

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, April 18, 2016**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), Muamer Durakovic (arrived at 6:20pm), T. Prasol, F. Kotowski, P. Scarpetti, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Denise Grafton, Michael DiBitetto, and Christopher Stelmach

EXCUSED: None.

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

D. Marshall: Alternates will not be voting this evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 3/21/16

March 21, 2016 Regular Meeting – *P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2016 meeting. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.*

March 31, 2016 Regular Meeting – *P. Scarpetti motioned to move the approval of the minutes of the March 31, 2016 meeting to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.*

WAIVER REQUEST & PUBLIC HEARING

1. SNHU DORM WAIVER (#16-08)
East Side Dr., Map 33, Lot 67

- **Waiver Request** from Development Regulations (6/4/12) Section 6.01 “Approval Required Before Work Begins”

Deferred to the SNHU portion of the agenda.

2. BERRY HILL ESTATES CONDO ASSOCIATION (#16-13)
Berry Hill Estates, Map 25, Lot 26

- **Waiver Request** from Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section II 2.24 –Residential sprinkler requirement

Henry Roy (Treasurer of the Berry Hill Condo Association): Our development was approved with fire suppression systems. I was told that in order to eliminate those and give each homeowner the option to continue or disconnect we need a waiver because it was part of the approval process.

J. Duffy: The site plan was approved with sprinklers. The Planning Board made that a condition of approval. The residents that are part of the Association have come forward and would like to remove that requirement because they are having issues with their sprinkler systems and the upkeep is expensive. The Fire Department did not have an issue with it because there is municipal water and hydrants on that site. This is only for those that have been built that are part of the Association, which is 35 of the lots. There are 72 remaining lots that are owned by someone else. Those units have not been built and they would have to come in and make this same request for the remainder of the project. The Fire Department wanted me to make the Association aware that they should contact their individual insurance companies to let them know they no longer have sprinkler systems.

H. Roy: We have made them aware of that.

F. Kotowski: Some time ago we got involved with the issue of requiring people to put sprinkler systems in certain types of dwellings. Berry Hill was one of them. Since that time there has been legislation in Concord that suggests that sprinkler systems do not have to be put in certain places and this is one of them. The cost of putting a sprinkler system in at Berry Hill is an extra \$5,000. I think it is a good idea to not require them as long as there is adequate water protection there.

F. Kotowski motioned to grant the waiver from Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section II 2.24 –Residential sprinkler requirement for the properties that are already in Berry Hill Estates, Map 25, Lot 26. Seconded by T. Walsh.

M. DiBietto: My concern is what liability the town might occur by rescinding that. They are attached units. We require sprinklers in a number of units, such as multi-families. I would also question how we could impose a requirement on the developer on the future units if we waive this.

D. Marshall: The owner of the remaining 72 lots would have to request the same waiver. If this waiver is being granted, and the Fire Department agrees due to the water already being there, I would see no problem with them getting that waiver.

M. DiBietto: Was municipal water already present? What was the rationale of the Board putting a condition on this?

D. Marshall: With municipal water is there a need for sprinkler systems?

T. Walsh: Back then, the ordinance said sprinkler systems needed to be installed in all houses. Since then, our ordinance and state law has changed to not require them in single and two-family dwellings. They are still required in multi-family dwellings.

M. DiBietto: What if someone decides to disconnect their system? I suspect there may be a lot of people who no longer have them operating. We have required them to be installed, but I am not sure if there is a requirement to keep them maintained.

D. Winterton: There is no enforcement regulation that we can go into anyone's house to check if they are working. I would support this motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Paul Scarpetti stepped down.

**3. BLUEBIRD SELF-STORAGE (#16-12)
7 College Park Dr., Map 14, Lot 1-10**

- **Waiver Request** to appeal assessed impact fees per Zoning Ordinance Article 30, Section H. 1. Appeals Under Impact Fee Ordinance.

John Cronin (Representative of Bluebird Storage): I am asking the Board to consider a waiver request that was detailed in our recent letter. That letter was prompted by a memorandum that initially indicated that the impact fees for this project, which is an 80,000 sq. ft. self-storage facility with approximately 20 round trips per day, would be over \$100,000. Since that letter was published, I have communicated with Planning staff and there were some calculation issues. It is now at \$78,400. Bluebird has developed a number of these projects throughout the state. The highest impact fee that they have paid is \$24,000. Being surprised by the number, they asked me to take a look at this and do some research. The big legal question and controversy that the Supreme Court has not yet pinned down are square footage impact fees, constitutional and legal. There is debate by scholars and different jurisdictions that unless the square footage of the building is rationally related to the impact, and there is a causal nexus, it doesn't provide any indication. I think there is some criteria within the ordinance and some historical information that will give you the authority to grant a waiver in this case. I looked at the impact fee ordinance. It was drafted by VHB in August, 2005. They came up with a couple of different methodologies in which a town can adopt impact fees. I don't question their analysis until the impact fee matrix. They developed a set of charts based on various items and categories, but there is no rational nexus to the type of use. There is a linear line that describes the uses. One is warehouses. This would be a warehouse by definition, but it is different from what you would see from a warehouse where there is a lot of truck movement, activity, and road impacts. The footnote at the bottom of the traffic impact fee matrix says: "Note the fees are expressed in dollars per unit for residential and dollars per square foot for non-residential uses. For unique land use categories that are not found in the table, the impact fee can determine by multiplying the number of new total daily trips generated by the site by \$148." If I do that calculation we would be looking at \$3,500 and \$4,000 versus \$59,200. I also looked at the Town Council minutes from September 28, 2005. There is a comment from Mr. Longfellow. He raised a question about the square footage fees. Mr. Jolin responded that roadway impact fees should not be compared to public safety impact fees as roadway impact fees should not be based on the size of the building and must also consider traffic due to particular uses. Our clients are willing to pay their fair share. This use is a low impact use. I would like to say that we would like a waiver to give us 20 x \$148 with the roadway impact fee because I think that is how the ordinance sets forth. I understand that staff has some discretion in unique situations. I would not have any opposition with deferring this to the staff and having a discussion with them. Ms. Duffy was kind enough to provide me with the information I

asked for, but in the short time frame we didn't have an opportunity to have a substantive discussion. We would like to come up with an arrangement where we pay what our fair share is. I also have the CIP program from 2013-2019. When I look at the capital improvements that are necessitated, none of them seem to be project specific. Most telling in this analysis is off-setting revenues. I would expect to see a projection of the impact fees that would be expected to off-set the cost. There is no entry for road impact fees suggesting that none were contemplated. There are entries for fire impact fees and the anticipated payment was \$0. The sewer fee was \$0. I think there are a number of legal issues. I talked to my client about what I thought his chances were if he were to have a non-adversarial proceeding. I don't think there is any fault. I think this is a sign of the times. If you choose to make a decision tonight, I would propose the public safety impact fees of \$19,200 and \$10,000 on the traffic impact fees for a total of \$29,200.

J. Duffy: I agree with Attorney Cronin that our schedules are outdated. I have spoken recently about those needing to be updated. We should start allocating some money to go towards that. Commercial projects pay two different impact fees which are roadways and public safety. Regarding the matrix, initially we hired Marty Kennedy from VHB who put together a study. There are several different uses listed on that matrix, one being warehousing, which we have always used for self-storage facilities. You can add any category but the study would have to be updated. The study has not been updated since Mr. Kennedy put it together. We base it on the square footage. This was based on warehousing which is one of the lowest dollar amounts. They have 80,000 square feet. It was \$.61. It is based on a formula of what was in place at the time of the study and what the projected build-out would be. We could have Marty Kennedy come to a future meeting. It was recommended it be updated from time to time. As far as the CIP, in our budget reports there have been several projects where monies have been allocated, that the Council has approved, for future roadway projects such as the Lilac Bridge, Hackett Hill Road and the Rt. 3A intersection, the sidewalks on College Park Drive, and others. Those monies have been allocated from the current impact fees that have already been collected. We have been using that money on a regular basis. We can meet with Attorney Cronin and see if it makes sense to base this on the per vehicle, but a traffic study would have to be done to show what that increase would be. If that is the case we should be looking at the uses because we have been basing self-storage facilities on warehousing.

M. DiBitetto: Have we ever had a situation where we adjusted the fees for a commercial or industrial user?

J. Duffy: Huttig recently received a return of their monies. At the time we did not have roadway impact fees and their contribution was supposed to be for roadways but it was based on public safety impact fees. They recently came in and requested their money back saying that it was collected illegally and it was returned to them in the amount of \$150,000. We do not assess the 62+ projects a school impact fee. The other one is if they provide a capital improvement in lieu of, but it is for the same amount of money. There is no reduction in price. Market Basket did that for the \$265,000 for the hourglass. When we collect roadway impact fees it is not collected for just in front of that site. The town has been divided into three sections which are the west side, the Rt. 3 corridor, and the east side. That money can be used anywhere within that section.

M. DiBitetto: In the case of Market Basket, I think we anticipated there might be a situation where site specific might come in and do a study, present it to the Board, and given that data there might be a re-

consideration of what the appropriate fee would be. Is this the call of the Board or does it go to the Town Council?

J. Duffy: According to the waivers that are allowed here, which are the senior waiver and the capital improvement, the capital improvement has to go to the Town Council.

M. DiBietto: The Board determines what the fees are at the time of approval of the project?

J. Duffy: Yes. I calculate the fees and then include them in my comments for the Board.

M. DiBietto: Is that part of the approval?

J. Duffy: Yes. It is one of the conditions of approval.

D. Winterton: Have we recently approved any storage facilities using this formula?

J. Duffy: A few years ago one next to the Granite Hill Shops and one on Cross Road were approved but have not been built. The ones by Rt. 3A and Profile Self-Storage were before impact fees.

D. Winterton: We could have a general discussion about the impact of impact fees on economic development in the Town of Hooksett. Attorney Cronin has already told us that the most Bluebird has paid in any other community was \$24,000. He has already offered to start negotiations at \$29,200. I would be anxious to reexamine our entire commercial impact fee status and to include this in that discussion. I would be in favor of having this decision delayed until Attorney Cronin could speak with our staff and possibly bring something back to us. If we are not competitive we need to ask if we want to be competitive and if not, why.

J. Cronin: I am not quarreling with the concept. I think impact fees, when done correctly, work and very few developers quarrel with them. However, when you have a use that is unusual, and it doesn't create an impact, the underlying lynch pin of the statutory law is the impact fee has to be necessitated by the development. That is fundamental issue. When you break things into three zones and apply it across the board, that is a dangerous territory for the town because one of the things that you have to do is specifically deposit that money in a segregated account and identify what improvements that money will be used for. If six years goes by and those things aren't built, I get my money back. There should be a direct correlation between the money, the fee, and the project. Otherwise the argument is that this is just a tax. I am happy to discuss it and try to work it out fairly.

D. Winterton motioned to table the waiver request to appeal assessed impact fees per Zoning Ordinance Article 30, Section H. 1. Appeals Under Impact Fee Ordinance for Bluebird Self-Storage (#16-12), 7 College Park Dr., Map 14, Lot 1 until May 16, 2016. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

P. Scarpetti returned.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING

- 4. LARRABEE/KOKOSING LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT (#16-09)
51 & 53 Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 52, 56 & 57**

Lot line adjustment between lots 13-52, 13-56 and 13-57 whereby 0.56 acres of Lot 56 to be consolidated to lot 57 and 0.66 acres of lot 52 to be consolidated with lot 56.

J. Duffy: We have found the plans to be complete and recommend that the Board approve the lot-line adjustment as presented.

T. Parasol motioned to find the plan complete for the Larrabee/Kokosing Lot Line Adjustment (#16-09), 51 & 53 Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 52, 56 & 57. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

Nick Golan (TF Moran): We have three lots of record that exist. There will be a lot-line adjustment and consolidation such that there will be two lots remaining, one lot of approximately 4.7 acres and the other 6.5 acres.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

T. Parasol motioned to approve the lot-line adjustment between lots 13-52, 13-56 and 13-57 whereby 0.56 acres of Lot 56 to be consolidated to lot 57 and 0.66 acres of lot 52 to be consolidated with lot 56 for Larrabee/Kokosing lot-line Adjustment (#16-09), 51 & 53 Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 52, 56 & 57. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPLETENESS

**5. LARRABEE LILAC PARK PHASE 2A – CHUCKSTER’S MINI GOLF (#16-07)
Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 52, 56 & 57**

Site plan for a miniature golf course and clubhouse.

J. Duffy: Chucksters met with us at a TRC meeting and they are proposing to do a mini golf course on Hackett Hill Road on the Larrabee site. They have a business in New York as well as Chichester, NH. The facility in Hooksett will not have all of the amenities that Chichester has, but they will have a clubhouse, mini-golf, and serve ice cream. They are complete and the public hearing would be scheduled for May 2, 2016.

T. Walsh motioned to find the site plan for a miniature golf course and clubhouse for Larrabee Lilac Park Phase 2A – Huckster’s Mini Golf (#16-07), Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 52, 56 & 57, complete. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

**6. LARRABEE LILAC PARK PHASE 2B – RESTAURANT (#16-10)
Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 52, 56 & 57**

Site plan for a 100-seat smokehouse restaurant.

J. Duffy: The applicant is requesting completeness only for a 100-seat smokehouse restaurant which would be adjacent to the mini-golf. The public hearing would be held on May 2, 2016. for adjacent to the mini-golf. There is an old barn on the property that will be moved to an agreeable location on the smokehouse site.

D. Winterton motioned to find the site plan for a 100-seat smokehouse restaurant for Larrabee Lilac Park Phase 2B – Restaurant (#16-10), Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 52, 56 & 57, complete. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

7. LARRABEE LILAC PARK PHASE 3 – FESTIVAL GROUNDS (#16-11)

Hackett Hill Rd., Map 17, Lot 7

Site plan for festival grounds (referred to as The Great Lawn)

J. Duffy: Initially this was proposed for completeness and a public hearing on May 2, 2016. They were not sure what to include since it is just an outdoor festival area with outdoor bathroom facilities. They wanted to speak with the Board because they are not sure if they should resubmit everything that is needed to find this complete or withdraw at this time and come back at a later date.

N. Golan: I had the opportunity to sit with JoAnn and Jim to get a feeling for what their expectations were for Phase 3. This is a glorified park that will have a grass area, port-a-johns, and a shuttle service. We need to provide a plan of the existing roadway to make sure it is adequate for the purposes of emergency and fire protection. We will also include some other notation that was suggested by JoAnn and Jim to what it is we are trying to accomplish with this. In our meeting, I was able to tell them there was going to be a bit of a delay. The middle portion of the site is currently under reclamation in accordance with the permits for the project. It makes it difficult to have a festival on the back of the site when there is reclamation going on in the middle. We were hoping to have a festival ground in the Fall of this year, but that will be pushed off until next year. Would it make sense for us to come back once that area is reclaimed so we can give you a more accurate plan, or is it something we just want to delay each meeting until it would be appropriate to be acted on. Our intent would be to as-built the area of that reclamation so that we can show how that access would work versus designing a roadway now which would not be accurate.

D. Marshall: Although it is not on the agenda, there is a Phase 4.

N. Golan: I believe there are 9 phases.

D. Marshall: Is there a potential that Phase 4 could come before Phase 3?

N. Golan: That is possible. We would provide that update as soon as that information becomes available.

D. Marshall: My suggestion is that Phase 3 and Phase 4 be held off.

F. Kotowski: What is your estimated completion date for the reclamation?

Jeff Larrabee (Property Owner): Approximately 3 years.

J. Duffy: They have already paid their fees. We already notified abutters, but if they are willing to withdraw at this time we can refund the application fees. If they want to continue it they will need to re-notify the abutters so they cannot get out of the abutter fees.

J. Larrabee: The reason we submitted was that the property in the back does not need as much reclamation as the part in the middle. As far as having a roadway to the back portion, which could be reclaimed within a year, it would be dependent on how much we had to upgrade that road in order to make it acceptable to the town. Then we were faced with the possibility of having to move it once we finished one part of the reclamation on the middle section. Maybe it is best to withdraw at this time.

J. Larrabee withdrew the application.

PUBLIC HEARING

(cont. from beginning of agenda)

SNHU DORM WAIVER (#16-08)

East Side Dr., Map 33, Lot 67

- **Waiver Request** from Development Regulations (6/4/12) Section 6.01 “Approval Required Before Work Begins”

8. SNHU ATHLETIC COMPLEX (#16-04)

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

Site plan for an athletic complex for intercollegiate and recreation sports programs on campus including sports fields and tennis courts, associated landscaping, parking and utility improvements.

- **Waiver Request** from Development Regulations (6/4/12) Section 6.01 “Approval Required Before Work Begins”
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist Items #19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34.

Robert Duval (TF Moran): It might be helpful to talk about the overall master plan for the campus and expand on discussions, traffic issues, etc.

Joe Sergie (Vice President for Finance, Southern New Hampshire University): I hope that we will be addressing concerns that have been raised. The Planning Board requested some type of Master Plan for future growth which we will be addressing as well as concerns around Victory Lane. I had a lot of discussion around campus to make commitments. We have a full team here tonight to talk about the site plan and some of these other items. The main campus has no plans for future growth. We are holding steady with our current enrollments. The re-investment into the campus is to provide a better student experience. We are looking to expand some of the athletic programs and replacing dormitories because the current ones are well beyond their economic and, in some ways, usable life. We have heard your concerns and are addressing them so that we can move forward.

R. Duval: The master plan for the campus concentrates on projects that are replacing older/obsolete uses. It is not expanding and not causing growth of the campus. It is improvements of older buildings with new higher quality buildings of the same use and expanding programs to enrich the student experience, not increasing student or faculty/staff population. Most of the buildings you see on the plan are existing buildings. The Welcome Center is currently under construction. There are a couple of projects that are before this Board which are the athletic complex and a new dormitory building. Those are the current projects that are either in construction, design, or planning. We have also identified some other locations where facilities could be built or expanded, however, there are no current plans to do this. The

