

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, October 17, 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 , T. Prasol, F. Kotowski, P. Scarpetti, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Denise Grafton and Christopher Stelmach

EXCUSED: Michael DiBitetto (Alternate).

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 10/03/16

October 3, 2016 Regular Meeting – *F. Kotowski motioned to approve the minutes of the October 3, 2016 meeting. Seconded by T. Prasol. M. Durakovic abstained due to not being in attendance at the October 3, 2016 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.*

EXTENSION OF SUBDIVISION APPROVAL

- 1. PAUL MAURAIIS
Maurais Street, Map 45, lot 33
Approval Extension of two-lot Subdivision**

J. Duffy: Mr. Maurais is now retired and has more time to work on what he would like to do with this land.

John Reardon: I would like to know what the overall plan is.

Matt Peterson (Hillside Design/Representing Paul Maurais): During the last year Mr. Maurais had this under agreement for someone to build on it. They walked away in the last two months. We are here for the two-lot subdivision. It leaves his existing house and a separate lot. He would like to sell that. He is not developing it, it just gives him the ability to sell his house and sell this piece separately.

T. Walsh motioned to grant the extension of a two-lot subdivision for Paul Maurais, Maurais Street, Map 45, Lot 33. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.

D. Grafton: The extension was set to expire on November 5, 2016 yet the date on the cover sheet says November 11, 2016. Could we clarify that.

M. Peterson: The notice of decision from last year was to extend to November 5, 2016. My cover letter was incorrect.

Motion carried unanimously.

INFORMATIONAL HEARING

2. NH NATIONAL GUARD 1227 Hooksett Road, Map 34, lot 4 Informational Presentation on update of Field Maintenance Shop

J. Duffy: The National Guard was here in February, 2015 with their conceptual plan. They have firmed up what they would like to do on the site. They hired an architectural firm and are here to give you an update. I have had several people who have come forth with concerns with the blasting and their wells.

Marty Sienkiewicz (SAS Architects): The project involves 19.6 acres. The site is roughly divided in half north to south. There is a ravine/drainage that splits that site. The proposed development is to the north of that drainage swail. This project is zoned Performance District. There are variable setbacks in that zoning district. We have exceeded the maximum zoning setback requirements for all of the buildings and parking areas. We are paying attention to maintaining a buffer and leaving as much of the wooded area as possible. We are striving to minimize the impacts on wetlands. The proposed development does not impact those. We are connecting to existing infrastructure for sewer, water, and electric and all of those have adequate capacity that has been confirmed and are at appropriate locations for connections to the site. We want to minimize alteration of terrain. We spent a lot of time setting the building elevation. The site has a good deal of ledge thus the blasting requirement. We tried to keep the building as high as we can to minimize blasting but there will be blasting as part of this. There are two proposed buildings. The primary building is a vehicle maintenance facility. There are two halves to that building. Roughly 11,000 sq. ft. is the administrative, office, and support area. Approximately 15,000 sq. ft. is the vehicle maintenance area. The administrative portion is facing Rt. 3. The building is oriented east to west so that the visual end is toward Rt. 3 and the view toward the residential neighborhood to the east is minimized. The work bay doors face north and south. In terms of use and traffic, there are 10-14 employees that will work M-F. There is parking that supports their vehicles and visitors. The vehicle traffic planned is six road tests per week, three customer appointments with 2-4 vehicles being delivered to the site weekly, and 2-3 visitors weekly. It is a low use facility in terms of traffic. The hours of operation would be 7:30-4:00. The part of the site that is disturbed is approximately 7.5 acres. There will be ledge removal. We have completed construction documents now. There is a comprehensive plan for ledge/rock removal. The requirements include creating a blast plan, performing a pre-blast survey of the area within 300' of the blast area, submitting notice to all abutting properties 7 days in advance, submitting notice to Hooksett authorities 24 hours prior to blasting, posting signs 500' from the work area, providing whistle before blast, pre and post blast 15 days prior to starting work, and notifying 24 hours prior to blasting.

Jeff Zweber (Engineering Ventures/Civil Engineer for the Project): There will be some blasting on the site but it will be less than 10,000 cubic yards of blasting which is significantly less than the amount of blasting that is generated from something like a quarry operation. There is a knoll in the middle of the site that is around 10' in height. It is difficult to address with absolute certainty any sound or noise. It does propagate off-site. The State of NH has best management practices for blasting that are recommended to be followed and we included them in the construction documents. Those should mitigate any off-site impacts. The studies include a seismograph that measure energy due to the density or configuration of the rock and if energy goes off-site more than expected. With the nature of blasting it is to concentrate the energy between the blast holes. That is done through the progressive sequencing of charges so that the charges do not go off at the same time. They go off in a quick succession so the energy is not wasted and the rock between the drill holes is what is pulverized and not off-site.

Nelson Charest (23 Harbors Drive): I am a direct abutter. Are they going to survey the houses when they do the blasting to make sure there is no structural damage to our property? They were blasting by the bridge and I could feel it at my house.

J. Zweber: The requirement is for a contractor survey within 300' of the blasting location. Due to the site being so long, north to south, it may or may not be surveyed. You would be contacted as a direct abutter. If you had additional concerns I am sure the blasting company's pre-blast inspector could survey your house.

N. Charest: Who would be liable if something does happen?

J. Zweber: As an engineer I do not get into the liability of things.

N. Charest: There are three houses that are direct abutters and we are sitting right on the ledge. My house is a foot off the ledge. I am concerned about my foundation.

M. Sienkiewicz: Understood. Blasting is a requirement for this project. The key to successful blasting without damaging anyone's property is to do the pre-blast survey and set up the seismograph. Charges can be adjusted each time so that every charge gets measured and a blasting plan is developed based on the magnitude of that charge. If they have to use smaller and more frequent charges that can be done. The people who will be doing the blasting are experts.

N. Charest: Do we have any recourse if we have damage?

M. Sienkiewicz: It would most likely be through the State of New Hampshire. It is a state project.

D. Marshall: It makes me nervous when specific questions cannot be answered and things are generalized. Each of the structures within 300' of this site will have a pre-blast survey. That means on-site they inspect the buildings inside and out prior to blasting?

J. Zweber: That is correct. Inspecting them would be subject to the property owner allowing the inspection.

D. Marshall: After the blasting is done, are we to assume the same structures will be examined again?

J. Zweber: Yes.

J. Duffy: Previously they said 300' from the blasting site, not the lot-line.

D. Marshall: It is 300' from the extreme of the blasting site. Should something go wrong and there is damage to one of these houses or other structures, are you saying it becomes a civil matter between those property owners and the State of NH.

Dave Mikolaities: (Head Engineer/Director of Public Works for the NH Army National Guard): The State of NH Department of Admin Services is a contract administrator. It would be brought up through that homeowner and that contract administrator to determine what transpired. I do not want to mislead you into thinking the general contractor will pay the individual.

T. Walsh: Is the 300' from the blast area a typical distance? In my own experience I was 1,000' away and got the pre and post inspection of my home when blasting was done. Where did the 300' come from?

J. Zweber: That is a minimum that was in the standard specifications. The contractor may choose to extend the survey in excess of that.

F. Kotowski: Is the contractor to be bonded to cover any damage that might occur to surrounding properties?

J. Zweber: There are bonding requirements, but I am not sure what those are.

F. Kotowski: Could you check to see if that will be in the contract?

J. Zweber: Yes.

D. Marshall: This is an informational meeting for them to bring us up-to-date on what is happening on the property. There is no decision to be made by this Board. The State of NH nor the federal government are subject to the zoning ordinances or sub-division regulations of this town. They came to us as a courtesy as they did originally. I expect that because it is the State of NH and we are all residents, they will be sensitive to what potential dangers there are and take the precautions necessary to ensure there is no damage.

M. Sienkiewicz: Based on this discussion my recommendation to the owner would be to expand the 300' to a larger number. I do not know what that will be, but we will have that discussion.

D. Winterton: Do you have an updated timetable on this project?

M. Sienkiewicz: We are hoping to put the project out to bid during December/January. If all goes as planned we would like to award it in spring to start construction in the April/May time frame.

T. Walsh stepped down.

D. Grafton will be voting.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

J. Duffy: At the October 3, 2016 meeting a motion was made to approve, the motion tied, and as a result failed, but there was no follow up vote. There should have been a motion to defeat. That would have, mostly likely, ended up as a tie as well. They are here for you to take another vote. If you decide to make a motion to deny and the vote is carried there needs to be reasons for denial because I have to issue a Notice of Decision and there have to be reasons for denial in case this goes to superior court.

D. Marshall: Would you like to add anything?

Jennifer McCourt (McCourt Engineering): We got the variance to have the multi-family units and the special exception to have the water tank on the property. Our on-site drainage meets the town and state regulations. The \$150,000 is a gift to the town to try to help a situation. Anything derogatory towards that I take exception to. There are a substantial amount of improvements that need to be made to be able to construct this project such as the roadway, the access up, and the drainage sewer improvements. These won't rent for short money. They are high end two-bedroom apartments. There will be a community room. If you want to talk about the water tank or road improvements I have more information from when the variance and special exception were granted.

D. Winterton: JoAnn, can you tell me how the impact fees are calculated for two-bedroom apartments versus if they were condominiums or single family houses.

J. Duffy: A condominium would just be a different form of ownership. It would not affect the impact fee. The impact fee is assessed as single family, multi-family, elderly, accessory, etc. The ownership as far as a condominium or multi-family does not make any difference. The only thing that would make a difference is if it was a townhouse condominium.

D. Winterton: If they were single family houses there would be more funds from impact fees.

J. Duffy: You would never fit that many single family homes there.

D. Winterton: I understand that. The school impact fees are important to our community and this could have a much greater impact than the ones they would be paying on our community.

J. McCourt: The impact fees are calculated on the impact that the 2-bedroom apartments would have and that is what we have to pay.

J. Duffy: The impact fees for multi-family for schools are a lesser amount than for a two-bedroom home. Studies that were done when the impact fee was formulated showed that apartments create less school-age children than single family homes do.

Open public hearing.

Pete Farwell: (24 Grant Drive): We attended a Town Council meeting on October 12, 2016 in which the safety council has proposed limiting the access from Rt. 3 onto Main Street. If that gets passed it will force all of the traffic that used to take a left onto Main Street, up the hill, and to turn left onto Pleasant View or up College Parkway and down by the library. Those of us on Beauchesne are concerned because of the affects on that short stretch of road. Traffic going up the hill will increase dramatically and there are already a lot of accidents there. I also have concerns with the drainage and water. For years Beauchesne has had severe water problems and some people have gone to great lengths and expense to get the water out of their basements. I understand there will be some money set aside, but if it will cost \$300,000 to do that. Where is the rest of the money going to come from. We ask that you consider that and the traffic.

D. Marshall: Regarding the comment on the traffic, there would be a north bound deceleration lane and a south bound isolated left turn lane so the road can handle the traffic coming in and out of the development.

P. Farwell: I am wondering if the moving of this traffic off of Rt. 3 and Main Street changes any study that has been done.

Vincent Lembo (56 Main Street): My understanding is that the people at Beauchesne Development have had extreme flooding from the Granite Hill Development. How much is the study on the drainage upgrade going to cost the town?

J. Duffy: The study was already paid for and completed in 2009.

V. Lembo: At the last meeting the town engineer stated that it would cost around \$300,000 to repair the drainage on Beauchesne.

J. Donison: The original study done by Stantec a number of years ago estimated the cost would be around \$150,000. I just did an update on that and conservatively it would be around \$300,000. It may be less but that is a safe number.

V. Lembo: Has anyone looked into where the rest of the money will come from to do the necessary upgrades to Beauchesne's drainage. Do we have that money in the CIP town wide drainage fund?

J. Donison: We have some money in the CIP for drainage, but I do not know the exact amount. I do not know where the extra funds would come from.

V. Lembo: Would the developer contribute more money for the drainage to alleviate the problem of the the Beauchesne development drainage? During the Mother's Day floods the Fire Department was pumping out everyone's basements. If the \$150,000 was done in 2009 and things have increased over time I do not know where the town will get the extra funds if it is not in the CIP. I think the development he is proposing will cause more drainage problems in that area.

J. Donison: The drainage study that was prepared for this development showed that there will not be an increase in run-off from the development.

D. Marshall: This Board depends on the analysis of the developer's engineers dealing with drainage and our review of that to determine what impacts a development would have on any off-site area. Those studies show there would be no impact. Our review of that indicated the same. The developer said he will contribute \$150,000 but that has nothing to do with his being responsible with what the problems are in the Beauchesne development. It is a contribution that will go toward helping relieve those problems, but at some point-in-time the town needs to step in to provide a share to correct those problems, or those residents need to form some sort of alliance to contribute money to resolve the issues. It is not this developer's responsibility to do that. They have met all of the requirements and we were satisfied when we approved them.

J. McCourt: I did some of the drainage work in Granite Hill. Having been through the state and town process since then, the requirements have substantially become stricter. What we were designing for back then and what we design for now are two completely different things. This has to get an Alteration of Terrain permit, and the state AOT are now requiring us to use extreme rainfall data which is updated to show things such as the Mother's Day flood. We are designing for bigger storms as well as infiltration, which we never did before, to try and infiltrate back into the ground water so that the water does not go off-site. The substantial amount of vegetation we are putting on this site to revegetate areas also helps in minimizing the drainage off-site. There is a huge difference from the drainage calculations back in the 1980's and what we do now by regulation alone.

P. Farwell: Will the drainage water that is collected go back into the ground or into the sewer system?

J. McCourt: Neither. From our site there is a culvert underneath Rt. 3. that discharges across the road now. By state law we cannot change our watershed area. There are four discharge points from the site but that is the main one. A culvert that goes across Rt. 3 to Beauchesne, runs down a ditch and is caught in a culvert that goes through the property, runs down Beauchesne into the town property, and through two culverts before it discharges into a larger drainage area and then to the river. That is where it goes today. We have to design for that point because of the wetlands. We cannot decrease the amount of water that is going there. We have to make sure that we maintain the same water shed going in the same area. The water has to be treated first before it can be discharged and also recharged backed into the groundwater and detained so we do not increase the channel flow during the lower flows and do not erode those channels. It is an whole engineering study that has to be completed.

P. Farwell: It discharges into Beauchesne?

J. McCourt: It has to by state law.

P. Farwell: Their development is putting an awful burden on those people. If they could discharge it into the sewer it would take the pressure off.

D. Marshall: Are you increasing the flow?

J. McCourt: No.

F. Kotowski: We cannot allow storm water to go into the sewer lines because we end up cleaning storm water.

P. Scarpetti: When is the \$150,000 to be paid?

Sonny Sell: When we start construction.

P. Scarpetti: Jim, is there any major work that could be done to alleviate some of the problems they have and do it in phases?

J. Donison: What is being proposed is to increase the size of the drainage pipe on Beauchesene Drive to a larger diameter. It would all have to be done at the same time.

Chris Lampron (1617 Hooksett Road): I live just south of the proposed Harmony Place development on the worst part of the turn on Hooksett Road. Since we have moved in it has been a concern. I have lived there for 14 years and have almost had ten accidents from people coming around the turn because I have no line of sight in either direction. I have contacted many people in town. DOT came to my house and agreed there is a heavy volume of traffic around the turn but they said no one coming around the turn was doing the speed limit. My daughter will be getting her license in a couple of years. I am not looking forward to having her learn how to pull out onto the street without getting hit. When this project first came up I had been talking to everyone in the town about the traffic issues. DOT said I could excavate my yard back to increase my line of sight but that would be at the expense of myself and my neighbors if they chose to do the same. We do not have the money to do that. Jen got flagged through the emails through JoAnn as far as what I was talking to people about. She came up with an offer to give me easement into their driveway. Instead of having to pull out onto Hooksett Road I could drive straight forward, pull into their property, and my exit point would be on their turn lane. That alleviates the majority of my concerns of navigating in and out of the traffic. I been trying to find a solution since 2004 and this is the only viable option I have seen. I hope that you take that into consideration and you approve it.

Close public hearing.

*T. Prasol motioned to approve the amended site plan for a 63 Unit Multi-Family Development for Harmony Place (#16-37), 1621 Hooksett Road, Map 14, Lot 27. Seconded by D. Grafton. Opposed by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried.***

T. Walsh returned.

- 4. EVERSOURCE (#16-33)
13 Legends Drive, Map 25, lot 80
Site Plan for Telecommunications Facility to include 120' Tower for Eversource use only**

T. Prasol stepped down

D. Grafton will be voting.

J. Duffy: They are back tonight to get your approval. Staff has no objections.

*F. Kotowski motioned to approve the site plan for a Telecommunications Facility to include 120' Tower for Eversource use only for Eversource (#16-33), 13 Legends Drive, Map 25, Lot 80. Seconded by D. Grafton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

T. Prasol returned.

WAIVER OF SITE PLAN REVIEW

5. GE AVIATION

9 & 13 Industrial Park Drive, Map 18, lots 42 & 43

Waiver of Site Plan for addition of Fitness Path and Pavement

Nick Golon (TF Moran): This would be a 4' wide, 700' long path. When we look at installing something of this nature we look at the baseline items such as grading, drainage, and other potential impacts. With regard to the additional pavement, that would be located behind the wastewater treatment building. That area was previously impacted by the fill material that came from the GE solar project. The area being paved will drain to the basin that exists now and there would be no adverse impacts. With regard to the path, it will follow the existing topography and will have the opportunity to infiltrate. I am not aware of any drainage problems in that vicinity.

Susan Niquette (GE): The Hooksett GE site won 2nd prize in a GE nationwide fitness program contest and as a result we have money available to us to do something health related. The walking path seemed to be the only viable option to fall within that funding program. This will be a great way for the employees to walk at lunchtime. There is lighting available and there would be a fence around it so only GE employees could use it. The only key to this is that we have to spend the money by December 12, 2016.

D. Winterton motioned to grant the waiver of site plan for addition of Fitness Path and Pavement for GE Aviation, 9 & 13 Industrial Park Drive, Map 18, Lots 42 & 43. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

JOINT MEETING: TIF COMMITTEE, SEWER COMMISSION, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AND PLANNING BOARD

6. TIF PRESENTATION

D. Marshall: The TIF Committee consists of members from the Planning Board (Denyse Grafton and myself), Town Council (Don Winterton), Dave Scarpetti (Economic Development), Sewer Commission (Frank Kotowski and Sid Baines), and the Village and Central water districts. The purpose of this was to develop an approach providing infrastructure and improvements along Rt. 3A to be named a TIF district. We are going to have a presentation by Stu Arnett from Arnett Development Group who has been responsible for the study and costing out various options for accomplishing these goals. The TIF Committee would like to have the blessing of the Planning Board to go along with the proposal to work within the TIF district with an aim to increasing the growth of commercial and industrial development along that corridor.

Stu Arnette: It has been my pleasure to work with the town since earlier this year on a question they had which was if infrastructure was to be built along Rt. 3A what would be some possible ways to do

the financing. A TIF is a small part of the question and whether it is a good idea or not. We will walk everyone through the process of how we got to the point we are at. The town will have the original PDF's of all of the worksheets.

S. Arnette discussed the Route 3A Infrastructure Six-Entity Task Force Report and Recommendations for the Town of Hooksett, NH by ADG-Arnett Development Group LLC, October 2016.

M. Miville: What types of businesses can be using the property now without sewer. Will the businesses that are currently there going to be required to go on sewer? Are the businesses that are there now the types that would continue to be there and can there be businesses on Rt. 3A that do not need sewer.

D. Marshall: There are some businesses that can operate on minimal septic systems. A restaurant is more difficult considering the size of those lots. They would be restricted as to what kind of businesses can go in there. The potential is that with sewer they could be bigger and produce more revenue.

M. Miville: I have a list of businesses that I would like to see in town and would like to recruit. I would like to know what can exist there now and is there a minimum limit as to what would require a sewer?

S. Arnette: Everyone along there currently is without sewer so what you see is what you will see more of. You have a Walmart and a Bass Pro but neither can expand. The area would be more vibrant with sewer.

M. Miville: Option 3 might be bigger restaurants, whereas option 4 might be smaller flower shops and that type of business.

J. Duffy: It would not necessarily be bigger restaurants. It would be ones that can wash dishes.

D. Marshall: Bass Pro would like to put in their restaurant and they cannot currently do that.

M. Miville: The TIF land is hilly. Does that mean if businesses want to go in this TIF district will they have to tear into that and put in retaining walls?

J. Duffy: The engineering study took the steep slopes into account. That area is by the movie theater. Ledge cannot be developed with septic but you can have sewer on ledge.

S. Arnette: There will not be much change in the middle section.

M. Miville: Someone has told me that the Master Plan had it where part of the west side of Rt. 3A was not supposed to be developed.

J. Duffy: One of the recommendations of the Master Plan is to provide sewer on Rt. 3 to Exits 10 and 11.

M. Miville: Are there any businesses there now that are seeking sewer?

J. Duffy: Bass Pro has expressed an interest in a restaurant and Arlie Green has expressed an interest. Hooksett lost out on FW Webb that just brought 1,000 jobs to Londonderry.

M. Miville: A lot of people are concerned that this won't be successful.

Vincent Lembo (56 Main Street): If a business goes in right now on Rt. 3A, for example a one hundred seat restaurant, they get approval, and they get a septic designed that would be able to accommodate that, they be able to do that, correct?

D. Marshall: Yes.

T. Walsh: A lot of the lots may not be big enough for that.

V. Lembo: Depending on how many lots are buildable they could get the septic system approval if they have the room to do it. Just because it does not have sewer does not mean there is a restriction that type of business could not go in there.

J. Duffy: I think the cost would be prohibitive depending on the size of the restaurant. There is a hotel that was just approved on Hackett Hill Road and that is proposed to go on septic.

V. Lembo: It is not prohibited if they want to spend enough to go on septic?

Sid Baines: The Sewer Commission is here to run a sewer line and to ensure the waste water is properly taken care of. I am looking into the idea of option 3 where the sewer line would be run from Exit 10, around the ice arena where it crosses the river and hooks onto the wastewater treatment facility. Our estimate is that it would cost between \$7 and \$9 million to do that. That would be the primary start to get this TIF off the ground and allow Exit 10 to develop. Exit 10 has Arlie Green's property which is 65 acres and is all ledge such as Granite Hill was. There is so much potential for Arlie Green's property. Bass Pro wants to put in a bowling alley and a restaurant, and Demoulas wants a hotel behind their property. Arlie was talking about a hotel on his. If you take all of these hopes the potential is endless at Exit 10 alone. If we can get the crossing around the ice house and that is all we do for now, when Exit 10 is ready to develop it would be a lot easier to make that connection from Exit 11 to the pump station. When someone speaks about putting in a one hundred seat restaurant with a septic system, it is important to remember that as soon as a septic system is it put in from the first day it starts to fail and it will eventually fail. With sewer that is eliminated. It is a great idea to put sewer over there. It is time. It needs to go in, it should go in, and it needs to impress the people that will pass it.

D. Marshall: In serving on this Committee, I do not think there would be many members of that Committee that would disagree with what Mr. Baines said. The Committee wants option 5, but the priority is Phase I, Exit 10 to the pump station, Phase II, Exit 11 to the pump station. We recognize that Exit 10 has better shovel ready prospects compared to Exit 11. It would behoove us to let the public know what the potential is and the phasing that we would be approaching once the studies show that it is viable and feasible to do. We are looking at Phase 1 South and Phase 2 North.

D. Winterton: I have served as Chairman of this sub-committee and it has been a pleasure to bring all of the people and departments that have a hand in this together. It is unique in the history of Hooksett to get Planning, Sewer, and Water having the same weight on the same project. I agree with Chairman

Marshall that the Committee is unanimous that this is a proper way to go. I like the way it is phased with safety nets. There is an “If” in “TIF” but there are stop gaps. Without a risk there is no reward. The town has taken a small risk by funding the Arnett project, by bringing engineers in, and the next step would be to find out the engineering and making sure the citizens and voters know that we still have a safety net and the ability to stop it. Each time a step is taken the risk is greater because investments will be made. Knowing we have a stop gap and what our total risk is to get the rewards I think we need to do that. I want to thank all of the members of the Committee for their attendance, input, and cooperation.

F. Kotowski: I think everyone in town ought to reflect on what a marvelous result came from the original TIF. When Arlie Green came into the area off of the other side of Exit 10 there were a lot of skeptics. I would like someone to look at our tax base and look at the big boxes that are there. They are there, out of the way, and make it convenient for us to shop. I would like someone to pull off the amount of taxes those big boxes give to our tax base. If we build it they will come. I believe that because we have not built it they have not come. I think it is time, and I think it is time we sell this to the general public so they can vote intelligently knowing what it will do down the road. When these places are built the debt will be paid quickly and this will help to keep our property taxes down and get other things in town done that we need to do.

P. Scarpetti: Pizza Man is a perfect example of septic. They are very successful and have already replaced their septic system. It has only been 4 or 5 years. It failed because they are successful. It would be great if they could be on sewer.

Mike Heidorn (Village Water): We have water main service in parts of the area in question. There are improvements that would make the district better in terms of water service. Our department is supportive of this. As a small department we struggle with revenue sources. Any incremental development in this area, if they chose to hook up to this, would be beneficial to us and keep rates down for our village water customers. I appreciate the opportunity to be able to be a part of this.

T. Prasol motioned for the Planning Board to be supportive of the development of the engineering, cost estimates, and bonds of the TIF that was discussed. Seconded by M. Durakovic.

D. Winterton: I appreciate the support of the Board and the opportunity to take this potential recommendation to the Town Council to craft a warrant.

T. Prasol: I think this makes sense and like the fact that there are stop gaps in place. It is about time.

F. Kotowski abstained due to the fact he is a member of the Sewer Commission and I would rather one of the alternates vote in my place. D. Grafton will be voting in his place.

T. Walsh: I look at the negative and the possible results. It would be short sighted to not look as this in the long term. I was sold when it was mentioned that the Pizza Man’s septic had failed in such a short period of time.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHANGE OF USE

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

*T. Prasol motioned to adjourn. Seconded by M. Durakovic. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**