

1
2 **HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

3 **Hooksett Town Hall Gymnasium**

4 **Monday, July 19, 2021**

5 **6:00 PM**

6
7 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 P.M.**

8
9 **PROOF OF POSTING**

10
11 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

12
13 **ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**

14
15 *D. Boutin motioned to nominate T. Walsh for the position of Chairman of the Planning Board.*
16 *Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*

17
18 *D. Boutin motioned to nominate M. Reed as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Board. Seconded by D.*
19 *Winterton.*

20
21 *R. Duhaime motioned to nominate C. Stelmach as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Board. Seconded*
22 *by P. Scarpetti.*

23
24 R. Duhaime: After serving several years as an alternate working my way up, the senior positions always
25 went to senior member. I feel, seniority wise the Vice-Chairman position should go to Chris. You also
26 cannot miss too many meetings as Vice-Chairman.

27
28 **Votes for Matt Reed**

29
30 **D. Winterton**

31 **D. Boutin**

32 **M. Reed**

33
34 **Votes for C. Stelmach**

35
36 **P. Scarpetti**

37 **R. Duhaime**

38 **C. Stelmach**

39 **T. Walsh**

40
41 *Motion carries to elect C. Stelmach to the position of Vice-Chairman of the Planning Board with a*
42 *vote of 4-3.*

43
44 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

45
46 **PRESENT: Tom Walsh (Chairman), Chris Stelmach (Vice-Chairman), Paul Scarpetti, Matt**
47 **Reed, Don Winterton, and David Boutin (Town Council Representative)**

48
49 **ALTERNATES: Robert Duhaime (Alternate), and Denise Pichette Volk (Alternate)** (left meeting
50 at 6:47 pm.)

51
52 **EXCUSED: Mike Somers**

53
54 **STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)**

55
56 **R. Duhaime will be a voting member this evening.**

57
58 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2021**

59
60 **May 17, 2021 Meeting – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2021 meeting**
61 **with following amendments. Seconded by M. Somers.**

62 ***D. Winterton: Line 196 should read “has a relationship with an abutter” not “has a relationship***
63 ***with the applicant.”***

64
65 ***Line 498 should read proposing \$1 million, 11,000***

66
67 ***T. Walsh: Line 544 should read “Seconded by D. Winterton.”***

68
69 ***M. Reed, R. Duhaime, and Denise Pichette Volk abstained due to not being present at the May 17,***
70 ***2021 meeting. Motion carried with a vote of 5-0.***

71
72 **OTHER BUSINESS**

73
74 **1. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

75
76 Andre Garron (Town Administrator) proposed the Capital Improvement Plan to the Planning Board (at-
77 tached to these minutes). T. Walsh had questions regarding the new format of the CIP. Christine
78 Tewksbury (Finance Director) explained how the new format of the CIP is structured. T. Walsh asked
79 what the current town building maintenance CIP reserve fund is and about doubling it. C. Tewksbury
80 explained it was being doubling because the there was no place the parking lots for the town buildings
81 were being budgeted. We thought it would be better to save for it yearly and add it to the existing re-
82 served that is in place. T. Walsh asked about the difference between the 2022-2023 CIP spending ver-
83 sus last year and if there is an increase or decrease? C. Tewksbury discussed what items would have an
84 increase and what would stay the same and stated there is an increase of approximately \$420,000 with-
85 out the paving. R. Duhaime asked if there have been any bonds that were paid off? C. Tewksbury
86 stated there was not, however, there was a capital lease that was paid off. P. Scarpetti stated that the
87 TIF is showing over \$6 million how that was funded. A. Garron stated that they are looking to leverage
88 what is in there with what can be borrowed, as well as some off setting revenue from the sewer com-
89 mission and end users. He stated that that the town has grant applications as well.

90
91 ***D. Boutin motioned to accept the 2022-2023 Capital Improvement Plan. Seconded by R. Duhaime.***
92

93 T. Walsh: I appreciate all of the work that has put into this plan. Each one of these items will go on the
94 warrant to be voted for or against by the towns people.

95
96 C. Tewksbury: It is the purview of the Town Council to decide where to place the items. They might
97 decide they are not going to do something or they might decide to put them in the operating budget or
98 as a warrant article. This is just the first step.

99
100 TW There are a few things I do not necessarily agree with but, to keep the process moving and as a
101 plan, I will support it.

102
103 M. Reed: Will the old town hall be on this?

104
105 A. Garron: The number and the plan will most likely be a warrant article. That is not planned for the
106 CIP this year. We want to get the plan first. Now that we have the direction from the Town Council we
107 can move forward with the meeting house and bring back to you what that will look like and what it
108 will cost.

109
110 R. Duhaime: At the Town Council meeting the public will have a chance to offer public input.

111
112 **ROLL CALL**

113
114 **D. Winterton: Yes**

115 **D. Boutin: Yes**

116 **P. Scarpetti: Yes**

117 **R. Duhaime: Yes**

118 **M. Reed: Yes**

119 **C. Stelmach: Yes**

120 **T. Walsh: Yes**

121
122 A. Garron: The next step is for this to go to the Budget Committee and then to the Town Council.

123
124 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

125
126 **CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION**

127
128 **2. CHELMSFORD HOOKSETT PROPERTIES, LLC**

129 **2 College Park Drive, Map 9, Lot 34-1**

130 **Proposed apartments in existing building**

131
132 T. Walsh: This is a pending case in the ZBA and I do not think it is appropriate for us to talk about it,
133 nor provide any type of opinions which would make us part of their deliberations. In my opinion, that is
134 not the way it is done.

135
136 Attorney John Cronin (Cronin, Bisson, and Zalinsky): With me is Arthur Sullivan of Brady Sullivan.
137 The ZBA asked if we would go to the Planning Board to get your feedback. In fairness to the ZBA one
138 of the things discussed is the former Cigna building. That is on a 36 acre parcel. Infrastructure was ap-
139 proved. They have also acquired the larger 60 acre parcel that is to the north. There are no present plans

140 to develop that. We have suggested that it makes sense to us to have you put a committee together to
141 master plan this. MU1, where this sits, is much more restrictive than MU2 across the street. When you
142 look at MU1 in this economy and with uses, you can't afford to build office space and lease it at cost. It
143 is a white elephant at this point in time. We would be happy to join with the committee to work to-
144 gether to master plan that northern parcel. I agree to leave the variance alone and head back to the
145 ZBA.

146
147 D. Boutin: This is not a reflection of you, it is about the process. It is not the role of the Planning
148 Board to be a consultant to the Zoning Board.

149
150 Attorney Cronin: I understand you do not want to have conflicts between the different roles of the
151 boards. We want to do whatever we are told to be transparent and present the plan the best way we can.
152 We would be willing to get a planner, a zoner, maybe the person you are working with as far as the
153 master plan to try to get some outlines and definition. We don't want to take a step alone and have peo-
154 ple say this is not what they want and stigmatize that land. I was surprised with the view up the river.
155 This would be spectacular for housing. I recognize where everyone is heading toward mixed use it is
156 just narrow in MU1.

157
158 T. Walsh: The 60 acres is meant for MU4. We will reach out to our Town Administrator and poten-
159 tially put something together.

160
161 **3. JR OUELETTE**
162 **3 Dartmouth Street, Map 18, Lot 29**
163 **Older Person Housing development**
164

165 JR Ouelette (President and Owner of Springwood Homes and Development Corporation; Resident of
166 Hooksett): Chris came before you on May 3, 2021 to see if four units could be build on this property.
167 Currently there is a vacant run down home on this property that is situated in the PZ. This area is in
168 need of a face lift and this project would jump start that process. The property is approximately three
169 acres in size, the land is relative flat, and it is adjacent to a mobile home park. The existing neighbor-
170 hood has some commercial, a 55+ older person development, and many residential homes. The existing
171 older person development is at the end of the street and wraps around to Hunt Street. Our interest in
172 this property is for building a 55+ older person community. Currently there are no new or used units
173 available in Hooksett and there is need with the aging population. This type of project will also provide
174 for an opportunity to increase our tax base without having to provide any services whereby making it
175 similar to commercial use. A rough conceptual plan is included in your package. We would like to cre-
176 ate a private road from Dartmouth Street to Hunt Street. The road would be owned and maintained by
177 the community. We are proposing a total of 14 stick frame units. The water and sewer departments
178 have confirmed that water and sewer is available for the units. This would consist of six single units,
179 four double units. Each unit would have a two stall attached garage, two bedrooms, two bathrooms, a
180 small patio, and full basements. We would hire a company for trash, lawn care, and maintenance that
181 the development would pay for. There would be nine overflow parking spaces. We want to get the per-
182 spective of the on a proposed use.

183
184 R. Duhaime: This is a pretty good idea. We were hoping someone would tie this lot to the front lot.
185 When you put the street in you are cutting it off. It almost makes sense and lends itself to it. As far as
186 PZ, it doesn't allow for this use. What is behind this?

187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233

N. Williams: Brookridge is within the MU5 which is a master plan community similar to MU2. It would place limitations on the density and total acreage. It does allow residential by right.

R. Duhaime: Would he be able to get 14 units on three acres if he was in that district?

N. Williams: It complicates things with 55+ communities because then we fall under our elderly housing ordinance which has its own limitations for the number of units that are permitted. Three dwelling units per acre are permitted by right.

R. Duhaime: Nine would be the maximum he could apply for and he is abutting that district, correct?

N. Williams: He would have to seek relief from the ZBA for this and to exceed the density.

D. Boutin: The structure is on Lot 56?

JR Ouelette: Yes, but that is not an accurate plan. It is really off.

T. Walsh: I know this is PZ. Someone came to us with this lot and asked about four houses. The reason we put this in PZ is we hoped this would turn into merged lots for the future plans of the town having commercial areas which is the direction the town is going in. I don't believe that person got a favorable recommendation. You are looked at 14.

JR Ouelette: They are two different things. A single family home costs the district money. For intensive purposes this is like commercial. There is no affect to the schools, no plowing, no trash pick up. It is all revenue to the town.

T. Walsh: This would require a waiver from the ZBA.

N. Williams: The residential use is not permitted by right. He could seek a waiver to allow for the use from the Planning Board or he could move the rezoning on to a warrant in March which has its own process.

M. Reed: To rezone Benton Road didn't that go to the warrant article?

N. Williams: That was for 7 Martins Ferry. That was a PZ lot that was put on the warrant through the appropriate channels. They had a public hearing to rezone it to MDR.

T. Walsh: We looked at that lot differently because it is behind McDonalds's and at the top of the hill. I did not realize they were going to seek immediate relief with the ZBA.

JR Ouelette: In speaking with Nicholas he stated I could go for a waiver and not petition the town. If that is the feeling of the board that is the direction I should take then I will head in that direction. If I can avoid that I would prefer to.

T. Walsh: You could come to us for a waiver with a plan set. If you get it you get it, if you do not it starts over and the only other avenue would be to get it on the warrant article to change the zoning and

234 hope it gets adopted by the citizens. Once adopted, if it is more than what the density should be you
235 would have to go to the ZBA to get a variance for density which is what happened on Martins Ferry.

236
237 JR Ouelette: If the waiver got approved here then I would have to go for a waiver?

238
239 N. Williams: Depending on the density you are proposing it could be that you would need a waiver.
240 Because it is being proposed as elderly housing it falls under the purview of MU7 which is outside of
241 Planning Board jurisdiction.

242
243 D. Boutin: I would not hold out a lot of hope of this board taking action on this at this time. I would
244 recommend you put out a warrant article to the town. You will get a much quicker answer.

245
246 C. Stelmach: Why are the six single units on one side and four double on the other?

247
248 JR Ouelette: I was just trying to mix them up.

249
250 R. Duhaime: For the amount of units put in that area there was no infrastructure on Hunt Street or
251 Dartmouth Street that was improved. I have heard from some constituents about the traffic issue trying
252 to get out of there. With the lack of timing between the lights on DW Highway they feel like they are
253 taking their lives in their hands trying to get out of there and this would be adding traffic to it. That is
254 why we were looking for some type of commercial development in that area. That was the whole idea
255 of keeping this lot in the PZ.

256
257 JR Ouelette: I was looking for a smaller type of development. This would keep with what is out there
258 now. I think any type of commercial will be tough to get approved. They woman who owns it is in her
259 80's and she would like to have a few dollars before she passes on. Commercial is hard to get approved
260 and no one is buying it.

261
262 T. Walsh: Getting out of there is notoriously bad because the timing of the lights is deteriorating.

263
264 ***D. Boutin motioned to close the presentation.***

265
266 T. Walsh: I am not comfortable giving you a recommendation.

267
268 **CONTINUED FROM JUNE 21, 2021**

269
270 **4. JERRY LEE BROWN & KAREN LEA BROWN #2021-16**

271 **57 Granite Street, Map 6, Lot 31**

272 **2 lot subdivision**

273 ***Public hearing was closed at the June 21, 2021, Planning Board meeting**

274
275 Joe Wichert: This parcel is serviced by municipal sewer and water. There is an existing one family res-
276 idence on the property. The abutters had concerns about the conditions of the house and drainage. On
277 the new lot we will keep the drainage better or the same. I do not believe there were an complaints.

278
279 T. Walsh: Nicholas, our engineer came up with two solutions and I don't see that either worked.

280

281 N. Williams: The July 14, 2021 memorandum from the town engineer states that he requires that they
282 mimic the existing drainage pattern that is there.

283
284 D. Boutin: What is the status of the house on that lot?

285
286 N. Williams: The home is currently vacant. We touch base with the owner, Mrs. Brown, and provided
287 an email correspondence to you.

288
289 N. Williams read an email dated June 22, 2021 from Mrs. Brown to him into the record.

290
291 D. Boutin: I think this is a straightforward sub-division.

292
293 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the sub-division subject to the existing home being demolished within***
294 ***6 months for a 2 lot subdivision for Jerry Lee Brown & Karen Lea Brown #2021-16, 57 Granite***
295 ***Street, Map 6, Lot 31.***

296
297 T. Walsh: I drove by the house. I saw the house and it is overgrown but I did not see any garbage.
298 Someone is mowing the parcel next to it. I was also there on a rainy day and it has been raining quite
299 often, and I did not see any water issues. I feel uncomfortable trying to do something with a contin-
300 gency like that.

301
302 D. Boutin: In the email she says she is going to do it. If she says she is going to do it we should clarify
303 in the record that she will do it.

304
305 T. Walsh: I am not saying that I disagree, I just don't know if we have the legal ability to do it.

306
307 R. Duhaime: I was looking at the house and the driveway. We could request to see where the houses
308 and driveways will be, make sure the drainage runs properly. I don't think the house is currently within
309 the set back.

310
311 N. Williams: This board granted a waiver to allow them to alleviate from the driveway requirement
312 which is 150' from the intersection.

313
314 R. Duhaime: Is the driveway going to be on Knights Ave for the spare lot?

315
316 T. Walsh: Yes. The site plan that was before us showed the driveway in its original position. The
317 added lot showed the driveway on Knights Ave. They needed a waiver because there was no other
318 place to put it.

319
320 T. Walsh: I asked if this could be done with a demolition permit. I did not know if we needed to spend
321 the money on an attorney because I did not think it would get to this type of motion.

322
323 ***D. Boutin motioned to get a legal opinion on what the Planning Board can and cannot do with the***
324 ***existing house and table until the August 2, 2021 meeting for Jerry Lee Brown & Karen Lea Brown***
325 ***#2021-16, 57 Granite Street, Map 6, Lot 31.***

326
327 T. Walsh: We are beating our heads against the wall over a minor sub-division.

328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374

P. Scarpetti: You have two lots, the house, and another lot. If they sell the other lot, or build on it, can we put a restriction that they can't get an occupancy permit on the new house until the other house is torn down?

T. Walsh: I don't disagree with either idea. It is an eyesore in the neighborhood. I don't know what we have for legal ability to be determining the outcome of somebody's asset. Regardless of what it looks like it is still somebody's asset. We can't tell them to knock it down. We can't hold it hostage on something else that we approve next door. That is my interpretation so I would be hesitant to put a condition on this like that.

J. Wichert: Mrs. Brown is in the audience. She says that is the intent. From a practical matter, the board signs a plan and we sell a lot. What if they decide they want to renovate the house? What does that mean? I think the only concern I am hearing from the board and neighbors is the condition of the existing house. If it is renovated, it is in better condition. Doesn't that alleviate the concern?

T. Walsh: I have to look at this is somebody's asset and they still own the asset. We do not have a legal answer so this is just opinions.

R. Duhaime: If the house is not conforming, and now you are creating another lot and not solving the non-conforming original lot, why would you do that?

T. Walsh: It is grandfathered.

R. Duhaime: It is until you sub-divide it. Now you have changed it.

T. Walsh: Nicholas, is the size of the existing lot conforming?

N. Williams: It is conforming.

J. Wichert: The only issue we have with the house location is it is closer than the current set back, however, that predates any of the ordinance. Whether we have one or two lots, that is a grandfathered use and the proposed lot line is greater than required. The requirement to remove a house to get a sub-division approved is something I have not seen before.

R. Duhaime: I would not have suggested tearing the house down. I was just saying if that is done I would like to see where both houses and the two driveways would be and then it would be easier for me to approve.

J. Wichert: There is only one spot we can put in a driveway and that is where it is now.

D. Winterton: Wouldn't this be easier for us if the house were down?

J. Wichert: We do road front sub-divisions all the time and do not have to take anything down.

D. Boutin: The email says it is going to be torn down.

375 K. Brown: When I decide what I want to do. I don't know if I want to replace it on the same footprint
376 or move it into the current guidelines the town has. Until I decide I do not want to take it down and fill
377 up the existing basement just to have to dig it out again.

378
379 D. Boutin: When are you going to decide?

380
381 K. Brown: I will decide when I am ready to decide.

382
383 P. Scarpetti: They own the property. If they want to leave the house and they hire a structural engineer
384 to redo it, that is their prerogative. We have to look at it from that standpoint. Until the health officer
385 has to go in and have it torn and assess the demolition to put an assessment on the property, I don't
386 think we make someone tear down a house. We can ask for legal opinion.

387
388 T. Walsh: I agree. I do not believe that we can legally take someones asset remove it so they can get
389 approved for a sub-division. It is an asset even if you think it is run down. Look at the price of founda-
390 tions and building materials. It is worth money the way it sits. That is an asset. There is a motion on the
391 table to seek legal counsel and to table this.

392
393 **Seconded by R. Duhaime.**

394
395 **ROLL CALL**

396
397 **D. Winterton: No**

398 **D. Boutin: Yes**

399 **P. Scarpetti: No**

400 **R. Duhaime: Yes**

401 **M. Reed: No**

402 **C. Stelmach: Yes**

403 **T. Walsh: Yes**

404
405 **Motion carried with a vote of 4-3.**

406
407 K. Brown: Is it normal to put restrictions on sub-divisions on a simple lot?

408
409 T. Walsh: Nothing is typical and that is why I voted to seek the opinion. There are conditions put on
410 just about every application to come out of these meetings.

411
412 *Break 7:25 pm*

413
414 *Reconvened at 7:37 pm*

415
416 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

417
418 **5. PORT ONE COMPANIES #2020-29**
419 **47 Hackett Hill Road, Map 17, Lot 7**
420 **500,000 sf warehouse/distribution building**

421

422 T. Walsh: We have a list of things that we put together at our last meeting. The applicant provided a
423 memorandum of the process of beginning to go through the items (attached).
424

425 Peter Bartash (Port One Companies): We want to give you an update of what we have been doing. We
426 have had a series of other meetings in town and have been coordinating with other stakeholders around
427 the project. We also want to show you images of the project in response to your questions about build-
428 ing materials, colors, and aesthetic of the project, we will go through the comment letter, and we want
429 to discuss the outline of the mitigation contribution that we are proposing to the town in response to the
430 question to clarify the schedule of those contributions. We are sensitive to recognizing that this is a
431 large project that the board is wanting to do it's due diligence to the project and process and we are go-
432 ing to continue to be a collaborative stakeholder as we have from day one. A part of that is ensuring we
433 are meeting with other stakeholders in town and having conversations around water and sewer exten-
434 sions, discussing off-site traffic improvements, and making sure we understand the needs of the town
435 beyond offsetting the impacts of the project itself. We met with the Hooksett Sewer Commission. In
436 attendance at that meeting was Andre Garron and the superintendent of the Hooksett Village Water
437 Precinct. We began to discuss the framework and details of how we could accomplish bringing water
438 and sewer to this site, who would be responsible for that work, and how that work would be funded as a
439 function of the contributions that we are proposing on behalf of the project and the work we have done,
440 to date, to evaluate the method of bringing the sewer and water to the site. We had additional conversa-
441 tions with Bruce Thomas, NH DOT, and NH DOT's consultant HNTB relative to NH DOT's evalua-
442 tion of impact to the toll ramp coming off of I93 to this project. We have conversations with the De-
443 partment of Environmental Services relative to their requests for additional information. We have been
444 providing the state with additional information to support our application request to dredge and fill the
445 two wetlands in the center of the site. The board has asked us to be more specific about the materials
446 we were proposing, the colors we were intending for the project, the character of the building, it's fa-
447 cade, and to provide some additional information as far as how the building will look and feel on the
448 site. I am showing an ariel view if you are hovering over the Benton Street and Cross Road looking
449 northeast toward the project site with I93 running diagonally from the right hand side to the upper top
450 portion of the slide along the right hand side of the proposed building. The proposed building is nestled
451 into the bowl of the site. We have spend a significant amount of time developing these images and
452 looking critically at topography of the existing landscape and to understand the nature of the buffering
453 of the site and the building with the existing site conditions. There is some significant natural buffering
454 opportunities that have important impacts to mitigating noise and light concerns. When looking at the
455 proposed building we are seeing the truck court sandwiched between the building and topography
456 against I93. The existing vegetative buffer is along the site boundary to the residential abutting proper-
457 ties along Hackett Hill Road and Cross Road. In the foreground is the rear 15 acres of our property
458 which is shown but not developed. The existing prime wetland will remain. On the facade we have be-
459 gun to develop a rhythm and language of colored panels that are typical for this type of architecture but
460 also start to breakdown the visual scale and length of the building and provide a repetitive facade as
461 you travel along the building. This building is not visible from the abutting properties. All the abutters
462 will be able to see is trees. There is no visual connection from these properties. You can see this build-
463 ing from the highway and a corner as you travel along Hackett Hill Road next to where Chucksters is.
464

465 D. Winterton: Is there enough room for all the parking proposed?
466

467 Nick Golon (TF Moran, Civil and Traffic Engineer for the project) There has been an update to park-
468 ing. The parking total has come down to less than 400 parking spaces. There is some additional area
469 that will flex space for truck trailer storage or parking.
470

471 P. Bartash: The parking is all accommodated to be in the front of the building. Looking at the view
472 from Hackett Hill Road facing southeast. The new proposed entry into the site has a median that forces
473 a right hand turn to force trucks to go toward the highway. The boundary with Chucksters has a vegeta-
474 tive buffer that will remain at the edge of the site. Due to the topography, the building is nestled into
475 the the grade. The front of the two parcels has been brought up significantly from its previous elevation
476 to provide additional screening to the building in the rear. There is only a 300-400' stretch on Hackett
477 Hill Road that you have view into the site. The view from I93 shows the facade and the rhythm of the
478 panels starts to breakdown the visual length of this building. It allows this building to recede into the
479 site itself. We are proposing transom mirrors along the length of the building which helps to break
480 down the visual vertical scale and provide natural light to the interior. The parking is situation along the
481 back side of the building. All of the trucking will be facing the highway.
482

483 P. Bartash showed a visual of the building from the toll ramp and coming onto the highway.
484

485 P. Bartash: For purposed of the visual, we pared away some of the trees on the buffer between the
486 highway and the site so that we could see down into the side and describe how this building sits in the
487 site itself and the color breakdown and facade of the building. The office operations will face the main
488 entry of the site. You can see the tops of the dock bays that sit on the back of the building facing the
489 highway. I93 is at or slightly above the elevation of the roof of this building. We specified and will be
490 installing structure that is solar capable. It is possible that, if a tenant were to be leasing and wanted to
491 install solar they would be able to. A possible tenant we are speaking with now is envisioning transi-
492 tioning their trailer trucks from fossil fuels to electric vehicles over the next five to ten years. Being
493 able to provide solar and electric on the site, that isn't just tapping to the power grid, is attractive from
494 an end user standpoint.
495

496 M. Reed: Isn't there a existing power line there? What are you going to do with that?
497

498 P. Bartash: The existing power line will remain. We are protecting the Eversource easement that is on
499 the site. Those power lines have to stay where they are.
500

501 T. Walsh: They were already moved once, weren't they?
502

503 N. Golon: Yes. They were relocated toward the highway. That is a backbone distribution line that ser-
504 vices the area.
505

506 P. Bartash: Regarding the material of the building, the entire facade is tilt up precast panels with an
507 architectural grade finish. It has a nice clean look to it.
508

509 D. Boutin: It is a nice looking building. What will your overall landscaping plan be?
510

511 N. Golon: In the south/southwest quadron of the building, which is the closest proximity to the wet-
512 land that is located partly on our site is a fairly significant landscape restoration project that is being
513 done as part of this project. There are varying elevations of grasses, shrubs, and small trees that are

514 conducive to the types of existing plants as well as rare and endangered species that are located within
515 that prime wetland. Our landscape architect took the guidebook from the wetlands bureau, took the spe-
516 cies that are conducive to that area, and supplemented them in that area. Beyond that are grass islands
517 on either side of the access drive and street trees. The front of the property will have street trees and a
518 larger central island that will provide some green scape. There is a landscape screen that is being pro-
519 vided consistent with your regulations to make sure we achieve the 50' landscape screening area when
520 there is a commercial use abutting a residential use.

521
522 D. Boutin: What will happen along I93?
523

524 N. Golon: The existing Eversource corridor is in that location. There is a portion of the lot that abuts
525 that highway that will not change. The existing tree screen that exists now between the corridor and the
526 highway will not be touched as part of this project.
527

528 D. Boutin: On the right side of the building?
529

530 N. Golon: Correct.
531

532 C. Stelmach: There is guardrail coming off of Hackett Hill going down into the road. How close to the
533 set back is that? Is there any screening between that and Chucksters to screen the road going in so the
534 golfers are not looking at it?
535

536 N. Golon: The benefit we have is the elevation change. We have a guardrail but there is not much that
537 can be accomplished there due to the limitation of the space. We could add a row of planting on the
538 other side of the guardrail and push the driveway over further, but that would be at the detriment of the
539 remaining parcel. We have tucked that driveway as close to the property line as was possible.
540

541 C. Stelmach: How close is the end of the guardrail? That is past the back side of the Chucksters prop-
542 erty correct?
543

544 N. Golon: If you are standing on Hackett Hill Road looking down at that angle, you have the limits of
545 the golf course and the bog that exists with the landscaped planting. We are tying in at the transition
546 that is a grass slope where it drops off. There will be a green buffer that exists between the two uses. It
547 will just be grass versus landscaping and the majority of that area is on the Chucksters lot.
548

549 C. Stelmach: I am talking about the berm that goes along the back of Chucksters. Could they plant
550 something along that to screen the road?
551

552 N. Golon: There is a fair elevation change. If it was a concern to them, planting in close proximity to
553 their closest element would shield it and provide some added benefit. That is true.
554

555 T. Walsh: Is the driveway set in stone? Is that an easement? What property is that?
556

557 N. Golon: We have established what that easement will be with the owner of the entity. Peter has had
558 on-going negotiations with him.
559

560 P. Bartash: We have explored multiple potential locations for the easement with the owner of those
561 parcels. The request to relocate that easement is directly from the owner of those parcels. They are
562 looking to consolidate their land area. We have agreed the easement should be located on this side of
563 the property. That is what they want to see. There may be some final refinement to specifics of the
564 grading of the drive area because they are trying to get the driveway as tight as it can be to the property
565 line. We are also realistic to what the limits are in terms of how far we can push that. We are showing
566 what we believe is the most realistic place for that easement to be as far as configuration and location
567 to allow them to do what they want to accomplish.

