

## Unofficial

### HOOKSETT ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Tuesday, November 12, 2013

HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING

SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Chris Pearson called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**ATTENDANCE:** Michael Simoneau, Gerald Hyde (arrived at 6:38 pm), Don Pare, Richard Bairam, Roger Duhaime, Chris Pearson, Jackie Roy, Phil Denbow, James Levesque, Council Rep.

**STAFF:** Matthew Lavoie, Code Enforcement Officer

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**August 13, 2013 Regular Meeting – M. Simoneau moved to approve the August 13, 2013 regular meeting minutes, with amendments. Seconded by R. Bairam. Motion carried.**

#### NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

**STERLING HOMES, LLC/SUMMIT VIEW SUBDIVISION**

**Case #13-14**

**South Bow Road**

**Map 12, Lots 1 & 24**

**LDR**

**A Special Exception is requested from Article 18, Section E (1a) of the Zoning Ordinance to permit construction of a road that crosses a wetland.**

Peter Julia (Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc.): This is a residential subdivision project located on the common boundary of the Hooksett and Bow town line off of S. Bow Rd. It is a conservation subdivision project, so the lots are a half acre or greater. The proposed roadway will cross through an existing wetland area that is presently bisected by an existing woods road. The alignment of the new proposed road, designed and to be built to town standard, crosses at the exact same location horizontally. Vertically there will be some fill which is why the impact is a bit larger. Peter will describe the wetland crossing because he has prepared the NHDS wetland permit associated with this crossing.

Peter Schauer (Schauer Environmental): I did the wetland mapping on the site. We are talking about two wetland crossings at approximately Station 6+00 and at Station 20+00 on the drawings. The impact at Station 6+00 will consist of three 24 inch culverts that are approximately 65' long. This wetland is a poorly drained red maple swamp. This wetland is fed by a watershed of approximately 20 acres. The culverts have been sized to accommodate a 100 year storm. Downstream from the crossing is a earthen dam man made pond that holds back a little bit of water in the springtime and during significant rainfall events. Our crossing will not alter this downhill pond and will allow water to pass through. During a 100 year event, the water will come to the top of the culverts only. It is a two ft. culvert. The water will raise two feet behind this wetland and continue to flow through.

C. Pearson: Is it a singular circular tube?

P. Schauer: Three 24 inch culverts. In the second location, is a wetland impact. We are filling 480 sq. ft of that wetland for a side slope to make sure it is a nice gradual slope. This wetland I am showing drains down through and into another brook that goes off-site. The remaining area of the land is going to be kept open space. There are no vernal pools in the development area.

C. Pearson: Could you please describe the second wetland again for me.

P. Schauer: It is a red maple swamp area, poorly drained. The impact is 480 sq. ft. The wetland impact is 5,930. We have a total wetland impact of 6,410 sq. ft.

C. Pearson: For staff, in the application, we need to clarify the exact numbers. We are going to have to do a site walk anyway, so can we get that clarified before our next meeting.

R. Duhaime: This is connecting to Merrill Crossing? How is the water being managed off of that road right now.

P. Schauer: I cannot answer that. I would have to have an engineer do that.

P. Julia: If you look at the presentation drawing, there is an existing storm water basin that handles all of the discharge presently from Merrill Crossing. The two projects, meaning the existing Merrill Crossing and the proposed, will not be linked in terms of a drainage system.

P. Simoneau: Is this in Bow?

C. Pearson: The wetland crossings are not in Bow.

J. Roy: On the Conservation Committee minutes there were three wetland crossings. Are there only two in Hooksett or are there three all together.

P. Schauer There are three. This was broken down into a north side and a south side.

J. Roy: It states something about meeting with the Dam Bureau as well, for the state. Is there an existing dam there now that will be removed? There is an earthen dam here that has been breached already. They are in discussions with the Dam Bureau about what is going to happen to that structure.

P. Julia: It was recently discovered by the Dam Bureau via a site walk and they are presently making a determination in regards to the dam. They have yet to classify it but they are going to. The owner believes the long term plan will to breach the earthen embankment at the southerly end. That will be worked out with the Dam Bureau in terms of size and design. I believe they want to maintain the waterway thru there. The impoundment, in my forensic opinion, was the result of earth excavation. There were some valuable materials there that were mined out and what is left is this impoundment. My speculation is that during that process, a lot of materials were pushed to the end and they improved it over time. There was a relatively inadequate eight inch pipe that is the main outlet to that impoundment. If you physically walk out there, it appears the pond drains naturally over the ground on the south easterly end of the basin. It drains so slowly there is no sign of erosion. The upstream watershed is approximately 20 acres. The hold that was left after the earth excavation is more than adequate to handle that drainage. That impoundment dries nearly complete at times during the year. It meets the criteria of the distance of greater than 10' from the top of the berm to the toe of the slope. What is not on this plan is the topography. There is 20' to 25' of relief from the top of this berm to the toe of the slope. At the back end, along the common boundary, that boundary line jogs because it is a natural ravine and there is no sign in instability. The new owner is left with this situation and they are going to deal with it in a legal manner in time.

R. Duhaime: Are some of the lots going into the retention pond area?

P. Julia: The boundary lines, that is correct. Those particular lots that you see are larger than the norm. All the residential construction will occur in the first 100' to 150'.

R. Duhaime: In other conservation sub-divisions they are smaller lots, so when you put the wetlands inside the lot that tends to send them back here. We required another subdivision to post where the wetlands are and put aluminum posts up to make sure people stay out of the wetlands, so they are not putting a shed out there or other issues.

P. Schauer: It is not a wetland now but it could become one being a detention pond.

C. Pearson: Is there a reason that you need to have that on these lots?

P. Julia: It is a slope issue. There is a significant amount of relief from approximately where the road is to the back part of where you see the wetland area. This is one of the only areas that plateaus enough so that we can excavate into the side hill, fill on the front end, and still not create a dam with this pond. This pond, approximately one acre in size, is designed to be a wet

pond. The reason is dilution. The significant amount of water meets the storm water criteria set forth by DES.

C. Pearson: What is there now? Is that area wet now?

P. Julia: No. There are no wetlands in the area of the proposed storm water basin.

**Application was read into record by Peter Julia**

C. Pearson: Can we get confirmation from staff that what he just stated is accurate. It is not in the prime wetland.

M. Lavoie: Yes it is accurate.

R. Duhaime: Do you have drawings of what the three culverts are going to look like?

P. Julia: No. Those plans are presently being revised. The initial plans that were submitted contained a cross culvert cross section but they are being revised and resubmitted. We are waiting to meet with Town of Bow Planning Board and collect their comments. Hopefully we can incorporate all planning and public input comments prior to releasing the final revised plan set which will include a cross section and more specific engineering data related to these culverts.

C. Pearson: Will we have those available by the next ZBA meeting?

P. Julia: Yes.

**Open to Abutters**

**No Abutter Comments**

**Closed to Abutters**

**Open to Public**

**No Public Comments**

**Closed to Public**

C. Pearson: We can schedule the site walk. Where would we best access for the site walk?

R. Duhaime: At the end of Merrill Crossing.

P. Julia: There is more room to meet there and park, but that would be the longer walk. The best place to see this crossing is to meet near S. Bow Rd. but there is not a lot of room. There is a turn-in that can accommodate 4-5 vehicles safely. People also park along the shoulder.

P. Schauer: If you have a pick up you can drive in. There is a field in there you can park in.

C. Pearson: We will meet at 8:30 am on November 16.

D. Pare: I cannot make it.

P. Julia: The drawings are in the works. I could bring an exhibit to the site walk. What will you be looking for. Could we stake something?

C. Pearson: We need to see exactly where the crossings are going to go. The square footage area on both, and the area where you are going to have the retention pond.

M. Simoneau: Can I confirm where we are going to meet?

P. Julia: I will make sure a project representative is there and parked along S. Bow Rd. There is still a real estate sign there.

***R. Duhaime motioned to continue until the next monthly meeting, December 10, 2013. Seconded by G. Hyde. Motion carried unanimously.***

**KOFFLER/GID, LLC/PETCO  
200 Quality Drive  
MUD3**

**Case #13-15  
Map 29, Lot 64-6A**

**A Variance is requested from Article 20A of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the installation of proposed Petco building and monument signage.**

Francis Dougherty (Koffler/GID and Owners of the Hooksett Common Shopping Center): I am here to talk about re-tenanting what is now the old Staples store; currently vacant. When I built this center back in 2003, there was certain zoning in place that related to signage. We realized the zoning changed. We are taking what is currently the vacant Staples store and dividing it in two. We will put in a 12,500 sq. ft. Petco as well as a future retail or restaurant use that is not defined yet so our application is limited to Petco only.

C. Pearson: What is left after the 12,500?

F. Dougherty: 7,950. In evaluating the current Petco signage proposal, I took a look at what we had in 2003 when we built the project. With regard to the previous Staples store I have a couple of numbers. One that looked at the signage if you include the red banding around the Staples

sign. I am not sure how zoning interprets that. I know when I built Bed, Bath and Beyond, Ken Andrews, at the time, interpreted that the black tile behind Bed, Bath and Beyond as part of signage. What Staples had was about 624 sq. feet of signage on the front. If you do not include the red banding we had about 221 sq. feet. Our proposal is 188 sq. feet. That is the Petco sign at the entrance as well as a secondary sign that says "Grooming" on the side. If I interpreted the current signage by-law correctly, we would be allowed 98 sq. feet. That is the total number for all the signage on the front which is less than what we had for Staples and more than I think is allowed for current zoning.

R. Duhaime: There will be other signage out by road?

F. Dougherty: Yes. The application seeks permission to replace the Staples panel, which was on the monument sign, with a Petco sign which is 37% smaller than what Staples was. We are going to have two-thirds of that existing panel from what was Staples for Petco, and a small panel available in the future for the second retailer.

C. Pearson: Is the Petco portion of the sign consistent with other Petco shops?

F. Dougherty: It is. In the application it has one. I took a look at a Petco in Westford, MA. We were trying to see what these look like at night. On Pg. 4 is a picture of what the Petco looks like in Westford. It is slightly closer than the view you might have from Quality Dr. but it is close to what you would see.

C. Pearson: Is that the same size?

F. Dougherty: It is similar but not exact. In terms of the size of the letters it is slightly smaller than Kohl's and smaller than Target.

J. Roy: Where is his signage of the other tenant going to be on the building?

F. Dougherty: We don't know yet. I am going to have to modify the facade to accommodate that as well as putting in a store front. We don't know what it is going to look like, or if we will have to ask for a variance for current zoning based on that.

C. Pearson: Matt, can you verify his calculation.

**Application was read into record by Francis Dougherty.**

F. Dougherty: For the record, I believe the distance from the right-of-way that I used was 417' in terms of calculating what is allowed for signage.

M. Lavoie: Did you calculate all signs together?

F. Dougherty: I calculated the 188 sq. feet sign as the sign over the Petco and the “Grooming” sign, in total. The 98 sq. feet is what I assumed signage was allowed based on the set-back from the Quality Drive right-of-way.

R. Duhaime: I see that it is basically LED lighting. Do you know how bright it is? Is the one on Pg. 4 how bright it is going to be?

F. Dougherty: It is the best representation I could find of what it will look like.

R. Duhaime: Do you know if that is LED lighting down there?

F. Dougherty: I believe that it is. It is a fairly new store.

### **Open to Abutters/Public**

Paul Godbout (Public): How soon are you planning on moving in?

F. Dougherty: If I were to get the vote this evening, I would be submitting building permit plans this week and probably opening the store the first quarter of next year. We will start construction just after January 1.

