

**HOOKSETT
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC)
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING – room 204
Thursday, June 11, 2009**

CALLED TO ORDER

J. Duffy called the meeting to order at 9:00am.

ATTENDANCE

Town of Hooksett

J. Duffy, Town Planner, D. Tatem, Stantec, P. Rowell, Building Dept., D. Boyce, Transfer Station, J. Gryval, Planning Board Chair, C. Granfield, Town Administrator (arrived at 10:00am), and G. Chabot, Manchester Water Works (arrived 10:15am).

1. (9:00 - 10:00am)

RIVERSIDE PUBLIC STORAGE (plan #09-13)

Paul Burnor, owner, and Matt Peterson, Woodland Design Group, Inc.

5 Cross Road, Map 17, Lot 37

Proposal to construct a 3-story 97,200 sq ft climate controlled self-storage facility.

Representing the Applicant

Matt Peterson & Doug MacGuire, Woodland Design.

J. Duffy: We would like to welcome you to the TRC for the public storage. We will start with introductions. We have Matt Peterson for Riverside Public Storage and Doug MacGuire.

M. Peterson: Doug MacGuire is the Project Manager. This is the site next to the MTS building; red roof with golf carts. Santa Clause is on the plan. The existing house is occupied as a rental. It is the north side of Cross Road. There is visibility from the highway. The existing utilities are stubbed. There is already a curb cut off Cross Road. I believe you guys asked for this originally. Sheet 2 is the demolition plan for the trees, houses, wells, and garage. That area will be loam and seeded as part of the project. Sheet 3 outlines the application for a 3-story climate controlled storage facility. We modeled it from Nashua. The façade, end cupolas are glass, and stucco on the sides; all high-end architecture. It is 32,000 sq ft per floor; total 97,200 sq ft. There is access to the north property line. There is parking for customers. There is a gate around the backside of the units. We propose a similar gate to Profile Self Storage. The detail will model fencing out back. Everyone comes out to the entrance that feeds to 10x15 doors on the south and east sides. The elevator area, bathroom, and hallways are designed accordingly. Whoever ends up going forward, each company has a different type of layout. For snow storage, and the Fire Dept. comments for their truck turn around, we will get that to them. For the

hydrant, we didn't know where the utility room will be, but will get a 24 ft drive-out in, and a 35 foot drive-out out back. There will be pole lighting around the perimeter. The grading is the cleanest we could get. MTS was on the site first. There is not a lot of earthwork or drainage. It is a closed drain system. There are five (5) total catch basins to collect all water into the detention/infiltration system on the east side.

D. MacGuire: A 50 yr storm didn't even come close.

M. Peterson: We know the sand and soils, and we did tie the roof drain into the pond. Grading, as you can see, the building is at 240', pretty much at grade. The existing house drops off, and we will fill in there. This is about as clean as we can do on any site in NH. Sheet 5 shows the utilities. That didn't get much easier. There are underground electric, water, and gas stubbed on the northerly property line, and 75 ft runs into the building. We did show a hydrant here. He (M. Hoisington) said we needed a sprinkler system with an alarm. Sheet 6 outlines the erosion, stabilizing construction with a silt fence, and sediment control around the catch basins. For all of our projects, Randy Knolls does all of our landscaping plans for us to meet all Town requirements. Dan is in process of reviewing.

J. Duffy: The new Zoning Ordinance states a 25 ft buffer between residential and commercial use. So I believe West River Road and Cross Road sides will need this buffer.

D. Tatem: I looked at that Jo Ann, and I think he is pretty close to that. Rather than a setback, I would show it as a vegetated buffer. It does not require where you have the driveway. Other than that, you need it.

M. Peterson: The rest of the plan set . . . Sheet 8 is for lighting. There are 18 ft lights around the parking area. Sheet 9 is the profile of the drainage system. We will fill in the back corner. Sheets 10,11,12 are the construction details. That is the project. Any questions?

P. Rowell: There should be a note on the plan, that it is in the groundwater protection district.

J. Duffy: There is a note under #4, Sheet 1. The note should also be on the site plan sheet.

P. Rowell: Jo Ann and Dan, on pg 114 it states no more than 10% or 2,500 sq ft, whichever is greater is rendered impervious. There should be some point reference.