568
569 T. Walsh: Where is the current access?
570

571 P. Bartash showed where the current easement exists.
572

573 R. Duhaime: I assumed that you would have kept the alignment with Pike intersection that is across
574 from this. That is the end of the state right of way. Is this is the town section of the road? As far as
575 keeping the traffic as close to the highway, I know elevation wise it is a bit higher at that part of the
576 road, but I thought this would be a shared driveway and now I see a private driveway. They are giving
577 you an easement across their property but they are assuming they are going to keep their driveway with
578 the state that they have now?
579

580 N. Golon: The state's jurisdiction ends at that abutment. The existing driveway that is on that property
581 now is a town driveway with a town driveway permit, not a state driveway. For the other projects we
582 proposed, even though NH DOT reviewed it from the standpoint of impacts to Hackett Hill Road and
583 Rt. 3A, it has never been a state driveway.
584

585 T. Walsh: Does the state still have an easement going along side Hackett Hill Road beyond their juris-
586 diction of the road itself?
587

588 N. Golon: With a prior applicant, we added supplemental landscaping so there had to be a joint use
589 agreement between the town and the owner stating the landscaping would be allowed but if we ever
590 wanted to take it out we have the authority to do so.
591

592 R. Duhaime: They are suggesting where you put this and you are in agreement to where it is?
593

594 N. Golon: We don't have control of what they do. The location of the current driveway easement is in
595 the middle of the two properties and is not conducive to future commercial development.
596

597 R. Duhaime: Commercial development comes second to the Hooksett town citizens. Normally you
598 would like up the intersections and there is a road right across from this.
599

600 N. Golon: There is also another driveway directly opposite to this intersection.
601

602 R. Duhaime: With the experience I have driving tractor trailers, I am curious about the island at the
603 exit. Why would you do that?
604

605 P. Bartash: One of the comments we received was discussing how modes of transportation would split
606 and where they and where they would travel. We know from speaking with our end users that the trac-
607 tor trailers are going to make the quickest possible move from the site to the highway and back because
608 that is their line of travel for distribution. There is no cost benefit to avoiding the toll. As an attempt to
609 provide a passive solution to continue to encourage tractor trailer migration coming out of the site, we
610 installed this island to create a right turn only condition for those trucks and to split those traffic modes
611 so that there would never be a left hand turn maneuver for a tractor trailer coming out. We also looked
612 at the turning radii and movements into the site to make sure the turning was completely appropriate
613 even with the island drawn in and designed around that intersection.

614
615 R. Duhaime: You don't want to provide a left hand turn lane?

616
617 N. Golon: It is not a question of want it is a question of need. Our traffic engineer ran the guidelines
618 and said a left hand turn lane is not warranted.

619
620 D. Boutin: Regarding a comment made about the design plans for the proposed retaining walls, I read
621 that as if you are stating you are not going to supply that information to the Planning Board and you are
622 going to wait and supply that information to the building inspector.

623
624 N. Golon: That is normal process.

625
626 P. Bartash: From a process standpoint and in terms of our approach to the project, part of that process
627 is to find the extent as to where the retaining walls are. The specific detail of engineering of those walls
628 is accomplished during the technical documentation stage before we submit for an actual building per-
629 mit application.

630
631 D. Boutin: That starts here. You need to supply that information to the Planning Board. Our town engi-
632 neer will review it. The town engineer has already raised questions about the different heights of the
633 retaining walls and that he wanted to see them uniform. This board needs to see your retaining wall
634 plans.

635
636 N. Golon: As part of the revisions to the plans that are before you, we have deleted a significant
637 amount of retaining wall. That was done with some minor revisions to the tractor trailer storage loca-
638 tion and some minor edits within the actual Eversource easement which can be accomplished by a joint
639 use agreement. With those revisions, 95% of that wall is under 21' which can be obtained with a free
640 standing wall; a typical redirock retaining wall. We have provided detail of that on the plan set. What
641 are you looking for?

642
643 D. Boutin: There is discussion about different types of walls.

644
645 N. Golon: We have reviewed the wall heights with Bruce Thomas and he does not have any outstand-
646 ing issues with regard to the proposed wall heights. Where we had a large section of wall previously, it
647 is now deleted. There was 2000 linear feet of wall was shown on the eastern side. We have deleted over
648 850 linear feet of it as part of the design revisions.

649
650 D. Boutin: You need to show that wall and it's height on the site plan.

651

652 P. Bartash: That wall is shown in detail on the site submission package.

653

654 N. Golon: That information is on the plans in detail and stamped by the structural engineer. The
655 heights of that wall are shown every 50’.

656

657 R. Duhaime: As a commercial driver, when you proceed down a hill you let off the fuel as a safety.
658 When you take a turn you decrease your speed. There is a large island to sweep a truck around. If you
659 have a long distance tractor trailer or truck and take a sweeping left hand turn the first thing you do is
660 weave to the right and turn to the left. I don’t want to hook that island, get a flat tire, or shift my load. I
661 am trying to turn into the site. The blinking light is up at the previous site. I don’t know the signage and
662 don’t see the lights.

663

664 N. Golon: That is the highpoint on Hackett Hill Road and you be coming to the crest. We can evaluate
665 pulling that curb line back 5 or 10’ to provide a wider girth as suggested.

666

667 R. Duhaime: Is anything mentioned as far as the arrows on the turning lines and the signage showing
668 how this will work? Will there be a blinking light moved down to this intersection?

669

670 N. Golon: The improvement on the plan are what is being proposed.

671

672 T. Walsh: I believe we are on Number 3.

673

674 P. Scarpetti: How far along are you on the final plans as far as the elevations? You have 1,000’ on the
675 western side that we don’t know what it will look like.

676

677 P. Bartash: As part of the updated application material, we provided full elevations of all sides of the
678 building and a full conceptual plan of the building to support that.

679

680 P. Scarpetti: Is it detailed what the materials are including the windows, etc.?

681

682 P. Bartash Yes and it spells out specifically what the materials are. There are enlarged details as well
683 that describe the nature of the elevation of the architecture.

684

685 Number 4 regarding the financial information was discussed later in the meeting

686

687 N. Golon read number 5 and number 6 and their responses into the record.

688

689 P. Bartash: We met with the Conservation Commission to describe what we would be proposing to do
690 to protect the prime wetland. We are installing a two foot wall along that side of the drive isle to protect
691 that wetland. As far as the classification of these wetlands being jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional,
692 there is an exception within the existing state regulations that would allow us to classify the man made
693 wash pond and detention pond as non-jurisdictional. However, for the purposes of our application to
694 NH DES relative to the wetland permitting, we have classified those as jurisdictional and included
695 those as a factor of the calculation that we will be contributing to the state. We tried to take a regulation
696 friendly view of the wetlands whether than fighting about what is in and out of jurisdiction.

697

698 N. Golon: Number 7 ambient light

699

700 T. Walsh: There will be zero candles at the line but will this have the glow? Will these be non-direc-
701 tional modern LED lights?

702

703 N. Golon: They are all in full compliance.

704

705 R. Duhaime: Is the lighting going all the way up the road and at the intersection?

706

707 N. Golon: No. We have tried to limit the locations of site lighting. A lot of this is building mounted
708 lighting. The site driveway has some light poles. Knowing we have residential neighbors we wanted to
709 be sensitive to that and design at the site line lighting for emergency access egress.

710

711 P. Bartash: This is in full compliance with the town of Hooksett lighting requirements.

712

713 R. Duhaime: Will the signage in the island be lit?

714

715 N. Golon: There will be no signage on the island.

716

717 N. Golon read numbers 8 and 9 into the record.

718

719 D. Boutin: Are we going to see that information or is only the building inspector going to see it?

720

721 N. Golon: You are presently seeing that information. It is included in the site plans.

722

723 N. Golon read number 10 and number 11 into the record.

724

725 N. Golon: Water and sewer are being done in coordination with the TIF district.

726

727 D. Boutin: My understanding is the sewer will be going across the river, across a couple of state par-
728 cels, down Cross Road, under Rt. 3A, and there will be a pumping station down by the ice arena.