### **Closed to Abutters/Public**

C. Pearson: Matt, I don't know if you already verified that or did you just verify that now?

M. Lavoie: We can go by the sq. footage that he proposed. That is fine.

R. Duhaime: Do the calculations include the signage out on the street?

M. Lavoie: That is a different sign.

M. Simoneau: So there are three signs?

C. Pearson: Yes. There are two signs on the building.

F. Dougherty: The monument sign would be a separate area than what I am presenting here.

C. Pearson: This is consistent with a lot of the things we are looking at on the Sign Committee and trying to fix a lot of the regulations on our sizes to conform to standards of what is out there.

P. Denbow: Did you say the square footage for the new store was 12,500 and the existing left is about 7,000+?

F. Dougherty: Approximately 7,930 plus a common hallway.

***G. Hyde motioned to grant a variance on Case #13-15, 200 Quality Drive, from Article 20A of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the installation of a proposed Petco sign, 188 sq. feet. Seconded by R. Bairam. Opposed by R. Duhaime. Motion carried.***

F. Dougherty: As a point of clarification, is there an opinion on the request for the monument sign? I found it difficult to understand what current zoning allowed in that case so I presented it as the proposal.

C. Pearson: The variance was for the 188 sq. feet on the store.

F. Dougherty: I believe the request sited that plus the monument sign is presented here.

C. Pearson: What is your case on the monument signage?

F. Dougherty: It is smaller than the one I had, but I had difficulty understanding how an existing sign is treated.

C. Pearson: I don't think there is a variance needed for that.

M. Simoneau: That is the third sign. Sign C.

F. Dougherty: If one is not needed that is great but I want to be clear.

C. Pearson: Matt, please confirm that.

M. Lavoie: It is not needed. It is an existing monument sign. The monument size is not changing, just the sign.

**MANCHESTER WATER WORKS      Case #13-16**

700 Quality Drive                      Map 29, Lot 64-2

MUD3

**A Special Exception is requested from Article 14, Section B of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the installation of a well/water facility on the property that will draw water from beneath the river for an added water supply to their overall system. A Public Utility Facility is listed under Permitted Uses by Special Exception.**

Jeff Kevan (TF Moran): Manchester Water Works owns Map 29, Lot 64-2. It is located on Quality Drive. Kimball Drive enters the property on the south end. There are three residential house lots at the north end that access from the property via a private access way. We are here for a



special exception to allow a public utility use within the MUD 3 zone. Across the street from Quality Drive is the ice hockey facility, BJ's and the Budweiser facility. What we are proposing is to utilize this property for Manchester Water Works. Their intention is to drill a well that has leaders out underneath that will draw water through about 20' to 25' of soil under the river bottom and bring that in as a water source for their facility. Once they have drilled the well they will run quantity and quality testing. They will determine what type of and if treatment is necessary. We would probably have a small treatment facility on the property as well. One operator would be on the site at any given time so there will not be a lot of traffic or noise on the property. It is a 7.17 acre site. We are proposing to address some of the access by providing an additional right of way for Kimball Dr. up to Quality Dr. and adjusting the access easement at the north end so that would come off of Quality Dr. and create a shorter access to those three homes. From your standpoint, we are strictly here for a special exception to allow this public utility use within an MUD district. Does anyone have questions concerning the use?

C. Pearson: What exactly are you putting in there?

J. Kevan: Basically we are going to drill a well that has radio feeds out underneath the river. The initial project is to put in a well. The well would be at the southern end of the property. Ultimately, I am guessing there will be a small building there for some form of treatment.

R. Duhaime: You don't know what the building will be, size, anything like that?

J. Kevan: Not at this point and time. We won't know until they have drawn the water and bring it through the soil as a form of pretreatment. That reduces the amount of treatment that will need to be done. Until they have gone through the process and tested it, they won't know the specifics. Then they would go through Planning Board process for that part of it.

R. Duhaime: So the water is going to be pumped into the water line basically already there?

Dave Miller (Manchester Water Works): We don't know the ultimate build-out and what it is going to look like there. We are planning to put this radio collector well on the southern portion of the site. There is an 8" or 10" water line that goes on Quality Drive. There is a larger diameter, I believe it is a 20" river crossing, that we did a couple of years ago to another site on the opposite side of the I-93 overpass also on Kimball Drive. The actual location of a treatment facility could be at either one of those locations. We simply won't know until we do this quality and quantity evaluation after we construct the well. If we need to provide treatment, and I think it is safe to say we will need to provide some level of treatment beyond what we get from the natural geology of the riverbank, the location of that facility would either be at the site we are

discussing this evening or the other site that we own about a mile south on Kimball Drive.

R. Duhaime: Is that on the Manchester side?

D. Miller: It is on the Hooksett side.

C. Pearson: What does that abut?

D. Miller: That is on Kimball Drive. In the vicinity of Riverside Plaza off of 3A. At this point and time we just don't have enough information to favor one site over the other.

R. Duhaime: Have you done any testing on the site?

D. Miller: Yes. We have been working with Wright Pierce Engineers since 2007. We initially were looking at a well located on the other site but, due to the de-icing materials and the I-93 and 3A interchange, there was some concern about sodium and chloride levels at that withdrawal location. We looked upstream and found this suitable soil material. Nice sand and gravel deposit. We did a 12" diameter test well at this location and determined the water quality and quantity are sufficient there for further exploration and to construct this radio collector well.

J. Roy: In your testing how much quantity are you anticipating on getting out of there?

D. Miller: Approximately 6 to 8 million gallons per day.

J. Roy: With 6 to 8 million gallons per day, what size treatment facility would you need?

D. Miller: It will depend on what level of treatment will be required. We won't know that until we do some extensive pumping tests and analysis once the well is constructed.

J. Roy: So your testing hasn't determined the type of water quality yet?

D. Miller: We have preliminary water quality results that are very good and very encouraging. There are a lot of questions that still need to be answered. I expect that there will be some level of treatment required, possibly some filtration, but it is too early to tell.

J. Roy: This will be serving all of the Manchester residents?

D. Miller: We also serve portions of Hooksett and five other communities in the Manchester

area.

P. Denbow: The numbers that you just provided. What do those look like compared to the existing site that you already have? You said there are two sites. Is the 6 million gallons per day that you were talking about at the facility we are talking about now, the one that is south of 93, or both?

D. Miller: The well will be located at this site. Whether or not we pump that water to a facility there or down the street a mile is to be determined. It will depend on what level of treatment is required. The site to the south is larger and it will depend on the proximity of a suitable water main to accept the treated water. There is more access at the other location. There are a lot of factors that we will have to juggle and we haven't gone through that exercise yet.

J. Levesque: Are the houses that are on Kimball Drive supplied by wells?

D. Miller: They are supplied by private wells.

J. Levesque: Will drawing so much water have any affect on their wells?

D. Miller: It is not anticipated to but that is something we will be investigating as part of the withdrawal and pump testing once the well is constructed.

J. Levesque: How many gallons a day?

D. Miller: About 6 to 8 million gallons per day.

J. Levesque: If you were to affect one of these wells, what recourse do these people have?

D. Miller: We will give them the best water we can provide from Manchester Water Works. That would be part of the New Hampshire DES permitting exercise that we will have to go through. Any impacts will have to be mitigated.

J. Roy: I know we are talking about just your structure, but those three houses on the north end are on a private road for Kimball Drive. You had mentioned connecting that to Quality Dr. I am curious how that will impact their daily life with a public road access to their private lots.

J. Kevan: They have a private passageway that runs through the property right now. It is not even an easement. They have rights to drive through the property. We have plans of the

driveway if you want them. We met with Public Works and talked about this. It would remain a private road similar to the way it is posted right now. It would come off just south of the cul-de-sac and loop in. Instead of having to maintain gravel access all the way through the property, we are giving them a paved driveway and it can be controlled and limited in various fashions but it is a private way to those three homes.

J. Roy: The road from Quality Dr. to those three homes will be private only?

J. Kevan: Correct. It will be a private access easement to those three homes.

D. Pare: When you say you are going to provide them water what does that mean? You are going to go underneath the ground and give them access to water?

D. Miller: If there is any impact to their wells, or if they desire to be connected to the system then it would be reasonable to assume that we would provide a water main. There is a connection out to the Quality Drive pipeline that exists already. That is a possibility. The details of that I don't have at this point, but it is not a stretch at all to provide them with water if there is an issue.

P. Denbow: If we allow the use for this, are we allowing the use for the treatment plant too or is that something they have to come back for? If we allow this use does it grandfather that in?

C. Pearson: The variance is for a public utility facility.

P. Denbow: So it can cover everything?

J. Kevan: The intent is to get an approval to allow a public utility. The lot is substantial in size. It is seven acres. There is plenty of room for us to provide adequate buffers to the neighborhood to the south or north. There is very low impact as far as what is there. There is no noise generated. There may be some pumps but they will be inside of a building. The noise would be within that structure. There is no traffic created by this use other than an operator.

P. Denbow: If everything went as planned and you got great flow of water but bad quality what kind of footprint would you be talking for a building?

J. Kevan: I don't know if we can estimate that size at this point.

D. Miller: For a treatment facility for that small quantity it would blend. There is plenty of room

on that site. I cannot speculate, but it would easily be designed to blend into the neighborhood to the best extent possible. That is something we would want to do in this neighborhood.

R. Duhaime: Do you have anything existing like this anyplace else?

D. Miller: This will be the first radio collector well, permitted, in New Hampshire. There are several throughout the country. I believe there are only one or two others in New England.

R. Duhaime: Do you have any idea of a treatment plan that we could look at? What do you have out by the lake?

D. Miller: I would be happy to give you a tour of the Manchester Water Works water treatment plant, but that is a 50 million gallon per day facility, so, based on size, it would not give you the same flavor.

C. Pearson: Are there any odors?

D. Miller: It is not a waste water facility. It is a drinking water facility. It will depend on the type of treatment provided and if there are a lot of solids we will be removing. That is unlikely given that we are going to be straining this water through 30+ feet of river bank. It is going to be a very high quality water. I would expect the residuals to be minimal in terms of quantity and odor. It is something that is easily controlled in the drinking water residual world.

C. Pearson: Would we see that in the Manchester facility?

D. Miller: We have residuals lagoons on site that you can see. We have five earth and pond that are maybe 3' deep, full of sludge.

G. Hyde: It peaked my interest that this is the first radio collector well in New Hampshire. Why aren't there more?

D. Miller: Most of the towns that are taking water from the Merrimack River have traditional water withdrawals. They need a lot more quantity. We are looking for something in the small to medium range in terms of quantity. Also, the natural geology has to be very specific for this type of well to work properly. Hooksett has beautiful sand and gravel deposit in that area that we are looking to take advantage of that. It doesn't exist everywhere along a river. Of the 6 to 8 million gallons of water we pull through this well, about 85% to 90% of that will be river water that strains through that natural geology. The other 10% would be groundwater. That is why it is

very unlikely to have much, if any, impact on the neighboring wells but we would be closely monitoring that.

G. Hyde: What type of environmental impact does a radio collector well have?

D. Miller: The way this is constructed, if you can picture a concrete cylinder on its end, maybe 12' to 15' in diameter concrete caisson, that goes down to bed rock, which is 70' to 75' below the surface at this location. Once you get to the bottom a concrete slab is poured and then they hydraulically jack out these laterals underneath the river. All you see from the surface is a 15 foot diameter caisson that could be at ground surface level or slightly above and then could be capped off with a small structure or a concrete slab. There is no impact to navigation and virtually no impact to the river ecology. The flows, compared to the run of the river at that location, are virtually insignificant to the amount of water that is going through that section of the river. This is a very low impact method of water withdrawal.

D. Pare: How far from the river is this caisson that you are driving into the ground?

D. Miller: It is probably between 50' and 100' from the edge of the river.

D. Pare: How much water runs through the Merrimack?

D. Miller: Off of the top of my head I do not know the river flow, but this is going to take a small fraction of one percent of the water from the river.

J. Roy: You said there would be a minimal amount of personnel that will be there until you have a facility. Once you are in Manchester, I know it is a 50 million gallon per day facility so it is hard to compare, but how many people work there? How large is that facility?

D. Miller: The water supply division is roughly 20 people. There are 11 operators, including a chief operator. We work three shifts, 24/7, 365 days a year, there is always somebody there operating the facility. We have a small laboratory staff, watershed patrol staff who patrols the 42 sq. mile water shed that our system is in. We also have a professional forester to do foresting activities on the property that we own. There wouldn't be anyone at this location unless there is some testing going on, which will occur over the next year or two at various times. If there is a facility located there, I would expect there would be one operator working at each shift.

J. Roy: You do not have an idea of the size of the facility that would be needed? I am not going to hold you to that but it really does make an impact on neighbors, traffic and everything else.

D. Miller: I don't think it would be as large as this building.

J. Kevan: If you are looking at the property it is 600' in length. Even if I had a building that was 150' or 200' long I would still easily have 100' or 200' of buffer on either end to separate myself from the residents. It is a long narrow property that lends itself to provide those buffers which, I think, we are willing to commit to.

R. Duhaime: Not including a treatment plant though?

J. Kevan: If I had a treatment facility that was 100' or 200' it still gives me a buffer of 100' or 200' between that building and any adjacent abutters. The only thing would be to Quality Dr. and Quality Dr. has some large box commercial buildings. This would be much smaller than any of those.

G. Hyde: You talked about the plausibility of connecting water lines to properties if there is any impact on wells. People who have wells are very protective of them. Without being able to provide exact details, at whose expense would you connect water to these buildings, if needed?

D. Miller: Most, if not all the expense, would be on Manchester Water Works.

G. Hyde: I know that is fairly expensive and there is impact on people.

D. Miller: It depends on how much pipe you have to put in the ground and the size of the connections. There is a lot that goes into that, but if we are already building infrastructure there it might not be too bad, but that would be Manchester's expense.

J. Roy: Are the public utilities subject to the same shore line permitting as everyone else or are you exempt from all of that? Do you have to go through the state for this?

D. Miller: I don't know the answer to that but I believe we are exempt. We have already had several discussions with New Hampshire DES, EPA, the Town of Hooksett folks and residents. We have been doing work at that site for the last couple of years and even more down the street at our other location. As far as what permits are required, that is part of our consulting engineer's work. TF Moran is working specifically on the zoning issue and the site subdivision plan. Those questions will be answered.

J. Kevan: I think you will see DES will take it as a bundle and address all environmental issues.

I'm sure they will consider the shore line protection rules and regulations as far as staying back, all structures need to be 50' beyond the ordinary high water mark, and consider the natural buffers in that bank.

J. Roy: I believe with your shore line permitting, anything with 250' would have to be approved and you would have to show your structures on a plan so you would have to have some idea of what your structure is.

J. Kevan: That is correct. Right now they are going to get a well in, start running testing, and determine the kind of flows and quality they have. They can design from there.

P. Denbow: So if you are just drawing water, most of the equipment is like deep well pumps and everything is located below the ground, for the most part. When you start to do any type of treatment that is done up on the surface. In reality, there is going to have to be some level of treatment. Based on how much treatment you need, that will be the size building you need to accommodate that?

J. Kevan: Correct.

C. Pearson: If you go forward with DES and have a plan, if you are just doing wells, do you need the special exception now? Can't we see after your work with DES is complete. I think your neighbors would probably appreciate that.

J. Kevan: Manchester Water Works does not want to invest money and put this well and radio collection system in the ground, and I don't know that we could do that, without having a special exception as a public utility.

C. Pearson: Will you have it with DES that it is the well first?

D. Miller: We have to build the well to test the water and then work with them. We have to go through the large ground water permitting application process and we can't do that without a well to pump water to provide the information they are going to require. That would put us dead in the water if we couldn't get this approved up front. This well is probably going to be \$1.5 to \$2 million to install.

J. Kevan: If you want to state that Manchester Water Works will obtain all necessary permits in NH and adequate buffers will be provided to the residents on the north and south end of the property we don't have a problem with those being conditions of this approval.



C. Pearson: That is something to consider. If I am an abutter, there are questions on what this will do to property values, noise, smell, etc. Where is the benefit to them and what value is it to them. There is no value unless you offer something that they can walk away with. That is something you may want to think about; seeing the building size and buffers, whether you are going to put a treatment plant there or not. We would be granting you a blank slate.

J. Kevan: I don't think it is a blank slate. We have stated this is a small facility, three shifts with one or a couple of people so traffic is not impact or issue. Whether the pump is drawing the water or there is a treatment facility that will be within a structure and the noise can be mitigated within that structure.

C. Pearson: Give us an idea of what structure will look like, what the noise level will be. I wouldn't want a possible water treatment plant and a pump station next to me unless I know what it will look like.

J. Kevan: As far as the traffic, I don't know what else you would like. The volume of water drives the size of the facility and the number of operators. They can state they are going to have a single operator or two at any given time. They can't depict the size and shape without knowing the kind of treatment required. They are doing this step by step. We need the special exception to allow the use on the property. We are trying to say that we will provide adequate buffers so any facility will be screened from abutters. If it is seen from Quality Dr. it doesn't make much difference because it has structures larger than this. Noise and odors will be mitigated within the structure so there won't be any impact to abutters.

R. Duhaime: As far as buffers, you also want to keep the river looking appealing. You are in the water business so I understand you won't do anything to damage the water. We know you want to make it fit the area but you have residents next door. It is hard to juggle that when we don't have anything to juggle with.

D. Miller: If you think about a water treatment facility you have 1) water withdrawal well 2) you have to run it through three different processes, which should be minimal in this instance 3) chemical treatment 4) physical treatment like a filter. It is just equipment, water running through it and some chemicals that we use to treat the water. There is not a lot going on other than some pumping. That could be submersible pumps down 70' below in that collector well or they could be surface level inside of a building. There would be an emergency power generator that would be exercised once a month. A chemical delivery truck, on occasion, would be coming through and unloading their chemicals. This could very well be an unmanned facility, we don't

know.

D. Pare: You are pumping 6 to 8 million gallons. What if everything goes so well you are pumping 25 million gallons?

D. Miller: We can't do that with this well. It is not designed for that kind of volume.

D. Pare: Would that facility grow if things work out better than you anticipate?

D. Miller: They operate at their best capacity when they are new and over time, as the soils start to consolidate, there will be a reduction in efficiency. We will have to go in and do some maintenance; redevelop the laterals under the river to restore it to that close to original capacity. We will find out up front the quantity that well can provide.

D. Pare: Where does the research come from that you already know that you might have to go underground?

D. Miller: We have done a number of test borings where you drill down to bedrock and sample the soil. We have also done those on and off shore. We have a profile of what those soils strata look like in those locations. We have done a 12" diameter pump test where we were withdrawing about a one million per day flow for about a six or seven day period. We used that pump test with a bunch of monitoring wells, including some of the neighbors wells, to measure the impact on withdrawals, determine the zone of influence of that well, what it was doing to depress the groundwater, and then provide that information into a hydraulic model to predict what the total flow could be from a radio collector well at that location.

D. Pare: Do these tests show odor and everything that comes out of this water?

D. Miller: The water is like well water, virtually no odor. The benefit of pulling this water through 25', 30' or 40' of gravel before it surfaces into the well, is a tremendous amount of natural treatment that is going on. It is a very high quality of water which we are hoping is sufficient to minimize the level of treatment that will be required.

P. Denbow: I have been to the plant at Massabesic and noise and odor do not concern me. I would think you could do a best case and worst case scenario and give us an idea of the sq. footage of the facility we are talking about and what it might look like. I know you can put in buffers, but I think we can come up with ball parks. For the abutters, regardless of the what the buffers look like, you are still going to see it from the river. We should be able to see some kind

of representation, best case, worse case or a combination of both. I think that would help us a lot.

### **Open to Abutters**

Cathy Barlette (Lot 29-30): The more I'm hearing the more concerned I am getting. You are coming here to ask for zoning privileges and they are writing a blank check for you. There is a lot of vagueness. We haven't done this before. We are only three houses, then there is the other side of Kimball Drive, but I think you would come here with more knowledge of what you are trying to do. I don't know if you are intentionally being vague or you don't know what you are doing. You have the well on the other side of 93. Is there any way you can test that water to determine what the quality is going to be so you know what size facility you would put in?

D. Miller: We did a test well there in 2007, and we found that the water quality was not up to our standards and that is why we moved to this site. I apologize for the vagueness. I am convinced that this project is going to work out extremely well for Manchester Water Works and our new neighbors. We just don't have the information that we need to definitively know the size of the building.

C. Barlette: Then you should not be asking for the check and the privileges.

D. Miller: How would you suggest that I do it then?

C. Barlette: I have no idea but after it is done it is going to affect people and it will be too late to change it. You and all of these people are living someplace else but we are living there. What if I am sleeping in the middle of the night and the chemical truck comes to unload things.

D. Miller: Between 8am and 4pm is when we allow deliveries.

C. Barlette: Let's say you find out the quality of the water is the same as the well on the other side of the underpass. What are we looking at for the size of a treatment facility?

D. Miller: We have already determined that the water quality is better than the well on the other side of the overpass. That is why we are here and that is why we want to build this radio collector well in that location.

C. Barlette: So would it be fair to say that, in a worse case scenario, it would be a 10,000 or 15,000 square foot facility?

C. Pearson: I think that is what we are all struggling with.

J Kevan: I think we were trying to not come in and take a stab in the dark, but that is what we are being asked to do. We can come up with a best and worst case scenario, as far as size of the building, what we would propose to have it look like and where it would be approximately sited on the property. We thought that by saying we would have the 100' to 200' buffer that would be sufficient, but clearly you are asking for more. We had come here being vague because this is a multi-step process.

C. Barlette: There is some talk going on about buffers, but the three houses that are down there have the right of way on that road. I don't know where that building might go, but it is in our deed to be able to drive through there.

J. Roy: Do you have a feasibility study to spend \$2 million on a well?

D. Miller: Yes. The study we have done to date has revealed that it is highly feasible to get a good quality and quantity water supply at that location.

J. Roy: So the feasibility study only brought you up to the point of the well, or best and worst case scenarios?

J. Kevan: The feasibility tells them they have a site that will function as this radio draw well and give them good quality and volume. Until they put well in ground and start the process, they won't know specifics.

J. Roy: How much did you spend on the 2007 well test?

D. Miller: Roughly \$250,000 and then another \$200,000 at this location. We are close to \$500,000 already, not including the cost of the land.

Paul Godbout: (73 Kimball Drive): I have a lot of concerns and questions. You said you tested the water at the location below the bridge and also the location 20' from my property line. You said you can tell the water quality is good at my property line, but then you also said you could not do the proper testing until you drill this cistern down. I don't understand why it would take \$2,000,000 of drilling this well head down to figure out how good the water is when you already told us it is good.

D. Miller: At the other site and this location we are looking for red flags. We got to a stopping point at the other location when we saw high levels of sodium and chloride that were unacceptable. We did not find that at the location next to your property. We have done the requisite work and are confident in the ability of that site to work out in a systematic form. This is not unique, it is how it is done in the industry. We have enough information to provide a good model that has led to the preliminary design of this well and we have every reasonable expectation that we are going to get the quantity and quality we need. We need to treat the water to a certain level in order to be permitted for a drinking water supply. We won't know that until we pull the actual quantity through that well, and get it to a steady point where it is pulling the water that we are going to get for the foreseeable future from that location using this withdrawal method. This is the only way we will satisfy our regulators. This has put all of us in a difficult situation. There are unknowns and I understand that. We are so confident this is going to be an excellent supply that we are willing to put down \$2,000,000 to build this well and go through the permitting process. If it is so untenable to the neighbors, we can put the treatment facility at the other location. I will provide some conceptual building layouts. We just weren't prepared to do that this evening.

P. Godbout: What is the buffer supposed to be between a residential house and a mixed-use commercial or industrial building? What is the standard setback for that?

M. Lavoie: I believe this land is zoned mixed medium density residential. It would just be a public utility on that property. I believe it is a 15 foot setback.

D. Miller: That is the setback, but the permitted uses could be personal services, businesses, recreation facilities. Similar to what is across the street. You are asking about a reasonable buffer. A minimum buffer would be 50' that would be natural or planted. That would be double rowed evergreen trees. We would be siting the building and providing a adequate buffer whether it be 50' or more in order to screen you from this facility.

P. Godbout: There is a lot of talking about the building, the pump house and the noise, but Dave brought up a lot more concerns. The sludge factor with mosquitoes. EEE is in Hooksett and we already have a ton of mosquitoes. I have concerns as to where the access road would be. I know we have to figure out the buildings first, but the road map and how it is laid out has to be right for it to work for everyone. We have 1000' of river frontage and the well head is going to be 30' or 50' off of my property line. I am not sure if there is a way we could move that north.

C Pearson: Do you know where the well is going to be placed?

D. Miller: The agreement we have with our engineering firm currently is to site the well. The test we did was very close to the property line and that has been a concern of ours. One of their first tasks, once they start gathering more geological information, is to move the well as far north as reasonably possible still keeping with the quality and quantity we are looking for. I can't tell you what that is going to be. The well itself is one thing. The building we can put anywhere on this site or the site down the road. The well can be a very low profile, ground level concrete slab that you can buffer from view.

P. Godbout: I see on the map that there are iron rods to be set. Is that for a fence?

D. Miller: No that is for property boundary demarcation.

P. Godbout: Do you plan on putting a fence up here?

D. Miller: There is a strong possibility that we would want to fence in any facility we put in.

P. Godbout: What would that look like?

D. Miller: I can be any kind of fence that is mutually agreeable with our neighbors that provides the security that will be required.

P. Godbout: If you are going to be putting up a fence, possibly chain link and rumors of barbed wire on top of that fence, it would reduce the value of my property. If you make these site changes and my value goes from \$500,000 to \$300,000, what kind of recourse do I have?

C. Pearson: One of the criteria they have to pass is that it will not decrease property values.

P. Godbout: I am concerned about the noise. The last time they did the drilling the house shook all day. The noise level of the drilling is an inconvenience and there are trucks everywhere.

C. Pearson: How long does the drilling take?

D. Miller: It could be four to six months to construct the well, maybe as much as eight months. It is a different type of construction than we did for the test well. It is not encasing from the surface into the ground.

P. Godbout: Why did the access road change from the original plans that we were given. The

original plans with the models had an open looking concept with grass and a little well head. Not really any impact to the road. Now everything is changing with additional access roads. Why?

D. Miller: If you look at the existing access gravel road, if there is going to be a building there in the future, we wanted to provide your three neighbors, at the end of Kimball Dr., better access out to Quality Dr. As far as the access at your end, we could make that work in a number of ways. We could have it so only Manchester Water Works or delivery vehicles would go through an electric gate or fence or we could keep it open. That is up for debate and discussion.

J. Kevan: It is a dead end road that doesn't have much of a turn around. Public works either wants a cul-de-sac at the end, some type of turn around, or access back to Quality Dr. so it is a drive through type of set up for plows and so forth. We can talk to them about alternatives or if we could gate this access up to Quality Dr. so it is only open when they are plowing

C. Pearson: Have you talked to Fire about what they would want going through there?

J. Kevan: They want the same set up, to be able to turn around or pull back up to Quality Dr. We could coordinate either leaving the design the way we have it, which is a road up to Quality Dr. with a gate, or we could go back and talk to them about what type of turn around they want.

C. Pearson: Have you gone to TRC to discuss any of this with them?

J. Kevan: At this point we don't have a site plan to go in front of the TRC with.

P. Godbout: Last time you did the drilling it was not supposed to impact the well. It never impacted my water flow, but within about three months of having the test wells dug, I had to replace my deep water pump twice because the pounding in the ground stirred all of the sediment up. I have had to replace my filters every month instead of every three months for my in-house filtering system. There is some impact even if it is not on water flow.

J. Roy: How long will it take for everything to settle once the construction is over?

D. Miller: I don't have good enough answer for that but I can say there won't be any drilling for this well. The caisson is set down to bedrock by digging, not drilling. The laterals are hydraulically jacked, pushed not drilled, under the river. The material is flushed back into the well and pumped out. There is not going to be that pounding, drilling action to construct this well.

Joe Darrah: (71 and 71A Kimball Drive): I don't have problem with the well going in, but every time somebody comes down there wanting to improve the area, they always want to fix our road by adding access. We don't want it. They want do it for their own benefit. They have seven acres and there is no need for them to put an access road across from our houses. We live down there for a reason. Back when BJ's and everyone went in there, the Fire Dept. said the access at the north end of that road is suitable. I don't want the people coming down Quality Dr. and turning around in our driveways. They say they drew a million gallons out a day and it did not affect anyone's well. When Public Service lowered the river to fix Manchester dam my well went dry. I have a dug well and am only down 20'. When they lower that river I am out of water. If you are going to be taking 6 to 8 million gallons of water out per day, I am going to be out of water. When BJ's went in it was supposed to have a gas station. They were going to give everybody water and that is why there is a main at the end of that berm at Quality Dr. Someone sat at my mother's table with me at 69 Kimball Dr. and said we would get water. Now we are told we will get water if we have trouble. In the meantime, I don't have water and now it is going to come to a debate with someone else as to who is going to pay for whether I have water or not. What is in it for us. We have had everyone come in saying what they are going to do for us. It never happens but their intentions are good. I am tired of hearing how much better they are going to make Kimball Dr. for us when, it is no better and is usually worse.

R. Duhaime: Why do you need 6 to 8 million gallons? What is the well going to do for the Manchester Water Works systems and the Hooksett residents? Is it going to lower the water?

D. Miller: Lake Massabesic, that has been the supply for Manchester and six surrounding communities including Hooksett for the last 140 years, has a limited quantity. We are currently at about 90% of the safe yield of that lake. We have been doing projections for many years. Some of the projections we did in the mid 80's were looking at us already having an additional supply by now. What we have seen in the last decade is a leveling off of consumption. A lot of that has to do with the low flow toilets, shower heads, faucets, downturn in the economy, etc. We are starting to see that creeping up again. This 6 to 8 million gallons is going to get us another 30 to 50 or more years of reliable supply before we have to look for more water depending on how our franchises grow. This has been in our plans for many years since the droughts we had in this area back in the 60's, which is what determined the safe yield in Lake Massabesic. In 2010, we had a mini drought and we drew the lake down almost 4'. Fortunately it fills back up quickly. If we have a short duration drought, or we know another long duration drought is inevitable in our future, we need to be prepared for that because we serve 160,000 in the greater Manchester area. This is why we are looking for additional supply.

**Closed to Public**



R. Duhaime: These homes are on leach fields. Isn't there a 75 foot butter from a leach field to a well?

D. Miller: Yes.

R. Duhaime: Do you have any information about these leach fields? How old they are, when they have been replaced, etc.

J. Kevan: We have not researched septic systems.

D. Miller: It is part of the permitting process.

J. Roy: For community wells, I think there is a 200 foot buffer. If we get to the point of well placement, could you please clarify that.

R. Duhaime: If the leach field there now fails, when it is replaced it has to be redesigned, correct?

J. Roy: No. It can be placed where it is, as long as it qualifies.

D. Miller: The caisson location is not the location of the well. Those laterals go a couple of hundred feet underneath the river. That zone of influence will be different from a typical vertical well. This will be a morphous type of shape.

J. Roy: The purpose of those distances are to protect the well drinking water which would be tested all of the time anyway, so I am sure the state would be on top of that.

J. Levesque: When is your meeting with the TRC?

J. Kevan: We have not set a meeting with the TRC yet?

J. Levesque: You are gong to need a lot more for them then you gave to us.

J. Kevan: If we are coming in with a site plan. Right now the proposal would be for any adjustments to the roadway and this well, which doesn't require us to do that. That is another step in the process that we would go through in the future.

J. Levesque: I would like to see more.

C. Pearson: I am going to have you go through your application at the next meeting. We need to schedule a site walk. For me, I would like to have something staked out at the site walk so we can get an idea of placement of where the well head and building possibly would be. If we have something tangible that we could go by, and your abutters could look at, that is agreeable and includes fence, the road changes, an idea of building shape and size, and maybe some aesthetics. We never look at something without something tangible, to grant anything.

R. Duhaime: Could we look at the facility in Seabrook?

D. Miller: That facility is larger than what I am talking about.

C. Pearson: Even visually, if you could show us what the well, pump house, etc. will look like.

P. Denbow: Even if you can give us some photos of an existing building and what the construction would look like.

D. Miller: We can do that.

C. Pearson: How long do you need to do that? We need to schedule a site walk and we need some visual reference when we go down.

D. Miller: A couple of weeks, at the most.

C. Pearson: How about if we schedule the site walk for Dec. 7 at 9:00 am? Are you prepared to come back before the Board at the following meeting?

J. Kevan: I assume if we are providing that information for the site walk that should be adequate for the Board.

C. Pearson: Do you need a site plan to go in front of TRC? I think you can go in front of them with concepts to at least discuss with Fire. I am thinking about the road.

J. Kevan: I can talk to the Fire Dept. If I provide a turn-around as you approach the property or a cul-de-sac that would be adequate. Right now there are temporary access points up to Quality Dr. or within the property. If I end that short of those then I need a permit and turn around. I will go back and talk to Public Works and the Fire Dept. and determine whether or not they will

accept that.

C. Pearson: When you come back, can you let us know if there is going to be a parking lot or utility shed. If you think of that in your concept can you let us know as well.

J. Kevan: We will do what we can.

***G. Hyde motioned to continue to December 10, 2013 pending a site walk on December 7, 2013. Seconded by G. Hyde. Motion carried unanimously.***

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

M. Lavoie: Everyone should have the Town of Hooksett Zoning Board of Adjustment Rules of Procedure to review to see if any changes need to be made.

C. Pearson: Do we need to agree to this now?

M. Lavoie: In the future, I believe. Changes take place at the beginning of January.

C. Pearson: Please go home and look this over to see if you have anything that you recommend to change or add. We will put this on the agenda for the next meeting and we will make sure we vote on it. Matt, the only thing I need to ask is that any time there is square footage or anything like that, put it right in the application so we can go by that and we will read it exactly as you put it. That will be what they are approved for.

M. Lavoie: Ok.

J. Roy: The property that is across from Pike, he had come before the Board and he was supposed to come back with his updated plan and never did. Is there anything we need to be doing as a town?

M. Lavoie: He came in for TRC. He has some things to address.

J. Roy: So he is working with the town?

M. Lavoie: Yes.

C. Pearson: Matt, can you ask if I can't make it to TRC if someone else can go on behalf of the

ZBA because that feedback helps us.

M. Lavoie: Yes.

R. Bairam: I would be glad to go.

***R. Bairam motioned to adjourn. Seconded by J. Roy. Motion carried unanimously.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

AnnMarie White  
Recording Clerk