D. Tatem: He is well over 10%, probably at 35%.

J. Duffy: That will require a variance if he is over.

M. Peterson: Did they get a waiver for MTS?

P. Rowell: This came in 2008, MTS came in before 2008.

J. Duffy: Peter, what page are you on?

P. Rowell: Page 114 #3, permitted uses E3. It is limited and controlled in this district.

J. Duffy: I don't think that section was in the old one; read #4, the next one down.

P. Rowell: Read #4 out loud. We restrict it in #3, but let it go in #4.

M. Peterson: We will look at that to determine if a variance is needed.

P. Rowell: You won't need to haul off site?

M. Peterson: No. The only thing left is loam.

D. MacGuire: To balance the site, the 1st floor elevation is at grade, but we will need to dig for the footings. We will bring in select materials. All that is pulled off, will be used for the back part.

D. Tatem: Dig a couple of test pits. MTS hit a vein.

P. Rowell: Any moisture in, you couldn't work with it. Are we going to have an issue with a 3-story building and shielding lights?

D. Tatem: They need to show the building cross-section. I would be surprised with the woods, that you will even see the building.

J. Duffy: Are you sharing a sign?

M. Peterson: Yes.

D. Tatem: We need some language for sharing a sign.

P. Rowell: Any signage should be on the plan.

M. Peterson: It has to be on the plan?

J. Duffy: Why does it have to be on the plan?

D. Tatem: Show the proposed signs to be located, sign, elevation, and view.

J. Duffy: Usually only the Rte 3 (PZ) signs are approved by the Planning Board.

D. Tatem: Standard detail in back.

J. Duffy: The reason why I am questioning this is the Scott Bussiere sign for ice cream. Bart said if someone shows where the signs will be on a plan, then they are grandfathered from any sign ordinance.

D. Tatem: The same rule for Hooksett Commons (Landing).

J. Duffy: I haven't seen anyone, except for Rte 3 (PZ) showing anything on the plan.

P. Rowell: It is easier to show the sign, if this doesn't get built for 4 yrs. The sign ordinance changed to 16 ft for Scott.

J. Duffy: Architectural rendering, you have been through the Aesthetic Committee. There is an Aesthetic Committee with two members of the Planning Board. Donna can arrange the review meeting of the landscape, and architectural review. The Aesthetic Committee needs to provide their comments to the Planning Board. They are non-binding recommendations.

M. Peterson: July 13th Aesthetic Committee?

P. Rowell: On the landscape plan, there is a cluster of trees and a small island. Will this impact the snow piling? I like having a nice straight shot for snow plowing. Also, show other snowplow areas.

M. Peterson: The trees are behind the fence.

P. Rowell: Is there enough snow storage? Think about how to plow those 100 inches of snow, so we don't put trees in way of loaders.

D. MacGuire: There is 10 ft from the curb to the fence all the way around. They may be angle blades.

P. Rowell: Loaders now.

M. Peterson: I will increase a couple of feet.

P. Rowell: Plow straight in. I don't know how it falls with the landscape rules. I am glad you didn't put any other planting in the other island.

D. Tatem: Those islands are required in the PZ.

M. Peterson: The island along the fence is for aesthetics.

P. Rowell: I end up on the sites a lot more after the fact. Propane storage, how are they going to heat?

M. Peterson: Natural gas.

D. Tatem: Matt asked us to specifically asked for a TRC review, more than we typically do (item underlined, comments next to item):

- 1) sign easement – language to share sign with MTS
- 2) drainage easement – Sheet 3 of 12 language
- 3) turnaround – no turn around at end, basically drive in and back out to striped area. It would be nice for a little hammerhead for a car to turn around. With the island there, backing to the striped island is not user friendly.
M. Peterson: We have 35 ft.
- 4) parking area – 44 ft drive and parking isle; assuming 2 cars could back out.
- 5) Fire Dept. –
M. Peterson: We met with Mike Hoisington first, Sheet 3 of 12, we will put a template and meet with him. Written e-mail from Mike; copy for Town and Dan's files
- 6) Bollards – are for whacking into. The length of south end, at every other door, to make a visible barrier for cars and snow plows
- 7) Pedestrian and vehicular access plan – required, a couple of arrows enough. You show cross walk stripes on the plan. Either take off the plan or put in the cross walk.
- 8) Grading – steeper than 3:1
M. Peterson: Should be on pg 6.
- 9) Detention pond grading – 3:1 should be 4:1 on inside of all detention ponds. Outside and can be 3:1.
- 10) Dumpster pad – I would recommend Pinard or someone to look at that – assuming front loading dumpster.
- 11) Leach field – 25 ft minimum, now it is too close to the property line.
- 12) Sheet 4 – overflow – Dave McCurdy had the same type of pond in the rear up the northwest corner. Detention was to hold a 100 yr storm, however he had overflow. Overflow went directly to rte 3A. I recommend it would go somewhere else.
M. Peterson: Treatment swale or something else?
P. Rowell: There needs to be a maintenance agreement on the infiltration of the ponds. There was a yearly Town checklist for the Town to inspect.
D. Tatem: There is a direct overflow back to Cross Road. Get into the back through the cut off swale. That would be safer.
- 13) SWIP inspections – Note on plan notification to be provided to Town within 3 days of each inspection
- 14) Detention pond – Maintenance schedule to hold a 100 yr storm.
D. MacGuire: I don't need to hold all water, just what I propose to outlet. Ponds with no outlets hold a 100 yr storm event within a 12 hr timeframe.
M. Peterson: Instead of overflow, a 12-inch pipe?
D. Tatem: I don't have a problem with overflow, just the location.
- 15) Grease hoods –
- 16) Block and sediment filter – on #5
- 17) Landscape – Sheet 7, allowed side slopes. I think you should remove leaders.

- 18) Lighting – Plan should be created by an engineer with expertise in the lighting field. We would like to see a note “we are qualified as an expert in lighting and have been designing over “x” years”.
P. Rowell: Install the lighting exactly as what is on the plan.
M. Peterson: I know. 2 ft exposed base, the owner of site asked to go to 3 ft, because you can’t damage the light pole.
- 19) Dumpster pad – Must be screened, not open chain link.
- 20) Details – Put specifications rather than referring to the spec book (Hooksett Blue Book).
- 21) 140N – Should be at least 500x fabric under the stone
- 22) water and gas line – existing line diameters
- 23) monumentation – Proposed for all corners (railroad spike at entrance to MTS).
M. Peterson: He still needs to set that.
D. Tatem: If it is on your property line, we need to show the angle point.
- 24) Wetland Scientist – Statement whether there are no wetlands or here they are.
Also, show wetland scientist’s address on plans. Your architect and wetland scientist should be on the cover sheet.
- 25) Class designation – No on Rte 93.

J. Duffy: Anyone else? Any other questions Matt?

M. Peterson: We will take care of these for the Planning Board.

2. (10:00 - 11:00am)
SUPERMARKET DEVELOPMENT (plan #09-15)
Reggie Ronzello, owner, and Matt Routhier, Asst Project Manager, Allen & Major Associates, Inc.
West River Road & Central Park Drive, Map 37, Lots 2-3, 3, 4, & 5
Proposal to construct a 76,325 sq ft supermarket.

Representing the Applicant

Matt Routhier, Allen & Major, Jim Lamp, J & Co., Kevin Dandrade, TEC, and Jennifer Hamwey, Allen & Major.

J. Duffy: We would like to welcome you to the TRC for the supermarket. We will start with introductions.

J. Lamp: We presented our conceptual to the Planning Board as a discussion item, and met with Dan and Jo Ann.

M. Routhier: The site is at Exit 10 located near Rte 3A and Central Park Drive. There is an existing 27 acres. There is a 135 ft power line easement. The intention is to relocate the power line, so that we can fit our program onto the site. We are proposing adding a signalized light for the entrance at West River Road adjacent to the off ramp. We propose a 75,325 sq ft supermarket with 382 parking spaces. We have handled the storm water with infiltration ponds; fast infiltration rate with pretreatment devices.

D. Tatem: What are they?

M. Routhier: Not a storm sceptor. It is a grease trap system; one at each outlet. They will outlet at the lower corner into these wetlands. We provided landscape from the street view. We added street trees along the front; Oak and they are fairly tall. We added a walkway to the southern side of the road up to healthcare building on Central Park Drive. It is a clean solution septic system; in tanks vs. leach field. We will have studies for the groundwater. We are relocating the right-of-way to the back of the building. We will have a buffer strip along the highway, as required. We are impacting a small area of wetland (no wetland fill). We have received a variance from the ZBA.

