

**HOOKSETT
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC)
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING – Room 204
Thursday, September 6, 2012**

CALLED TO ORDER

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

ATTENDANCE

Town of Hooksett

Jo Ann Duffy, Town Planner, Matt Labonte, DPW-Building, Leo Lessard, DPW, Diane Boyce, Recycle & Transfer, Mike Hoisington, Fire Dept., and John Gryval, Planning Board Chair.

Public Attendance: Donald Winterton, resident

1. (9:00 – 9:30am)

BIELIZNA, Diane & Stanley - plan #12-18 (Well, Septic, zoned MDR)

Don Duval, Duval Survey, Inc.

1266 Smyth Road, Map 48, Lot 19

Proposal to subdivide for 3 new lots.

Representing the Applicant

Don Duval, Duval Survey, Inc.

D. Duval: This is a 3-lot subdivision off Smyth Rd. to be serviced by septic and well. It is the same people (Bielizna) who recently did a subdivision on Prescott Heights. We have gone to the State for our subdivision approval. Wetlands are marked for the whole property, and we completed test pits. We have a couple of waivers: 1) topography on total site – remaining 18 acres with Bielizna new house, 2) building and wells within 200 ft. of subdivision – located within 3 lots, but not within 18 acres, 3) Site specific soil survey, and 4) underground utilities – want overhead like rest of neighborhood (150 ft. from pole to overhead is free).

Donald Winterton: It is not free if you want utilities underground.

D. Duval: Hooksett's new drainage requirements are quite extensive for on-site drainage. The wetland are tributary to the Merrimack River. I will check with Dan @ Stantec on this. The driveways will meet all sight distances. In previously talking with Leo, we will not be using the existing stonewall as a boundary. We will grant 25 ft. from the southerly line to the Town.

L. Lessard: You should document the 25 ft. to the Town on the plan.

J. Duffy: You are not removing the stonewall?

D. Duval: No. The note on the 25 ft. to the Town will be on the plan to be recorded.

D. Winterton: Is it a 4-lot major subdivision or a 3-lot minor subdivision? It is a 4-lot.

D. Duval: We are creating 3 new lots.

J. Gryval: If subdividing, the main (parent) lot then counts in addition to the 3 new lots. Therefore this is a 4-lot major subdivision.

J. Duffy: You will need to follow the checklist for a major subdivision. These lots require sprinklers. The Town has chosen to adopt it (sprinklers).

M. Labonte: We are one of ten towns that adopted it.

D. Winterton: We are one of nine towns.

J. Gryval: You will need to ask for a waiver of the sprinklers, if you will not be providing them.

M. Hoisington: A cistern is required, if the Planning Board grants the waiver for sprinklers. Referred to 13-D

D. Winterton: SB91 and HB109 stated that if towns already had the requirement for sprinklers, they could keep it.

M. Hoisington: Their last subdivision (Prescott Heights) was supposed to be sprinklered, but the Planning Board waived it after they approved the subdivision. If we (Fire) had known it was going to be waived, we would have required a cistern.

J. Duffy: The Town takes over the cistern.

D. Winterton: I would also question a waiver of underground utilities.

J. Duffy: This is an existing road.

D. Duval: It will be a waiver for all 3 houses to allow overhead utilities.

J. Duffy: The lots are quite steep?

D. Duval: We show a 75' x 100' square for the buildable area, but they can build the house where they want within it.

J. Duffy: You need to meet the driveway grade.

M. Labonte: When you apply for the driveway permit, the grade will be scrutinized.

D. Duval: I will add a note on the plan that during construction of the homes, the driveways will be at <10%.

J. Duffy: Who is doing driveway permits now?

L. Lessard: DPW.

J. Gryval: Do you assign a lot number when the plans are approved?

M. Hoisington: We assign numbers at time of building permit. Yes it would be easier to have assigned # at time of approval for emergency vehicles. I will look into this.

D. Duval: Allot of towns assign the lot # before we even go to the Planning Board.

J. Duffy: No 2nd TRC is required.

2. (9:30 - 10:20am)

MAURAIIS - plan #09-25 (Manchester Water, Sewer, zoned MDR)

Doug MacGuire, The Dubai Group, Inc.

49 Mammoth Road, Map 45, Lot 33 & Map 45, Lot 31-1

Proposal to subdivide lot 33 into 2 new lots and to make lot 31-1 into a conforming lot with frontage. Proposal also includes roadway improvements and Town Right-of-Way.

Representing the Applicant

Doug MacGuire, The Dubai Group, Inc.

D. MacGuire: We have made changes to the Maurais subdivision. We went to ZBA for redevelopment options on the back piece: ZBA included workforce housing, standard housing (density), proposed single-family homes, but site doesn't meet multi-family. Now we are proposing an open space subdivision which is supposed to be 20 lots, but we could only get to 17 lots. Original road sheet 9 shows looking at 700 ft. of road measured to center of the cul-de-sac and two standard subdivision lots (Map 45, Lots 33-1 & 33-3). For the new proposal we shortened the road to 472.19 ft. and eliminated two of these lots. Frist we want to amend the conditionally approved plan for 4-lots (plan #09-22). I have a few questions for staff to move forward.

J. Gryval: Was the existing road ever approved?

J. Duffy: It is privately owned.

D. Boyce: we don't collect there.

L. Lessard: We don't maintain it, therefore it's a driveway.

J. Duffy: This proposal would turn it into a public road. Did you meet the 500 ft. requirement?

D. MacGuire: It is proposed now for 472.19 ft., but we may be able to extend it to 500 ft. Otherwise we may ask for a waiver of this requirement instead. We are adding a road to provide access and have legitimate frontage for the Maurais house and existing lot.

J. Duffy: Robert Pantel, previous Highway Director, had said that less than 500 ft. of roadway and less than 5 houses weren't worth maintaining.

J. Gryval: You should comply with the regulations, whether you agree with it or not.

D. MacGuire: For the rear parcel to conform with the ZBA, we needed to have the 472.19 ft. of roadway. It is one or the other. Meet ZBA requirement or meet 500 ft. in Planning Board requirements. I can't see any obvious negatives of having 472.19 ft. of roadway. Per your regs, it is measured from the center line of the existing road to radii of the existing circle. Dan (Stantec) would interpret it this way.

L. Lessard: I would not have a problem with the 472.19 ft., but you would need a Planning Board waiver.

J. Gryval: The regulation is there, so you would need to tell us why you can't meet it.

L. Lessard: According to plow trucks, it meets the 500 ft.

M. Labonte: You are meeting the intention of the Development Regulations with the 472.19 ft. This is better than a hammerhead.

L. Lessard: You are not coming to a dead end with a hammerhead, and I can still get around to maintain it.

J. Duffy: So you will do an amendment to plan #09-22 first, then you will come back with a site plan for the back parcel.

D. MacGuire: Yes. I changed companies and now work with The Dubay Group, but have full release of the previous Woodland Design Group plans. In our previous application, we were not looking to do a defined sidewalk. We would extend the pavement 28 ft. wide road with a 4 ft. painted line down one side. We met the 40 ft. radius for the inner circle with a 24 ft. isle. However when you get down to the end of the painted line, one option is to slightly reduce the inner diameter of the circle by 4 ft. to allow the added width.

M. Labonte: Looks like you have room in the outer diameter.

D. MacGuire: Where do I add the 4 ft.? For the cul-de-sac, you would follow one-way even though it is 24 ft. wide to accommodate two-way traffic.

J. Duffy: What is the purpose for having it 40 ft.?

D. MacGuire: I believe for fire apparatus.

J. Duffy: Is there anything on the inside of that?

D. MacGuire: Sheet 10 has the collection point at the center of the cul-de-sac with a small detention pond on the outside of the cul-de-sac. Then there are no easements for the Town to maintain. When there is future development for the rear of the parcel, drainage would have to be moved and easements. Keep all within the ROW, then no easements are needed to access private property.

L. Lessard: Where to drain – pipe down?

D. MacGuire: It will still drain at same property on the plan. It is the maintenance to be down in ROW by Town.

L. Lessard: I like your drainage plan. Are you planning on landscaping in that area?

D. MacGuire: Mr. Frasier (abutter) is opposed to any easement access on his property to include sloping. DPW at the time of the 4-lot subdivision (#09-22) didn't want landscaping in ROW, because he didn't want to maintain it. Mr. Maurais has ownership of the 4 lots, and we can work with easements on those lots. If Mr. Frasier won't allow easements on his property, then we don't see a benefit of ROW.

J. Duffy: What about planting street trees vs. landscaping on private property?

L. Lessard: I can see Mr. Frasier's point. It is his property and he doesn't want to maintain landscaping.

D. MacGuire: We can work street trees into the cul-de-sac.

L. Lessard: Something is better than being bare.

D. MacGuire: Something planted that won't need an irrigation system to keep it going.

M. Labonte: The painted stripe delineated for the sidewalk on sheet 9 is different than sheet 1.

D. MacGuire: I only dead-ended to show on the plan today. Now I have a 24 ft. and cul-de-sac that will have a one-way circulation. If concerned, I can off-set 4 ft. in width to fit the curve, but it won't be a uniform curve.

M. Labonte: Keeping a radius a true circle slows traffic down.

D. MacGuire: We can maintain the 20 ft. or kick a radius here. But to Matt's point for traffic, a true radius slows traffic down. A fire truck would hug the inside radius.

L. Lessard: Does fire have a problem with the 20 ft.?

M. Hoisington: No, as long as I get my trucks around.

D. MacGuire: I will propose it at 20 ft. to have traffic control through here. Dale, previous DPW Director, was concerned with the structure for sewer and didn't want them in the road.

L. Lessard: I have no problem with sewer in middle of road. If we needed to maintain, we are not going on private resident lots.

J. Gryval: Why is it better to dig in ROW vs. roadway?

L. Lessard: It is 25 ft. to top of trench. For safety and OSHA it is easier to maintain in the roadway.

J. Gryval: Isn't it expensive?

L. Lessard: It is less expensive than fixing resident lots. This road will be overlaid by the Town in 15 yrs. It is a 1 inch riser for sewer and then done.

D. MacGuire: If sewer is in the center of the road, then cars are not hitting them. For the back parcel, sewer will connect to the front or have an easement through the back of the parcel. If in the back, sewer wants us to put a generator in.

L. Lessard: What does Bruce say about sewer?

D. MacGuire: Bruce wants sewer in the road. I will update the DOT driveway permit. Mr. Frasier should look at subdividing his back piece to make a lot, because it would have frontage onto our new road.

M. Hoisington: Hydrants?

D. MacGuire: There is a hydrant at Mr. Maurais' house and two more at the back in the future. Vertical granite curbing is required. Do you want swales with a retaining wall or curbing?

L. Lessard: Do they allow sloping curbing?

J. Duffy: I think they would need a waiver.

L. Lessard: If you put curbing, then you would have a raised sidewalk?

D. MacGuire: Raised sidewalks would need to be maintained by the Town.

L. Lessard: We would raise or plow blades and clear the sidewalks. I would let vertical curb go, and have sidewalks with no grass.

J. Gryval: I don't like to see kids walking in the road to get to the school bus. Even though there is a painted line, they will still walk in the road.

D. MacGuire: The previous proposal had a 1,000 ft. of road for 5 houses, so we weren't looking at granite curb.

M. Labonte: Now we only have one waiver for the cul-de-sac 500 ft.

J. Gryval: The question the Board will have is why can't you conform to the regulation.

D. MacGuire: ZBA granted a variance for 17 lots. If we lengthen the cul-de-sac, we may lose a lot.

M. Labonte: ZBA granted up to 17 lots.

D. Fitzpatrick: \$75.00 is the balance in the Stantec SPR escrow account.

J. Gryval: Sewer in that area has always been an issue. The Castle Drive developer left during construction, and the Town had to pay.

ADJOURNMENT

J. Duffy declared the meeting adjourned at 10:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator