on February 3. The delay was due to holiday schedules and trying to schedule time with Hookett Sewer Commission. This is a minor extension that has been granted in prior years. The abutters and public received timely notice.

D. Winterton motioned to grant the waiver regarding the time for fulling the conditions in order to ask for the extension. Seconded by D. Grafton. Motion carried unanimously.

J. Surdukowski: This is the Plan B for the site which is having a 249 sq. ft. on-site treatment plant. Since last year there has been some definitive work from Walmart on it's current view towards the sewer line project. We shared this with representatives from the Sewer Commission and other town entities. Walmart remains interested in the sewer project, however, they are no longer interested in the notion that they would act as the banker, do all of the planning, and wait for money to trickle back in over a period of years. They would welcome further discussions the Sewer Commission might convene with stakeholders in the area. Walmart is interested in paying their fair share of the project. Walmart wants to see more numbers and further ideas about how this might be funded and constructed. For now they would like to stay on the current system. This extension is in the spirit of trying to keep the Plan B option open. Walmart sees other entities that could come to the table and hopefully cooperate. Last year this hearing was valuable and I will send all comments to the top of Walmart as I did the last time I was here.

Sid Baines (Hooksett Sewer Commission): We had a telephone conversation with Walmart on January 14. That was the only time we had any contact with them since the last Planning Board meeting when they got their fourth extension. Several members of the town were there. We would like the dialog to continue but due to their past history we fear that if they get the extension they will disappear again. What happens if they do disappear and it expires next January? My fear then is that it goes back to square one, they present a new plan, and the five years starts again. How do we prevent that from happening?

D. Marshall: If we don't grant this you are back to square one and they can continue to operate with the system they have until that fails and are forced to do something. There is nothing this Board can do to force them to do anything except to continue operating the way they are. I understand the Sewer Commission, this Board, and the Town would like to have the sewer line go across the river because it would do a lot of good things for the community, but we have no lever to have that funded by private entities.

S. Baines: A lever that you have is to condemn the system.

D. Marshall: That would be the town, not the Planning Board. That would be a health issue. How close is that to being a failed system?

S. Baines: They pump every two weeks.

J. Surdukowski: Walmart believes the pumping has something to do with the restaurant inside throwing off grease. Internally they have not been told anything is failing. Anecdotally, we have heard that may not be the case.

S. Baines: I have smelled the odors and, if they are providing that much grease, there is a problem.

D. Marshall: When we approved Bass Pro Shops there was a provision that, at some point, they wanted to put in a restaurant.

S. Baines: We are hopeful that will happen. I have had conversations with Bass Pro Shops over the last couple of weeks and they are interested.

D. Marshall: Where do they feed their system to?

S. Baines: They have a septic system that they pump every week.

D. Marshall: They would feed to the same system if they added a restaurant?

S. Baines: No. They would not put a restaurant in unless they had sewer.

D. Marshall: Are they prepared to pay for a sewer line extension?

S. Baines: We just started dialogue with them and talked with the manager. He said he has had emails with the hierarchy and they have showed interest.

J. Donison: At the next Town Council meeting, we will be hearing a discussion on the Sewer TIF District.

J. Surdukowski: Are you thinking about creating a TIF District?

S. Baines: It is in the planning stages of discussion.

M. DiBitetto: I assume DES subsurface approved the septic system with the intention that they would put in a wastewater treatment facility or connect to the sewer. How did it come to pass that there is a septic system and there is a discussion about the wastewater treatment? What is their involvement in the pumping schedule? Is DES actively involved in the monitoring?

J. Surdukowski: My understanding was that Walmart was going to come up with a new system or plan and realized septic was not something they liked. I believe Walmart has shifted from wanting an on-site treatment plant to wanting to be on municipal sewer. I think this was more of an internal company culture than mandate from DES. I do not know if DES is involved in the pumping.

M. DiBitetto: I don't think a wastewater treatment plant is an attractive alternative.

J. Surdukowski: Walmart is looking at the cost of that project. Management has been told the septic is still fine and is operating as it should. Neither the on-site treatment plant, nor being the banker for the sewer seems attractive. They are currently facing a reconfiguration and a lot of their stores are closing. However, they do not want to take it off the table and that is why they are asking for the extension.

M. DiBitetto: DES is the one that approves sub-surface disposal. They have jurisdiction over our own sewer plant. Clearly the sewer system is preferable. Mr. Baines, how can we facilitate your planning process with all the players. Do you have the resources you need to generate numbers and encourage the parties to come to the table and line up the resources to get this done?

Sid Baines: We have made every effort to make that happen. We started this several years ago and when we heard Walmart was having a problem, we indicated that we had capacity if they could get the wastewater to us. We drafted an agreement between the Sewer Department and Walmart where, if they funded the construction costs, we would reimburse them as people came on with system development fee money. They were amenable to that and, right before the agreement was complete, we tried several times to contact them and there was no response. When it is time for their extensions we hear from them. Our conversation with them was positive. They would like to hook onto sewer but don't want to go through all that is involved with that process. We indicated we would assume that role provided we had the financing to do it.

M. DiBitetto: Do we have an alternative plan that we might be advancing?

S. Baines: If TIF comes to pass there will be.

M. DiBitetto: If that comes to pass, will it be ready to put to the voters this year?

S. Baines: That is up to Town Council.

D. Winterton: It is responsible for all parties involved to have Plans A, B, and C. The Town Council is making an effort to put plans in place because the town and many of our business would both benefit from what Mr. Baines is discussing. It seems Walmart does not want to be in the wastewater treatment system business. I think if we grant the extension we are enabling this to continue.

D. Marshall: In this case, failure seems to be our best approach. If something fails something has to be done and it does not have to be done by the town. The idea of the town having a warrant article for a bond issue for \$4,000,000, hoping to collect from future development, is fine as long as every tax payer in this town pays for it, not just the users.

J. Surdukowski: Even though it took so long to get the current information we have from Walmart, one downside of denying the extension is that you won't have that yearly check-in. If you don't have that will the process break down?

M. DiBietto: One alternative we have is to shorten the term of the extension. Are we required to extend for one year?

D. Marshall: No.

M. DiBietto motioned to grant the extension for three months.

S. Baines: This is the last full year approval that is allowed.

J. Surdukowski: Walmart has a very big bureaucracy and the big decision makers get shifted around.

M. DiBietto: What happens at the end of the 5th year?

S. Baines: This was a temporary system to begin with. They had an alternative to come to the Sewer Department.

D. Winterton: Walmart came to the town asking if they could build their own sewer under the river. In turn the town asked if they could work together and make it be bigger so others could hook on. Senator Boutin and others in the legislature created new law that the Department of Revenue Administration allowed Hooksett to do this. It was Senate Bill 223. There were headlines in the newspaper that discussed this as a public/private cooperation that would be a model for getting this done. I can understand the frustration of the Sewer Commission with not having communication.

M. DiBietto motioned to grant a 60-day extension for Walmart (Wastewater Treatment Plant) (#08-37), 3 Commerce Dr., Map 37, Lot 43. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

F. Kotowski and T. Prasol returned.

CHANGE OF USE

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

➤ Zoning Amendment Workshop

C. Cronin: This is the last opportunity for a workshop before the first zoning public hearing which will be February 22. If you have any changes to the draft amendment, please let me know. Amendment 4 is the proposed article for the keeping of chickens. I have reached out to the town attorney and received a reply email from him with a legal opinion on the grandfathering clause. It is not protected information. Every amendment gets approved by town legal and then gets sent back to us.

C. Cronin read the email from Attorney Matthew R. Serge into the record.

F. Kotowski: I have gotten so many calls regarding this issue. I think a lot of people in Hooksett have chickens, and I think this should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. However, I also think the CEO needs some guidance.

D. Marshall: I have no objections to raising chickens, however, a person does not have any right to allow them to cross over onto anyone else's property. The people who raise chickens need to understand that, especially in the zones that would be affected. The CEO has to have some leverage to say that something needs to be done if they are wondering on other people's property. In MDR how many is too many and how many can fit on one lot? In the LDR there is no issue. This has to stop being an emotional issue. Let's create an ordinance that respects those that raise chickens and those that don't want chickens running on their property.

M. DiBitetto: Is the raising of chickens on anything other than LDR presently not a permissive use? Are we presently dealing with a non-conformity of use that we are trying to bring into legal conformity, or are we becoming more restrictive?

C. Cronin: We get a lot of requests in the office asking if they are allowed to keep chickens. We then ask them what zone they live in. If they live in LDR they are allowed to have whatever they want. If they do not live in LDR currently chickens are not seen as a permitted use. The intent of this ordinance is to bring all of the people not living in LDR, that have chickens, into conformity and to allow them to continue that use. If there is a complaint, we do not want any gray area in the zoning ordinance. We don't like to turn people away when a person's neighbor has chickens and we tell them they can't.

D. Marshall: Handling this on a case-by-case basis would not be a good position for the CEO to be in.

F. Kotowski: I was voicing my concern for people who have never had a complaint about them, however, I can also see where the CEO needs leverage.

