

**HOOKSETT  
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC)  
MEETING MINUTES  
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
Thursday, November 13, 2008**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

J. Duffy called the meeting to order at 9:10 am.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Town of Hooksett**

J. Duffy, Town Planner, J. Gryval, Planning Board Chair, P. Rowell, Building Dept., S. Agrafiotis, Police Dept., D. Tatem, Stantec, M. Hoisington, Fire Dept., D. Hemeon, Highway Dept., and C. Pearson, ZBA Chair.

**Ravenwood, Laurel Road & Spruce Court, Map 21, Lot 15**

**Representing the Applicant**

George Chadwick, Keach-Nordstrom, and Dennis Demers, owner (arrived @ 10:00am)

**1. Ravenwood (plan #06-23)**

J. Duffy: This is a plan to create a 40-lot open space subdivision. This is in addition to lots 15 & 15-41 that are open space lots. The applicant has been before the TRC a few years back and is here today to provide updates.

G. Chadwick: Presented overview of plan. Back in 2002 design phases were presented. In 2004, we went to the TRC, received comments and started the wetland process. We will have our wetland permit in a day or two. We are back to the TRC today due to several back and forth reviews for the wetlands. The lighter green area on the plan is prime wetlands. We have a 100' buffer around this prime wetland. Because of the length of time it took to get back here today, this buffer has changed. The State now has a 100' prime buffer. We had to go through a public hearing with the State about 1 ½ months ago. Jocelyn Degler, DES, to write-up the permit. We are crossing the prime wetland, but there is no impact. The bridge is to span the wetlands. We do have prime wetland buffer impacts. Along the prime, we identified 100' setbacks and will place placards. Keep the prime wetland out of all the lots and keep it in the open space. Project follows cluster-housing criteria in LDR zone; 100' buffer around perimeter, outside of lots, and within open space. This is a 40-lot subdivision with 2 open space lots. Cluster minimum can be 12,000 sq ft., 25% of total area as open space = 23.25 acres @ 61.1 acres = 46%.

D. Tatem: What is the percentage of wet to open space?

G. Chadwick: 50% non-wetland of minimum required (required 16.65 acres, project has 23.25 acres).

P. Rowell: Why the old cluster requirements?

D. Tatem: Because it was found complete under the old regulations.

G. Chadwick: 2 open space lots = 1x 41.7 acres in size, and 1x 19.4 acres in size. Density of project = total parcel – 15% for roads, minus jurisdictional wetlands = 46 lots allowed and we are proposing 40 lots. All lots have individual wells and disposal systems with underground utilities.

P. Rowell: This is why people complain about cluster subdivisions. This plan doesn't benefit wildlife.

D. Tatem: Hooksett cluster subdivision regulations were rewritten drastically last year.

P. Rowell: Cluster is good if used right. We are dancing around the wetlands with this plan.

D. Tatem: Open space for public use. Documents would need to state public access is allowed.

D. Hemeon: How would the public access?

G. Chadwick: Cluster, each lot has easy access to open space. My lots front onto the open space.

J. Gryval: Developing everything but the wetland is not good.

J. Duffy: For the percentage of open space, it would helpful to color it in on the plan vs. keeping it white.

G. Chadwick: Purple line designates open space, and the white is uplands. What is colored in is wetlands. There are 133 acres, we are required to have 33.3 acres and 50% needs to be uplands. This equals 16.65 acres and we are providing 23.25 acres.

J. Gryval: I thought it had to be usable open space.

G. Chadwick: Definition of usable? You can hunt and walk through it. Granted it is not playgrounds or ball fields. We can further talk about public access or just used by the homeowners. I am hearing you would prefer to have public access.

P. Rowell: The big detention pond in the open space, is it in the uplands?

G. Chadwick: Yes, about an acre.

P. Rowell: The detention pond in 5 yrs will become wetlands. This is exactly what cluster should not look like. We should have usable land with wildlife corridors.

G. Chadwick: For health and safety, we were asked to connect the 2 cul-de-sacs. This cuts off the wildlife corridor from left to right. Open space to the other open space or Town land. We did the best we could to try to find other open space for this project to tie into. The watershed water does not flow through this culvert. The culvert is for wildlife to cross through.

P. Rowell: Lots 15-3 & 15-2, take these lots out and open them up for wildlife flow.

G. Chadwick: This was a 46-lot subdivision initially. It has been reduced to 40 lots per the State's request for environmental concerns.

C. Pearson: ZBA concern was the 8 lots in the bottom corner of the plan. The residents also are concerned with this area. The critter crossing is a concern. The better idea for open space was to remove these 8 lots.

G. Chadwick: It was brought to my attention from the developer about the 8 lots. For the developer, these 8 lots are the best to develop. The proposed phasing of project:

- Phase I - construction of Willow Path to Laurel Road to the existing cul-de-sac (connection between 2 cul-de-sacs) and 17 lots
- Phase II – construction of the remainder of Laurel Rd. Length of cul-de-sac around 1,500 ft. This meets your criteria of 1,200 ft.
- Phase III – construction of Ravenwood Drive

D. Hemeon: Phasing, how long are these three phases going to take? I have roads 5,6,7 yrs old now that are cracked and ruined.

D. Tatem: You can require an overlay of the whole site before completion.

G. Chadwick: A through road is a collector road. It falls under typical Town requirements; local road standards with a 50 ft right-of-way.

D. Hemeon: What is the total road?

G. Chadwick: 1,500 ft; 1 ½ miles of road.

D. Hemeon: Detention ponds?

G. Chadwick: Four 8x8 boxes and one bridge 24 ft wide and 8 ft high.

J. Gryval: 13,000 acres in this State are lost to hot tops, etc. If it were up to me, I would not approve cluster subdivisions. However, it does meet our regulations.

P. Rowell: For the 4 yr vesting period, this one has not been signed and recorded yet.

Why does this fall under the old regulations?

J. Duffy: This plan was found complete, but no decision made by the Board.

D. Tatem: George dropped off plans 2 weeks ago. I scanned through them, but have not started my formal review. Based on this meeting, I can start the review.

G. Chadwick: The majority of drainage did not change. October 2007 is the last Stantec review letter and it had 6 items.

D. Hemeon: The water that runs off into K-Mart and the Benton Road area, Dan are all these detention ponds going to help this area?

D. Tatem: Do you suggest looking at a decrease in volume?

D. Hemeon: For drainage, look at the downstream.

G. Chadwick: We will follow the DES rules for this project per Amy Clark at DES.

J. Duffy: You have a special exception for wetland crossings. Is the Conservation Commission OK with this?

G. Chadwick: Changes have been made to this project, since they last reviewed it. The lots decreased and the buffers increased. We are willing to go talk to them.

J. Duffy: You show two or more lots with very long driveways in the right corner. How long are the driveways?

G. Chadwick: 600 ft.

D. Tatem: The one lot in the back appears longer.

J. Duffy: Lot to open space, is there a detention basin? The building envelope is not that large. I think this lot should remain in open space.

G. Chadwick: I will talk to the developer, however it does meet your requirements.

J. Duffy: What is the update with the cell tower at the entrance way coming in from Laurel Rd to the land to the right (not buildable)? What is done to protect the two vernal pools?

G. Chadwick: Distance from the house to one vernal pool is approximately 150-200 ft. The other vernal pool distance is 200 ft. We can look at other means of protection such as placards.

D. Hemeon: Access to detention ponds?

G. Chadwick: Access easement behind the houses. Easement dedicated to the Town.

J. Duffy: I haven't seen access behind houses. I would recommend the one lot configuration for vernal pool to be put in open space.

G. Chadwick: New rule with the State is 100' setback for prime wetlands.

J. Duffy: We should update our requirement from 75' to 100'. Several wells overlap to other lots.

D. Tatem: 10 ft overlap OK to another lot or open space.

J. Duffy: Easement?

D. Tatem: Not needed if less than 10 ft.

J. Duffy: New phasing ordinance effective May 2008, spells out how many lots for each phase. You fall under the old regulations.

G. Chadwick: I will look at the new phasing regulations.

S. Agrafiotis: Will the phase I roads be completed before the lots are constructed?

G. Chadwick: I will need to speak with the developer.

D. Hemeon: The road has to be built and paved before the CO.

D. Tatem: Road must be accessible during construction phase.

S. Agrafiotis: If the project stalled, the road would still be there?

D. Hemeon: We would have a Bond to finish the road if the project stalled.

M. Hoisington: Cisterns?

G. Chadwick: Phasing came about after cisterns. It meets your requirements. Where would you prefer them to be?

M. Hoisington: Every house must be within 1,000 ft from a cistern.

D. Hemeon: One cistern on Spruce and one on Laurel.

M. Hoisington: It is the driving distance of 1,000 ft from the cistern. We don't lay hose through the woods.

D. Hemeon: Spruce and Laurel doesn't look like they will cover the main road.

M. Hoisington: No cistern in Phase I means no CO. You need to add one. All houses have to be sprinklered if they are outside of the 1,000 ft.

G. Chadwick: Phase I location for the cistern?

M. Hoisington: The high point.

D. Tatem: If you put it on the end (top left of plan), this may also help the existing homes. This is the high point. Setbacks for 4K (bottom right lot), needs to be updated for setback. Without losing lots and road, you could have smaller lots for this cluster (cut off back of lots and open space gets bigger vs. lot loading). Shared wells downsize lots considerably.

G. Chadwick: Developer wants individual wells and septics, no sharing.

D. Tatem: Plan meets cluster ordinance requirements, but not the “spirit” of the ordinance.

G. Chadwick: We have done everything we can to narrow the lots.

D. Tatem: You can still shave the back of the lots.

P. Rowell: Is the sewer close to this project?

D. Tatem: Community wells – one per phase?

D. Demers: For marketing purposes, homeowners want to take their own risk for wells and septics.

G. Chadwick: Underlying feeling, they don’t like clusters.

D. Tatem: Cluster smaller lots, limited or less roadways, and more “continuous” open space.

D. Demers: I have duplicated what has been approved by this Town for past projects. Now it is changing. This is my second plan for Ravenwood, because of wetlands. I mimicked approved plans. This project was done before Beaver Brook Development, development off Roy Road, and other plans Scott Bussiere has completed. Now I am hearing a different flavor.

D. Tatem: A lot of lots are larger than they need to be.

D. Demers: People want land.

D. Tatem: You want big lots, but under a cluster development. This is not the spirit of the ordinance. You can make more open space. Two thin lots on the other side?

G. Chadwick: I need to look at lot loading based on soils.

D. Tatem: A complaint was made on how the open space is to be utilized. Phase III is proposed to have access walking behind people's homes. I agree you meet the regulations.

D. Demers: Aren't you required to keep a 100' strip?

G. Chadwick: Use of open space?

D. Tatem: Useable open space such as walking trails.

D. Demers: You have approved clusters in different locations. You are not being consistent. The last time we were here for TRC, we got approval.

C. Pearson: I know there were a lot of complaints at the ZBA.

D. Tatem: The new Austin Woods plan is a nice design.

J. Duffy: Since Dennis last came before the Planning Board, the 65-day clock has expired. I spoke with Dennis and I know he was waiting for the State DES approval. I gave him until December 2008.

D. Tatem: You meet requirements. One change, make lots smaller & widen open space.

J. Duffy: What is the status of the cell tower?

D. Demers: Renewed option for one more year. Proposed cell tower location at the middle top of plan (lot 15-15).

J. Duffy: I recommended lot 15-15 be eliminated, due to the long driveway, detention, and proposed cell tower; buildable envelope. I think if you go forward with the cell tower, put that in first, then the development.

### **Adjournment**

TRC Meeting adjourned at 10:25am. The next TRC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 11, 2008 @ Hooksett Town Hall Chambers (room 105), 35 Main Street.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick  
Planning Coordinator