J. Duffy: They have been to the ZBA for a few different things, and they have been approved by them.

J. Lamp: 8 ft escalation, 4 ft discharge - disturbance in wetland buffers for bridge and parking for a total of 600 sq ft of impact.

J. Hamwey: It is in a variance.

D. Tatem: You will need a waiver as well for over 6 ft.

P. Rowell: Both Dan (8ft and 4 ft)?

D. Tatem: The groundwater protection area states a ZBA variance. The Development Regulations for the 4 ft, require a waiver from the Planning Board as well.

M. Routhier: There is an 8 ft separation from the septic to the ledge. We will ask for a waiver. There is no treatment of waste in the field.

D. Tatem: It is required 4 ft for a seasonal high.

M. Routhier: That we have.

D. Tatem: I would support a waiver for the 8 ft to the ledge.

M. Routhier: The 5 ft of existing natural soil, I am not sure that is achievable. We will probably ask for a waiver for that too.

J. Hamwey: List of waivers (underlined):

SITE PLAN REGULATIONS

1) 11.09.1 – 2% driveway slope

D. Tatem: Our regulations now, what is the slope of the driveway off of the pavement?

M. Routhier: 3%-5%.

- D. Tatem: If it is a Town road, we would not support it. Being a State road, your DOT permit would be looking at that.
- 2) 11.09.13 – driveway excess 300 ft
D. Tatem: You don't need a waiver for that.
- 3) 11.09.23 – minimum pipes
M. Routhier: Inside the structure, there is space in between the pipes.
D. Tatem: You should probably ask for a waiver. Also, make sure the manufacturer doesn't compromise.
P. Rowell: These are drainage structures?
M. Routhier: Yes.
D. Tatem: We have had manufactures say they will chew up. A blanket waiver won't be a good idea on this one.
J. Hamwey: Provided estimated diagram.
- 4) 11.13.25 – surcharge pipes
M. Routhier: Pipes are 25 yrs.
D. Tatem: It is a closed drainage system.
J. Lamp: We are trying not to discharge the pipes up the slope. One last run shouldn't affect the system.
D. Tatem: The reason for the requirement for the closed drainage 4 ft diameter system, if there is only a detention pond.
- 5) 11.13.26 – pipe covers
D. Tatem: We would not support this waiver.
J. Hamwey: Would you make an exception to the rule?
D. Tatem: Provide a reason why you would want to do it.
P. Rowell: Also provide changes for separations.
M. Routhier: They are up against clay.
J. Lamp: You are not underneath pavement.
M. Routhier: All pipes are at minimum 2 ft of cover; 3 ft pavement, 2 ft over land.
- 6) 11.13.220
- 7) 11.13.221 – catch basins
J. Hamwey: They are high capacity grades.
D. Tatem: We would not support a blanket waiver for the whole site. I encourage you to get 2 or less.
- 8) 11.13.235 – 4:1
D. Tatem: I haven't seen this waived yet.
M. Routhier: 3:1 ponds, another area 4:1.
D. Tatem: 4:1 is what I have seen for every interior pond. Ponds have free borders. There is a saturated area of concern. Above the water table, you could go 3:1.
J. Lamp: We will get it signed and stamped by a Geotech. We will cut the slopes 2:1, and that will be supported by Geotech plans and calculations.
- 9) 11.13.210 – one culvert crossing
M. Routhier: Outletting into the swale you can see on the plan; existing swale.
J. Lamp: Can we do an inlet there?
D. Tatem: With corrugated pipe.
M. Routhier: It is at 7%. It can't get any flatter.

SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

10) Section 2 3.06 – DES

J. Hamwey: We are going to DES to ask them for a waiver.

11) Section 2 3.01 – scale

D. Tatem: All are 1:40.

M. Routhier: All are at 1:50 and one is 1:100. The lighting plan is required at 1:20. As long as they are legible; at 1:40-1:50 they are hard to read. It is case by case.

12) Section 3 3.07 – wetland fill

J. Hamwey: There is a variance by the ZBA.

13) Section II - scale requirement

D. Tatem: 1:250, vicinity sketch. The intent is to see a lot of area around it. It is not technical, therefore I don't have an opinion.

J. Hamwey: We have an addendum that can be added to the plan set. The plan was originally required by the ZBA.

J. Duffy and J. Gryval: That is fine.

14) 200 ft – abutters, septic & wells (next three items)

D. Tatem: I haven't seen this waived. The aerial is very helpful to abutters.

M. Routhier: Septic locations and wells?

D. Tatem: Do the best you can. If an abutter says you can't go on the property, do the best you can. The location of the parcel is very easy to do.

P. Rowell: The 2 parcels, pond and stream, I would like to see where these are.

J. Hamwey: Is GIS information acceptable?

D. Tatem: Yes. For neighboring parcels, the State may have plans. Information can be taken from the recorded plan.

J. Hamwey: That is it for waivers. 5 ft, 4 ft and 8 ft are not listed, but will be added.

D. Tatem: Less than 4 ft seasonal high, I believe the State allows 3 ft. Follow those criteria. It is case by case.

P. Rowell: I think you said 3ft to the ZBA.

M. Routhier: We shouldn't have an issue there.

D. Tatem: Kevin (Dandrade) spoke with our engineer for the traffic study. It is still premature to provide our comments.

K. Dandrade: We provided a summary. We met with NHDOT and Town (David) for scoping when and what. At that time, it made sense for a corridor. We have a lot at interchange 10. There is seasonal shopping traffic (Target, Kohls, and regular traffic all at the beginning of December). Still we were conservative. The regional NHDOT station in Bow, and numbers inflated 13% higher to provide a conservative analysis. Lowes and Walmart are down the street. Central Park North (Technology Drive) and Quality Drive across from there. There were improvements made at Lowes. The Town and DOT stated it was not necessary to go that far south (to meet up with Lowes). Interchanges, 10 yr

forecast; start 2008, opening 2010, and 2020 as the horizon. With the healthcare facility shifts, it will benefit Central Park Drive and Rte 3A traffic. Currently that is an unsignalized intersection. Now when taking a left turn out of Central Park Drive, they can come through our site and access a traffic signal. That is a much safer area. We looked at the volume of traffic off Rte 3A. As part of our permitting, we are looking at a potential phase II for a small building and hotel. For transportation we wanted to look at all the traffic, however phase II is not proposed at this time. At the site, we want to nail down the grade and slope perspective. Rte 3A - NHDOT cutting right turn lane into the site, a new left turn lane (in an existing median island), and carving an additional lane off the ramp. There is a significant amount of capacity for Lowes and Walmart that were added with the additional through lane. It is complete and factored into our study for the existing conditions and our counts. There will be 3 lanes coming out of our driveway with an entirely new signal design due to the widening. There will be new equipment for every approach. The project with the supermarket estimates 188 trips entering & 121 leaving in the morning AND 430-450 trips entering & leaving in the evening. Saturdays, middle of day (11am-2pm) 450-480 in and out over the course of an hour. We have the peak hours as 11am-2pm & 4pm-6pm. The trips closely reference Lowes and Walmart. The estimates change 5% here or there, but significantly are similar. The traffic at the north and south bound ramp systems, 20% of new trips & 30 % new trips further south (Manchester west to Exit 7 @ 293). The end of day capacity, great benefit for Central Park Drive (Circle K and gas station). 120 trips in the peak area will be shifted to a new signal. This will be a huge decrease in delays coming out of there. Ramp system, North Technology Drive and Quality Drives, are a level of service "C" in no build and build conditions. Because of interchange traffic, by the time Technology Drive and Quality Drive, there is a second or two delay per vehicle. Northbound ramps have 2 left turn lanes, and 2 right turn lanes; we maintain a level service "B". Opening year will be a level service "B" or "C" and incorporates all of our traffic and Lowes & Walmart's traffic. Level service "C" or better is acceptable per DOT. The site driveway is introducing a new approach. We are adding capacity at different turn lanes, as efficient as possible to 1) minimize green time, 2) level of service "C" or better, and 3) 32 seconds delay per vehicle. Opening no build level of service will be "B" with a 16 second delay per vehicle. Opening build level of service "C" with a 25-28 second delay per vehicle. DOT worries are for level of services "D,E,F"; areas of significant delay. Level "C" preflow conditions will have no long queues. The mitigation is confined. There are lengthy lane drops in front, left turn lane, right turn land, and a new signal. The DOT requires a fine turn system upon opening at all intersections.

J. Duffy: Questions for Kevin? The plan for the proposed hotel and retail, Matt when we met you said retail would probably be going way? On the plan, could you add the hotel/retail to be approved under separate application? For the abutters list, PSNH needs to added. For approval of the street name, the forms you can get from Peter's office (Building Dept.).

D. Tatem: You will need two names.

P. Rowell: I will check with 911 requirements.

D. Tatem: If the retail store is built off the other street by the "T", you will need a 90 degree turn stop sign. Whatever 911 says.

J. Duffy: The Fire Dept. makes that decision. Aesthetics Committee, rule in the ordinance states you cannot have 100 ft length without a jog or break. Impact fees, for the roadway we made an agreement with Lowes and Walmart to hold for 10 yrs. The Goonan Rd intersection is with the NHDOT. A portion of the fees went to the State and they bonded money. I wonder if you would agree to us holding the bond for 10 yrs vs. only 6 yrs.

J. Lamp: If that is consistent with what you have done with last two projects, we would consider that.

J. Duffy: We can get you that paperwork. The septic system 75 ft buffer is along I-93, the ordinance states a natural buffer. Since you are disturbing the area, is there anything you are showing that you are reclaiming, or planting?

M. Routhier: The existing vegetation under the power lines is adequate. There is a concrete chamber system.

J. Duffy: Get something in writing from Peter, as CEO, that he is good with that. Since that is in the ordinance, the Planning Board cannot waive.

P. Rowell: 15 ft?

J. Duffy: Read the ordinance "no penetration of the 75 ft buffer is allowed".

P. Rowell: 75 ft buffer, natural vegetation under the power line (shrubs up to 10 ft tall). With septic, you can't plant shrubs. 75 ft buffer, what is naturally vegetated? We assumed whatever grew under the power lines.

J. Hamwey: The power company has maintenance rights to clear.

J. Lamp: Ambiguity allows that the buffer, 15 ft must be heavily vegetated.

J. Duffy: It would be helpful to have something in writing in the file from Peter.

J. Lamp: We will get you the PSNH requirements.

P. Rowel: I am familiar with that, I own property. Normally it is grasses. Leave the blueberries. If you want to draft something for me, I will look at it.

J. Duffy: Groundwater restriction is 10 % impervious, best management practices.

D. Tatem: Show plans with calculations of the impervious coverage.

J. Duffy: The Planning Board will determine if this project is a regional impact. If they determine Manchester is affected by the traffic, you would need to notify Manchester as an abutter, as well as the SNHPC. If yes, I am not sure if also CNHPC would need to be notified since they abut Hooksett. If yes, then the whole plan sets need to go to the planning commissions and City of Manchester. Guy Chabot, Manchester Water works, is here today.

G. Chabot: I will need full sized plans, when available. The water main at Rte 3A is not delineated. We had a water main break on the other side of the highway and we were digging around the bends. We need anything along the frontage. I would strongly recommend a couple of test pits at the right turn lanes. Once you start moving things out, you don't want to mess with it. There is an existing sleeve there. We would be more than happy to physically go to the site and locate the water mains. 24 x 12 T that services that site. It was for the original Central Park I construction, instead of tapping the big main. Cross sections along Rte 3A, I need to do a formal review on the site. The requirement for the water main should be extended from your project to Central Park I with 8" pipe.

D. Tatem: Does the water main go up their new driveway road?

M. Routhier: Yes.

D. Tatem: Also, need the cross section for that roadway too.

J. Duffy: Was the water extended along Rte 3A or the internal road?

G. Chabot: Internal road. For water quality, the loop lines back through an 8" line from a 12" line.

D. Tatem: Can we get a letter from Manchester Water Precinct that you have capacity. Matt, you need that letter before you can even get on the Planning Board agenda.

G. Chabot: I can get that letter, pending full review, to get you into the Planning Board. There is a 24" main along Rte 3A. There is an acreage charge out there.

J. Lamp: Is it a flat fee based on the parcel and not the development?

G. Chabot: It is per acre.

J. Lamp: Can you write us a letter on the fee structure; consumer price index.

J. Duffy: Matt, status on PSNH relocation?

M. Routhier: Jim?

J. Lamp: We will draft a letter of intent with PSNH for the connection of roadway to Central Park. For the concept plan for the hotel at the end of Central Park, we would come off mid length from the connector road for an angle at the power lines. We will have a letter of intent by the time we submit or time of public hearing for the Planning Board.

J. Duffy: Also submit a copy of the Purchase & Sales stating you can come in off Rte 3A. This was something that one of the Planning Board members asked for.

