

1 **Official**

2
3 **HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**
4 **HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**
5 **35 Main Street**
6 **Monday, April 20, 2020**
7

8 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:03 P.M.**

9
10 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

11
12 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

13
14 **PRESENT: Richard (Dick) Marshall (Chairman), Paul Scarpetti, David Boutin, Christopher**
15 **Stelmach, Matt Reed, and Robert Duhaime (Town Council Representative)**

16
17 **ALTERNATES: Brett Scott**

18
19 **EXCUSED: Tom Walsh**

20
21 **STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)**

22
23 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 2, 2020**

24
25 **March 2, 2020 Meeting – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2020 meeting.**
26 ***Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

27 **Roll Call**

28 D. Marshall - Yes

29 P. Scarpetti - Yes

30 D. Boutin - Yes

31 C. Stelmach - Yes

32 M. Reed - Yes

33 R. Duhaime - Yes

34 B. Scott - Yes

35
36 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

37
38 **DISCUSSION**

39
40 **1. DAVID SCARPETTI, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CHAIR**
41 **RSA 72:80 Commercial and Industrial Construction Exemption**
42

43 D. Scarpetti: The state of NH has four economic development tools that we can use. Three are ap-
44 proved in economic revitalization zones. They are 1) RSA 162 - N: Economic Revitalization Zones. 2)

45 RSA 79-E: Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive 3) RSA 162-K: Tax Increment Finance
46 Districts. (These are described in detail in the Town Council Staff Report for the February 26, 2020
47 meeting. The new one we would like to adopt is RSA 72:80-83 - Commercial and industrial construc-
48 tion exemption. This is for new construction in commercial zones, industrial zones or both. Under ad-
49 visement of the Economic Development Advisory Committee, the Town Council may specify certain
50 parcels of land to which this exemption applies. The exemption includes up to 50% of the increased
51 municipal property tax as a result of new construction, or renovations/additions/improvements to exist-
52 ing structures. The exemption may not exceed a period of 10 years from the date the application is
53 granted. The goal is to attract construction and generate jobs in commercial and/or industrial sectors
54 and add short term reductions in property tax revenues, while potentially benefiting from new construc-
55 tion in the long term in terms of net gains/increases in property tax revenue and employment. This
56 would not be able to be used for the parcels which are part of the current 3A TIF because it would be
57 counterproductive to the purpose of the TIF.

58
59 N. Williams: The Town Council would need to make a motion to enact this the same way they did
60 with the other three. We took this to Town Council and I recommended we get input from the Planning
61 Board, as adoption has various implications for land use. A few examples of properties have been pro-
62 vided that may benefit from this RSA. They are listed on an email dated April 15, 2020 from David
63 Scarpetti with a subject line of Hooksett Properties. There are some that are sitting vacant or not being
64 used to their best potential. These do not have to be properties that are vacant. They can be properties
65 that are condemned such as the Animal Crackers property.

66
67 C. Stelmach: I was under the assumption that the Mr. Bee's property was not vacant and being used by
68 Faulkners.

69
70 D. Scarpetti: That is being rented by Faulkners. We wanted to put it on the list because it would be a
71 benefit to clean that up.

72
73 M. Reed: How have you been marketing this or how would you market this?

74
75 N. Williams: Once this makes it through Town Council with a motion it will be left up to the realtors
76 that handle the property exchanges.

77
78 M. Reed: How would the town market it to the realtors?

79
80 N. Williams: That sounds like a great opportunity for a sub-committee of the Economic Development
81 Committee.

82
83 M. Reed: Would this be for specific businesses?

84
85 N. Williams: The Town Council would determine that. It has to be carried through uniformly for eve-
86 ryone that sends in an application.

87
88 M. Reed: Would there be parameters for businesses that can or cannot apply?

89
90 N. Williams: It is marketed for industrial and commercial. We could have legal take a look at it.
91

92 R. Duhaime: I am in favor of this. We have been letting the developers do some of the planning. I
93 think this would help the town planner and administrator to set up meetings to let businesses know this
94 is available. The Economic Development Committee could invite some of the property owners into
95 their meetings to fill in some of the holes around DW Highway.

96
97 P. Scarpetti: Regarding the time frame, I think 10 years is a long time to give a tax break. I think the
98 first few years are critical for success with a company and a five year window would be plenty of time
99 to get someone on their feet and become profitable. Other than that I think this is wonderful to spur de-
100 velopment. Has anyone reached out to businesses to get their input?

101
102 D. Scarpetti: I spoke with Mr. Faulkner. They are excited about this being enacted. We would like to
103 put up signs in the revitalization zones. It is six different areas. The Economic Development Committee
104 should start working on land and what is available for the property owners. We could talk about five
105 years and maybe the percentage could be less than five years.

106
107 P. Scarpetti: Are the existing programs listed on our website for Hooksett? That would help to promote
108 this.

109
110 N. Williams: There is an entire web page devoted to them on the town's web page.

111
112 D. Boutin: Are any of the lots on East Point Drive and Londonderry Turnpike able to be combined to
113 permit a larger development?

114
115 N. Williams: None that were provided are contiguous with one another.

116
117 D. Boutin: I think this is an excellent program looking toward the future. Hooksett is lacking in hous-
118 ing. I think we could work out something with the Town Council to work out something as far as hous-
119 ing that is affordable for our young families. We should have two or three parcels that should be zoned
120 for apartment use.

121
122 B. Scott: I think it is important that properties are targeted and 10 years is too long. This needs to get
123 into the realtors hands for marketing.

124
125 D. Marshall: This is a tax incentive program?

126
127 D. Scarpetti: Yes

128
129 D. Marshall: So the rules we have in place still apply. This does not do anything except offer a tax ex-
130 emption. This is a great way to attract new business. I agree that 10 years is a long time. Five years
131 would be a good figure. For the Town Council to accept this it needs to show that giving these busi-
132 nesses a tax break will bring in more businesses. As far as housing, that is great, except that we have to
133 remember this is a tax incentive program and does not change the zoning. If apartments were wanted,
134 the zoning would have to be changed.

135
136 D. Boutin: I think housing should be a top priority and should be considered before a vote is taken. It
137 should be done selectively and with regulations.

139 N. Williams: We could meet with the Economic Development Committee one more time. I would like
140 to go to Town Council with a more fine tuned recommendation as far as the parcels we are looking at.
141 We can take a look at those with the Planing Board at a later date.

142
143 D. Scarpetti: Could we add properties to this at any time?

144
145 N. Williams: Town Council can always add a property with a motion.

146
147 R. Duhaime: I can mention to the Town Council that we are targeting different parcels and you are rec-
148 ommending five years as opposed to 10.

149
150 D. Boutin: I would like to see this go back to the Economic Development Committee and have this
151 fine tuned and include two or three parcels for the lack of housing issue along the Rt. 3 corridor. I
152 would like to be included in any discussion.

153
154 ***D. Boutin motioned that this to back to the Economic Development Advisory Committee to fine tune***
155 ***this and that all Planning Board members be invited. Seconded by D. Marshall.***

156
157
158
159

160 Roll Call

161
162 D. Marshall - Yes
163 P. Scarpetti - Yes
164 D. Boutin - Yes
165 C. Stelmach -Yes
166 M. Reed - Yes
167 R. Duhaime - No
168 B. Scott - Yes

169
170 **Motion carries with a vote of 6-1.**

171
172 **2. BRUCE THOMAS, TOWN ENGINEER**
173 **Final TIF plans**

174
175 B. Thomas: Underwood Engineering has been working on an engineering study for the TIF district for
176 the past year. There have been several meeting with the TIF committee. They have the scope of work
177 we would like to proceed with. The engineering study is basically complete and the preliminary design
178 is being finished. Currently they are trying to get the Town Council to approve of the Town Adminis-
179 trator of signing a contract with Underwood to proceed with the final design of the project. The scope
180 of the work on the final design for Phase 1 and 2 is around the exit 10 area. There will be a pump sta-
181 tion in the area of Kimball Drive just east of Home Depot. There will be an additional river crossing at
182 that point and the sewer will be pumped from the Martins Ferry pump station to the sewer treatment
183 plant. From that pump station it would go to the south of Kimball Drive and connect to Rt. 3A in the
184 area of Goonan Street. The sewer would go north and south hooking up to Walmart, Market Basket, the
185 cinemas, etc. From the pump station on Kimball Drive would also go northerly across to the area of the

186 shops which include Dunkin Donuts. Phase 3 would have a pump station installed at the tri-town arena.
187 The sewer would go southerly, up to 3A, about 1,600' up Cross Rd., northerly through a couple of state
188 properties, and cross the Supreme Industries property. Phase 4 would be installed from the tri-town
189 pump station and along the river to the intersection of 3A and Hackett Hill Road. This was tabled at the
190 last Town Council meeting due to a concern. The sewer went west on Cross Rd., out of the TIF area,
191 took a turn to the north, and across Supreme Industries property. The concern is that it would be leav-
192 ing the TIF area and the residents on Cross Rd. were never told there would be sewer and they might
193 have a problem with it. Also, the town would design up to the point of the intersection of 3A and Cross
194 Rd. and up to the Supreme Industries property. Supreme Industries would do the design of their prop-
195 erty. If we did the design on their property and they revised their site plan we would have to redo our
196 design. We will be going back to the town council to explain these plans in more detail. The Town Ad-
197 ministrator has been working with the Town Council to address these items. A couple of councilors
198 were also concerned that we are not putting out a new RFP for the final design. The contract for the de-
199 sign work included the preliminary design, engineering study, final design, and construction engineer-
200 ing. The intent has been to negotiate the final design. Until now we did not know what the final design
201 would be. We would like the Town Council's approval for the Town Administrator to sign. The con-
202 tract for the engineering study and preliminary design is \$807,200. The total contract amount will be
203 was for \$431,800. When this is all done we will be approximately \$60,000 under budget. The amend-
204 ment for the final design will be \$1.2 million. The warrant article was for \$2.5 million. We have the
205 funding to do this. Due to the Town Council's concerns we broke out the cost of the design that would
206 go out of the TIF district and up Cross Rd. The design cost would be reduced by \$34,400. If they finish
207 this design and do that part later it would cost \$70,000. The TIF Committee and Economic Develop-
208 ment Committee support this design. In the Exit 10 area, our intent is that the town would construct the
209 sewer up to 3A and private companies such as Walmart, Market Basket, and Bass Pro Shops would do
210 the construction of the sewers on 3A itself. On the north end, we could construct the sewer to Cross Rd.
211 and Supreme Industries would do the construction from Cross Rd., across the state properties, on across
212 their property to a point we would designate on Hackett Hill Rd. I am not sure how those agreements
213 would actually work. We are working on contacting their corporate offices. I am hoping the Town
214 Council will approve the design because we are on a tight schedule due to timing to put together a war-
215 rant article, if need be, for next spring. We have existing funding from the Sewer Commission of \$1.2
216 million, \$2.25 million that has already been collected from the TIF district. We are going after some
217 clean water surface evolving loans. Those loans could be paid off from the loans with the annual in-
218 come that we are making from TIF district in the future. The difference would be on a warrant article
219 which would be about 10.27 million. We might have to break up the construction into more managea-
220 ble pieces instead of doing that.

221
222 B. Scott: No comments at this point. Happy to see this proceeding.

223
224 D. Boutin: I think this is a wise project for the Town of Hooksett. I know they are going in for funding
225 to the Town Council on Wednesday and I hope they approve it.

226
227 P. Scarpetti: This is not going under a road once it leaves Cross Rd.?

228
229 B. Thomas: Correct.

230
231 P. Scarpetti: I think there should be something in writing that Supreme Industries will pay for that
232 sewer line before we agree to pay for the engineering.

233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279

B. Thomas: We would like to have an agreement that if we did the design the way I described we would constructed it to Cross Rd. and they would construct it the rest of the way.

R. Duhaime: The Town Council was surprised that the design was going outside of the TIF district. That is not what the voters agreed to and there is the issue of the abutters. There is also the issue of the state surplus land What is the state decides to put something there because there will be sewer and water. That is not the intent of the TIF district. The state does not have to ask the town if they want to put something there. I also have a design issue. The plans have changed from the initial ones the Town Council had approved. At first were not going to do the second pump station. The line was going to have to be buried on 3A deep at tri-town to get the elevation and it would be gravity fed. Now, due to the two pump stations, they have redesigned the water and sewer line to go to Cross Rd. It was going to go from tri-town, uphill to the south end of 3A. Phase 1 and 2 are the priority parts of the project design. Why is the third phase being designed when we don't know if the we can afford the first phase. The water line going to Cross Rd. is benefiting Supreme Industries. Going down 3A would be a shorter route. These plans changed everything and the Town Council members are not sure that is what they approved.

C. Stelmach: The engineering from Cross Rd., up the power lines, and through Supreme Industries, the design and engineering is on the town, but the construction is on Supreme?

B. Thomas: Supreme Industries would have to agree to it and they have not agreed to it yet.

B. Scott: I would say focus on Phase 1 and 2 for now. You are looking too far ahead.

B. Thomas: I understand what you are saying but the thoughts of the TIF committee was to have all of the sewer design done and then it just has to be constructed. It is also cheaper to do it all at once instead of piece meal.

B. Scott: It isn't piece meal, it is in stages.

B. Thomas: If you have an engineer design it all at once it is less costly due to the resources.

B. Scott: Would the cost saving be that significant?

B. Thomas: It would be a savings of \$34,400. It would cost \$70,000 to do it later. It is cheaper to do it all now. You could debate whether to bring it up Cross Rd. as it does go out of the TIF district. We should look at if you want to cut the design in half the way you are describing.

M. Reed: Why would you burden Hooksett with that extra cost to service a private property when they should be burdened with that cost. It could be built right up 3A and if they want to tap into it then they can pay for it.