729

730 P. Bartash: We evaluated the three possible routes to bring sewer to this site: 1) over land, through the
731 neighborhood, directly across Rt. 3A along Cross Road, and through an easement to the south of our
732 site; 2) out of Tri-Town, across Rt. 3A, underneath the highway, and through the Ritchie Brothers par-
733 cel with a directional board; 3) up Hackett Hill, up Rt. 3A, and around to Hackett Hill Road. Of those
734 three options, looking at practicality and cost, the best option appears to be to go over land and up from
735 the south to the site. We would be introducing sewer to the site from the south, extending sewer
736 through the parcel to the front parcels and back to Hackett Hill Road. Future developments on Hackett
737 Hill Road could then take the connection point and eventually create the remainder of the loop to the
738 pumping station.

739

740 D. Boutin: Where is the sewerage going? Is it going into the pumping station to pump it underneath the
741 river, and over to the treatment plant?

742

743 P. Bartash: Yes. There is an existing line underneath the river. As a part of this improvement, that new
744 pumping station would be installed and it would activate that line underneath the river.

745

746 P. Scarpetti: Are you going to build a pumping station at Tri-Town or are you going to go to the pump
747 station being proposed at Exit 10?

748
749 P. Bartash: There is an aspect of what we are proposing to do that is what we are able to contribute to
750 solve this issue along with the TIF district. There is a lot of coordination with broader efforts in town to
751 do the work at both Exit 10 and 11. We heard tonight about the CIP and that there is ongoing dialog
752 about how to be able to do improvements at both exits. We would be connecting to a new pump station
753 at Tri-Town arena and not going down to Exit 10.

754
755 D. Boutin: You are paying for the pumping station correct?

756
757 P. Bartash: We are aiming to do is to be able to provide the up front capital to be able to support the
758 construction of the pumping station and the water and sewer network connections. Also, we are not
759 seeking tax relief for the project so that we immediately would be paying into the TIF district to the
760 amount of roughly \$1.5 million per year, once the facility is operational, to fund those district improve-
761 ments.

762
763 D. Boutin: Do you know how much it costs to build a pumping station?

764
765 P. Bartash: Yes.

766
767 D. Boutin: How much?

768
769 P. Bartash: Approximately \$3 million for the pumping station.

770
771 D. Boutin: You are going to pay for that?

772
773 P. Bartash: When looking at how the work is financed and funded, it is not just writing a \$3 million
774 check for the pumping station and a \$3 million check to bring the lines to the site. It is the project writ-
775 ing and the contributions we will be making that would fund the actual work through the TIF district,
776 and the project helps the district pay down that cost by not requesting tax relief. The project finances it
777 in coordination with the town rather than the project entirely shouldering that cost which would render
778 the project financially infeasible.

779
780 D. Boutin: You can't expect the town to kick in.

781
782 P. Bartash: The TIF district itself is designed specifically to facilitate the redevelopment of these prop-
783 erties and to encourage the extension of the water and sewer network in this area. We, as a project, are
784 going as far as we can to be the catalyst to be able to make that work happen in this district. Other pro-
785 jects will have the potential to be able to tap in that could never front the cost of doing that work.

786
787 D. Winterton: If I am hearing you correctly, you are going to help and probably build the pump station
788 for about \$3 million. The TIF district already has a project in mind and engineering in mind that they
789 would like to do. Your thoughts are that the TIF district could borrow the money somewhere, or bond it
790 somewhere, to put in that infrastructure but because you are going to be inside the TIF district, I don't
791 know what that parcel pays for taxes now,

792

793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839

P. Bartash: \$20,000.

D. Winterton: you will be paying \$1.5 million. That means the TIF district will receive \$1.5 million a year for that project until the entire project is done.

P. Bartash: Correct.

T. Walsh: Some towns want more money, as a downstroke, and will ask for tax relief for a period of time. We are going to have to look at all the infrastructure that needs to happen, look at how much that \$1.5 million will cover, and how long it will take the bonds off.

D. Boutin: I don't understand who is paying for the pipe.

T. Walsh: The way I understand it the way this is working is, because they are in the TIF district, they have their proposed up front money for certain projects. That is what they are planning on contributing. They are hoping the TIF district is successful. Because they are in the TIF district their \$1.5 million per year property tax goes towards paying the bonds off in that TIF district. I don't think they are proposing paying for it.

D. Boutin: The town isn't going to bond it.

P. Bartash: This is talking about the contributions to number 4. We are proposing to contribute \$1.2 million on day one which will cover the bond allocation for that additional work that we need to have happen, so that money is available in escrow to the town before the property is ever paying taxes. In that we are in the TIF district, we are not requesting any tax relief. We are paying for this work. We are just not paying for all of the first costs of the work. We are providing additional funding for the town to be able to start the work that it has wanted to do for a long time and also providing surety to be able to allow for that bonding to happen to be able to do that work.

D. Boutin: If you are putting \$1.2 million into sewer, what are you putting into Hackett Hill Road Rd., Rt. 3A, and Exit 11.

N. Golon: We have that information as part of number 4. There is a full contributions breakdown within your package.

N. Golon read item 12 into the record.

T. Walsh: The NH DOT is seeking the tenant information?

N. Golon: Yes. Additionally off-site analysis of the toll plaza is being conducted by HNTB at the owners expense. As part of the overall evaluation of the intersection at Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A and the queuing at the toll plaza are being looked at.

D. Boutin: With regard to off-site road improvements, are you proposing to do anything on Hackett Hill Road from the Exit 11 ramp down to Rt. 3A?

P. Bartash: I would like to talk about that at the end when we talk about the contributions. There is an overlap.

840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886

T. Walsh: You hired HNTB?

N. Golon: No. NH DOT hired HNTB.

T. Walsh: They haven't done anything because they are waiting for the tenant information from you?

N. Golon: We need to update the traffic study to be representative of that tenant specific data. The original traffic study is being updated. I looked at the preliminary results. The expectation is that the updated traffic study will be issued to NH DOT in the following days for them to review. That can then be turned over to HNTB so they can evaluate the toll booth.

P. Bartash: NH DOT has to elected to accept the traffic study, provide a conclusion of it, and and then they share it with their consultant for its peer review of the information that we provided.

T. Walsh: Originally I heard you say you are revising and spending more money on this. The original estimates of what the applicant has spent on the traffic study is in the range of \$25,000. Originally, even at TRC last year, we were going to be looking for an independent traffic study with a fiduciary relationship to the Town of Hooksett, not just relying on the applicant's information. In the history of the Planning Board, some of the traffic studies we have received have not been accurate with reality. What is the status of that? I am concerned that you are spending a lot of money on something that may not be accepted by this Board as that is not what we asked for at the beginning at TRC.

