

Unofficial

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, November 7, 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 and Christopher Stelmach

EXCUSED: Muamer Durakovic and Michael DiBitetto (Alternate).

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

D. Grafton will be voting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 10/17/16

October 17, 2016 Regular Meeting – T. Walsh motioned to table the minutes of the October 17, 2016 meeting to the November 21, 2017 meeting. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

IMPACT FEE APPEAL

- 1. SCOTT BUSSIERE/SJB DEVELOPMENT
290 West River Road, Map 17, lot 10
Impact Fee for Church Use**

J. Donison: Mr. Bussiere and the potential tenant have asked for relief. The only activity at this site will be on Sunday which is a reduced traffic day.

Scott Bussiere: The church will have 60 seats. There will be a service on Sunday and maybe a couple of times during the week. There will not be 37 cars per day going in and out of there as is suggested.

Pastor Ted Ogle: The primary use would be Sunday morning for a church service. Initially our group will be around 30 people and the primary use will be Sunday morning. I would estimate at first there would be less than 20. During the week there may be some small bible studies, but 90% of the use will be Sunday morning during church services.

D. Marshall: You are not using the entire building?

S. Bussiere: Just one unit.

Pastor Ogley: This unit is 1800 sq. feet. There are six units in the building.

J. Duffy: They are assessed the impact fees as they develop each new unit. Every time there is a different type of use it gets assessed according to the use. Normally churches do not pay impact fees because it is their own land and building, but in this case he is leasing so it is not considered a non-profit agency.

D. Winterton: If we waive this, the church grows, they move, and a commercial tenant comes in, would we be able to assess impact fees at that point?

J. Duffy: Yes, for the difference in use.

D. Marshall: You will not waive the entire impact fee?

J. Duffy: It is not a waiver. That would have to go to the Town Council. It is an appeal of the charge.

D. Marshall: If we change the charge doesn't that have to go before the Town Council?

J. Duffy: Not according to the zoning ordinance.

D. Marshall: He is appealing what we are charging so we would have to come up with a reduced charge. If the church leaves and something with a higher volume use comes in, we can reassess and charge the difference?

J. Duffy: Yes.

S. Bussiere: I currently have a therapist and a personal trainer as tenants and my total impact fee for that was \$5,050. I don't feel 37 trips per day is realistic.

J. Duffy: This is just for the road impact fee.

D. Marshall: Is staff recommending any impact fee?

J. Donison: One option would be one seventh of it which represents the average over the course of seven days with the future tenant paying the difference.

J. Duffy: The only reason it is \$148 is because in the table of uses churches are not listed. If something is not listed we go by the \$148 per new trip.

D. Winterton motioned to grant the appeal to reduce the impact fee for church use to 6 trips per day x \$148 which is a total of \$888, plus the public safety impact fees for Scott Bussiere/SJB Development, 290 West River Road, Map 17, lot 10. If this property were to be used as a commercial use, the

difference in impact fees of what is being set and the cost of the impact fees for the commercial use would be assessed and paid at the time of the change of use. Seconded by T. Walsh.

T. Walsh: This is not a commercial endeavor and it is easy to see this will not be used that often.

Motion carried unanimously.

WAIVER REQUEST

2. RICK AND DEBBIE HURTEAU

42 Pearl Drive, Map 16, lot 78-11

Waiver for Subdivision Requirement of installation of Fire Sprinkler System

*D. Winterton motioned to grant the waiver for the subdivision requirement of installation of the fire sprinkler system for Rick and Debbie Hurteau, 42 Pearl Drive, Map 16, lot 78-11. Seconded by T. Walsh. **Motion carried unanimously.***

**3. JOHN KANE, SHAW'S PLAZA PARKING LOT
REVISED LANDSCAPING**

J. Donison: The parking lot where Shaw's supermarket is was recently repaved. They came to the town to ask if there were any permits needed to pave the parking lot and I told them there were not. In the process of repaving the existing landscaping was removed and new landscaping was put in. I contacted Mr. Kane who is the representative for Keypoint Development and asked him to be here tonight to discuss this. This is an old site plan from the 1980's. At that time there were no extensive requirements for landscaping.

John Kane (Keypoint Development): This property was inherited from a foreclosure in 2013. We were going through a series of issues and they have their own regulations in which we can and cannot do certain things. We advised them they needed to upgrade the plaza to bring in more tenants because we have lost more tenants that we have taken in. Shaw's was pushing us to upgrade the parking lot so we milled and resurfaced it. We were told that we did not need a permit. As part of the project we painted the facade of the buildings and did the landscaping. A lot of the trees along the main line were dying. We took down the trees. Some of the tenants had asked me to take them down due the potential for blocked visibility. I went to Doug Knott and asked him to put together a plan. We did not change anything with regard to the islands. We wanted to get rid of the dying trees and add some color. We added almost 1,000 plants. We realize we took down some height. The intent was to improve the appearance of the center and keep it viable. We would also like to improve the lighting. If we broke any rules we apologize.

Doug Knott (Landscape Architect/Knott's Land Care, LLC): Everything that got put in is drought, heat, and salt tolerant. The ornamental grasses do not grow over a 3' to 4' range except for one section where they are 5' to 6' where there is no blocking of line of sight. The plants require minimal maintenance as there is no irrigation on the property. There will be a lot of color. We removed some arborvitae due to a potential safety issue. We scraped the mulch off down to the granite curbing and dug enough to put the plants in. There is no increase in asphalt.

D. Marshall: Do you feel what you planted will survive a heavy New England winter? A lot of where you planted has a lot of snow that gets piled on it.

D. Knott: Yes. The plants are based on this use and the majority will survive. What does not will be replaced.

J. Kane: I want to cut them back in Fall so they are not unsightly, and then they will grow back in the spring and look nice.

D. Marshall: I noticed at the east end of the Shaw's building a handicapped parking space which was the closest to the building, not requiring a person to cross an isle, was taken out as well as curb cut with a ramp. That is now a vertical curb. Why was that taken out?

J. Kane: We hired an engineering firm to design it. I was told that ramp was not ADA compliant.

D. Marshall: I have a problem with that because now it is required for all handicapped persons to go across an active traffic isle. However, there is nothing in our regulations that precludes you from doing that.

J. Kane: That is how the entire complex is set up but if it is an issue we could put it back.

D. Marshall: It is just a comment.

D. Winterton: When they came in and said they were going to pave the parking lot, should they have asked about the new landscape design?

J. Donison: Yes.

J. Kane: I had one company doing the paving and one doing the landscaping. It was under their contracts to get the required permits. If I knew it would be an issue I would have followed up with this.

T. Walsh: I did not realize that you cut down any trees. It is clear you want to make the property look better. You said there was a line of site issue with some of the tenants. Are you going to be putting a revised site plan together for the layout? I would like to see some trees.

J. Kane: I am okay with adding trees for some height if you would like me to.

D. Marshall: The suggestion would be to work with Jim, fix the plan, and come back on November 21.

F. Kotowski: What percentage of green is there now compared to what was there before?

J. Kane: There is a lot more. Doug added 938 plants.

D. Knott: When it is in full bloom it will look beautiful.

J. Duffy: An alternative to the applicant coming back to the Board would be for me to work with him and report back to the Board.

D. Knott: We were discussing putting in honey locust which is a good street tree and can take the drought and salt.

*T. Walsh motioned to allow J. Donison to work with the applicant to come up with a reasonable revised landscaping plan, with the addition of trees, for Shaw's Plaza Parking Lot and to have the trees planted by the end of May, 2017. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

PUBLIC HEARINGS

**4. 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**

D. Marshall: This plan was found complete at the last meeting.

J. Duffy: This currently consists of two lots which the owner would like to merge into one lot which required a notice of merger which would be signed by the Chairman. The land is zoned commercial. The rear of the lot contains some wetlands. It would be used as a warehouse transfer facility. The buffer abutting lot 24, which is zoned residential, will require a 50' buffer along the property line. The fire department is all set with the plans. The impact fees total \$24,938. Manchester Water Works is all set with the plans. All of the state permits have not yet been received but they must be handed in prior to signature by the Chairman. They are asking for three waivers.

P. Scarpetti motioned to grant Waivers 1) Soil types; 2) Location of abutting leach fields and water supplies; 3) Preparation of plans for Registered Land Surveyor, for UTZ Office/Transfer Facility #16-42, Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, lot 33 and 33-3. Seconded by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

J. Donison: The original review letter dated October 28 was sent to the applicant. The engineer responded with plans addressing almost all of the comments. There are a couple of minor engineering comments. The driveway does not have any lighting. The regulations state there needs to be lighting on the parking. The question is if our regulations require the driveway have lighting. We also requested that additional landscaping be provided on the frontage on Rt. 28. Four trees have been proposed. I have a question on whether the sign will or not be lit. A sign application will have to be submitted. There are a couple of items regarding drainage but that can be addressed when discussing Alteration of Terrain.

J. Duffy: Planning has all been met except for a buffer that is along lot 34. I just received the revised plans so I am not sure if that has been addressed or not.

Luke Showalter: The entire back of the lot is within wetlands.

J. Duffy: The note on the plan needs to specify 50'.

Frank Demarinis (Sage Engineering and Development): The site of a light is controversial. If the Board wishes we are willing to add some lighting.

D. Grafton: How far back does the driveway go from the street?

F. Demarinis: The driveway itself is about 150' long.

D. Grafton: I would think if we were going to ask for lighting we would ask for something at the entrance of the driveway to eliminate anyone coming and going from that property and for visibility.

F. Demarinis: We do not have a problem installing a totally shielded light at that spot.

T. Walsh: There are no regulations that state there needs to be a light in that area?

J. Donison: No.

T. Walsh: I have no objection either way. There just needs to be caution that there are houses across the street.

D. Winterton: I would not require you to install a light, but think it is a good idea if you think it is a good idea due to the road being very dark. Would this mirror a street light or would it be lower?

F. Demarinis: This would be more directed down and approximately 15' above ground.

D. Winterton: I think it is a good idea and it would enhance the project.

F. Demarinis: Then we are asking the Board for allowance to be able to install a light at the entrance of the driveway.

J. Donison: For clarification, this plan approval is only for Phase 1.

J. Duffy: In the beginning, I suggested that if they wanted to do Phase 2 to ask for it now.

F. Demarinis: I think it would be better to come back. I wanted to Master Plan this and come back if we seek to put an addition on.

D. Marshall: If you are seeking an addition it would be for additional storage?

F. Demarinis: Yes. Same use, larger space.

D. Marshall: The other issues?

J. Duffy: The others have been addressed except for the permits which would be part of the condition.

F. Demarinis: We submitted the driveway permit about 2 months ago and are waiting for them to come in.

D. Marshall: At this point I cannot sign the plans and that means they cannot be filed.

D. Winterton motioned to authorize the chairman to sign the voluntary merger for UTZ Office/Transfer Facility #16-42, Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, lot 33 and 33-3. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motioned carried unanimously.

Open public hearing.

Todd Castonguay (1227 Smyth Road): Both properties will abut my property. I have some concerns about ground water quality and the 50' buffer. What will that entail?

J. Duffy: It means they have to leave the wetland in it's natural state. It just needs to be shown on the plan.

T. Castonguay: So they won't touch the wetland?

J. Duffy: They can't.

T. Castonguay: I got a notice from the NH Department of Environmental Services stating that my groundwater might already be affected with MBTE due my close proximity to Londonderry Turnpike. I have a deep water well. The brook that goes through my property is a trickle. Anything that goes into the swamp that is on their property will back fill my well.

J. Donison: Regarding the letter Mr. Castonguay received, about 3 or 4 months ago we have a presentation by a representative from NH DES. They selected Hooksett as an area of potential MBTE contamination because of an old automobile wrecking lot in addition to a few old service stations. They selected the homes in the Smyth Road to Prescott Heights area and asked if they wanted their water voluntarily tested and to report back to the town at a later date and to let us know how many of those wells showed contamination of MBTE. They were going to provide a plan to address it. All of the money that is available for the study and for addressing the issues is from the gas companies including Exxon who had a fine and that went into a special MBTE fund.

T. Castonguay: That is my only objection to having this built aside from enjoying the woods.

Close public hearing.

P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the site plan for 17,660 sf building AND a 9,000 sf future expansion addition for Phase 2 for a transfer facility for UTZ Office/Transfer Facility #16-42, Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, lot 33 and 33-3, subject to all permits and a 15' high pole at the driveway entrance with a shield focusing down. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

T. Walsh and F. Kotowski were excused to leave the meeting. C. Stelmach will be voting.

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

P. Scarpetti motioned to continue Chucksters's Mini-Golf (#16-38), Hackett Hill Road, Map 13, lots 56 and 57 to the November 21, 2016 meeting. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

6. 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.

DETERMINATION OF REGIONAL IMPACT

Nick Golon (TF Moran): Supreme Industries is looking to locate a regional contractors office on the rear quarter of the existing parcel. Approximately 15 acres would be Unit 3 of the condo site plan. We have been before this Board, went through the zoning process, and obtained a special exception and a variance. We have come to terms with the Conservation Commission regarding an impact fee. As we went through the ZBA process we spoke about what we were proposing. Relative to the project goals there would be a 15,000 sq. ft. building which would be 24' tall. Within the building we would have 4,000 sq. ft. of office, 500 sq. ft. of retail area dedicated to the mulch sales on the property. The remaining 10,500 sq. ft. would be a 5-day car port. There would be a gravel area for the swamp map storage which would be about 131,000 sq. ft. Vehicles would be parked on pavement. There would be a 10,000 sq. ft. area for mulch sales. When we first brought the project forth we had that located adjacent to the building. It has been moved to the very far southwest corner of the property to be farther away from abutters. The existing timber mat bridge crossing will be preserved. The existing gravel road will be rebuilt. One of the outstanding questions that we have is with regard to the engineering part of the project. We need a letter or something similar to show that it is adequate for our intended uses.

J. Donison: There is an existing wooden bridge servicing the proposal. Is the existing bridge able to sustain the load that will be imposed on it?

N. Golon: With regard to the use of the site itself, the gravel would be used for the mats, and there would be a paved parking area on the north side of the building which would provide 23 parking spaces. We would have a commercial access drive that would lead up to Hackett Hill Road. The hours of operation would be 7:30 to 4:30, there would be 8 office employees and 15 off-site employees. There are two access points into the property. The gravel pit access road is approximately 35 liner feet. There are improvements being proposed for that gravel road. Our second point of access would be the commercial paved road. For grading and drainage there would be runoff from the area of the gravel yard and parking that leads into proposed stormwater management basins and infiltration basins that are designed for the 100-year storm event. There would be no discharge. A second smaller basin at the bottom of the road is based off of state requirements. For the access drive there would be a closed drainage system with catch basins to pick up the stormwater run-off. As far as utilities there will be an on-site well, and on-site septic, that will be located in close proximity to the building. Electric services will be provided and designed to come from the existing distribution poles that run adjacent to the gravel pit. Otherwise we would be able to connect to Hackett Hill Road. We are currently working that out with Eversource. There will be a holding tank adjacent to the building to pick up any of the ancillary run-off. The landscaping for the parking lot meets minimum standards because we are looking to spend landscape funds in other areas. The goal is to minimize the line of site by adding white pines. Relative to the existing site grades versus what will be there, that building will sit 25 to 30' lower than the existing grade. There is a steep slope that will be proposed along the westerly buffer as it transitions down the

driveway. We understand there are concerns about the site driveway. It would be limited to employees and clients. We want a clean site. The site driveway is designed per the town regulations. The conflict has to do with the residential buffer setback. There is a combination of elements that has been deemed acceptable by the Planning Board. The landscape plan we included has a retaining wall with a 6' privacy fence along the top. If they don't want the fence we will remove it. There would be a variety of plantings within that area. We tried to generate a naturalized landscape plan to blend in with what is there now. There is no perfect solution. It is not possible to provide a 50' buffer.

D. Marshall: The solution is no access through Hackett Hill. You are asking for access to a commercial property through a residential property and that is not permitted.

N. Golon: It is commercial use for commercial land. We do recognize there is residential property abutting this.

D. Marshall: Can you meet the buffer requirement?

N. Golon: No, however, the Planning Board has the opportunity to approve otherwise. The problem we run into is they do not want people driving 2/3 of a mile on a gravel road and the Fire Department is advocating for a secondary regress from the site. This is their land. Why are they not allowed to build this?

D. Marshall: They cannot meet the requirements. I understand you have an alternate, but if this Board says they don't like the alternate you can't use the alternate.

J. Duffy: Article 22 - Definitions - Buffer zone (adopted 5/8/12) states: "Whenever a commercial or industrial use abuts a residential use, zone or district, a buffer zone shall be provided subject to the approval of the Planning Board. (This is where Mr. Golon is saying the buffer can be approved by the Planning Board.) The buffer is an area within a property or site, generally adjacent to and parallel with the property line, either consisting of natural existing vegetation or created by the use of trees, shrubs, fences and/or berms, designed to limit continuously the view of and/or sound from the site to adjacent sites or properties. (I have concern with the sounds coming from a contractors yard.) The buffer shall be not less than fifty (50) feet in width and shall be planted with a dense screen of shrubbery and trees not less than eight (8) feet in height at the time of planting. The screen shall be at least twenty-five (25) feet in width and shall be permanently maintained suitably by the owner. The buffer shall provide a year-round dense visual screen in order to minimize adverse impacts. In order to maintain dense screen year-round, at least fifty (50) percent of the plantings shall be evergreens. Existing natural growth may be included as part of the screen. No penetration of this buffer zone shall be allowed. With the approval of the Planning Board, a suitable combination of other elements, such as fencing, berms, boulders, may be incorporated within the buffer zone."

N. Golon: Sounds would be approximately 1,500' from that residence. What provides a better screen from sights and sounds than a sound wall which we have created? I do realize that instead of looking at trees the abutter will be looking at a wall with landscaping.

D. Marshall: What is the Board's view of accessing Hackett Hill Road?

P. Scarpetti: This has been a real concern. This is trying to be forced into a residential area. You are putting all of your efforts into this road when you could be putting the money into the project. People would have a harder time finding this place than if the other entrance was used. We have been very vocal about this and you keep coming back with it.

D. Marshall: I will not give up on the 50' buffer. It is an intrusion into this neighborhood.

N. Golon: The applicant will not be allowed to build within the 50' area that runs from Hackett Hill Road to the base of this area?

D. Marshall: If I treat the driveway as commercial, which it is, you need a 50' buffer on both sides of that road. You cannot get that. This Board tries to encourage businesses to come to this town but not at the sacrifice of the residents.

P. Scarpetti: We have approved many things for Lilac Park and have been accommodating but I think you need to respect our opinion on things as well.

N. Golon: Perhaps we did not understand the depth of concern. Our intent was to give you the representation of what it was we were asking.

D. Winterton: I did not take the site walk, however, earlier tonight we heard a concerned resident say that he was going to miss the woods behind his property. In the state of New Hampshire we tax views. I would think this would diminish the property owners value.

C. Stelmach: Looking at the grade from Hackett Hill past the house, looking at the wall, where is the grade of the driveway?

N. Golon: There is a wall and a 6" elevational change on top of it that is approximately 4' wide. On the other side of the fence would be a guardrail. It is along the abutters property line.

Open public hearing.

Kevin Clark (87 Hackett Hill Road): I appreciate that Nick has been working with me, but I will be looking at brick and fence instead of trees. I have written a letter and have been in front of the Board numerous times. A road in that area is a ridiculous idea.

J. Duffy: SNHPC has asked the Board to make a determination if this site plan has regional impact.

P. Scarpetti: motioned that there is no regional impact on this site plan. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

Tom Asci (93 Hackett Hill Road): That is a tough corner. Two weeks ago someone in a vehicle went off the road and was down in the woods. The safety issue is huge. That bend is horrible.

N. Golon: I understand the concern. The majority of accidents take place at night. We are lighting the parking lot and that corner. There is a suggestion to put a site light at the top of that driveway. It is good clear site distance in either direction.

T. Ascii: The issue is not a lighting issue, it is speed. It would not be conducive to a residential area.

K. Clark: I agree with that statement. I have no problem with what they are doing out back but the road is dangerous.

J. Duffy: The other thing the Planning Board needs to discuss is the surface of the contractor yard and whether that would require pavement or not.

D. Marshall: What is the distance between the orange building and the brown spot on the plan?

N. Golon: 600'.

D. Marshall: What will be stored there?

N. Golon: Swamp mats.

D. Winterton: How will those mats get in and out of there?

N. Golon: The gravel road.

D. Marshall: If I wanted a truck load of mulch which entrance would I use?

N. Golon: The gravel pit entrance.

D. Marshall: Then why do you need the driveway for only 15 employees with all of the problems we have been talking about?

Pat LeClerc (Supreme Industries): We have clients that will want to come and visit the site and we want to have it look professional.

N. Golon: Part of the concern is that people driving in will be driving on an actively reclaimed gravel road. We are years away from the full reclamation of that. We are hearing the facility it is not an issue it is the driveway that is an issue. Safety for the public is paramount. I think we have more homework to do as far as our options.

D. Winterton: How would the workers that would be constructing the building get to the site?

N. Golon: The gravel road. All of the construction equipment is coming through the gravel pit. The driveway would be the last thing to get built.

D. Grafton: At this point, I don't have any problem with the building. Where the last tree is, you could cut the driveway off and make a round-a-bout. You could use the mats for fire access and use all those funds for the other side.

N. Golon: That does not meet national fire protection standards and they would not take their equipment on it.

D. Marshall: My personal feeling is to have you put that driveway to bed once and for all.

J. Duffy: Can I get clarification on the surface of the contractor yard.

N. Golon: It is gravel. There would not be any parking on it.

J. Duffy: That needs to be shown on pavement.

N. Golon: Understood. We understand your concerns and would like to reevaluate. I would appreciate a continuance.

*D. Winterton motioned to continue the hearing for 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 until November 21, 2016. Seconded by D. Grafton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

**7. 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**

J. Duffy: The use of surrounding parcels is missing. Everything else on the plan is okay.

Nick Golon (TF Moran): The wetlands permit requested from DES was not approved.

D. Marshall: You are taking the property line and swinging it to the right?

N. Golon: Yes by .31 acres.

D. Marshall: Added to Lot 13-56.

N. Golon: Yes.

*T. Prasol motioned for completeness for 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. Seconded by D. Grafton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

*P. Scarpetti motioned to approve 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. Seconded by T. Prasol. **Motion carried unanimously.***

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

N. Golon: This modification is to accommodate the existing wetland. This does not follow the view for the reclamation of the gravel pit. We will have a large hold on the property but DES did not feel the requirements were met. We created some tiers within the mini-golf so the slope of play will bring you into the wetland and back up. The owner wanted to bring this back to natural grade and that will not be able to be accomplished. The smokehouse on the adjacent parcel is no longer there as it cannot be accommodated at this time. Stormwater water management is handled the same way and the same design.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

D. Winterton motioned to approve the amended site plan for Chuckster's Mini-Golf (#16-38), Hackett Hill Road, Map 13, lots 56 and 57 with conditions which are to define with a note and details the locations of the curbing and the locations of parking space concrete wheel stops. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

BUSINESS OCCUPANCY

None

WORKSHOP

9. PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES

J. Duffy: There will be two potential zoning changes: rewriting the Accessory Apartment Article and rezoning land no longer owned by MSG.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

J. Duffy: Notice of Merger - 17 and 21 Highland Street, Map 6, lots 53 and 54 - merged into one lot to be know as Map 6, lot 53. This requires signature by the Chairman.

None of the the dates for the Manchester Sand and Gravel Tour work for the members of the Planning Board. New dates will be requested.

The Town of Hooksett has been notified from the Town of Pembroke that a project in Pembroke has been found to have regional impact. The project, known as Pembroke Meadows, is located at 282 Pembroke Street in the medium density zone. This project consists of 125 acres of land which will be con-

solidated and re-subdivided in order to create 110 new residential building lots. We have abutter status so the Town of Hooksett can voice concerns as an abutter.

D. Grafton: Will this accommodate children who will be going to Pembroke Academy?

J. Duffy: Eventually.

D. Grafton: How many Hooksett students attend Pembroke Academy?

J. Duffy: I do not know that answer.

D. Winterton: I don't think we have much to say as far as the regional impact in terms of schools because they take our students as a courtesy. I think the impact to us will be traffic coming down DW Highway. If we did declare there was regional impact is there any way for us to access their impact fees to improve DW Highway? I don't think there is any impact on us.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**