B. Thomas: It is a significant cost but is minimal compared to the construction cost. We always said the construction cost going up Cross Rd. and to their property would be their cost. Supreme Industries might get a benefit to this but the other properties in the area will get a benefit as well.

280 M. Reed: The main line is for multiple business but the up shoot up Cross Rd. would just be for Su-
281 preme Industries.

282
283 B. Thomas: It could service properties up Cross Rd. I agree with your point, but with it going up Cross
284 Rd. it could service more than just Supreme Industries.

285
286 D. Boutin: Did you mention that Supreme Industries is paying for the pipe that will be on their prop-
287 erty. They have agreed to do it across their property.

288
289 B. Thomas: They have not agree to anything yet and I am not sure the new owner is in agreement with
290 what his predecessor wanted to do.

291
292 D. Boutin: The TIF district saw a benefit for it to go through that area for now and in the future. It
293 would be unfortunate for \$34,000 to see that go by the wayside.

294
295 B. Thomas: I agree.

296
297 D. Marshall: Is there any action necessary by the Planning Board?

298
299 B. Thomas: I am just filling you in.

300
301 P. Scarpetti: Bruce, they don't have an agreement with the state right now for this to even cross it. My
302 recommendation is to design the sewer to the property line of the TIF district and have them step up if
303 they want to. Then you will be able to see if they are serious or not serious. Then the Town Council
304 will be happy because you are staying within the TIF district.

305
306 **EXTENSION OF APPROVAL**

307
308 **3. KASSAS REAL ESTATE #2020-05**
309 **1461 Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 49-C**
310 **Extension of approval for a bank**

311
312 N. Williams: This was an amended site plan that was approved in March of 2018. The was filed on
313 time but got pushed back due to COVID. Mr. Kassas has provided us with detailed list of his leasing
314 efforts, which are extensive. We find no issue with this.

315
316 George Kassas: I have provided a high level summary of the leasing activity that I have been doing as
317 well as with two prominent real estate brokers. We have several interested parties are various levels.
318 We have potential showings this coming week. We will run into delays with the bank due to the current
319 situation. We are spending all of the right money to keep this a premier property.

320
321 *D. Boutin motioned to approve the extension of approval for a bank for Kassas Real Estate #2020-*
322 *05, 1461 Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 49-C, until April 20, 2022. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.*

323
324 R. Duhaime: Will they be notified again that the two year limit has run out?

325

326 N. Williams: They are required to submit their request for an extension 30 days prior to the extension
327 end date.

328
329 R. Duhaime: The regulations say that extensions can be granted for a one year in length for five years.
330 Can we approve this for two years.

331
332 N. Williams: The verbiage in the development regulations was changed last year when we took a look
333 at the number of extensions that we were granting to be for a maximum of five one year extensions and
334 the Planning Board can exercise its own discretion.

335
336 R. Duhaime: We should be sticking to our regulations of only doing the one year extension for a limit
337 of five years.

338
339 Roll Call

340
341 D. Marshall - Yes
342 P. Scarpetti - Yes
343 D. Boutin - Yes
344 C. Stelmach - Yes
345 M. Reed - Yes
346 R. Duhaime - No
347 B. Scott - Yes

348
349 **Motion carries with a vote of 6-1.**

350
351 **4. THE DUBAY GROUP, #2020-07**
352 **Summerfare Street, Map 35, Lots 7, 1-8 & 1-9**
353 **Extension of approval for Autumn Frost 18-lot subdivision**

354
355 N. Williams: We are looking forward to seeing this get off of the ground. If the extension is granted
356 we would like to set up with the developer a pre-construction meeting with a representative with each
357 of their contractors so everyone is on board with all of the conditions of approval.

358
359 D. Marshall: This request is for an extension of the two year active and substantial period?

360
361 N. Williams: Yes. They previously met all of the conditions of their approval. The plan is a signed and
362 recorded sub-division at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds. They are asking for an extension of
363 the active and substantial period.

364
365 *D. Boutin motioned to approve a two year extension of approval for Autumn Frost 18-lot subdivision*
366 *until April 20, 2022 for The Dubai Group, #2020-07, Summerfare Street, Map 35, Lots 7, 1-8 & 1-9*
367 *subject to the applicant having a pre-construction conference with the Planning Department as spec-*
368 *ified by the Town Planner. Seconded by R. Duhaime.*

369
370 Roll Call

371
372 D. Marshall - Yes

373 P. Scarpetti - Yes
374 D. Boutin - Yes
375 C. Stelmach - Yes
376 M. Reed - Yes
377 R. Duhaime - Yes
378 B. Scott - Yes

379
380 **Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

381
382 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

383
384 **5. HEMLOCK ESTATES, LLC #2020-03**
385 **Laurel Road, Map 21, Lot 15**
386 **37 lot subdivision**

387
388 N. Williams: All of the engineering comments and outstanding issues have been addressed. The home-
389 owners association documents have been reviewed and approved by the town attorney.

390
391 Jon Rokey (Rokey Consulting): We worked with the town engineer closely. The outstanding things
392 with the Town of Hooksett have been taken care of. We are trying to get things finalized with the AOT
393 and wetlands. We are close. We went through every plan to make sure the well radiuses' are com-
394 pletely on the properties and are on our plan and the surveyors plan.

395
396 R. Duhaime: Where and how would it be worded on a deed so the property owners know the town is
397 not responsible for access near the retention ponds and the residents will be responsible for their
398 maintenance.

399
400 J. Rokey: If there is an easement on a lot, it will be on the deed of each lot.

401
402 R. Duhaime: The lots are 155.

403
404 J. Rokey: The minimum is 153. We added the extra we needed.

405
406 P. Scarpetti: The red lines look like roads on the plan.

407
408 J. Rokey: Those are the access roads to the ponds.

409
410 Open public hearing.

411
412 Open to public comments.

413
414 John O'Neil (Manchester Water Works): We are an abutter to the south of this property. I talked with
415 the Town Engineer regarding the drainage as far as storm water treatment. As far as the prime wetlands
416 on their property have you talked with DES?

417
418 J. Rokey: We had a permit prior to this and are trying to get the final permits.

419

420 J. O'Neil: There was a recreational plan that was added. On the southeast corner there is a recreational
421 trail. Is that part of the plan? It is used as a foot trail for the neighborhood?
422

423 J. Rokey: That area is untouched by this development.
424

425 J. O'Neil: Does the town want to identify that on the plan? It is currently not identified.
426

427 J. Rokey: It is shown on the plan. We can add a label.
428

429 J. O'Neil: That would be great.
430

431 Open public hearing.
432

433 Vanessa Demers (18 Summerfare Street): 1) I have been seeing a lot of people coming onto my prop-
434 erty unannounced. 2) There seems to be a bear population in our neighborhood that are coming out of
435 the woods. With this development what will happen with the bears. 3) As far as traffic, people in the
436 neighborhood drive fast and there will be more commuters.
437

438 D. Marshall: Due to the season the bear activity has been active. As construction starts the bears will
439 move. As far as traffic there is nothing the Planning Board can do about speeding. I would encourage
440 you to speak with the Police Department.
441

442 Carolyn Connolly (7 Spruce Court): Can you share with me the distance from the edge of Willow path
443 and 5 and 7 Spruce Court.
444

445 J. Rokey: The distance in between the two houses is about 156'. The road from your house is approxi-
446 mately 72 ft. from where the new edge of road will be. We are going to clear most of the way to the
447 property lines. You are about 56 ft. from your own property line. All of that tree'd area will remain a
448 buffer to you. The road from the existing house, I do not have a distance on that but it is the same dis-
449 tance from the original plan.
450

451 C. Connolly: Will there still be a line of trees untouched on my property? No history of addition of
452 construction to the home did not have any decision on where this road is placed.
453

454 J. Rokey: Even with the addition on yours, you are still approximately 56' away from the property
455 line. The new road is centered within the right-of-way that always has existed.
456

457 C. Connolly: I am still within the required set-back?
458

459 J. Rokey: Yes.
460

461 C. Connolly: Has there been a discussion regarding the routing of cars to cut through this?
462

463 J. Rokey: We have not had a traffic study with regard to that. I would think that staying on the main
464 road would be the better path to go as opposed to winding around roads.
465

466 C. Connolly: With regard to the street running along my property line is there any sort of privacy fence
467 or trees buffers if my children are playing in the yard.

468
469 J. Rokey: That would only be a concern if you cut down your own trees. There is a lot of buffer in
470 place.

471
472 R. Duhaime: That is an issue if you build off of a sub-division. I cannot see Spruce Road being a col-
473 lective road. You can't stop where cars will go. I think there will be some people cutting through the
474 sub-division. There should not be that much traffic that needs to be addressed, but it is possible there
475 will be traffic going through.

476
477 P. Scarpetti: This could help the people on Farmer Road as far as going through there.

478
479 Brad Dupuis (20 Summerfare Street): We are expressing our concerns about the project. We firmly do
480 not want this project to start. My wife and I work from home. There have been multiple people looking
481 at this for years. We have people in our yards. There have been auctions. We were told in 2004 the land
482 across the street was conservation land and there would never be anything build there. We have con-
483 cerns about what is going to be going in there, what it will do to the property values, what it will do to
484 the traffic, the phases of the project, how long will it take, if will there be a traffic impact study, and
485 why do you have punch through and interrupt a neighborhood. Can we protest this further through an-
486 other forum? We understand business has to happen but we hope this never gets off the ground.

