

**HOOKSETT
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC)
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING – room 204
Thursday, May 13, 2010**

CALLED TO ORDER

P. Rowell called the meeting to order at 9:00am.

ATTENDANCE

Town of Hooksett

P. Rowell, Building Dept., M. Hoisington, Fire Dept., J. Gryval, Planning Board Chair, D. Boyce, Transfer Station, S. Agrafiotis, Police Dept., and D. Tatem, Stantec (arrived 9:20am).

1. (9:00 – 10:00am)

UTILITY SERVICE & ASSISTANCE INC. (plan #10-06)

**Thomas Skeffinton, owner, and Jason Hill, Holden Engineering
117 & 131 Londonderry Tpke., Map 43, Lots 27 & 30**

Proposal for an 11-lot commercial subdivision with a new roadway (site is located north of East Industrial Park).

Representing the Applicant

Jason Hill, Holden Engineering.

P. Rowell: We would like to welcome you to the TRC. We will start with introductions.

J. Hill: I am a Civil Engineer at Holden Engineering and I represent the applicant USA (Utility Service & Assistance Inc.). The site is at the east side of Londonderry Tpke. This is a preliminary subdivision plan. There are 11 lots including the existing business. The site will be serviced by Manchester Water Works and there will be septic for each site. It is a 45-acre site zoned commercial. The existing business provides utility services such as poles. His (USA) building is in the middle. This is a 100' scale plan. There is an existing driveway. We are looking to use that driveway for the proposed roadway. We talked to Stantec preliminary. We also spoke with DOT for what will have to be done. There is the possibility of drainage north of the existing driveway. The lot sizes vary. My client wants to subdivide his existing business that has 9 acres devoted to that use. The owner has not determined specific use for the build out. The pads are 10,000 sq ft to 25,000 sq ft for proposed buildings. There is a lot of flexibility in use. The use may be general office. Retail would not be a good use here. For parking, we calculated for the demand of office use. They will have a lot of options on these sites. This is an overview of the layout. For stormwater drainage, we will use the site off the back of the cul-de-sac, and along the roadway (Londonderry Tpke). This is a subdivision plan. We will come

back in the future with a site plan. The preliminary discussions with DOT and Stantec was for work on the by-pass. Distributed aerial view of site; it is across from Eaton's Cake Decorating and Dempsey Pipe, north of Eastpoint Park. Mitigation will be needed on the by-pass for a southbound left turn and a northbound right turn to the site. For bonding, mitigation will occur at build out once we have a better idea of uses for the buildings. We will utilize some of the tract for widening of the roadway in terms of ROW taking. There is good sight distance at this intersection. Road profile – there are two different vertical alignments: higher is the proposed roadway platform constructed upon initial development of the roadway construction. Stantec and Town, Town has a requirement for 2% vertical grade. Those alignments provide are a safe platform. We would like to introduce a curve within the 200 ft.

M. Hoisington: What is the grade for the entire site?

J. Hill: 8% grade. The intersection platforms dig into the ground.

M. Hoisington: Grade for the back of the site?

J. Hill: Back has some fairly steep areas; general 8-13%, others 15%, and others are flatter.

P. Rowell: Cul-de-sac location?

J. Hill: It is at the end of the profile. We are not cutting. We are filling. The slope is at 8%.

P. Rowell: Will there be retaining walls on the site plans?

J. Hill: The buildings may be tiered with an upper and lower level. This is a depiction of a box for the subdivision only. If someone wants to come back to develop the site, they would need to get a site plan approved. These lots are larger than what they would need to be. This was done intentionally for flexibility of the site. The parking exceeds what would be required for office use.

P. Rowell: What Mike was getting to is that all the driveways must meet the 10% grade requirement and be 50-100 ft off the roadway. It is the same pad that the State requires. Show driveways on the subdivision plan.

J. Hill: We don't know at this point what the buildings will look like.

J. Gryval: Don't count on a waiver for driveway grades from the Board.

David Scarpetti, Cindy Dr. abutter: It is a good plan (commercial) for our tax base, but you haven't taken into consideration the abutters on Cindy Drive. My lot & house are at the back of your property line. That whole building will be 70 ft in the air behind my property. When trucks were there at 2am for the USA business, we would hear them.

That grade is substantial. Before the subdivision is granted, those back two lots should be redesigned before it can be done.

D. Tatem: I spoke to Jo Ann yesterday. The driveway accesses are required to be designed. The plans must meet zoning. There are also the lot and access requirements.

D. Scarpetti: There is a 25 ft buffer required for commercial use to residential use.

J. Hill: For these lots, we can create a suitable design for the expected use. Maybe an unspecified office use. We will illustrate that there is suitable land.

P. Rowell: Are you showing the worse case scenario?

J. Hill: Yes, a high intense use to meet Town requirements. Dan said drainage would have to be a final design. Now he also wants the roadway and accesses, so when they build this project we won't have additional runoff. When someone buys this subdivision, he will have an existing lot to utilize.

D. Scarpetti: The back two lots should be eliminated. This project is right in the back yard of the Cindy Drive homes.

D. Tatem: And the height of the buildings can be 75 ft.

J. Hill: We are not proposing a site plan here, just a commercial subdivision.

P. Rowell: Wetlands on site?

J. Hill: There is forested wetland. There is some jurisdictional wetland by the roadway ditch that we will have to go to the Conservation Commission and ZBA. We did test pits to support the soils. For drainage, we will take care of it via recharge. The soils are moderately well drained. There are a lot of woods, but we would be reducing the peek run off into the ground.

D. Tatem: If you are clearing the lots as part of the road construction, then show that on the plan.

J. Hill: The only clearing will probably be to get to the lots. For the septic system designs, we are not proposing those at this time. Once we have the site use, then we will design the septic for the site development. The water pressure works.

P. Rowell: We have comments from Guy Chabot @ Manchester Water Works: "The lots in question Map 43, Lots 27 & 30 appear to be in our franchise limits. They front on Londonderry Turnpike and we have an existing 16" main in the street. A couple of preliminary questions:

- 1) What is to happen to the existing road? Will it be turned into a public road?

- 2) There is (hard to tell, plans lack info) I believe, a fire service feeding proposed lot 3. This main is private and cannot be used to feed the new lots. A new public main (extended from Londonderry Turnpike and in the proposed road) will have to be petitioned with the Board of Water Commissioners as part of the review process.
- 3) Available pressure appears to be 60 psi.

J. Hill: The roadway will be built to Town standards, but not sure the Town will take it over. Dan, we would request a waiver at platform 28.

D. Tatem: I had a discussion with Bernie. The roadway was to be private and not Town.

J. Gryval: The Board, whether Town or private, looks at safety.

M. Hoisington: Water pressure in the back?

P. Rowell: The main is private. A new public main would have to be petitioned.

M. Hoisington: All buildings must be sprinklered, and have hydrants every 500 ft. How wide are those roadways?

J. Hill: 25 ft. What about sidewalks for a commercial subdivision on a private road?

J. Gryval: The Board would like to see sidewalks.

M. Hoisington: The businesses could include offices, retail, and restaurants per the zone.

J. Hill: We are proposing a closed drainage. It is cleaner.

P. Rowell: Has the Planning Board thought about a wide lane without curbing in lieu of a sidewalk?

J. Gryval: Yes, the Board has discussed this on other projects.

D. Tatem: Yes, it is an option in the regulations.

P. Rowell: It would be easier for Dale to plow.

D. Tatem: I would be surprised if Dale would want this as a Town road. Typically a commercial subdivision road remains private.

J. Hill: USA owns the existing north lot. We will not alter Map 43, Lot 27.

M. Hoisington: Lots 1 & 2, how steep are they?

J. Hill: The platform constructed and designed with the lot development is less than 10%.

D. Tatem: So that lot all the way to the right will not front on the by-pass.

J. Hill: Correct.

P. Rowell: Jo Ann Duffy had a list of comments:

- 1) The rear portion of the site abuts MDR and requires a 25' buffer. Lot 11 will also require a 25' on three sides as it abuts residential uses.

J. Hill: Lot 11 is an existing lot and we are not touching it. We are not proposing any improvements within 25 ft of the rear. That will be addressed when we are developing the lots.

- 2) The zoning of the surrounding parcels should be noted, as it varies from lot to lot.

J. Hill: Yes, I will note.

- 3) The lot seems extremely steep for the size of the buildings proposed. Additional information will be required to determine suitability of these lots.

J. Hill: The lot has some steep areas. We looked at the Town requirements and we exceed those. A commercial lot with water available is 2,500 sq ft per use per the Town regulations. The lots are 2 ½ - 5 acres each, and we are proposing a single use per lot. It is 20,000 sq ft exclusive of setbacks and slopes at 25%. We fit the buildable circle inside those lots. The only lot at a 25% slope is in the back.

- 4) Where is the driveway for lot 1; through lot 3?

J. Hill: Lot 1 has a common access driveway a few hundred feet in. For lot 3, we will reconstruct the intersection (this lot is the existing facility) for a proposed driveway.

- 5) Site distance may also be an issue for lot 11.

J. Hill: Lot 11 - not proposing development or new access points.

- 6) Cul-de-sac shown on Cindy Drive is not correct; this road continue further.

J. Hill: I agree it should continue further.

- 7) Plan titled "Alternative A". Are there other alternates?

J. Hill: Alternative A is the only one proposed at this time.

J. Gryval: I don't like to speak on behalf of the Board. I will bring these comments back to the Board.

D. Tatem: I have asked all my questions.

D. Boyce: I have no comments.

M. Hoisington: Make sure the water pressure is adequate and that you don't exceed the grades.

S. Agrafiotis: The DOT entrance should be safe.

P. Rowell: Surplus material; all of a sudden there is a big pile in the woods. You talk about a two-phase driveway for the widening on by-pass 28. Example you build one for the 4 buildings, then you build another driveway for building #5 you tear up the first phase. Build the road the first time and be done with it vs. phasing and tearing up later. For driveways, the first 20 ft should be shown on the plan with the profile and drainage.

D. Tatem: The regulations are assuming a finished floor and grading.

P. Rowell: How to determine the building elevation on a lot when you are not sure what the use will be?

P. Tatem: Show the worst-case scenario.

P. Rowell: The subdivision plan should show all the required buffers, so the person buying the subdivision knows the requirements. Also, the front buffer hasn't been talked about and that should be clearly shown. I could see a potential McDonald's for this site saying the traffic is good. Extend Cindy Drive out and show the homes and any clearing lines on Cindy Drive.

J. Hill: We will have the building envelope area and grading up to that plan. We will show the utility extensions up to those lots.

D. Tatem: For the sight distance on by-pass 28, you will need to conform to DOT requirements and AASHTO. We recommend an intersection sight distance vs. a stopping sight distance. Map the entire site for wetlands. For the DES permit, wetland impacts on the proposed lots need to be shown.

J. Hill: The Town requires site-specific soils. Would the Town be looking at the entire site?

D. Tatem: Typically for the subdivision roadway and construction, but discuss the soils with the Board. Also, have specific notes for public/private roads. Drainage must be clearly noted for someone purchasing lots, so they are aware they are responsible for it.

P. Rowell: Is a traffic study needed with the alteration to by-pass 28?

D. Tatem: Yes, worst-case scenario for stacking, decel, and if a left-hand turn lane is needed.

J. Hill: We agree a left-turn lane is needed. We want to talk to the Board that any improvements will not be built until the site is developed.

D. Tatem: Head's Pond is the same way. Their traffic signal will be built when their site is developed.

P. Rowell: Referred to profile sheet – I am OK with some improvements on by-pass 28, but don't tear up that whole phase for a second phase.

D. Scarpetti: How long is that road?

J. Hill: Less than 1,200 ft.

D. Tatem: Aren't all commercial roads private? I can't see any advantage to the Town owning the road.

D. Boyce: Quality Drive became public.

J. Hill: Documents would need to be provided to the Board to review for private maintenance.

D. Tatem: Talk to Dale on the roadway.

J. Gryval: We have an application for a private road now to become public (Maurais).

D. Scarpetti: Have something more detailed for the use of the back 2 lots on that steep slope.

P. Rowell: If approved, it does become a lot of record.

D. Scarpetti: Even include the size of the buildings on the back 2 lots.

P. Rowell: I would suggest more of a tree buffer back there.

J. Hill: We will have roadway lighting.

D. Scarpetti: And you will have lighting around and on your buildings.

P. Rowell: Make sure the site plan lighting is specific. Take these comments back to your client. This is the type of subdivision we would like to see.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Rowell declared the meeting adjourned at 10.00am. The next TRC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 10, 2010, Hooksett Municipal Building, 2ND FLOOR ROOM 204.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator