

1 **HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**
2 **HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**
3 **35 Main Street**
4 **Monday, March 2, 2020**

5
6 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:03 PM.**

7
8 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

9
10 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

11
12 **PRESENT: Richard Marshall (Chairman) Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), David Boutin, Christopher**
13 **Stelmach, Matt Reed, Peter Scarpetti and Robert Duhaime (Town Council Rep.)**

14
15 **ALTERNATES: Brett Scott**

16
17 **STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)**

18
19 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 3, 2020**

20
21 *February 3, 2020 meeting – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the February 3, 2020*
22 *meeting. Seconded by C. Stelmach.*

23
24 *T. Walsh said that the word ‘on’ (line 109) should be changed to ‘over.’*

25 *T. Wash said that the word ‘paper’ (line 256) should be changed to ‘documents.’*

26 *T. Walsh said that the word ‘know’ (line 331) should be changed to ‘done.’*

27 *D. Marshall called for a vote on the amended motion.*

28
29 *Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0. P. Scarpetti abstained due to not being in attendance*
30 *at the February 3, 2020 meeting*

31
32 **D. Marshall: We will have one agenda change. The Public Hearing on the Development Regulations**
33 **Amendment is scheduled for 6:00 pm, so we will take that up now.**

34
35 **PUBLIC HEARING**

36
37 **DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS AMENDMENT**

38 **Section 11.13 – Water Systems and Private Well Radii**

39
40 **D. Marshall: I will read the proposed amendment to Section 11.13 of the Development Regulations.**

41 *Private wells shall include a 75-foot protective well radius. No leach fields shall be located within this*
42 *radius and no septic tanks may be within 50’ of the well head. All additional setbacks, per NHDES, must*
43 *be adhered to. The entire well radius must be contained within the property lines, including the lot’s*

44 *frontage (right-of-way). The well radius shall be allowed to extend into any wetland buffers located*
45 *within the lot's property lines.*

46 *For bedrock wells which do not meet the setback requirements as stated above and as specified in We*
47 *602.08, a well contractor shall use special methods of construction to provide additional protection from*
48 *potential pollution. A completed setback reduction form must be filed with NHDES and the Code*
49 *Enforcement Officer indicating that the contractor has:*

50 *1) Installed no less than 40 feet of casing in the well, with no less than 10 feet of casing into competent*
51 *bedrock; and*

52 *2) Grouted the casing as specified in We 602.05*

53 D. Marshall opened the public hearing at 6:08 pm.

54 Scott Bussiere: Why can't the well radius go into open space? It is no man's land. That's always a
55 problem with some of these small lots nowadays.

56 D. Marshall: That is a good question, but it is not within our regulations.

57 S. Bussiere: No one can use that land. Why make it so hard on the builders? Nothing is being invaded. It
58 is tough on the builders. Why can't the regs say that?

59 N. Williams: I see no issue with it, given that we allow the well radius to encroach into a wetland buffer.

60 S. Bussiere: Why can't you make life easier for us?

61 R. Duhaime: Open space is common land, and there is an issue of possible litigation. If a condo
62 association allows a private well's radius to encroach, and then there is contamination, that could be
63 complicated.

64 S. Bussiere: Wells can't contaminate.

65 R. Duhaime: Depending on how the drainage runs, who knows what could happen? An attorney would
66 have a little fun with that. It's the only reason I can think of.

67 S. Bussiere: If there is a retention pond on a property, you can put the well radius on it.

68 R. Duhaime: You could always request a waiver.

69 S. Bussiere: That ties up the Planning Board for no reason. Other towns allow this.

70 D. Marshall: Developers bring plans to us. They should make these changes before they get here.

71 S. Bussiere: The radius is just a circle to keep a leach field out. There is no logical reason for keeping the
72 radius out of open space. Why make it difficult for no reason?

73 D. Marshall: You can always ask for a waiver.

74 S. Bussiere: You see a lot of waivers.

75 D. Marshall: There is nothing in our regs that goes either way. It is logical for developers to follow the
76 regs and not to be looking for ways to get around them.

77 D. Marshall closed the public hearing at 6:13 pm.

78 ***D. Boutin motioned to adopt the regulations as printed. R. Duhaime seconded the motion.***

79 **Motion carried with a vote of 7-0.**

80 **DISCUSSION**

81 **PANO PANOURIAS**
82 **1143 Hooksett Road, Map 39, Lot 28**
83 **Proposed subdivision**

84 D. Marshall: The applicant is not here. We will drop this item to the end of the agenda.

85

86 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

87 **CHUCKSTER'S #20-01**
88 **51 Hackett Hill Road, Map 13, Lot 56**
89 **Amendment to install a fence as a buffer**

90 N. Williams: This is a housekeeping issue. Mr. Blasko has agreed to replant the buffer as shown on the
91 original, approved site plan. He spoke with the abutter, who is amicable to that. The replanting will be
92 done in late April. The staff will inspect the site to ensure that the buffer is planted as on the approved
93 plan, and we will hold the bond until we are comfortable that the plants will not die again.

94

95 D. Marshall closed the public hearing.

96

97 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve this application. T. Walsh seconded the motion.***

98

99 **Motion carried with a vote of 6-0. P. Scarpetti abstained because he was not here for the discussion.**

100 **STRATEGIC CONTRACTING, LLC #19-29**
101 **1794 Hooksett Road, Map 6, Lot 114**
102 **27 lot residential subdivision**

103 N. Williams: I would like Doug MacGuire to review the results of the traffic study requested two
104 meetings ago. The only other revision from my comments is about the secondary fire access discussed
105 previously. We could not agree on who would be maintaining the secondary access. Fire personnel
106 recommended the secondary access, but it is not required under the State Fire Code, and thus we have
107 taken it out.

108

109 D. MacGuire: The traffic study was done as requested. We consulted with Steve Pernaw of Stephen G.
110 Pernaw & Company, Inc. to look at the potential effects of this development and also the effects of the
111 extension through the Bernice Street right of way. He determined that it would be a low generating use.
112 The am peak would add 24 trips, coming and going. The pm peak would add 29 trips. By contrast, the
113 NHDOT reports 16,665 trips per day on this road, down from 17,600 in 2017. There is a significant
114 amount of traffic on this roadway. The extension of Bernice to Granite Street further improves
115 circulation because it provides different ways to go, spreading out the traffic. In many areas the traffic
116 was negligible. His conclusion was that the additional trips won't significantly alter the safety at nearby
117 intersections. Mr. Pernaw recommended traffic controls: adding a STOP control at the intersection of

118 Bernice and Bert, plus paint and a STOP control at the intersection of Granite and Bernice Streets. These
119 have already been added to the plans.

120

121 Lori Cyr, 63 Pleasant Street: Do you know which day of the week was used and how far on Hooksett
122 Road it covered?

123

124 D. MacGuire: The NHDOT recorder was placed north of Granite Street and south of Pleasant Street. It
125 was done on a Tuesday, using 7:00 - 8:00 am as the morning peak and 4:00 – 5:00 pm as the evening
126 peak.

127

128 L. Cyr: It is a nightmare between Pleasant and Granite on Friday evenings after work and on weekends.
129 Also, with 27 homes and two cars at each home, plus visitors, it is hard to believe the trip generation
130 data. Route 3 South traffic is out of control.

131

132 Clifford Jones, 1 Bert Street: I looked at the study and the numbers look inaccurate. I have done these
133 studies before, working part-time at Stantec. Twenty-seven homes with two cars each is about 70 trips. I
134 live there. Traffic finds the path of least resistance. There are three bus stops on Granite Street. A lot
135 more vehicles will be driving up Bert Street. Four driveways in the plan do not meet development
136 regulations for distance from other driveways. The reason is safety. My driveway is 20 feet from the new
137 intersection. At a speed of 30 miles per hour, the stopping distance is 75 feet. This is too close and an
138 accident is bound to happen. With no disrespect to the Planning Board, there is a piece of land which is
139 not part of the development. It is Town property. According to the Town Attorney, the Town Council
140 approves or disapproves the use of town-owned land.

141

142 D. Boutin: Can we get clarification regarding the Town property issue? How would the Planning Board's
143 acting on this subdivision affect the town land?

144

145 N. Williams: It is my understanding that the ability to approve a public roadway is within the purview of
146 the Planning Board. Once this happens, Town Council officially accepts the roadway at the
147 recommendation of the Town Engineer.

148

149 C. Jones: I would recommend that you talk with the Town Attorney.

150

151 D. Marshall: The Town Council does not weigh in on street layouts.

152

153 C. Jones: They approve or disapprove the use of town land.

154

155 D. Marshall closed the public hearing.

156

157 D. Boutin: The traffic study answered our questions. The Town Engineer is satisfied.

158

159 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the subdivision. T. Walsh seconded the motion.***

160

161 T. Walsh: First, I have a question for the staff or the chair. Not long ago, the abutters and neighbors
162 didn't believe a traffic study because it was done by the applicant. I thought that, going forward, we
163 were going to solicit the studies and bill the applicant. Why did we get off of our own recommendation?
164 Second, I have to agree that the traffic study results are questionable – 27 houses, each with two cars,
165 generating only 24 trips during peak hours. And, if there is such a low traffic impact factor, why is that
166 connector so important? The intersection of Bert and Granite seems to be the gorilla in the corner, so to
167 speak.

168
169 D. MacGuire: The total trips a day, per the report, is 300. I think that applicants should work with the
170 professionals they choose. Mr. Pernaw has done many jobs for this town. He is a licensed professional
171 and has placed his stamp on this report. To insinuate that he is making this up seems...that's how I took
172 that. If I'm incorrect...The extension of Bernice Street was recommended by the Planning Board. It
173 extends Bernice Street as was always intended. The conveyance was not a blank slate. It was conveyed
174 with the intention of having an extension of the roadway for public access. This was the exact intent in
175 1957 or whenever it was done. You have town sewer, water and natural gas through the right of way.
176 Versus a 90-degree turn, this extension is a cleaner and safer option. The extension allows more
177 disbursement of traffic with left and right turns from Granite Street. It is under the Planning Board's
178 prevue to terminate the right of way. If you decide to do that, just let me know. It is cheaper for the
179 applicant to not build the extension.

180
181 T. Walsh: My first question was not directed at you. I was looking for an answer from the Chair or from
182 staff regarding Board procedure. I did not insinuate that anybody was speaking an untruth. I appreciate
183 your second description. It helps everybody in the room to know that the traffic study reported 300 trips
184 per day and 24 in the peak morning hour. You were a little illusive with the description in your
185 presentation.

186
187 R. Duhaime: Steve Pernaw worked on many traffic studies for the town, and he always did a great job.
188 He is one of the best in the State. His professionalism is without doubt. Safety is the issue with the
189 extension of Bernice Street, and we are talking about safety on Bert Street. You will be disbursing traffic,
190 but it is not going to be any safer. When the connector road went through, Granite Street was a cut
191 through, a collector road. When the connector road went in, Granite Street traffic went down. Another
192 thing for this Board to consider is this: If you don't pull this now and later a safety issue comes, the Town
193 will foot the bill for paving this road and finishing the intersection.

194
195 T. Walsh: I'm sure that all people who do traffic studies are professional. The reason we had the
196 conversation before is perception. The Town could hire the same professional as the applicant. There
197 was no insinuation that someone was doing something wrong.

198
199 D. MacGuire: As a cure for the perception issue, the Board could solicit its own independent study when
200 or if there is strong disagreement. It is rare, but I have seen it done. The applicant should choose the
201 professional for a traffic study and should not have the burden of two reports. Another option is that
202 abutters could pool resources and do their own study.

203
204 P. Scarpetti: Looking at the intersection of Bert and Bernice, what size vehicle could make that turn?

205

206 D. MacGuire: I did not run simulations because we weren't proposing to not have the turn. This is a
207 great style of residential urban development, with small lots and grid-style roads. It made sense not to
208 extend Bernice Road at one time. Now it is better not to force the 90-degree turn.

209

210 R. Duhaime: Manchester Sand & Gravel has already been approved for a development with 400 homes.
211 Steve Pernaw came in. There was a question about funneling traffic from Webster Woods. The road has
212 been widened. The traffic will stack in two lanes heading south and make one lane. The traffic light has
213 already been approved. They are going to want to take a right and go down Merrimack Street.

214

215 D. Marshall: I want to note that this motion includes the extension and 'no secondary access.' If this
216 fails, on the extension from Bert to Granite, everything parked on that right of way needs to be
217 removed. That is town-owned land.

218

219 D. Marshall called for a vote on the motion to approve this subdivision.

220

221 **Motion carried with a vote of 7-0.**

222 **COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING**

223 **HEMLOCK ESTATES, LLC #20-02**

224 **54 Spruce Court and Laurel Road, Map 26, Lot 3-24 and Map 21, Lots 15 & 16**

225 **Lot line adjustment and lot merger**

226

227 N. Williams: The plans are complete. We have received the required documentation from abutters
228 regarding the lot line adjustment. There is one additional waiver request regarding the 75-foot
229 protective well radius.

230

231 ***D. Boutin motioned that the application is complete. P. Scarpetti seconded the motion.***

232

233 **Motion carried with a vote of 7-0.**

234 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the waiver for the 75-foot protective well radius. R. Duhaime seconded***
235 ***the motion.***

236 D. Boutin: Why are we getting this information tonight?

237 John Rokeh: The well radius waiver is for the lot line adjustment and consolidation plan.

238 **Motion carried with a vote of 7-0.**

239 Bob Kilmer, Sanford Surveying and Engineering: This is Lot 3-24.

240 J. Rokeh: The lot line for the existing home on Spruce Street was adjusted for the new road. It goes off
241 the lot.

242 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the lot line adjustment. P. Scarpetti seconded the motion.***

243 **Motion carried with a vote of 7-0.**

244

245 **HEMLOCK ESTATES, LLC #20-02**
246 **Laurel Road, Map 21, Lot 15**
247 **37 lot subdivision**

248

249 D. Marshall: The memo from Bruce Thomas says there are 45 issues to be addressed.

250

251 J. Rokeh: I completed the Alteration of Terrain comments and delivered them Wednesday morning last
252 week. The issues were mostly for me to read. There were spelling errors and drafting issues with the
253 plan that I needed to clean up.

254

255 D. Marshall: Do we need a positive letter from Mr. Thomas?

256

257 ***Mr. Boutin motioned to table this item until March 16th. Mr. Reed seconded the motion.***

258

259 R. Duhaime: I suggest giving yourself an extra foot on the well radius to include eight inches of casing.
260 You can save design dollars so we don't have to require the eight-inch casing. And please look at the
261 update with drainage. There are a lot of elevations.

262 **Motion to table carried with a vote of 7-0.**

263 D. Boutin: Do we have to table #1?

264 D. Marshall: No, he has to reapply.

265 D. Boutin: Regarding the use of consultants, we have done this both ways. We concluded that hiring the
266 consultants ourselves was a disaster. It is more common than not that the applicants hire their own
267 consultants for Alteration of Terrain or traffic studies. If the studies are not adequate, we should get our
268 own. We don't want to go back to hiring consultants.

269 D. Marshall: The reason we hired the consultants was we used multi-discipline firms such as Stantec. Mr.
270 Thomas can handle 90% of these now, but he is not comfortable doing traffic studies.

271 D. Boutin: One possibility is to have a list of 3, 4, 5, or 6 consultants for applicants to choose from.

272 N. Williams: Six is a lot in this area. Perhaps a list of three or four is more reasonable. We have Stantec,
273 Keach-Nordstrom, and TF Moran. This is the first time I have worked with Steve Pernaw.

274 T. Walsh: The only reason I brought this up was perception. Picking from our list is not a bad idea. This is
275 not the last time we are going to see this.

276 M. Reed: We are not calling them liars. They are professionals, but their work is based on assumptions.

277 T. Walsh: For the public, a completely neutral study looks better.

278 P. Scarpetti: Taking it one step further, the traffic study could be presented to the Planning Board by the
279 traffic engineer, who would have said 300 trips, not just 24 at the peak am hour.

280 D. Marshall: Almost every developer uses the peak hours. When you look at the total volume, it is a lot
281 of cars, but it is not difficult to get in and out of this development as it is in others.

282 B. Scott: How much ground does the Town have to deny a subdivision based on traffic?

283 D. Marshall: It is about mitigation.

284 B. Scott: I can't see holding back growth. We have a housing shortage in Hooksett. I live near there. It is
285 busy, but that is 27 happy families.

286 T. Walsh: Do we have traffic studies for Hemlock Hills? That is 133 acres.

287 R. Duhaime: That is further out.

288 T. Walsh: They will empty onto Farmer Road.

289 R. Duhaime: Or Laurel Street.

290 D. Marshall: I have never felt an anti-development feeling on this Board or any other. The developers
291 should follow the regulations.

292 P. Scarpetti: We don't want the same situation that we had in South Bow regarding wells.

293 R. Duhaime: It's that eight-inch casing.

294 N. Williams: Prior to Mr. Rokeh's presentation tonight, the plan was different; they now have bigger lots.

295 P. Scarpetti: A couple of lots need to disappear.

296 ***D. Boutin motioned to adjourn. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.***

297 **The meeting was adjourned at 7:14 pm.**

298 **Respectfully submitted by,**

299

300 **/s/ Kathleen Donnelly**

301

302 **Kathleen Donnelly**

303 **Recording Clerk**

304

305 **PLEASE SEE SUBSEQUENT MEETING MINUTES FOR AMENDMENTS TO THESE MINUTES.**

306

307

308