J. Lamp: Selling properties with a curb cut at the signals; signed with Ronzello.

J. Hamwey: We have an authorization of sale.

J. Duffy: We need something in writing that the State is agreeing to that (curb cut on Rte 3A), because he (Planning Board member) was surprised at that.

D. Tatem: The site plan needs to be recorded, therefore take a bunch of stuff off it and add the property lines and bounds. The rear highway bonds are not held on the survey. We prefer the survey hold those bounds; it is cleaner. If not, have them explain why they didn't.

J. Duffy: The registry of deeds is fussy with what they will accept to record.

D. Tatem: Show as much information to show a complete site. You have a catch basin symbol, but no notes. Also, the proposed grading is not on the site plan.

J. Lamp: Looking for improvements?

D. Tatem: Basically the plan should be as if it was built. Signature block; show date approved and date signed lines. Wetland and soil scientists' addresses to be added. The compaction of 90 should be 96. Show the details rather than referring to something else. The Town Blue Book is specific about the pipe trench, fabric, etc. Cut and paste that into your comments. Give me a call to further discuss.

J. Hamwey: Dan, did you do that book?

D. Tatem: The Blue Book has been around since 2001.

J. Duffy: Rene at Stantec did the Blue Book.

J. Hamwey: Could I get it in CAD?

D. Tatem: Signage, there is a new ordinance.

J. Lamp: For the sign at the main entrance and alternate location, we will need a variance with the ZBA.

D. Tatem: Article 20-A.

P. Rowell: Intent to cover all 3 areas.

J. Duffy: For signs, only the PZ comes before the Planning Board

J. Lamp: It will be a 50 sq ft face, and 20 ft.

P. Rowell: Show the signs on the site plan to include size.

J. Duffy: However, if they want to go larger, they have to go to the ZBA. They can't show on the plans, unless they have their variance.

D. Tatem: The building sign, underneath the chart, the calculation is more than 300 ft off the road. You may be able to use a percentage.

J. Duffy: The Rte 3A signage changed 5/13/08.

J. Hamwey: The site plan we will show. If needed, we will come back later.

D. Tatem: Put a note on the site plan that it expires in 3 years. Submit for a full application. One most common missed requirement is the first section bottom 100ft, etc.; put a note on the plan that there are no trails vs. no note at all. The plans are a document. The Planning Board will talk about off site improvements.

J. Duffy: Are you planning to submit for the July 13th Planning Board meeting?

J. Lamp: That is a June 23rd deadline for July 13th, and that may be too soon.

D. Tatem: At anytime you would like to meet with us for the technical parts, we (Stantec) and the Town support open communication.

J. Duffy: At application, we need envelopes all prepared for abutter mailings. We are in the middle of changing site plan and subdivision regulations. The Planning Board has a workshop meeting set up this month. The sooner you get your application in, the better.

P. Rowell: There is a sewer main proposed to cross the river. Are you guys are aware?

M. Routhier: Yes. Manholes to tie into the future.

P. Rowell: Have you spoken with Tombs? The abutter for access.

M. Routhier: We have been in touch.

J. Lamp: Discussions, we don't want to fog things up. After approvals, then we would be more than happy to discuss with them (what would impact our signals and our traffic).

P. Rowell: Lighting, again, must be installed as designed. Make sure the electrician, the designer, and installer are all on the same page.

J. Lamp: It is Lowell Central Electric.

D. Tatem: Lighting, professional or has expertise in the lighting field.

P. Rowell: Landscape plan, big trees in small islands; they don't grow. Tie landscaping into what the Planning Board says. I noticed trees in the snow removal area. There is a retaining wall along the roadway, how big? Is the bridge all the way back?

M. Routhier: 10 ft at the highest point down to 3ft.

D. Tatem: Submit a stamped shop drawing, before the pre-con meeting. A-H, those plans need to meet. I can send you that note. Water review done by Manchester Water Precinct for capacity is a completeness issue. His signoff on the design will hold up your approval. If sewer, also separate review by Hooksett Sewer, Bruce Kudrik. Submit your plans in case you want to tie in.

J. Duffy: Everyone will be very pleased with what is coming in and very excited to have you here.

J. Lamp: Thank you for your time.

ADJOURNMENT

J. Duffy declared the meeting adjourned at 11:00am. The next TRC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 9, 2009, Hooksett Municipal Building, 2ND FLOOR ROOM 204.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator