

Unofficial

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, October 3, 2016**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:06 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 and Christopher Stelmach

EXCUSED: Muamer Durakovic and Michael DiBitetto (Alternate).

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

C. Stelmach will be voting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 09/12/16

September 12, 2016 Regular Meeting – P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the September 12, 2016 meeting, with amendments. Secoded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

COMMENTS TO THE ZBA ON SPECIAL EXCEPTION

- 1. J.K. Mullikin & Sons, LLC #16-39
87 & 89 Auburn Road, Map 36, lots 21-3, 22 and 61
Special Exception from Article 18, Section 18.G.2.c.
Wetland Impacts of 1,350 sf over the extension of Jaime Lane and 900 sf impact for the driveway leading into lot 21-3-1**

Jon Rokeh (Rokeh Consulting): We went to the Conservation Commission and went over the project. We want to create a sub-division where we would extend Jaime Lane. We met with JoAnn and Jim and worked out options on how to do a cul-de-sac on this property. This was the final version we came up with for three lots off the extension. To service this lot there are two wetland crossings so we had to go to the ZBA for that. To get the correct amount of frontage for the three lots we are proposing two wetland buffer impacts. The largest of the wetland buffer impacts is 1,133 sq. ft. The smallest is 435 sq. ft. The largest of the wetland impacts is 1,350 sq. ft.. The smallest, for a driveway, is 900 sq. ft. We went to the Conservation Commission. They made a recommendation to the ZBA to approve the project. We went to ZBA where there was considerable abutter input and there was a site walk scheduled. We had

the site walk and a lot of the concerns the abutters had were taken care of at the site walk. Once we get through the ZBA process we would come before you for a full site plan process.

D. Marshall: There is an existing house on one of the 5 lots?

J. Rokeh: Yes. There are three separate parcels. A small parcel, a main parcel, and an existing lot with the house of record. There was a non-conforming lot and we are proposing to lot-line adjust the existing lot so that it becomes a conforming lot. There is a road frontage lot and three new lots off of the extension of Jaime Lane on the top.

D. Marshall: Point out the wetland impacts.

J. Rokeh pointed out the wetland impacts.

J. Duffy: Steve Couture sent me an email stating the Conservation Commission was not meeting on October 10 due to Columbus Day so they would not have their comments in until later in the month.

J. Rokeh: The official written comments?

J. Duffy: Correct. I am not sure when ZBA will be able to vote on this due to those comments. As soon as the ZBA process is finalized they are planning to submit the sub-division plan to the Planning Board.

Jim Donison: The Conservation Commission might have made a recommendation to not intervene. Steve was not at the meeting. Please review the Conservation Commission minutes.

J. Rokeh: From the meeting we were at everyone seemed positive. Coming out of the meeting we felt as though it was a recommendation for the ZBA.

T. Walsh: Is there some activity?

J. Rokeh: Yes. On an existing lot of record.

*P. Scarpetti motioned to send a letter of recommendation to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for J.K. Mullikin & Sons, LLC #16-39. Seconded by F. Kotowski. T. Walsh abstained due to not being at the site walk. **Motion carried.***

PUBLIC HEARING

2. HARMONY PLACE (#16-37) 1621 Hooksett Road, Map 14, lot 27 Amended Site Plan for a 63 Unit Multi-Family Development

Jennifer McCourt (McCourt Engineering Associates): The request is for an amendment to the 2009 conditional approval which was originally for 63 units of elderly housing. We received a variance to go to multi-family for the 63, 2 bedroom, units. We were also granted a special exception for the water tank. The big difference is there is a road going to the existing water tank with a booster pump station. The current site plan shows where the new water tank would go and we shifted the booster pump sta-

tion. It is all at the same elevation so all the design characteristics for the booster pump station stay the same for fire and sprinkler for the three buildings with a drive under. The big change with parking is the additional parking in front for the multi-family due to the increase. We added a driveway for the abutter to the south along with sewer service. The landscaping stays the same except some of the landscaping is not being disturbed and we added some landscaping around the tower. The detention ponds, drainage, access road, improvements on Rt. 3, and the sewer connection through Beauchesne stays the same. We added a playground area. One of the waiver requests is to not put in some parking spaces. That comes out of the visitor parking. We do not want to encourage having non-registered or extra vehicles stored on site. They can be built if it is an issue for visitors and extra spaces are needed. We would rather have the green area. We have the 1,250' of roadway improvements on Rt. 3. I submitted the traffic study from Steve Pernaw which shows that the improvements we are proposing still more than facilitate the development. We are still standing by the gifting of \$150,000 for the upgrading of the drainage on Beauchesne Drive and part of Albert, which is 840' of pipe, and reconstructing about 700' of roadway which affects 9 homes directly and up to an additional 11 homes indirectly. We are connecting the abutter to the north and the abutter to the south to sewer, providing driveway access, and working with Hooksett Village Water Precinct to put in their new water tank and giving them access up the road to be able to access it which is a better situation than they have now. The first waiver is regarding the parking spaces. The regulation requires 158 parking spaces; 126 for the residents and 32 for the visitors. The waiver request is to construct 152 spaces, unless the need arises, and then the additional 6 spaces can be constructed. All of the facilities are designed to accommodate the six spaces. The reason is to facilitate more green area and prevent storage of unwanted vehicles on site.

F. Kotowski: If the additional parking spaces became necessary, would that mean you would reduce the size of the playground?

J. McCourt: No. It would reduce the green space around the playground.

T. Walsh: What do you mean by storage of unwanted vehicles?

J. McCourt: It could be boats, a camper, anything.

T. Walsh: That could happen anyway.

J. McCourt: It could, but in their spaces. We do not want extra pavement and have people decide the visitor parking spots belong to them and use them for something.

D. Marshall: Are you going to designate parking spaces specifically for each apartment?

J. McCourt: There will be two for each apartment.

D. Marshall: Will there be numbers to identify them per apartment?

J. McCourt: The ones in the garage will be that way.

D. Winterton: Who would determine if the six additional spaces will be needed?

J. McCourt: The owners or the town, if it comes to their attention. It could be done through Code Enforcement.

T. Walsh asked to step down stating he does not believe he can be fair to the applicant between all the conditions that are still outstanding and the number of waivers.

J. McCourt: The next waiver is the same one that was requested on the conditional approval. It is for where the regulation requires a parking space size to be 10' wide. The waiver is requested for the parking garage spaces adjacent to the columns which will be 9' 6" wide. It is at the farthest away from the wall. Where the cars doors are opening they will have the full 10'. It is to accommodate the structural stability of the building in an efficient manner. A minor reduction will allow more room at the critical areas of the car doors. Some of the spaces are greater than 10'. The third waiver is the same waiver that was granted previously with a conditional approval. The regulation requires the roof pitch be a minimum of 10:1. The waiver is requested for the main roof to be a 6/12 pitch to accentuate the 10/12 pitch of the dormers. This will allow the resources of the roof excess to go into the facade and the additional roof height will only make the building more visible and less attractive. The spirit of the regulation is to create esthetically pleasing buildings and that is why it is designed as it is. This was originally approved back when you had your architectural design committee and they were in favor of it.

D. Marshall: Does staff have any comments on the waivers or problems with the waivers?

J. Duffy: No.

*T. Prasol motioned to grant Waiver 1) 158 spaces are required (126 for residents and 32 for visitors). The applicant has provided 152 spaces and has shown an area for the additional six if needed in the future. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

*P. Scarpetti motioned to grant Waiver 2) the regulations require parking spaces to be 10' wide. Requested waiver is to allow 9'6" wide for 2' of the space near the building columns at the isle side of the parking space in the garages. Seconded by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried unanimously.***

*D. Winterton motioned to grant Waiver 3) Roof Pitch 10/12 is required. Requested waiver is to allow 6/12. Seconded by T. Prasol. **Motion carried unanimously.***

Open public hearing.

Barry Cogan: With the egress from the development is there going to be a traffic light?

J. McCourt: The new access from Harmony Place will have a left and right hand turn lane out and a widened entrance in. Coming from the south going north will be a through lane and a right hand turn lane into the development. Going southbound there will be a left hand turn lane into the development and a through lane. A signal is not warranted. This is a DOT road and to be able to put a signal there we would have to have a warrant.

Chris Lampron (1617 Hooksett Road): I am located just south of this development. I had some initial concerns and, speaking with the contractor, all of them have been resolved. At this point I have no objections.

Marc Miville (42 Main Street): I am here to represent some of the citizens of my district; the area of Beachesne Drive, Grant Drive, across and up the street from the development. There have been years of concerns due to drainage. Many homes have flooded basements because of it. That started when Granite Hill was built. A lot of the drainage seepage was due to the new development. They are expressing their extreme concerns that another development across the street from them in another area, along with University Heights just east of them, will wipe out any mitigation for drainage. Main Street was just fixed for drainage issues. There are concerns about flooding in their basements and they believe it will get worse with this development and there not being any trees or bushes to stop the drainage. There is concern about this going from elderly housing to multi-family. The sewerage and renters would create a strain on infrastructure facilities and on the schools. There is also concern about the tax base. We hoped this would have at least been condominiums as opposed to rentals.

J. McCourt: In 2009, when this was originally approved, that concern was at the forefront due to the drainage because that was the time of the Mother's Day floods and a lot of flooding occurred compared to now when we are in a drought situation. The stormwater management/drainage on-site meets all of the town and state regulations as far as detaining the water on site. The owner of the property has committed to donate \$150,000 to upgrade the drainage system within Beachesne Drive which Stantec signed. I gave a copy of the drainage design to Jim Donison as he was not part of this in 2009. It is an increase in the drainage pipes going down through Beachesne Drive to be able to accommodate the existing drainage that was designed by Stantec along with a cost analysis.

F. Kotowski: Has our town engineer reviewed the drainage situation and could he comment on what is being planned and what affect any mitigation would have on Beachesne Drive in the future?

Jim Donison: I reviewed the proposed drainage design that Jennifer McCourt referenced and the proposal by Stantec back in 2009. The estimated contribution from the developer was \$150,000. I took an estimate of what the drainage improvements would cost on Beachesne Drive for drainage, pipes, ditches, headwalls, and paving and my estimate is around \$300,000. Their comment was they are not proposed to participate in 100% of the cost of the drainage because they are not contributing 100%.

F. Kotowski: If this project moves forward, how soon would that \$300,000 have to be spent and where would the \$150,000 come from?

J. Donison: I do not have an answer to that question.

Sonny Sell: In the beginning the engineers had estimated \$150,000 to do that drainage. I am not sure how it increased another \$150,000 since then unless it is due to inflation.

Jim Donison: I am being conservative in my estimate.

D. Marshall: If there is a cost share, whether that would be the town or another developer that would have to be resolved.

J. Donison: I prepared a review of the plans and had some minor comments. Comment 5 was my misunderstanding of the drainage report. There is not an increase to the off-site. It says the impact to the abutter shows that the post development run-off will increase. That is incorrect. It was pointed out by

the design engineer that the post-development run-off will be less. My other comments are minor with regard to the details of the lighting fixtures, the title on the landscape drawing, and some minor notes on the plans.

J. Duffy: I had a comment that Note 19 should be changed and I added that the impact fees due would be \$299,250. I also had a question as to whether the sidewalks were still planned along the frontage of Hooksett Road

J. McCourt: Yes they are.

J. Duffy: My only other question to the Board would be, if this is approved, whether you still want to continue requiring the \$150,000 as a condition of approval.

D. Marshall: Have you received the permits from Hooksett Village Water and Sewer and the drive-ways?

J. McCourt: Hooksett Sewer has signed my application to the state and it is there for review. We are in the process of negotiating the final lease agreement with Hooksett Village Water. DOT has all of the paperwork for the driveway permit and we are waiting for those permits as well as AOT. I have a letter from Steve at the Fire Department saying they are all set.

Tom Thibeault (66 Hackett Hill Road): I am trying to locate the exact location of this project and I also do not understand what is meant by older person housing?

D. Marshall: That was the original plan, but that was dropped. It would be general apartments.

Chris Lacroix (34 Grant Drive): Being one of the homeowners that has been affected routinely by the flooding and drainage issue, I am very concerned about that. More concerning to me is that they are going to move a new water tower into place almost directly in line with my house. It is several hundred yards away but a million gallon water tank has a good chance of taking out most of my house if something were to happen to it. That is a problem for me safety wise. We have a young neighborhood with a lot of children. That is something to think about when you are talking about adding traffic like we already have with the Main Street project coming through the neighborhood. Now there will be a water tower and more children. This went from a 55+, to a mixed-use project. How can we be sure this will not become Section 8 and become a drain on us? I have worked for communities where this has happened. Properties can change hands and become not a good place.

Close public hearing.

D. Marshall: Is there any motion from the Board? If there is a motion to approve the motion must include all of the comments that are addressed in the memorandum from Jim Donison. I will not sign the plans until I am assured those have been taken care of. The other was to ensure that there was a commitment to \$150,000 donation to the drainage improvements on Beauchesne Drive from the owner to the developer.

P. Scarpetti: I would like to clarify that this went from elderly housing to open apartments by getting a variance from the ZBA so our hands are tied as far as that.

T. Prasol: This plan included the water tower at the request of the Hooksett Village Water Precinct? What will happen to the water tower if this does not get approved?

J. McCourt: DES is requiring them to build this water tower for their consumers. There is an existing water tower which is much older technology and it has never had a problem. This one will be a high end/state of the art tower. If it is not on this property it will be someplace adjacent to it.

D. Marshall: This site has been picked for the water tower. If this plan was denied is that site still valid?

J. McCourt: It could be. It would just cost more for Hooksett Village Water Precinct to develop it. They have the special exception to build it there. If they can make a lease with Sonny Sell to do it, it could be valid.

D. Marshall motioned to approve with all of the conditions listed on the memorandum from Jim Donison. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.

D. Winterton: I would not be voting for this project. I believe people should develop their land the way they see fit, however, I do not feel this is the type of development that would benefit the citizens of Hooksett. I would love to see the water tower go in, but to leverage 63 apartments that we do not know what they will do to the impact of the town in order to leverage the water tower is an unfair burden to put on this Board.

F. Kotowski: I feel much the same as Mr. Winterton. Originally this was to be 55+ housing. There was no water tower involved. We are looking at a situation where, not to far down the road, the town will have to spend another \$150,000 to mitigate a problem that should have been resolved a long time ago. I will be voting not to approve this.

D. Marshall: Although I understand what they are saying, even if this project does not get built should there be another major rain season the people on Beauchesne Drive will experience the same problems and there will be no money to deal with it. It will be their problem.

Roll Call

TP - Yes

PS - Yes

DM - Yes

DW - No

FK - No

CS - No

Vote 3-3. Motion fails.

J. McCourt: Could I please have the reasons for the denial.

C. Stelmach: Elderly housing is one thing. We do not know who will moving into the mixed housing and the impact to the community. With the water tower that high, where would that water go if something were to happen. We do not know what the structure around the tank would be.

J. McCourt: I would have thought that any concerns with the water tower would have come up during the special exception where we came before you to get your input. Had I known the water tower would be an issue I would have had Hooksett Village Water Precinct here along with their engineers. My understanding is that the water tower is being built to current standards which far exceed what they built in northern Hooksett, and far, far exceeds what is there today. I do not have all of the specifications. Had I known, I would have brought the experts with me to explain all of it. Due to the fact that it is designed and controlled through the town and the state there are regular inspections of the tower to make sure there are no problems with it and it is highly regulated because they do not want to have any problems. The tower that is up there has been able to function for so long because it has been taken care of. The two-bedroom apartments or condominiums that we were proposing would be on the higher end similar to Granite Hill. There are garages underneath. These have to go for a lot of money to support the infrastructure.

D. Marshall: This Board needs to be exceptionally careful when listening to comments that are made about the type of people that might move into the housing due to discrimination. If the zone permits this, and they meet the requirements, I do not understand how you can fall back on an excuse like that. The motion has failed. The applicant has the right to come back without prejudice but they will have to go through this process again.

T. Walsh returned.

COMPLETENESS REVIEW

3. **UTZ OFFICE/TRANSFER FACILITY #16-42**
Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, lot 33 and 33-3
Site Plan for 17,660 sf building and a 9,000 sf future expansion addition for Phase 2 for a Transfer Facility

Frank DeMarinis (Owner of Sage Engineering and Contracting/Developer): We are going to be in front of you in one month. I want to introduce myself and answer any questions that you may have.

J. Duffy: The application is complete.

F. Kotowski motioned to find the plan complete for UTZ Office/Transfer Facility #16-42, Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, lot 33 and 33-3. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Marshall: The public hearing will be on November 7, 2016.

4. **JEFF LARRABEE/SUPREME INDUSTRIES #16-43**
47 Hackett Hill Road, Map 17, lot 7
Condominium Conversion for Map 17, lot 7

D. Marshall: Is the application complete?

J. Duffy: Yes.

P. Scarpetti motioned to find the plan complete for Jeff Larrabee/Supreme Industries #16-43, 47 Hackett Hill Road, Map 17, Lot 7. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

**5. SUPREME INDUSTRIES/LILAC PARK PHASE 3 #16-44
47 Hackett Hill Road, Map 17, lot 7
Site Plan for a building composed of 4,000 sf office space and 500 sf retail space with a 5-bay carport for a regional office for Supreme Industries land clearing division and contractor's yard for the storage and sales of mulch, storage of equipment.**

J. Duffy: They are asking for one waiver for completeness checklist to the master plan only, not the entire application. There should only be one waiver listed, not two, but the application is complete.

D. Winterton motioned to grant the waiver for Supreme Industries/Lilac Park Phase 3 #16-44, 47 Hackett Hill Road, Map 17, Lot 7 which is for completeness criteria for the master plan. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motioned carried unanimously.

T. Prasol motioned to find the plan complete for Supreme Industries/Lilac Park Phase 3 #16-44, 47 Hackett Hill Road, Map 17, Lot 7. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Marshall: The public hearing will be on November 7, 2016.

Nick Golon (TF Moran): There were four questions that the Board asked for clarification on and we said that we would provide those if you would like to hear them. In regards to the uses, the location of the mulch sales area was questioned as to where it would be, how large it would be, and it was asked to be depicted better on the plan. Previously, we had it right next to the building which was closest to the abutters. We have relocated it to the furthest southwest corner of the site placing it as far away from residential abutters as possible. There would be 100 x 100 sq. ft. area/10,000 sq. ft. We are envisioning a 10' to 15' pile which would be between 1,500 and 2,000 cubic yards of mulch at any point in time. That will be the largest amount that will be placed on site. With regards to traffic, we will have a total of 23 employees, 8 of which will be in the office, 15 will be our migratory workers which will come in their personal vehicles, load up in three man crews and exit the site. As far as trip generation, there will be no more than 30 trips in the peak am or pm hour. It is only that high because on their way back their will be people entering the site in the work vehicle and leaving in their personal vehicles. It accounts for approximately one trip per minute during those times. The retail portion accounts for no more than two trips coming in, one trip per minute. With regard to the site distance of the driveway that work has been completed, submitted to the town, and confirmed that we have a minimum of 400' all season site distance at the driveway for Hackett Hill Road. Regarding the limitations to the driveway's use, all non-passenger vehicles will use the gravel pit road. The largest vehicle entering from Hackett Hill would be an F-450. In regards to enforcement of that, there will be condominium documents required, signage at the entrance of the gravel pit road, and a sign placed at the end of Hackett Hill Road for the driveway stating "no mulch sales, use gravel pit road." As a project team we understand we cannot put this on Code Enforcement to enforce the condominium documents. There would be an onus on Supreme to be a good neighbor. We will schedule time to meet with the closest abutter so that he can see

specially where these things will be and will give us an opportunity to make improvements to the design.

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

6. **JEFF LARRABEE AND KOKOSING, LLC (#16-34)**
51 and 53 Hackett Hill Road, Map 13, lots 56 and 57
Lot Line Adjustment – Parcel A to be consolidated with 13-56

Continued until November 7, 2016.

7. **CHUCKSTER'S MINI-GOLF (#16-38)**
Hackett Hill Road, Map 13, lots 56 and 57
Amended Site Plan

Continued until November 7, 2016.

8. **BIRCH HILL CONDOMINIUM SITE PLAN #16-40**
MARK PLANTIER AND JEFFREY GREEN
4 & 6 Birch Hill Road, Map 8, lot 80
Condominium Conversion Plan

J. Duffy: The application is complete.

*T. Parasol motioned to find the plan complete for Birch Hill Condominium Site Plan #16-40, Mark Plantier and Jeffrey Green, 4 & 6 Birch Hill Road, Map 8, lot 80. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

Open public hearing.

Mark Plantier: This is an existing two-family home that we are looking to convert to a condex. The intent is to have an owner occupied situation.

D. Marshall: What is currently on this lot?

M. Plantier: A two-family home. A three bedroom unit and a two bedroom unit. A townhouse style duplex.

D. Marshall: What is the blue line down the middle?

M. Plantier: To divide the property 50/50.

T. Walsh: Does that have to be done for the condominium documents?

M. Plantier: It is stated as part of the condominium documents so that each person has their own side. It creates two owners versus tenants.

P. Scarpetti: What are the limited common areas?

M. Plantier: It is town water and town sewer. The limited common area is approximately 50' which is a common hall to access the electric meters.

D. Marshall: Do you have to delineate on the property with a fence?

M. Plantier: There is not currently a fence but there could be.

T. Walsh: If there was no fence, how do they know where to divide?

M. Plantier: It was surveyed.

J. Donison: There is a driveway on the left and a driveway on the right.

J. Duffy: They are setting bounds for the property line.

D. Winterton: This is not uncommon in the Town of Hooksett is it?

J. Duffy: No.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

T. Walsh motioned to approve Birch Hill Condominium Site Plan #16-40, Mark Plantier and Jeffrey Green, 4 & 6 Birch Hill Road, Map 8, Lot 80. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

**9. LEO AND IRENE DOYON #16-41
67 Chester Turnpike, Map 15, lot 43
Amended Subdivision Plan for a driveway easement for Lot 15-43 and a new driveway for 15-41-1**

J. Duffy: The owner is in Florida. Don Duval prepared the plan and he retired. This is a sub-division that was initially approved in 2008. It was one lot and they were dividing it into two. Lot 43 has less than 200' of frontage but they received a variance from the ZBA. When the plan was approved, the driveway for Lot 43 physically overlapped the lot-line of Lot 43-1. They were supposed to move it over and build a new driveway entrance for Lot 43. The driveway for Lot 43-1 is toward the right hand side. The owner, Doyon, would prefer to leave the driveway the way it is and provide an easement. He has been paying taxes on two lots, however, someone is interested in purchasing Lot 43-1. They agreed the easement would be fine. He wants to go back to the plan the way he wanted it in the first place and see if the Board would grant the amendment. Don Duval certified that the site distance is 200' in both directions. There is no problem with the driveway. There is currently an existing house on Lot 43 which is owned by Mr. Doyon.

T. Walsh: Was there a variance?

J. Duffy: He had a variance in 2008 for the frontage.

F. Kotowski motioned to find the plan complete for Leo and Irene Doyon #16-41, 67 Chester Turnpike, Map 15, Lot 43. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

T. Walsh motioned to approve the amended sub-division plan for Leo and Irene Doyon #16-41, 67 Chester Turnpike, Map 15, Lot 43. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

BUSINESS OCCUPANCY

J. Duffy: 1. Heather Chapdelaine, 1558 Hooksett Road, Unit C2B – wellness & medical spa – approved. 2. Daniel Plourde, West River Road, Map 1, lot 2-1 – Food Truck – approved with conditions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

10. SOUTHERN NH PLANNING COMMISSION OPENING

D. Marshall stated the process of filling a vacancy of the SNHPC.

Douglas Chamberlain: I submitted an application over the summer along with my resume. I would be happy to answer any questions. I have lived in these parts for about 40 years. I have lived in Hooksett since 2012. I am originally from Vermont. I am an attorney in Concord and will be retiring shortly. I am looking for other things to do with my time and talents. I have always been interested in planning, architecture, land use, and related subjects. I studied a lot of it in Harvard College and Columbia Law School. My law practice has ranged beyond that but I did a fair amount of work with land use and development and related fields such as historic preservation. My wife and I are happy to be living in Hooksett and we are trying to find ways to get involved with the community. With my background and experience I feel that this is an area I could make a contribution. I saw the opening in the newsletter that came out with the tax bills. I have not followed the work of the commission in tremendous detail but am familiar with what it's charter and charge is, it's areas of interest, the things it pursues, particularly in the area of transportation planning, which is an area of interest of mine. I want to be a part of what SNHPC continues to develop in an environmentally conscious way. I know the Executive Director of the Commission and look forward to working with him and, the other people on the Commission and the staff. I appreciate your consideration.

Cutler Brown: I have been a resident of Hooksett since 1972. I work with your Chairman at the highway department. I came to Hooksett when I took a job with the SNHPC. I worked for them for 16 years with regional planning, reviewing site and sub-division plans for local planning boards because they did not have town planners, transportation planning, land use planning, regional plans, and local plans. I then went into the private sector in civil engineering and surveying. I set up a permit tracking process because these plans get confusing while waiting for permits. I wrote many fiscal impact studies for commercial, industrial, and residential projects. I did a lot of traffic engineering, traffic signal design, and traffic studies for various projects. I have a Master's Degree in Urban Planning and Policy Devel-

opment. I joined the Planning Commission in 1972 because I wanted to utilize those skills more than I was at the highway department. I have been on the Board of Liberty House in Manchester for 6 years. I work with the Raymond Coalition for Youth to keep them away from alcohol and drugs. I am in a church band where I play the base guitar and have been married for 53 years.

D. Marshall: I have never met Mr. Chamberlain but he has an excellent resume. I do know Mr. Brown and have worked with him.

F. Kotowski: I think that Mr. Brown's past experience and the fact that he worked for SNHPC for several years would be an asset, but I think that Mr. Chamberlain would be an asset as well.

T. Walsh: I would recommend Mr. Brown due to his experience.

T. Walsh motioned to send a recommendation to the Town Council to appoint Mr. Brown to the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

F. Kotowski motioned to adjourn. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**