older dormitories that we want to replace will be torn down. Because they will be torn down, that opens the area up as a potential building pad. It is a suitable place for dormitory use so that could potentially be a future dormitory location. We also have the CB Sullivan area that contains two industrial buildings off of Alice Ave. Although these buildings are owned by the University there is no current project proposed to reuse these buildings. That may change in the future and if it appears that a use is advantageous to the University, we will come back to this Board with a proposal, the appropriate traffic studies, and other design information. Another significant feature is Victory Lane which connects East Side Drive in the back just past the site of the new dormitory, to Alice Avenue. It is currently gated and was constructed for internal access for the University. There have been a lot of questions on whether it could be used to help facilitate campus traffic to and from Alice Avenue that would avoid having to go down Donati and Bicentennial. There has been a lot of internal discussion at the University. There was reluctance to do so because the University sees N. River Road as the main entrance to the campus. They did not want to have this back door become a replacement. However, the University has decided that it would like to open Victory Lane to traffic during the day on a trial basis starting this Spring from May - June and opening again in the Fall, on a trial basis, from September - December to see if it works out for the University and to make sure there are no problems associated with this. It would be on a trial basis during daylight hours, Monday - Friday. We would like to discuss that with this Board. We think it is a win-win situation. It makes use of this infrastructure, will help to take some of the traffic pressure off of Donati and BiCentennial. By opening the road during the daytime hours security concerns will be addressed, they have also assured themselves that the gateway entrance experience will be preserved by this temporary opening. We would like to see the Board support us in this trial opening. VHB has done an extensive traffic study in connection with the athletic complex. They, and we, have looked at the opening of Victory Lane to traffic. There is little or no likelihood for cut-through traffic to use this connection through the campus. If this trial opening does happen, the University is going to study traffic volumes at nearby intersections to verify there are not substantial impacts, other than beneficial impacts.

T. Walsh: Some things I have heard are possible future acquisition of properties. Is that accurate?

J. Sergi: We will continue the strategy of looking to see about acquisitions of any parcels that become available that are adjacent to the University. There is nothing final. We will be demolishing the CB Sullivan buildings. We have no plans for that part of the campus. It is for long term potential use. We are working with the City of Manchester to solution the mill operations. I do not know how that will play out. As we look at the operations of Manchester it may or may not come into consideration as we look at the overall campus. In the spirit of transparency, we are doing a lot of exploring, however, there are no decisions yet.

T. Walsh: I have heard that it is the University's strong desire to acquire River Road from Martin's Ferry to the new Welcome Center.

J. Sergi: That is not in any discussion at leadership.

D. Winterton: Could you give us an update of the traffic light situation.

R. Duval: The traffic light was recently approved and that would be constructed at the intersection of East Side Drive, Mountain View, and River Road. It will be going through design with Public Works in Manchester.

D. Winterton: On Victory Lane, who is responsible for plowing and enforcement?

R. Duval: That is a private road owned by the University and those things would be taken care and supervised by the University.

M. DiBitetto: Could you point out the main parking lots for the commuters.

R. Duval: The idea was to make this a walking campus and put the parking on the perimeter so that people could drive to the campus, park, and walk to their destination throughout the day. The primary parking lots are the recently constructed East Side Drive parking lots and the ones at the north end of Martin's Ferry.

T. Walsh: Would that light still be needed if Victory Lane was opened?

R. Duval: Yes. In addition to the volume signal warrants, this intersection met the warrants for crash experience. Although it doesn't meet the numbers for pedestrian warrants, it is a very high pedestrian count. Pedestrian safety is a main concern of the University. Both of those reasons justify putting a signal at that location. The warrants will continue to be met depending on the time of day.

Gordon Leedy (Landscape Architect and Planner/VHB): This is a large property with several parcels that comprise the side of River Road that comprises the campus. The northerly property line is far from any developed abutters. Messer Brook creates a nice buffer between the University and the adjacent neighborhoods. There is a conservation easement over a portion of that land. The athletic facility comprises Victory Lane, a driveway that comes in, a turn around and drop-off area, a parking area, a large pedestrian concourse, a building that will house concessions and what you would typically see in a concourse for an athletic facility as well as offices for athletic staff, locker rooms, and alumni reception areas. There will be seating in grandstands for 1,500 spectators. This will be a state of the art NCAA standard track facility, with areas for jumps and throws. The interior will be a sport turf facility that performs like natural turf. There is a new competition tennis facility planned. It will be set up so that in the future that we may be able to put a bubble over four of those courts. There will be knee walls on the sides and the ability to construct facilities that will allow us to inflate a dome for winter practice and use. Off of Victory Lane is another parking area. We are proposing to add an additional 311 parking spaces. A facility like this operating conditions which are day to day operations, and SNHU game day, which will happen outside of peak hours. A lot of the people coming to the SNHU games would be campus residents and many would be walking. SNHU has been a good NH citizen and has made arrangements to provide access to these facilities for state wide events. There would need to be a management plan put in place for those events. We have looked at parking and traffic demand and it would not put undue stress on the system, particularly if Victory Lane was available. All of these conditions are happening today on campus, they are just happening at the other field and the field house. This is not anticipated to create significant additional demand for either traffic or parking. As far as the details of the plan, there is a sidewalk adjacent to Victory Lane that connects to the large commuter lot and the satellite parking areas, as well as a sidewalk that goes to the concourse area. We have planned for areas for busses and media trailers to park. There is also a handicapped accessible area. The track and grandstands will be secured and the access would be through the concourse. There are three service accesses. The drainage system is a combination of surface and subsurface drainage. There are two swails that go into a detention ponds and a network of piping that collects the drainage into a large basin. We

are having discussions with DES about the rate and amount of infiltration that we can claim. These are permeable soils that are suitable for the infiltration. We are hopeful that we may be able to reduce the size of this pond and save some trees. Currently this is what DES is requiring us to do. This lot surface drains to the edge and into this infiltration basin. We are required to infiltrate nearly the entire 25-year storm. This plan accomplishes that and it will safeguard the water quality of the Messer Brook watershed as well as prevent any kind of surface erosion from happening from surface run-off. We have a sewer line that runs from the concourse down the hill, crosses where the existing Woods Road crosses, and connects to the main line that goes over toward the interceptor adjacent to Messer Brook. We were granted a variance for that buffer from the ZBA. We are proposing to not have any wetland impact, but there is a 40' wetland buffer associated with those wetlands so we needed a variance for that impact. Gas also comes down the hill paralleling the sewer line, same crossing, and connects with an existing gas service over by the dormitory. Water is coming from an inset that is further out Victory Lane. The proposed line parallels Victory Lane, comes up the drive isle, and services the site with both domestic and fire suppression supply. There is also electric and telecom that comes down that same corridor. All of the details have not yet been finalized.

D. Winterton: Could you discuss the lighting structures?

G. Leedy: We are proposing state of the art light fixtures that will be shielded and pointed at the field. Glare is unavoidable but there is no light trespass into the adjacent neighborhoods. We can light the entire field with four banks of lights. They are 90 degrees to the closest neighborhood. As far as the landscape plan, there is a mixture of trees. This will be a showplace for the Town of Hooksett. There is an area that we are not clearing and is forest that will remain. We have three basic conditions of parking; game day, normal day, and special events. We have done an analysis of how much parking is available in these other lots during events. With the additional 311 spaces there is ample parking for all events. An extensive analysis of this was submitted to staff. In terms of traffic, we talked about opening Victory Lane. We counted traffic on Donati Drive, Bicentennial, and River Road. This project is not adding any new trips to the network. Opening Victory Lane will help because it would take a number of the morning right turns out of the Bicentennial Drive intersection and conversely in the evening. All of our experts are here if you have any questions. We have done a lot of speaking with staff and had an engineering review. We have addressed all of the town's comments. We are in the process of review by DES for the AOT permit. We are having discussions with them about what kind of infiltration values we should be using and have already gotten some technical comments from them which we are addressing. We are hoping to have that wrapped up by the beginning of next month. The sewer connection was approved by the Hooksett Sewer Commission and the Conservation Commission weighed in on our buffer impacts. We have a waiver request in front of you for site clearing and there is another request for site clearing for the dormitory.

D. Winterton: What percentage of your students that live in dormitories have a car on campus?

G. Leedy: Quite a few of them.

D. Winterton: On days of special events if you have a high percentage of students living on campus that have vehicles, that might impact that number. Do you designate where the students have to park?

G. Leedy: There are parking permits in place.

D. Winterton: Does that permit tell them where they can park, or can they park anywhere?

G. Leedy: It tells them which lot they can park in, not a dedicated space.

P. Scarpetti: Is there a reason you did not do a walking path from the dormitories on East Side Drive?

G. Leedy: There is an existing Woods Road which offers a crossing, but there is a wetland in the center that you would not want pedestrians to be crossing. There may be the potential of doing a pedestrian path in the future, but it is not part of this plan. There is a school of thought to saying to watch where the students walk and put the path there. There are trail connections and it makes eminent sense to make other connections in the future.

T. Walsh: What is the seating capacity?

G. Leedy: 1,500 in the grandstands and some capacity for lawn seating or standing outside of the stadium.

D. Grafton: Is there an existing sidewalk on Victory Lane?

G. Leedy: Yes. On the south side of Victory Lane which is the opposite side. We are proposing a crosswalk.

D. Grafton: You could put a crosswalk in where the parking lot is.

G. Leedy: That is a good idea.

D. Marshall: Let's take the issue of the waiver request for the dormitory.

J. Duffy: The reason they want the waiver request first is to clear the land before the birds migrate to that area.

D. Marshall: Will you remove the trees?

R. Duval: In the case of the dormitory the trees will be cut and left. The purpose is because of the May 15 deadline for migratory birds. In the normal course of business we would like to do the clearing associated after approval, however, it makes sense to be able to construct this as soon as possible to do the tree clearing now before the Board has taken up the site plan itself. There is a similar request for the athletic complex.

D. Marshall: If an environmental group comes before the Planning Board and questions us because they feel you are trying to beat a regulation what do we tell them?

R. Duval: This is to be protective of migratory birds. If we can take those trees down the migratory birds won't nest in them.

D. Marshall: If migratory birds decide to nest are you allowed to cut the trees or do you have to wait until the nesting season is over?

G. Leedy: You are supposed to. You can still clear during the period the migratory birds may be in evidence but you should have a wildlife expert and rescue people in case a tree is taken down that has small birds in it. That law is a set of regulations but there is no sanction. The University is acting out of an abundance of environmental concern.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

F. Kotowski motioned to grant the waiver request from Development Regulations (6/4/12) Section 6.01 "Approval Required Before Work Begins" for SNHU Dorm Waiver (#16-08) for East Side Dr., Map 33, Lot 67.

F. Kotowski: I think it is environmentally sound to take the trees down before birds mitigate there. If the trees are down the migratory birds will nest someplace else.

*Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

D. Marshall: Now we will take the waivers for the athletic complex.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

F. Kotowski motioned to grant the waiver request from Development Regulations (6/4/12) Section 6.01 "Approval Required Before Work Begins" for the SNHU Athletic Complex (#16-04), East Side Dr. & North River Rd., Map 33, Lot 67. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.

D. Winterton: Are you going to leave those trees down?

G. Leedy: We will be taking those trees out. We will not be grubbing or stumping because we need an AOT permit in hand.

D. Marshall: How are you taking them out?

G. Leedy: On trucks that would go out Victory Lane to West Alice.

D. Marshall: That road was not built for that purpose and will not meet the weight limits. Are you prepared to deal with any consequences of that?

G. Leedy: We do not have a choice.

Motion carried unanimously.

D. Marshall: The next matter is in reference to a waiver request from completeness checklist Items #19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34.

G. Leedy: This is a very large lot of which we are proposing to develop a relatively small part of. This has to do with showing various things within 100' of the property line, the buildings on the site, etc.

D. Winterton motioned to grant the waiver request from Completeness Checklist Items #19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 for the SNHU Athletic Complex (#16-04), East Side Dr. & North River Rd., Map 33, Lot 67. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

J. Donison: We went back and forth on revisions to the plan. The main comment I had was that I want a confirmation from SNHU that there was not going to be a traffic increase as a result of the athletic facility. They responded that there will not be an increase in traffic and I am taking their word for that.

D. Marshall: Who is doing the traffic study?

G. Leedy: Nick Sanders from VHB.

J. Donison: The other comment I had pertained to the parking lot. They talked about trying to move the students around with the pedestrian paths and the sidewalks. They spoke about the master plan and there were some comments that when they build the north parking lot they would come back with a landscape plan for an entrance and a median. I would like them to speak to their intention of that and the time frame. Where the town is proposing to do sidewalks along Martins Ferry Road, we would like to coordinate that work with our project so we don't have two construction seasons happening in different years.

D. Marshall: Where do we stand in relationship to the pedestrian bridge?

R. Duval: That is up to me to get information and report back to the Planning Board and the Town. I will look at that and get back to you. I understand there is a cost share component to that.

D. Marshall: There needs to be something that gets people to the other side of the brook safely.

R. Duval: In dealing with the other matters, I have not gotten to that but I will in the next week or two.

D. Marshall: This goes back to give and take and a coordinated effort. Jim and his staff have a limited amount of time to get the sidewalk project together and completed.

R. Duval: Could you give me a week?

D. Marshall: That would be agreeable. If I said that we could give you answer at the next meeting regarding the athletic facility would that be acceptable?

R. Duval: If that is the way it has to be. I just have not had a chance to look at it.

Monther Mardini (Southern New Hampshire University): The cost would be \$52,000.

J. Donison: We are asking for 50 percent of that. We are talking about the connectivity of the town population with SNHU. There are some people that walk that path. We hoping that when the sidewalk

is built there will be connectivity with students going to the businesses and residents going to the athletic facilities at SNHU when there is an event.

R. Duval: It would be 50 percent up to \$25,000.

J. Donison: Correct.

R. Duval: That is a contribution to the town and then the town manages it from there?

J. Donison: It would bid out as part of the sidewalk project, with the understanding that you would build a sidewalk in front of the business school from the segment at the corner to their driveway, with a crosswalk. That would be part of the landscaping that you are proposing to do.

R. Duval: Can I commit to the bridge tonight?

D. Winterton: As the Town Council representative to this Board, we had discussions last Wednesday that our Town Engineer presented about the sidewalk and what contribution people were going to make. My feeling was that at the Planning Board meeting that you hosted at your facility, and this meeting tonight, has been positive and I would hope that future meetings would be positive. With the trees being approved to be cut down, if the site plan is not approved for two-weeks does that set you back in your building time-table for the athletic facility?

R. Duval: We can move forward with the \$25,000.

D. Winterton: I don't want this Planning Board to be involved in a quid pro quo for the Town. I like the sense of cooperation and the tenor that your organization is bringing to the Board and the fact that you listened to this Board. I would like to have you come back in two weeks for site plan approval. I don't think that would set you back in your construction of this facility because the trees still need to come down.

R. Duval: We will come back in two-weeks and I committed to the \$25,000.

*D. Winterton motioned to table the site plan request for an athletic complex for intercollegiate and recreation sports programs on campus including sports fields and tennis courts, associated landscaping, parking and utility improvements for SNHU Athletic Complex (#16-04), East Side Dr. & North River Rd., Map 33, Lot 67 until May 2. Seconded by T. Prasol. **Motion carried unanimously.***

DISCUSSION

9. SNHU

Victory Lane – Request to open gate temporarily from April – May and August – November 2016

D. Marshall: When would you like to open Victory Lane?

J. Sergi: As soon as possible and close it at the end of the school year. We would like to have it open by the end of the school year to get some traffic counts, close it for the summer, and open it again mid-August.

D. Marshall: It will be open on weekdays only between the hours of 7am and 7pm with gates closed on the weekends?

J. Sergi: Yes.

G. Leedy: We will add that no thru trucking is allowed.

D. Marshall: Are you intending to have security personnel monitoring this?

J. Sergi: Yes.

D. Marshall: Are you going to put traffic counters out on all three legs?

G. Leedy: It is also turning movement counts.

D. Marshall: If you have three counters out you will have the counts.

G. Leedy: This is also to see what this does to Bicentennial Drive.

P. Scarpetti: You will have construction vehicles going through during the summer?

G. Leedy: Yes.

D. Marshall: I assume you will have someone at the gate in the summer at all times.

G. Leedy: There will be some kind of control.

J. Sergi: We don't want to create a situation where the residents are upset at you and us so if you have any suggestions or comments please let us know.

D. Marshall: When the residents were here, I am wondering if they thought they were going to be invited back to meetings with further discussions.

J. Sergi: Should we delay this?

M. Mardini: Regarding the public residing on Donati and Bicentennial, opening Victory Lane will alleviate the traffic. The only commuters that will benefit from this would be staff, students, and faculty. With the residents you are not making a mistake by granting us to open this.

G. Leedy: This will only subtract volume in front of these abutters homes. By opening this on a trial basis with counts being taken we can prove that assumption. If that turns out to not be so, then we can come back to the Board and make appropriate changes.

D. Winterton: My suggestion is that there be a trial basis from now to the end of May, through the summer, and then revisit with this Board where we might invite the public before the Fall opening.

J. Sergi: The school traffic pattern will open again at the end of August. There was a lot of discussion around campus about this. I am trying to come to a middle ground between the Planning Board and the various constituencies on campus. The original design was for an internal road for the CB Sullivan Buildings and have it opened up occasionally. If it is opened in the summer there will not be a realistic count with student activity.

F. Kotowski: I think this is the only way you will find out for sure what opening that roadway will do.

J. Sergi: Do we have the understanding that if the college community determines that they feel uncomfortable with this opened, would we be able to close it?

F. Kotowski: It is your road.

J. Sergi: I would not want someone coming back and saying there are conditional approvals based on that road coming back for a discussion.

T. Walsh: We talked about alleviating the traffic years ago, especially on Donati, but they insisted on putting a gate up.

J. Sergi: It has to do with security reasons.

T. Walsh motioned to open Victory Lane starting tomorrow until the end of May, then the gate will be closed and opened for construction purposes until August 15, 2016. On August 15, 2016 SNHU will report to the Planning Board to give the results of what the traffic studies show and the Planning Board will make a decision going forward. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

Tom Walsh left the meeting at 8:14 pm.

BOARD DISCUSSION

> Recommendation for SNHPC Commission Position – Leslie Boswak

J. Duffy: We have not received anything from Leslie Boswak as of yet.

P. Scarpetti motioned that the Planning Board make a recommendation for Leslie Boswak to fill the SNHPC Commission Position, subject to receipt that she is interested. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: We had one Change-of-Use meeting but they ended up withdrawing their application.

OTHER BUSINESS

D. Marshall: Regarding the Chapter 3 existing land use, the mapping needs to be redone. Whatever zoning changes were made need to be done and existing land use in the 11 years since that master plan

need to be incorporated in that mapping. With regard to Table 3.1, what Jim submitted and how this was laid out originally was confusing. There needs to be clarification. We need to have Jim explain why changes were made, why things were removed, and what needs to be corrected. I don't think a half hour will be sufficient for this matter. We need another meeting, once per month, that is solely a workshop dedicated to this Master Plan. The last time we did a Master Plan it cost \$40,000. It was not done by staff. It was done by outside consultants. Jim and JoAnn are capable of doing this, but they have their other duties to attend to for their jobs and I don't understand how they will pile this on top of those duties. I would like to do a test run and select a night in May to work on this. We would need to have the changes from Jim and JoAnn sent to us a week before for us to look over.

On May 23, 2016 there will be a workshop dedicated to the Master Plan to work on Chapters 1, 2 and 3.

ADJOURNMENT

*D. Winterton motioned to adjourn. Seconded by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**