M. DiBitetto: The CEO could come in and say there can be no chickens in any of these zones and we have legal standing to do so. We can't ignore this situation and need to find a way to make this work. Our lack of action may cause a more restrictive situation.

D. Winterton: We discussed that, if we put in a ordinance, chickens need to be confined either by coop or fencing; if you build a structure you should need a building permit, because with anything you need a building permit; and we have a noise ordinance. That gives the CEO leverage and also satisfies the people who want to raise chickens. I want people to be able to use their property in the way they believe is best for their families.

Gerald Hyde (member of The Zoning Board): I would suggest the ordinance be allowed as it is because it is not addressed positively or negatively in the MDR. We already have leverage because we have ordinances in place. We could have the restriction of having the yard fenced if there are chickens.

M. DiBitetto: Agriculture is currently defined as permissible in LDR, and not a permissible use in the

other zones. The CEO is in the position of enforcement, not us.

T. Prasol: I agree with the need to have some sort of enclosure to be respectful, and I agree with the phase down. I would support the ordinance moving forward. I also agree with the 3 sq. ft. per hen. If we don't put a cap on the number it could create an unhealthy situation.

C. Cronin: The two big issues are 1) Trying to bring the non-LDR people into conformance and 2) There is a general consensus they should be caged or fenced. Would you entertain the idea of, instead of a new article, doing a new bullet in the Zoning Ordinance, under general provisions, stating something to the effect that the keeping of chickens is permitted in all zones and chickens shall be kept within secure enclosures or fenced areas at all times with the exception of LDR having no restrictions?

D. Marshall: You could list the zones.

D. Winteton: Could we also put a number of chickens per sq. ft. of yard space?

G. Hyde: If we want to put a limit on it, you could do it per sq. ft. of enclosure. UNH suggests 10 sq. ft. per chicken with fencing and 3 sq. ft. per chicken in a coop.

M. DiBietto: I think public input at the public hearing will be helpful. We are not skilled at chicken raising. The Board's intention is to find a way to make this happen correctly. Legally speaking, we need to get this permitted so that people can go on to raise their chicken's with the assurance they will not be cited.

C. Cronin: The first public hearing will be held on February 22.

M. DiBietto: Mr. Hyde, could you work with the townspeople that are interested in this and come up with a suggestion on how to best modify this ordinance and have it done correctly.

M. DiBietto: On the conservation sub-division, one of the suggestions was that the small lots would be appropriate if there was a community well and community septic. If the Board wanted to consider adding "or community sewer and community water," I think that would be an acceptable addition.

OTHER BUSINESS

C. Cronin: With regard to meeting with SNHU about the southern leg of the parkway it was discussed to do that at a separate workshop. We had the opportunity to meet with them, and it seems like that would be a pretty short discussion. Would you rather do it during a Planning Board meeting or still keep it as a separate workshop?

D. Marshall: After the meeting tonight, I think we need more time for discussion with them. We need to see a bigger plan. This won't just be about the by-pass issue.

C. Cronin: We will schedule that for February 29.

J. Donison: The intent is to invite Town Council as well as SNHU to the discussion.

D. Marshall: We need to make sure SNHU understands this is a discussion about their entire development.

Planning Board Alternate Application

Anne Sorensen: We have been in Hooksett for 6 years. I noticed a lot of businesses were moving out and not a lot were moving in. If I am on the Planning Board, I could see why and maybe do some work to encourage businesses to come in. What are your expectations, what type of work would I be doing, and what type of impact would I have?

D. Marshall: We have the alternate positions because it gives people an opportunity to see if they want to become a permanent member. As a vacancy occurs in the regular membership, we try to draw from the alternates to fill those slots. The Town Council has the ultimate say on membership. As far as what you do, you look at sub-divisions and site plans, making changes to the regulations and zoning ordinances, and development of the master plan. Meeting times vary. We are charged with seeing to the orderly development of the community. We have had an attitude on this Board that we need a balance between commercial, industrial, and residential, being cautious about letting residential become so overwhelming that we cannot off-set it.

A. Sorensen: What is your expectation from me other than coming to the meetings?

D. Marshall: That is the primary responsibility, aside from site plan walks. There is not much that is done independent of each other.

D. Winterton: There are courses the town will pay for you to go to. Preparation is important. If there is an application I will usually drive by the address to reference it and examine the site. I do that because it is in the best interest of the applicant. The homework is important.

A. Sorensen: How do I know what to do?

D. Marshall: You would receive an agenda with items included that are part of that.

A. Sorensen: It sounds interesting. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk