

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, May 2, 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), T. Prasol, F. Kotowski, P. Scarpetti, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Denise Grafton, Michael DiBitetto, and Christopher Stelmach

EXCUSED: Muamer Durakovic

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

D. Marshall: Denise Grafton will be the only alternate voting this evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 3/31/16 and 4/18/16

March 31, 2016 Regular Meeting – P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the March 31, 2016 meeting at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

April 18, 2016 Regular Meeting – T. Parasol motioned to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2016 meeting at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION

1. Sylvia VonAulock, SNHPC

Sylvia VonAulock (SNHPC): I have been with the Planning Commission since June. The Commission has a Complete Streets Toolkit Project. Complete Streets make the streets safer regardless of your ability of transportation. Some of the elements are bump-outs, crosswalks, and painting. They are designed for all users whether a driver, walker, biker, etc. Complete streets improve safety for all users, encourage economic development, improve quality of life, provide choices, increase the attractiveness of the community, and improve health by encouraging walking and biking. Project elements are stakeholder team, research (NH and beyond), policy focus, engineering and design standards, a pilot program, and

toolkit. The stakeholder/advisor team is made up of Bedford, Windham, Derry, Manchester, Goffstown, Frankestown. Outside of SNHPC includes Nashua, Concord, Portsmouth, and Keene. Other Planning Commissions are SWRPC, NRPC, CRPC. State agencies are NHDRED and NHDOT. Other agencies are Transport NH, MTA, Bike/walk alliance, AARP, and HEAL NH. Our stakeholders are involved with providing input to the project, building toolkit development, and sharing Complete Street progress in NH such as what's happening in our state, and why Complete Streets work for NH and Trends. As far as research within and outside of NH, we have linked with the statewide Complete Street Policy Effort (May 6 Legislative Ride) to discover existing complete street projects, invite engineers and landscape architects to highlight their success stories, encourage neighboring Planning Commissions to share their work, and web search existing resources. Trends and Case Study Research includes green streets and green drainage elements such as rain gardens and tree filters. Policy guidelines include highlighting existing examples in Concord, Portsmouth, Dover, Keene, and Swanzey, researching experts in Complete Streets such as Smart Growth America's National Complete Streets Coalition, and finding examples for urban, suburban, and rural. Engineering design standards include federal regulations, local allowances, and rural, suburban, and urban challenges. The pilot program includes three communities (urban, suburban, and rural focus). Possible projects may include policy development, design standard development, education outreach, and a pop-up planning initiative (demonstration project). Removable items would be placed in a location where the public can come to use it to see how it works. There is an accessible toolkit which will include fact sheets and CD's. We will also have a web-based presence.

T. Walsh: I see the bump-out's on the complete streets. Snowplows cannot see them and I would think that maintenance would be expensive.

S. VonAulock: Maintenance is more expensive, however, they are finding the downtown thrives so much that you are increasing the tax base and there is economic gain. There are no more empty store fronts. It is a net gain. You can research cost benefits of Complete Streets . If there is a Complete Street in front of your home it's value increases.

T. Walsh: There is information to prove these are cost effective?

S. VonAulock: Yes.

M. DiBitetto: We do not have much of a walkable community or a continuity of a system. Bikers either ride on grass or take a risk riding on pavement. Is there any initiative to address this on state roads?

S. VonAulock: We have representation from DOT on our Stakeholders Committee. They have a complete streets webpage. They are contact sensitive and will go by what the community wants. If your community says to DOT that we have 12' wide travel lanes and we want to narrow that down, they will listen. Every community has the ability to begin that conversation and it is a conversation they are interested in.

T. Walsh: Our state roads are paid for through our road toll and the design of the roads is for automobiles because they pay for the roads. Has there been any talk of getting revenue from bikers or pedestrians to use those roads?

S. VonAulock: That is a good question and I do not have an answer. You have the application and can talk to staff of what you might like to do.

**2. Stuart Arnett/Arnett Development Group –
Presentation of the TIF Study for the Route 3A Corridor**

Stuart Arnett (ADG): We have been contracted to work with the town to look at several questions regarding whether or not and how to finance commercial/industrial infrastructure along your two commercial routes, Rt. 3 and Rt. 3A. We have also met with the Hooksett Sewer Commission and subcontracted out an engineering report. The key thing tonight is talking about how this fits with your Master Plan and your Master Plan implementation? I would like to thank JoAnn, Jim, and Bruce for being helpful. Our goal is to get you a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District Option for financing commercial and industrial sewer infrastructure to Exits 10 and 11. It is a local property tax. It includes all of the 4 property taxes collected which are town, school, county, and state education; Increment which is the total local taxes received above what is now received; Financing which is a tool to accelerate debt pay-down and lower debt-service costs to taxpayers; and District which is a temporary designation by Council of a desired growth area, that does not impact any other uses. A TIF district is not - does not change anyone's tax rate, tax assessment, obligations, form or timing of tax payment to the Town, reduce or effect the bond rating or capacity, require any public spending, effect zoning, allowable uses, or other Town-designated districts, last forever or get too large, change capital budgeting procedures, expand or amend easily, or apply to private property. It is an instrument of the town and controlled by Council and Town Administrator, does allow up to 100% capture of new, incremental property tax revenue for paying debt, vs 20% +/- Town portion, save interest costs for tax-payers, terminate when all IOUs are paid, is invisible to tax-payer if "in or out" of the District, does strictly limit uses of financing and revenues, is for town-owned infrastructure only. Planning Policy Questions are is it a good idea to provide municipal sewer services to Exit 10 and 11 areas and the section of Rt. 3 that connects both? If "yes" or "maybe" it needs to be decided Where?, When?, For Who?, How much? (What are the capital and operating costs? What are the operating and potential new property tax revenues?), What is the best way to finance the public infrastructure? (private funding or public funding: debt, fees, TIF increment saving.) Are Exits 10 and 11 and 3A Sewer Extensions. Possible or "Why Not" This includes cost to tax-payers, growth happening anyway (see Exit 10 to-date), too much growth already (negative impacts of traffic, pollution, or runoff into the river, the existing ground based systems are working, don't duplicate, lowers sewer treatment capacity for elsewhere, it is seen as a business subsidy (wait to see what happens). Reasons to invest include tax incremental revenues are greater than all costs during debt-period, no loss of existing revenues, 100% gain to tax-payer once paid-off, encourages better growth by higher density, growth along 3a corridor is a Master Plan goal, existing septic at Exit 10 being inadequate, property-value added to exit 10, 11 and 3a lands, and Town-owned parcel, sewer treatment capacity is adequate (generates positive operating cash flow), jobs for residents, help local business, waiting may be a lost opportunity, lose significant increments forever, local businesses and investors go elsewhere. The TIF Development Plan Questions and Answers are Where to put it (Along 3A, Not along Route 3, Commercial and non-residential zones -residential zones are excluded.) When? (Design and Engineering - 2016, Construction - 2017.) For Who? (Commercial and Industrial zones, new and existing business, residential may hook-up, not required.) How much? (What are the capital and operating costs?, what are operating and potential new property tax revenues?) What is the best way to finance the Infrastructure? (Private funding - Walmart Escrow, connection fees.) Public Funding. (State loan funds and grants, Sewer Commission escrows, Public bonding via TIF, TIF Escrow - save and invest later.) Possible Actions and Key Considerations. Key Considerations are Costs and

Revenue Projections, new development potential, Timing (Town Meeting deadlines and Warrant language, 2 years to design and build, Opportunities lost if delayed or rejected, Borrowing costs, other bonding requests), voter Education and concerns, Sewer Commission operating issues, is is a good idea, do it now or later?, determine participation of Sewer Commission, private investment funds such as Walmart and new Exit 11 proposals, and strategy to get adoption, submit a TIF Development Plan to Town Council and adopt or reject. Next Steps and decisions include adopting a TIF District to either: 1. Start building up the Increment “just in case.” 2. Fund additional planning and design. 3. Fund full engineering drawings. 4. Authorize bond - or save-then: RFP for build, escrow private contributions, escrow any new TIF revenues, establish the required Advisory-Oversight Committee via Council, monitor compliance. Votes: Determine boundaries (amend current district boundaries or new district), Allowable uses proscribed, prohibited uses listed, costs: “not to exceed”, revenue forecasts over time, differences over time, decide excess TIF revenue to debt versus General Fund (ex. 50/50), set conditions required for vote.

S. Arnett: We are planning to come back at your June meeting.

J. Duffy: I will email hardcopies of the slide presentation to the member’s of the Board. If could take time to read it we will put it back on the agenda for June. At that time you may feel comfortable making a recommendation to Town Council on which option you would prefer.

S. Arnett: JoAnn, you know have the engineering information. We will also provide you with a narrative.

D. Winterton: This data is going to be important to look at and will be very helpful.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. SNHU ATHLETIC COMPLEX (#16-04)

East Side Drive & North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67

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

J. Duffy: SNHU was here at the last meeting. They presented the overall site plan for the athletic complex and there were some questions raised concerning traffic. Bob Duval was present at that meeting and explained what they plan to do for the traffic study which is currently on-going. Jim has a separate report that you should all have a copy of which includes his comments.

J. Donison: At the last meeting the sidewalk and pedestrian bridge were discussed. I have been working with SNHU and the design engineer and have come up with sidewalk easement language. That has been reviewed by the Town attorney and is acceptable to all parties. They are proposing to extend the sidewalk from the corner where Martins Ferry Road turns onto N. River Road and have agreed to participate in the cost of the pedestrian bridge.

D. Marshall: The form and content of the sidewalk easement deed has been approved by our Town attorney as well as SNHU?

Jim Donison: Yes.

J. Duffy: The lighting plan was submitted but the details of the fixtures have not been included in the plan set. The concern I have is that, because this is a large facility, I am not certain as to how many lights there will be and if the lights will meet our lighting ordinance. If this is approved, I would request that a condition of approval be that the lighting plan is thoroughly looked at.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

D. Winterton: At the Town Council meeting on Wednesday there was a discussion about the tennis courts. Would those be opened or closed to residents of Hooksett if the courts are empty? Would there be passes required?

Monther Mardini: There will always be consideration for the community of Hooksett. There should be some room for the public to use the tennis courts as they do now. It would just need some coordination.

F. Kotowski motioned that the site plan for an athletic complex for intercollegiate and recreational sports programs on campus including sports fields and tennis courts, associated landscaping, parking and utility improvements for SNHU Athletic Complex (#16-04), East Side Drive & North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67 be approved with the condition that the lighting thoroughly looked at before moving forward.

M. Mardini: We will submit anything that they would like or is needed.

F. Kotowski: I was pleased to be invited to SNHU to show us around so that we could see what is going on. Is the bridge a 50/50 split with the town?

J. Donison: SNUH has agreed to contribute \$25,000 towards the cost of the bridge.

Seconded by T. Parasol.

D. Marshall: If this is passed I will sign the plans only after I have been told by the Town Engineer that the lighting plan has been examined and found adequate.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. BLUEBIRD SELF-STORAGE (#16-12)

7 College Park Drive, Map 14, Lot 1-10

Waiver Request to appeal assessment impact fees per Zoning Ordinance Article 30, Section H.

1. Appeals Under Impact Fee Ordinance

J. Duffy: Attorney Cronin just returned from vacation and I have a meeting scheduled with him for this Thursday. I would request that this be continued to May 16, 2016.

T. Walsh motioned to continue the waiver request to appeal assessment impact fees per Zoning Ordinance Article 30, Section H.1. Appeals Under Impact Fee Ordinance for Bluebird Self-Storage (#16-12), 7 College Park Drive, Map 14, Lot 1-10 to May 16, 2016. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPLETENESS

5. **SOUTHERN NH UNIVERSITY (#16-15)**
2500 North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67
300-bed 4-story Residence Hall

J. Duffy: The application is complete and the public hearing will be scheduled for June 6, 2016.

D. Winterton motioned to find the plan complete for a 300-bed 4-story Residence Hall for Southern NH University (#16-15), 2500 North River Road, Map 33, Lot 67. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **BOONE/ASSURED REALTY TRUST (#16-14)**
South Bow Road, Map 12, Lot 14-2
Four Lot Residential Subdivision

J. Duffy: The application is complete and the public hearing would be scheduled for June 6, 2016.

T. Walsh motioned to find the plan for a four lot residential subdivision for Boone/Assured Realty Trust (#16-14), South Bow Road, Map 12, Lot 14-2 complete. Seconded by D. Grafton. Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION

7. **David Campbell**
- > **Lehoux Dr., Map 24, Lots 36-4 & 34-5**
Proposed subdivision and access plan
 - > **Map 19, Lot 4-A**
Establishing lot of record
 - > **The Parkway**
 - > **Rezoning of MUD5**

David Campbell (Attorney for Manchester Sand and Gravel): I am showing you tax map 19-4a of Gilbert Block. Since 1983 Gilbert Block has been leasing that property which is shown as a lot of record. The assessment shows that the owner is Gilbert Block and they have been paying the taxes. The title is owned by Manchester Sand and Gravel. At some point we need to sell this piece of property to Gilbert Block or another party and we need an affirmative statement from you that it is a lot of record. We talked with Steve Buckley about this. He agreed and I could get something in writing from him.

D. Marshall: We would need that.

D. Campbell: He agreed that it is a lot of record but thought that there could be a subdivision. We do not want a sub-division because we don't know how the property would be used. We would rather be able to transfer it as a lot of record which, according to town records and the registry, it is. I think we should re-address it. Maybe this is something Christine Fillmore should look at on your behalf before we make a formal presentation to you. I wanted to show you what we have that states this was designated as a lot of record in 1983. Gilbert Block is noted on the town records as being the owner, it is not, and they have been paying the taxes since 1983. The deed underlying it is Manchester Sand. They had a lease agreement which is now null and void and there is a deeded right of way so they have access to our hall road out to Rt. 3 as well as a sign easement on Rt. 3. Do you want us to talk with your legal counsel?

D. Marshall: We will need something on record that is presented to the Board that says in the opinion of Town Council it is a lot of record. Then we could take an affirmative action to say that it is.

D. Campbell: We would like something affirmative.

J. Duffy: We have a new town attorney and I can get you that information.

D. Campbell: We will come in with the Sewer Commission to make a joint presentation about what needs to be done at the end of Lehoux Drive. The Sewer Commission owns one side and Manchester Sand owns the other side. There is a paper road that goes through to Brox. We want to come in with a sub-division and consolidation plan that both the Sewer Commission and Manchester Sand endorse and present it to you for your consideration. The parkway is something that we come in with and the end of every year and ask for a one-year extension. I don't mind doing that but it clouds how we market it.

Ron Corriveau (Manchester Sand): Industrial Drive heading south was supposed to go down to Exit 9 through the SNHU parcel. It was stimulated by some cooperation with them. We understand that their interest has lapsed. We sold off Outdoor World and GE occupies a part of Industrial Drive. The grand master plan for the parkway was the corridor to come down Petersbrook into the Valley, to the south, and out to Martin's Ferry. We are hearing there is a lack of interest to the south and we question if this is going anywhere.

D. Campbell: This doesn't make any provisions for exits onto the land. When it is determined what kind of ramps are needed or off street to get into this land, and do the set-backs, this piece would be chopped up. This is currently attractive because it is the largest piece of single ownership, industrially zoned property north of Londonderry. Something we should address this year is whether or not this should be kept on the books or removed.

T. Walsh: The southern part of the parkway is the biggest concern for marketing of that piece. What are your thoughts about the northern part?

D. Campbell: That is dead because of Head's Pond and the land in between is all conservation land. When we drew the line it was because we thought there were going to be a lot of things out there and there was various zoning. None of the things that were rumored through the years happened. The economic engine does not exist to pay for the road and the conservationists would not be in favor of a roadway running through there. As far as whether it stays on the books or not it is not hurting us either

way, however, it doesn't make sense to have lines that cannot be built. On the southern leg it hurts the marketing of industrial land. I would like to see both designations be taken off.

D. Winterton: I would have a hard time not supporting taking it all off.

D. Campbell: Things have evolved in different directions. We thought there would be a lot more traffic. Exit 10 took a lot of the retail growth out. The residential growth has slowed. There is no economic engine, private or otherwise, to build a road of that length.

F. Kotowski: If the road were to be taken off of the master plan, would that mean that Manchester Sand would be more aggressively marketing those pieces of property that are now cut up by the road?

D. Campbell: Yes.

F. Kotowski: From an economic development prospective it seems that you should send a letter to Town Council explaining why you want to do this and let them set up a time to discuss it.

D. Campbell: It is a call by the Planning Board. We have a development agreement with the Planning Board as part of the Head's Pond development that says by a certain date we were going to deed over that parkway. We have extended it by one-year twice. It is this Boards decision to either enforce it and say to deed it over or to waive it.

J. Duffy: Who would retain ownership?

D. Campbell: Manchester Sand and Gravel.

J. Duffy: The north and south are currently listed in the state's regional transportation plan for 2025-2040 for funding.

D. Marshall: That would have to be taken out.

P. Scarpetti: I agree with Don but would also ask that there be more emphasis put on the light that should be put on the end of the road. By taking this away the only way out is onto Rt. 3. I think a plan needs to be worked on for a light.

D. Campbell: I agree with that. Currently the signalization of that is grandiose because it was meant to handle a parkway. If it is now just a local road a more modest intersection can be put there which cuts the cost and it will be easier for a developer to come in on both the industrial and retail side.

M. DiBietto: Currently there are multiple opinions on this. Prior to the meeting a few weeks ago with SNHU, I did not think it would go anyplace, but after that meeting I had the sense that there was potentially some life in the possibility of the parkway. I don't think this should be voted on lightly.

D. Campbell: If it is not discontinued, we would not be able to develop it to it's best potential.

M. DiBietto: The town has had a long standing Master Plan showing a parkway. We need to unwind that process to determine it is no longer feasible or needed, and make a definitive decision.

D. Marshall: All of the parties need to meet together. The issue in the southern area is they would have a great deal of trouble marketing the property the way it is especially with improvements that would have to be made to Rt. 3.

D. Campbell: You are correct. If there is no parkway the intersection could be greatly reduced.

D. Marshall: We have to look at yours as well as Brocks. If Brocks were to get unloaded it would be a large impact on this town.

D. Campbell: We are going to keep the paper road to tie into Brocks. We understand from Brocks that they are not planning to tie into Manchester Sand's road network or Lehoux Drive until the time the quarry is exhausted and that has 40-75 years of life. There are wetlands and private concerns in the way. SNHU would have to keep a corridor clear for the next 40 years.

D. Marshall: We need to get a meeting organized.

J. Duffy: SNHU, Manchester Sand, and Brocks.

M. DiBitetto: What about the NH DOT?

D. Marshall: The state has the cross-section analysis for that entire route.

M. DiBitetto: Does it determine what the carrying capacity would be?

D. Marshall: It is the concept of the department created years ago in the same cross-section that is there now between McDonalds and Legends. The four lane divided urban type design.

M. DiBitetto: I would want to see that completed crossway be able to handle the growth of the associated properties. Then I would be comfortable saying to focus energy and economic resources on upgrading Rt. 3.

D. Marshall: Rt. 3 is capable of being upgraded as long as money is no concern.

D. Campbell: There are contributions the town can make that can help reduce those costs. For example, the town could prevail to Eversource that it is the best interest of the town versus having a private developer move their telephone poles. That has worked in the past and can save a half a million dollars. There is a cooperative way to improve Rt. 3 but to think that the last man standing will carry all of those costs will not work.

D. Winterton: When the by-pass was discussed, there were not as many vacant commercial properties as there are now. There are commercial properties for sale that have no interest. As long as we say there is a parkway that might take traffic away from them more, I don't know how we are helping those businesses. I think this needs to be put to bed.

D. Campbell: Our Master Plan has to be updated. The properties that have been sold out under MUD 5 need to be rezoned because they cannot meet the requirements of MUD 5. JoAnn suggested a sub-committee.

J. Duffy: Yes. A lot of these properties have been out and on their own for a while, especially the residential ones. When people come in and want to add on, they are confused as to what zoning they fall under. We don't want to end up having an entire sub-division be non-conforming from the start.

D. Campbell: We would be happy to help make those determinations. At the same time we can address separately, or together, how the parkway will be treated and we can update our Master Plan with notes to show that we made our quotas for the project on a number of things such as open space and public use. We want them in the record and I would think that you would like to have a clean zoning ordinance going forward.

M. DiBitto: Your plan shows how you developed the site. Was there a notation on each development on how it was being developed and zones.

D. Campbell: We can go back and find all of the plans.

D. Marshall, D. Grafton, and M. DiBitto volunteered to serve on the sub-committee.

J. Duffy: Some of the zoning in the MUD districts has changed over the years.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 8. 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.

Nick Golan (TF Moran): This is Phase 2A and 2B relative to the northwest corner of the lots also known as 51 and 53 Hackett Hill Road.

Mark Blasko (Owner of Chucksters): The golf course will have a different design and similar style to the one in Chichester, nice landscaping, and use of water. Structures incorporated into the course will be a covered bridge, gazebo, and a short fire tower.

N. Golan: There will be a clubhouse that measures 36 x 40 or just over 2,000 sq. ft., a pavilion which is 30 x 40 or 1200 sq. feet located directly to the east and is an open air structure. The materials used will be rough sawn pine in a natural cedar tone and roofs will be either standing seam or architectural shingles. The additional structure is the fire tower. It is approximately 24 ft. tall. We realize it will require a building permit. It is a component of the course itself. The site layout is comprised of 50 parking spaces including the two required accessible spaces and a single dumpster enclosure that would be located in the northwest corner of the paved area. It will be fully enclosed and there will be screening from the public way. There are two mini-golf courses proposed. The first phase, which is identified as Phase 2 on the plan, is an area just over 36,000 sq. ft. and would be fronting along Hackett Hill Road. Harris Mini-Golf designed the course working with Mark and his team. There is a waiver that is before you in regards to this application for an alternative landscape frontage. We would like to provide addi-

tional landscaping within the mini-golf itself. We want people to see the mini-golf course and doing plantings along that frontage would hamper site lines. With the improvements that are being made to the grading it takes the slope down so that we have our all season clear distance looking up Hackett Hill Road. If we were to install plantings along that area that site line would be diminished. Another component of that waiver request is the existing topography. There is a tremendous grade drop from Hackett Hill Road and there is presently a guardrail located there. The only way to screen the proposed work would be to locate those trees within the right-of-way. A suggestion might be to move the driveway, however, we are hindered due to the grade drop. It is not realistic to relocate the driveway. The types of landscaping would be a mix of trees such as pines, elms, oaks, and flowering pear as well as a good variation of shrubs. As far as signage, there is a proposed monument sign located on the south side of our driveway. We wanted it to be visible but not hinder the drivers perspective when pulling in and out of the driveway. It will be located at the southwest corner of the site and will be approximately 20 sq. ft. There will also be a wall mounted sign on the building facade that would be approximately 6 sq. ft. Utilities that are servicing this property with electricity will be fed via the existing overhead line. A new utility pole will be installed and go overhead to tie into the proposed building. Regarding water, when we originally submitted our application we had proposed an extension of the Hooksett Village Water Precinct line. We are still waiting for approval of the original extension for the hotel project. Due to the timing being that Chucksters is looking to move forward with construction as soon as permits are granted, that water line will not be installed in time. We will be installing a water well for the purposes of Chucksters. When we get to the second application for the smokehouse that is not proposed for construction until Spring of 2017. That would be serviced by a municipal extension. There is no sewer in this area so we will be using an on-site septic. There will be an ice cream service included with the mini-golf so there will be a grease trap added. Site lights will be LED pole mounted fixtures within the requirements of the town. We would like to use open drainage where possible. We proposed two infiltration basins. There is a AOT permit required. This is a cost effective use of the land and should provide the necessary treatment for the impervious surfaces that we are proposing. We will have an AOT permit and a sub-surface permit for the septic. There is an existing wetland on-site which is close to the location of the fire tower. It is just over 7,000 sq. ft. A wetland dredge and fill application has been applied for. It is a localized depression and not a vernal pool.

J. Duffy: What happened to the barn?

N. Golan: The barn is being relocated to the smokehouse parcel.

J. Duffy: The plan you have here is for the smokehouse as well?

N. Golan: Correct. We should update the plan to give a representation of where that is going.

J. Duffy: The Fire Department had commented that the road heading into the site needs a name and there is a form that needs to be filled out.

N. Golan: We are aware of that. Jim had a suggestion to provide a sidewalk along Hackett Hill Road that would go from the hotel area to the mini-golf. There is an existing 10' shoulder there now that provides a walking surface. Just beyond that roadway is a significant grade drop. Trying to build on the opposite side of the guardrail would be problematic. What we reasoned as an appropriate compromise is we provided some interconnectivity from the proposed site being a paved sidewalk that would tie into that existing paved shoulder.

T. Walsh: It looks like the whole project will be connected from within. Is that correct?

N. Golan: Relative to the site access drive we are proposing that as part of 2A and 2B. In the future as additional uses come along that road would be extended. If they do decide to extend that road it requires further approvals.

D. Grafton: On the Chucksters portion you have 50 parking spaces. What is your maximum capacity within the park at one time?

N. Golan: We are well within the town guidelines. We have provided 50 spaces, which is consistent with the other Chucksters operations. This is a smaller location than the other ones.

D. Grafton: We don't want to discourage the residents from being able to partake in this activity due to the lack of parking.

N. Golan: There are an additional 43 spaces for the smokehouse. We have just under 100 parking spaces for both.

D. Grafton: You want to make sure there is adequate parking.

N. Golan: We feel there is adequate parking and it well exceeds the requirements of the town.

D. Marshall: The frontage of these lots is both on Hackett Hill?

N. Golan: Yes.

P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the waiver for the plan scale for Larrabee Lilac Park Phase 2A – Chuckster's Mini Golf (#16-07). Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

F. Kotowski motioned to approve a waiver to provide an alternate front landscape area within the mini-golf course. doing on the lot itself be permitted. Seconded by D. Grafton. Motion carried unanimously.

Open public hearing.

Judy Labbe-Huard (90 Hackett Hill Road): I am opposed to this plan. We moved to Hooksett in 2000. One of the draws in bringing us to Hooksett and specifically the Hackett Hill Road area was because it is residential, rural, had low traffic counts, and small town charm. Since we moved there Exit 10 has been developed extensively and the corridor between Exits 10 and 11 is getting developed. We have seen increased traffic. The speed on the road is way to fast. A commercial development that is going onto what I believe is a residential road is going to bring more traffic and faster cars. Now, on my way to and from home, I am going to have to look at an unsightly mini-golf course that that are asking for waivers for that do not even go along with the town requirements for landscaping. I do not want to see a fire tower that is beyond tall. We have been talking about doing improvements to our home, but I am getting to the point where I am thinking about moving away from this area because the development is pushing me out. I love my home and my neighbors but I don't want more development closer to my

home.

D. Marshall: Were you aware at the time you bought your home what this land was zoned for?

J. Labbe-Huard: I was not but it sat as an empty lot as long as I have known the area and there was never any talk of development back then.

Close public hearing.

J. Donison: We had an original review letter and we got some responses which I responded to. Regarding the sidewalks, they proposed to provide a short link between Hackett Hill Road and the corner of their lot for Chucksters. On full buildout of this entire site should the developer provide the opportunity for future sidewalks to connect all of the different sites? There will be adequate room to walk along Hackett Hill Road but it is not a designated sidewalk. They will be able to go off of Hackett Hill Road to Chucksters, but once they are at Chucksters does the Planning Board want to have it as a condition that at least the provision for a sidewalk area be provided once the other Phases are done?

D. Marshall: There is a wide green space between his property line and the edge of the pavement. Is that existing?

J. Donison: It is existing green space but it is a very steep slope, probably 2:1.

N. Golan: From a grading prospective we have graded a shoulder at the top of that existing drive that would allow for installation in the future.

D. Marshall: Is that shown on the plan?

N. Golan: Yes.

D. Marshall. Do you agree to that?

N. Golan: Relative to the provision for it's construction, I do not have the capability of agreeing to that. Relative to future provisions for construction after the fact it gets tricky especially from the financial aspect. Once Chuckster's is up and operating who would then be responsible for building that sidewalk? It is a question from Jim to the Board if the Board thinks that what is provided is suitable and will serve our purposes for the proposed development now and in the future.

D. Marshall: A sidewalk easement would have to be shown.

J. Donison: I think that would be appropriate.

N. Golan: In favor of who?

D. Marshall: At some point in time if the town decided it was essential it could be put it in. As it develops we may require the rest of it.

Jeff Larrabee: The 50' buffer from the residential zone to the commercial, going back to the pond the

the intention has been to make a 50' connectivity trail so that people can go from one part of the development to another but along the most scenic portion of it. The plan was to have the 50' buffer become the sidewalk connector to the rest of the development

N. Golan: That is noted on the plan. The idea is to create that Lilac path to interconnect the developments. It is important to have the interconnectivity and I think we have accomplished that with having that path versus something that would just be along the roadway.

J. Donison: At the next level of development, what would be the opposition to providing the commitment that a sidewalk would be placed? It might be good planning.

T. Walsh: Pedestrian safety is important. I think it would be fair to show where any walking trails would be.

N. Golan: On sheet 2 of the master plan, we are showing some of the Lilac Path.

D. Winterton: It looks like the connectivity can be done internally rather than on Hackett Hill Road.

F. Kotowski: The connectivity should be shown on the plans.

T. Walsh motioned for conditional approval of the site plan for a miniature golf course and clubhouse for Larrabee Lilac Park Phase 2A – Chuckster’s Mini Golf (#16-07), based on the barn being notated on the plan set where it is located currently and where it will be located when it is moved. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

**9. LARRABEE LILAC PARK PHASE 2B – RESTAURANT (#16-10)
Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lot 52, 56 & 57
Site plan for a 100-seat smokehouse restaurant.**

N. Golan: This is proposing a 4,000 sq. ft., 100-seat smokehouse style restaurant which includes a 27x44 outdoor concrete patio. The materials for construction would be barn wood siding with a metal roof, a single dumpster which will be screened from the public way and adjacent mini-golf with a row of arborvitaes. Landscaping is provided within the parking lot as well as around the perimeter. There is a similar waiver request with regard to the street trees along the frontage. The site lines would be obscured relative to the driveway. There is also the acknowledgement that as the site develops should an additional use be placed north of the smokehouse, the Planning Board would have the opportunity to ask for additional landscaping for that use. Relative to utilities there is an overhead electric line that comes across Hackett Hill Road to a utility pole that then goes underground to our proposed transformer which is located on the west side of the building. We have tried to keep in mind some future planning as far as buildout of the project. We have continued that underground electrical to the other side of the proposed access drive where we would have a sector cabinet that would provide the opportunity for future connectivity to those other lots and uses if that is deemed to be the most cost effective route for the electricity. Relative to water, this will be an extension of the Village Precinct municipal service. This building will be sprinklered. Relative to septic sewer needs there will be an Enviro Septic located north of the proposed parking lot. Site lights are LED pole mounted fixtures. Drainage will be a single infiltration basin with a pre-treatment forebay meeting the requirement of the town and AOT permit that will be required. Permits required will be the AOT and septic outside of the town approvals. Jim

had a few comments for us to address. On it was adding a guardrail on the east most corner of the access drive. There is a platform at the top of 5-6' but it drops off to a 3:1 slope. It is steep so it does make sense that we provide the guardrail there.

D. Winterton: What about signage?

N. Golan: We don't have any current signage proposed. Once the signage is realized we will be back for approval.

J. Duffy: I am trying to figure out how people are going to walk through the Lilac Path and cross over a wetland. I do not have any issues with the smokehouse itself.

T. Parasol motioned to accept the completeness criteria checklist for Larrabee Lilac Park Phase 2B – Restaurant (#16-10), Hackett Hill Rd., Map 13, Lots 52, 56 & 57. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

T. Parasol motioned to accept 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. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

J. Donison: The plans refer to Phase 1 golf course and Phase II. Is the intent to do Phase 1 before Phase 2 or Phase 2 before Phase 1?

N. Golan: For the purposes of the dialogue tonight, Phase 2 will be first.

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARING

**10. JOSEPH TIMMONS (#16-16)
12 Alice Avenue, Map 45, Lot 1
One-Lot Subdivision**

Arthur Siciliano (Land Surveyor): Joseph Timmons is here with me. He owns a piece of land on Alice Avenue that is in the urban density residential district. The lot size is 24,861 sq. ft. It is not in a flood hazard zone. The minimum lot size requirements are 9,000 sq. ft. with 90' of frontage. On our plan we are showing the existing house and garage. We would like to subdivide a lot off of Coaker Avenue which is the 9,000 sq. ft. lot. This lot will tie into sewer and water. The sewer line is a manhole and does not connect to Alice Avenue. There is water that goes along Coaker Avenue.

D. Marshall: This is a two-lot subdivision because you are creating two lots.

J. Duffy: We are concerned with the number of new lots at the end of the year.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

T. Parasol motioned to find the plan for Joseph Timmons (#16-16), 12 Alice Avenue, Map 45, Lot 1 complete. Seconded by T. Walsh.

P. Scarpetti: Because the house is not within the set-back did they have to go for a variance?

J. Duffy: No because it is an existing structure and it is not becoming more non-conforming by adding that lot-line.

Motion carried unanimously.

*F. Kotowski motioned to approve the subdivision for Joseph Timmons (#16-16), 12 Alice Avenue, Map 45, Lot 1 with the conditions that a note be added to the plan for clarification that the new lot be serviced by water and sewer, a excavation permit be obtained for the water and sewer, and a driveway permit is required. Seconded by D. Grafton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

WAIVER REQUEST

11. BEAVER BROOK SUBDIVISION (#16-17)

Londonderry Turnpike, Map 49, Lots 49 & 58

Waiver Request from Section 22.02 Requirement Pertaining to Active and Substantial Development

J. Duffy: The applicants AOT permit expired so they made some changes to the plan and they wanted to come back and have the Board approve the amended plan. They never met their active and substantial development and are running closer to never being able to get vested. In your ordinance there is a clause that you can grant an extension. The extension they are asking for would give them 2 more years until August, 2018 in order to do substantial completion and vesting of the project. The Town's attorney explained that you don't have any authority to extend the substantial completion portion of the requirement, only the active and substantial development section. They want to be able to vest and were first planning to do a developmental agreement. That never came forward. Once there is an agreement in place, they are coming back with another property owner to approve the changes that were made as a result of extending the AOT permit.

P. Scarpetti: That was for the improvements on the plan for the drainage?

J. Duffy: Yes but their biggest concern is they do not want to use everything they have invested and they would be able to vest the project.

D. Marshall: They are asking for an active and substantial development to be extended to 8/9/17?

J. Duffy: Yes. If they were to do that work and meet the definition of active and substantial, it would give them another year to do substantial completion which would be 8/9/18.

D. Marshall: Does our attorney agree with that?

J. Duffy: Yes.

Attorney Greg Michael (Bernstein Shur): Under your Town of Hooksett regulations, Section 22-02, it narrows the state statute, the 5-year vesting period. The 5-year vesting period then would be 8/9/2018. There is an active and substantial completion requirement to allow you to continue to develop the project. My clients were actively developing the project through the November, 2014 time-frame under the approval that was finalized in August of 2013. They have spent over a half million dollars on the drainage and road work, roadway, underground utilities, drainage, and erosion control measures. They have done almost half of the infrastructure work on the sub-division. The AOT permit expired November, 2014. It could not be renewed because under the regulatory scheme that changed they had to reapply for that permit. Dealing with the state took a lot of time and they finally obtained the new permit in January, 2016. When the permit expired the project and work had to stop that would have moved this toward active and substantial. We have the new permit. My clients are prepared to move ahead. They have a substantial investment in this project. They have soft costs for the original development of almost \$300,000, the land costs are in excess of \$2 million. There is a lot of money invested in this project and they would like to and are prepared work toward the appropriate time goals that are established by your regulations and the state statute 674-39 which your regulation mirrors. We are requesting a waiver of that limit. We believe it is fair, makes sense, and is good cause for the request. The other matter that JoAnn brought forward needs to be heard by the Board and involves the very minor adjustments that had to be made to conform to the newer AOT requirements. Jon Rokeh has done an outstanding job of making those adjustments while barely touching the plan. That will be scheduled for another meeting.

J. Duffy: The application has not yet been submitted because we are waiting for the agreement with the abutting property owner.

Attorney G. Michael: We expect to have that shortly.

T. Walsh: Why did the AOT permit expire before you got the approvals?

Attorney G. Michael: To get this approved the AOT permit is needed. There were a number of conditions imposed by the Board that needed to be addressed. By the time those conditions came forward and were met the AOT permit time ran out and now we are in this position.

John Rokeh (Rokeh Consulting): The DOT permit was originally issued in 2007 and was extended in 2009 for a 5-year extension to 2014. By the time we got started in 2013, they were almost to the end of even the extension periods.

P. Scarpetti motioned to extend the waiver request from Section 22.02 Requirement Pertaining to Active and Substantial Development for Beaver Brook Subdivision (#16-17), Londonderry Turnpike, Map 49, Lots 49 & 58 based on the reasons given. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

CHANGE OF USE

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

None

OTHER BUSINESS

D. Marshall: We received a letter from Leslie Boswak stating her interest in serving on the SNHPC. We approved that subject to receipt of the letter. Has the recommendation gone to Town Council?

J. Duffy: Not yet but it will.

J. Duffy: The Town of Allenstown received a grant to do a Plan NH Charrette. It will probably be held on September 30 and October 1. They will be extending an invitation to neighboring communities closer to the event.

T. Walsh: Are there any plans for roadway improvements on Elmer Avenue?

J. Donison: We currently have 3 projects out for bid. One is milling and paving. In areas that are in poor shape milling and spot paving will be done. We also have crack and chip sealing. We have a 5-year plan to mill and pave different areas so we will take a look at that.

D. Marshall: How are things moving along on Martins Ferry?

J. Donison: Bids are expected on May 13.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**