487
488 D. Marshall: I don't know who told you that was conservation land. The only way this could have
489 been conservation land was if someone had it as conservation land and paid a penalty to take it out.
490 Nevertheless, this sub-division meets all of the regulations.

491
492 J. Rokey: That right-of-way has always been a potential for development. All we are doing is utilizing
493 it.

494
495 D. Marshall: When you first got this plan, when Mr. Dupuis bought his property that right-of-way was
496 on his plan.

497
498 Discussion ensued regarding some of the previous public input being with regard to The Dubai Group,
499 #2020-07, Summerfare Street, Map 35, Lots 7, 1-8 & 1-9.

500
501 P. Scarpetti motioned for reconsideration of a two year extension of approval for Autumn Frost 18-lot
502 subdivision until April 20, 2022 for The Dubai Group, #2020-07, Summerfare Street, Map 35, Lots 7,
503 1-8 & 1-9. Seconded by M. Reed. D. Boutin opposed stating that an appropriate action was taken and
504 the meeting should move forward.

505
506 D. Marshall: We did not take an appropriate action. If we were meeting in person we would not have
507 had a problem with this. Since this is electronic the Board was not notified there were people waiting to
508 speak on this matter.

509
510 D. Boutin: So for one person we are going to go through this all over again?

511

512 D. Marshall: There are two people that wanted to speak, Mr. Dupuis and Ms. Demeris, and they have a
513 right to speak.

514
515 D. Boutin: I don't know what they hope to accomplish.

516
517 D. Scarpetti: That sub-division was approved in 2014.

518
519 D. Marshall: We are going to continue with Hemlock Estates, LLC.

520
521 John Markis (9 Spruce Court): 1) The initial request for the wetland impact was submitted by Dennis
522 Demers, File No. 2007-01-418 which was an impact of 4,615 sq. ft. of wetland in two locations to ac-
523 cess this sub-division which was originally supposed to be 40 lots was denied by the state. It was ini-
524 tially said during this meeting that was approved and it was not. The current request made by Hemlock
525 Estates, File No. 2019-03-667 is requesting for more impact of the wetlands, 5,192 sq. ft., in two loca-
526 tions which is on extension until May 8, 2020. The original sub-division that was discussed by the
527 Planning Board in 2007 required that a span bridge be constructed over the prime wetland. It was deter-
528 mined that a culvert, which is currently being proposed, was not sufficient by the town. There was con-
529 cern that there would be a restriction of water flow through that area negatively impacting the entire
530 prime wetland that was upstream of that area. These lots are in an LDR area and do not meet the re-
531 quirement of a LDR requirement of at least 2 continuous acres per lot. I assume that is irrelevant be-
532 cause this would be considered a cluster development. That 2 acres is required whether or not private or
533 public utilities are being brought in. According to the master plan "the development area inclusive of
534 all non buildable areas such as wetlands must be equal to or greater than the minimum acreage which
535 would be required if the land was developed as a standard single family residential neighborhood. If a
536 wetlands adjustment for non buildable acreage is considered for a single non clustered residence then it
537 must also be applied to the entire cluster development." It appears that requirement has not been met. It
538 does not appear that it meets the spirit of the ordinance. The prior developer attempted to do this and
539 the Planning Board shot down the initial plan because it was considered not adequate in the sense that
540 the amount of open space made available was not sufficiently useable. Overall the way out of this de-
541 velopment does not appear to maintain the aesthetics of the bordering neighborhood because these lots
542 are much smaller and the houses are not spaced accordingly. I am concerned about the property values
543 of the adjoining neighborhoods on either side which do meet the conventional LDR requirements. I am
544 concerned there may be blasting to put this development in. This was brought up with the last proposal
545 that was done. There is a significant amount of ledge that is back there. This property has passed
546 through several builders that have all determined this property was not conducive to this type of devel-
547 opment. Is any damage that is sustained to wells or foundations that may occur on other properties cov-
548 ered by the developer? What if any change will there be to the run-off that is bordering the back side of
549 my property? As far as traffic, this will create a pass through. The last time this went before the Plan-
550 ning Board it was proposed that the access point on Spruce Court would be gated, used for emergency
551 use only and be reduced in it's total size.

552
553 J. Rokey: On the wetland application we have gotten comments from both wetlands and AOT. The
554 size of the pipe is sized appropriately to pass the storm without surcharging it. The bridge was overkill
555 in terms of the drainage, therefore, we made the application with just the box culvert. If there is any
556 blasting the blasting companies do pre-blast surveys of the houses, wells, foundations, take pictures of
557 everything and are fully insured for any issues they cause. It is my understanding that they rarely have

558 any issues. In terms of the access on Willow, none of the plans I had seen had a restricted access to
559 Spruce Court.

560
561 R. Duhaime: There is enough dry upland to meet the two acre requirement. Nick, is that correct?
562

563 N. Williams: Yes. The lot sizes do not have to conform to the LDR standard in the conservation sub-
564 division.

565
566 R. Duhaime: Regarding the intersection on Spruce, you have the driveway in the radius of the curve.
567 You cannot have a driveway turning on a radius in the middle of a curve.
568

569 J. Rokey: A portion will get removed and loamed and seeded.

570
571 P. Scarpetti: Having a gated road is not good planning. I would rather see the road open so that people
572 can go east or west, into or out of the property.
573

574 D. Boutin: This plan has been around for a long time. Many of the issues the abutter has raised have
575 been addressed.

576
577 Close public hearing.
578

579 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the 37 lot subdivision for Hemlock Estates, LLC #2020-03, Laurel***
580 ***Road, Map 21, Lot 15. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.***

581
582 Roll Call

583
584 D. Marshall - Yes

585 P. Scarpetti - Yes

586 D. Boutin - Yes

587 C. Stelmach - Yes

588 M. Reed - Yes

589 R. Duhaime - Yes

590 B. Scott - Yes

591
592 **Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

593
594 ***D. Boutin motioned to reconsider The Dubai Group, #2020-07, Summerfare Street, Map 35, Lots 7,***
595 ***1-8 & 1-9, extension of approval for Autumn Frost 18-lot subdivision due to public input. Seconded***
596 ***by M. Reed.***

597
598 Roll Call

599
600 D. Marshall - Yes

601 P. Scarpetti - Yes

602 D. Boutin - Yes

603 C. Stelmach - Yes

604 M. Reed - Yes

605 R. Duhaime - Yes

606 B. Scott - Yes

607

608 **Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

609

610 D. Marshall: This board has heard the presentation and we are opening to the public.

611

612 B. Dupuis repeated his prior comments.

613

614 D. Marshall: This is a sub-division that has been approved and has been recorded with the Registry of
615 Deeds. The applicant is only looking for an extension of the active development.

616

617 B. Dupuis: Will we be privy to what is going to be happening across from our house as far as the type
618 of homes and the stages of development.

619

620 D. Marshall: Any developer is not going to be building low cost ranches in that area. I cannot see this
621 would change the look of your area, aside from the fact that you will be looking at homes instead of
622 vacant land.

623

624 N. Williams: If Mr. Dupuis would like to be kept informed of the items related to the actual construc-
625 tion, I requested that the new developer meet with staff for the pre-construction. We take minutes at
626 those meetings and talk about the phasing, construction access, and other things I think Mr. Dupuis
627 would be interested to know. I can make those minutes available to him.

628

629 B. Dupuis: That would be great.

630

631 *D. Boutin motioned to approve a two year extension of approval for Autumn Frost 18-lot subdivision*
632 *until April 20, 2022 for The Dubai Group, #2020-07, Summerfare Street, Map 35, Lots 7, 1-8 & 1-9*
633 *subject to the developer having a pre-construction conference with the Planning Department as*
634 *specified by the Town Planner. Seconded by R. Duhaime.*

635

636 Roll Call

637

638 D. Marshall - Yes

639 P. Scarpetti - Yes

640

641 D. Boutin - Yes

642 C. Stelmach - Yes

643

644 M. Reed - Yes

645

646 R. Duhaime - Yes

647

648 B. Scott - Yes

649

650 **Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

651

COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING

6. S&H LAND SERVICES #2020-08

141 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, Lot 24

Site plan for Office

652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698

John Rokey: Peter Stoddard and Tom Huot are on as well. They are the owners of S&H Land Services. showed the site plan. They went through a zoning process which they could describe. They also did a sub-division. This is an existing house at the corner they they would like to convert into a survey office.

J. Rokey showed and described the site plan.

J. Rokey: We received the State of NH driveway application, received that and I sent it to Nicholas and Bruce. We are all set in terms of state permits.

D. Marshall: Is the plan complete?

N. Williams: Yes. I would like you to address the impact fees. This is a change to a commercial use. We do not have a commercial site plan on file for it. The impact fees would typically be assessed per the square footage of the building. That total came out to \$4,719.80 for the public safety and traffic impact fee. Typically we give some kind of credit because we are taking the residential use out of the equation.

D. Marshall: This lot has never paid impact fees before so as far as we are concerned this is brand new.

B. Scott: I would say that if it hasn't paid impact fees \$4,719.80 seems fair.

D. Boutin: I think it is a good reuse of the property and will bring great use to the property. The fee is reasonable.

P. Scarpetti: I concur.

B. Scott: I concur.

D. Bouton motioned that the site plan for office for S&H Land Services #2020-08, 141 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, Lot 24 is complete. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.

R. Duhaime: Will there be any signage?

Peter Stoddard: We have someone working on signage now. We are planning on putting a small sign up near the road. We were hoping to submit a sign permit at a different time.

R. Duhaime: A concern would be a lighted sign.

N. Williams: Peter, could you provide to me what the signage will look like.

P. Stoddard: Yes. I can do that within the next week.

Roll Call

D. Marshall - Yes

699 P. Scarpetti - Yes
700 D. Boutin - Yes
701 C. Stelmach - Yes
702 M. Reed - Yes
703 R. Duhaime - Yes
704 B. Scott - Yes

705
706 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

707
708 Open public hearing.

709
710 Open to public comments.
711 No public comments.
712 Close to public comments.

713
714 Close public hearing.

715
716 *D. Boutin motioned to approve the site plan for office for S&H Land Services #2020-08, 141 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, Lot 24, conditionally upon the signage being approved by the staff. Seconded by C. Stelmach.*

719
720 Roll Call

721
722 D. Marshall - Yes
723 P. Scarpetti - Yes
724 D. Boutin - Yes
725 C. Stelmach - Yes
726 M. Reed - Yes
727 R. Duhaime - Yes
728 B. Scott - Yes

729
730 **Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

731
732 **7. RAVEN WOOD, LLC #2020-09**
733 **237 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25**
734 **Amended site plan for additional commercial buildings**

735
736 D. Marshall: Is the plan complete?

737
738 N. Williams: Yes.

739
740 *D. Boutin motioned that the amended site plan for additional commercial buildings for Ravenwood, LLC #2020-09, 237 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25 is complete. Seconded by C. Stelmach.*

741
742
743 Roll Call

744
745 D. Marshall - Yes

746 P. Scarpetti - Yes
747 D. Boutin - Yes
748 C. Stelmach - Yes
749 M. Reed - Yes
750 R. Duhaime - Yes
751 B. Scott - Yes

752

753 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

754

755 J. Rokey: When we originally did the plan we showed all three buildings. The two I am showing in
756 blue were ghosted back because we only had a ZBA approval for a single building. The zoning change
757 that just went through makes it okay for these two buildings to now be constructed. The site is con-
758 structed, the septic is built, the detention pond is done and the cistern is in. Pad areas were built for the
759 other two buildings and now they can be built. All of the approvals were for the built out site.

760

761 M. Reed: When will the trees and shrubs be planted and the landscaping be done?

762

763 Scott Bussiere: Grass won't grow for another two weeks but we are going to hydroseed the rest of the
764 job and finish the trees in the next two weeks in the front.

765

766 P. Scarpetti: Will all of the buildings be one color?

767

768 S. Bussiere: Yes.

769

770 D. Marshall: I want to congratulate you on the good use of the these buildings. They look really nice.

771

772 Open public hearing.

773

774 Open public comments.

775

775 No public comments.

776

776 Close public comments.

777

778 Close public hearing.

779

780 ***P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the amended site plan for additional commercial buildings for Ra-***

781

781 ***ven Wood, LLC #2020-09, 237 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25. Seconded by D. Boutin.***

782

783 **Roll Call**

784

785 D. Marshall - Yes

786

786 P. Scarpetti - Yes

787

787 D. Boutin - Yes

788

788 C. Stelmach - Yes

789

789 M. Reed - Yes

790

790 R. Duhaime - Yes

791

791 B. Scott - Yes

792

793 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

794

795 **OTHER BUSINESS**

796

797 N. Williams: Starbucks would like to go before you on May 4. I mentioned we would try to meet the
798 third Monday of every month during the time we are meeting via zoom. Do you feel comfortable with
799 the May 4 meeting or would you like me to hold off?

800

801 D. Boutin: Would that be remote?

802

803 N. Williams: As far as I know yes. I have not heard otherwise at this point.

804

805 It was a consensus of the Planning Board to hold the next Planning Board meeting on May 4, 2020 at
806 6:00 pm.

807

808 **ADJOURNMENT**

809

810 ***R. Duhaime motioned to adjourn. Seconded by C. Stelmach.***

811

812 D. Marshall - Yes

813 P. Scarpetti - Yes

814 D. Boutin - Yes

815 C. Stelmach - Yes

816 M. Reed - Yes

817 R. Duhaime - Yes

818 B. Scott - Yes

819

820 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

821

822 **The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 pm.**

823

824 **Respectfully submitted by,**

825

826 **/s/ AnnMarie White**

827

828 **AnnMarie White**

829 **Recording Clerk**