P. Bartash: We have done a lot of permitting in a lot of communities and a lot of project work north of 30 million sq. ft. in the last almost 14 years. There is an inherent mistrust in any information an applicant would provide to any board or community. There is a respectable mandate that a Board has to protect that communities interests and needs. I have been disappointed by the fact that there is a sort of unspoken negotiation that happens through this process whereby the applicant proposes information that is favorable to it, the board says "we don't trust you," and now we have to go through this peer review process having our experts talk to your experts to agree or disagree on the numbers to arrive at a conclusion about who is going to fund and pay for the impacts from a project to make sure the needs of the community are met. In this case, there is complicating factor, wherein we are talking about a project on a site that has its impacts to the surrounding roadway network, and a series of existing conditions on that roadway network that predate this project, and are unrelated to this project. From day one, when we went to the TRC, and submitted to the ZBA, we have said we do not want to do this the same old way. We want to take a forward looking approach to being a collaborative stakeholder and solve these issues along side the town rather than on the opposite side of the table. We were told, respectfully, that we were getting a little to far ahead of ourselves in front of the ZBA. We did the math and figured out the costs of making the improvements to the intersections and how we could provide the funding to the town to do that work. If we are doing our job and listening to the stakeholders in this community, one of the things we hear consistently is the voters have shot down improvements to Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A three times on the warrant articles. There is no money to make these changes and improvements. It is an existing issue that has no end in site. The town has finally put a corridor study on it as part of the CIP because they are attempting to try to advance the ball on that issue. Part of the town wanting to advance the ball on that issue is knowing that this project, as proposed, is willing to make contributions to fund the improvements to these intersections. The intersection improvements that we are describing in the traffic report, and that SNHPC has agreed to, are sufficient in terms of mitigation

887 and are far in excess of the calculated impacts of this project. For example, if the board says we don't
888 trust your numbers and a consultant comes back and says "you were off by 100 percent and your traffic
889 impacts are double what you are proposing, the money we are proposing to contribute would still cover
890 the impacts from this project. What we are asking is what this request for a peer review really means to
891 us and it is a matter of time. The cost of those reports is substantial, but also the costs to a project, in
892 escalation alone, are extraordinary. Since the day we started this project to today, the hard cost budget
893 for this project has gone up by almost \$5.5 million. The extra 60 days it would take to go through a full
894 independent traffic study are not only going to add the cost of the study, but probably another half a
895 million dollars worth of hard costs to the project in escalation alone. I know that today these contribu-
896 tions are what we can support and that changes the more that our economic information changes. It
897 may get to a point where you want to go through the entire independent traffic study review process
898 and we say, it is not feasible, and the town is stuck in the same position it has been where a project has
899 been started and failed. We want to be prepared for success and that is what we are trying to bring. This
900 is not a matter of principled objection to getting the independent traffic study. It is because we don't
901 feel that study will yield information and provide information or support to the town that will materi-
902 ally change what this project can actually create in terms of actual impacts to the town or these issues.
903

904 T. Walsh: I am looking at this from a different perspective. You are looking at this information based
905 on the contributions and I am looking at it from simpler terms. This was told to you by the TRC. That
906 solicitation of a peer traffic study could have been from the beginning before you went to the ZBA. In
907 my opinion, you ignored what the representatives of the Planning Board at the TRC meeting requested
908 and hired TF Moran to do it and now are talking about finances if it has to be done again. You were
909 told this was required from the beginning and that was ignored. Now that the NH DOT is involved, it
910 seems like there is another analysis that is going to be done, and there is a chance we are going to have
911 more people in the game. My instincts and feelings are the same. For example, we were told the other
912 Amazon location on Quality Drive would generate less than a fast food restaurant and were given the
913 numbers from TF Moran. It was going to be very low impact and we would not see a thing. The reality
914 is the impact is not less than a fast food restaurant. We were told they most of the traffic would be done
915 during off peak hours. Every time I go to Home Depot the Amazon vans are backed up down the hill
916 and into their own driveway and they have to go through three or four cycles of lights to get to Rt. 3A.
917 That is not what we were told and I do not want to see it again. We can talk about the money all we
918 want, but I want to make sure whatever happens works. That is not working and I feel like we were lied
919 to and I am not going to let the wool to be pulled over our eyes again. In terms of the money, I'm sorry,
920 but this could have been addressed a lot earlier.
921

922 P. Bartash: I hope the board recognizes that there has not been an instance where we intentionally or
923 willfully ignored anything we have heard or received. We came to the Planning Board and TRC in par-
924 allel with the zoning review. If your position is that we have to do the third party traffic study, we
925 would have to have our own traffic study regardless to do, and that is a decision the board should come
926 to as a definite conclusion so we can move through that issue and focus on a solution. I want to know
927 concretely what the charge is.
928

929 T. Walsh: I have heard nothing but good about this process from staff. That is not my position and, if I
930 came off that way I apologize. I think this is a win win for everybody. I just don't want to see our past
931 experiences happen again. If it happens again, at this scale, it will be a mess.
932

933 P. Bartash: This is an entirely different use classification. We are specifically prohibited from doing
934 last mile distributions at this site.

935
936 D. Boutin: We have a several page document with a total of 24 questions that this board and depart-
937 ment has raised and they have addressed these questions. I am impressed and have not seen other appli-
938 cants to this. I respect your opinion and would like to offer a compromise.

939
940 T. Walsh: I stated my opinion and the only reason I did that was because at the last meeting you mo-
941 tioned to have a third party traffic study done.

942
943 D. Boutin: Sometimes we change our opinion and I do feel that we need to protect the interests of the
944 town. Maybe a compromise could be that, if the applicant would agree, we hire an independent traffic
945 engineer to do a review of the TF Moran traffic study and provide us with a report on the study. That
946 should only take a couple of weeks to do. It would be cheaper for them and at the end of the day we get
947 what we want.

948
949 T. Walsh: I have no objection to that if we can find someone that will do it.

950
951 ***D. Boutin motioned to hire an independent traffic engineer to do a review of the TF Moran traffic***
952 ***study for Port One Companies #2020-29, 47 Hackett Hill Road, Map 17, Lot 7, 500,000 sf ware-***
953 ***house/distribution building.***

954
955 P. Scarpetti: Peter, you said that you have done millions of sq. ft. of projects. There has to be a project
956 that is similar to this that you could do a traffic study that you could see how many trucks come in and
957 out. This report was done in February of 2018. It was revised it but not by doing an actual study. It is
958 more of an educated assumption.

959
960 N. Golon: We used the ITE. We do make engineering assumptions as to what the traffic patterns will
961 be.

962
963 P. Scarpetti: In February of 2018 we did not have a pandemic and the whole industry has changed
964 since then. It was done in the winter and not in the summer when there was a huge change on Rt. 3A.
965 You have the experience from other buildings and have done actual studies that you can present to us.
966 If we hire someone, you can give them the information that Dave is suggesting. I do not want assump-
967 tions. I want to know, from experience, how many trucks come in and out of those places and if you are
968 spot on.

969
970 P. Bartash: What I spoke of is not exclusively industrial. It is multiple different project types through-
971 out 14 different states in the United States. The way the traffic conclusions are arrived at are by looking
972 at the worst case scenario that are backed by actual historical data of these types of facilities and how
973 they operate. The ITE conducted a full scale national survey of these types of facilities in 2017. When
974 we originally talked about the traffic issue with the zoning board internally, we asked if we could look
975 at nearby facilities to understand the relative accuracy, or not, of the traffic study. The conclusion we
976 received from the multiple consultants we spoke with was that there are too many site specific factors
977 to every user and each property to make that kind of assumption. There is always some synthesis of the
978 data that has to occur in order to evaluate the worse case scenario to the property itself. We are provid-

979 ing a number of trailers, parking spaces, and storage spaces. We know those parking spaces are not go-
980 ing to be 100 percent filled 24 hours of the day and not all docks will be used on the first day or ever.
981 Some of the potential users we have spoken have mentioned they need 15 docks or 36 docks, which is
982 less than 30 percent than we are providing, however our traffic study predicts for 100 percent which is
983 the worst case scenario. It makes sense to me to have an independent reviewer review what we have
984 proposed. The current traffic conditions on Hackett Hill Road are less than pre-pandemic as well. The
985 goal of this is to be as realistic as possible.

986
987 N. Golon: NH DOT is reviewing this as well due to the adjacent intersections and their consultant.

988
989 T. Walsh: This will be in conjunction with NH DOT?

990
991 P. Bartash: Yes.

992
993 **Seconded by D. Winterton.**

994
995 R. Duhaime: The town hired TF Moran for the improvements to the intersection. TF Moran took some
996 of their leads from the town but had to please NH DOT. The town was trying to move it along and try-
997 ing to please the State of NH. You can see the slight conflict. Now you have hired TF Moran to design
998 the engineering and do the traffic study for your site. At the same time we wanted the bottleneck taken
999 care of at Walmart between the two intersections, but instead the state of NH made the improvements
1000 in the City of Manchester. You can see how the NH DOT has their own set of rules and can spend the
1001 money where they want because they are going to get what they want in the long run. That is the prob-
1002 lem with this intersection and the failure of the toll booth. They collect a toll and the town of Hooksett
1003 is getting the shortfall. I think if we do a small one representing the town we will be protecting the citi-
1004 zens.

1005
1006 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

1007
1008 T. Walsh: That motion supersedes the motion at the last meeting. What is the number before you need
1009 an RFP?

1010
1011 N. Williams: 3,000. If it exceeds a certain amount, which will be billed back to them, it will have to go
1012 through the RFP process.

1013
1014 N. Golon read number 13 into the record.

1015
1016 R. Duhaime: Have you thought about putting anything on the slopes other than grass because it would
1017 help with the noise.

1018
1019 N. Golon: It provides for a natural mix and for mother nature to establish, not a row of trees, but an
1020 actual suitable landscape that will in fill over time.

1021
1022 R. Duhaime: There are no plantings on those slopes. The State of NH has slope easements. Are there
1023 easements on those slopes?

1024
1025 N. Golon: No.

1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071

R. Duhaime: It is strictly the utilities that goes over the top of it?

P. Bartash: Correct.

R. Duhaime: Are there restrictions from planting? I was curious about the south that the wires do not go over.

N. Golon: The southerly most portion of the site has be recreated and eliminated the tractor trailer storage. That will be in a more naturally occurring condition. It is an existing gravel recollection site. With what is proposed now it will not be a hardscape, and will have the opportunity to grow as a natural landscape. We are calling for the slope mix along the side on the slope.

P. Bartash: We are going to be using a slope mix that includes the types of planting you are speaking of.

N. Golon: We can provide additional details to show where that mix will go.

R. Duhaime: If you stabilize that south bowl it will stop noise from traveling.

N. Golon read number 15 into the record.

P. Bartash: The original conception included a second building on the rear fifteen acres. The fire department at the TRC meeting identified the fire lanes around that building as an issue and that building has since been removed.

P. Bartash read number 16 into the record.

D. Winterton: There are fire impact fees and they have a sprinkler system.

N. Golon read number 17 into the record.

P. Scarpetti: You are proposing to go up Hackett Hill. Do they expect you to go across country to do this?

N. Golon: They want us to go south to Cross Road, down Cross Road, under the highway, and down Rt. 3A.

P. Bartash: In the spirit of the contributions portion, the improvements to this district and the TIF district are more holistic than this project. If the work is already going to be happening, there is an opportunity to install water along side it, it can be designed, engineered, and implemented at the same time, and funded through an agreement with the town, than all parties benefit. If it were just on us, as an applicant, to do that work there is no way we could do that.

P. Scarpetti: I understand the loop.

1072 R. Duhaime: Water is in the TIF district so there would be no reason we would do the sewer improve-
1073 ment and not the water. Water already has some engineering done on Hackett Hill adding a bigger line.
1074

1075 N. Golon read number 18 into the record.
1076

1077 R. Duhaime: That being recessed helps echo it up. I hope your noise expert took that into account.
1078

1079 N. Golon: Once you read the study, if there are questions we could try to have our consultant here to
1080 answer them. If there are questions in advance you can provide to Nicholas we will be sure we have
1081 answers to them for the next meeting.
1082

1083 N. Golon read number 19 into the record.
1084

1085 C. Stelmach: There is site distance to the left?
1086

1087 N. Golon: The best site distance that we could provide is the high point in the road.
1088

1089 N. Golon read number 20 into the record.
1090

1091 P. Scarpetti: That is going cross country.
1092

1093 N. Golon: Currently. As thing evolve with the TIF district and designs this can be fluid.
1094

1095 N. Golon read Items 22, 23 and 24 into the record.
1096

1097 T. Walsh: Who have you been in contact with at NH DOT?
1098

1099 P. Bartash: The aspect of the improvements that we would be funding are under the jurisdiction of
1100 John Corcoran. He is the decision maker on this application.
1101

1102 T. Walsh: Have then given you a time on how long it will take them?
1103

1104 P. Bartash: HNTB indicated they could have their materials turned around within two weeks of ap-
1105 proval to proceed by NH DOT. We are submitting the tenant specific information to NH DOT within
1106 the next day or two. At that time we will confirm the timing of NH DOT's approval to it.
1107

1108 P. Bartash: Our intent is to continue to meet with planning staff and NH DOT to have comments col-
1109 lected and back to the board for the next meeting if possible.
1110

1111 N. Golon: The schedule of proposed contributions distributed in your packets.
1112

1113 P. Bartash broke down the proposed contributions (refer to the schedule of proposed contributions that
1114 is attached to these minutes.
1115

1116 D. Winterton: How did you get to the 1.1 million on traffic?
1117

1118 P. Bartash: We added up the public safety improvements, roadway traffic improvements, toll plaza and
1119 Rt. 3A fair share contributions, and the voluntary roadway and traffic improvements.

1120
1121 N. Golon: This project has the opportunity to pay the town's portion of Hackett Hill and Rt. 3A.
1122

1123 P. Bartash: We hear clearly from the town engineer and staff that improvements to Hackett Hill Road
1124 and Rt. 3A may not be simply installing a roadway. We don't want to make that decision for the town
1125 as to how this issue will be solved. We want to provide the funding to the town to be able to accom-
1126 plish the most expensive solution if it so chooses and so it could implement any number of solutions
1127 along Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A from the prospective of the town.
1128

1129 P. Scarpetti: Regarding the \$120,000 on public safety, wouldn't that go to fire?
1130

1131 N. Williams: It is a 90/10 split. 90 percent to fire and 10 percent to police.
1132

1133 P. Scarpetti: There would be no sunset clause on the voluntary contributions but the impact fees would
1134 be a six year return. If this took more than six years we are back to square one. Is there any way to lock
1135 that in?
1136

1137 P. Bartash: As a function of our agreement for those contributions and a function of the language
1138 around those contributions, we want to see these improvements imparted in this area. We would be
1139 looking to the town to force language to force this improvements to happen. Our goal to make sure the
1140 town has the money to execute the solutions.
1141

1142 R. Duhaime: The NH DOT could make you pay for our improvements at Main St. and Rt. 3A. We
1143 don't know yet. If they like the traffic study they will comment and then tell you what they want and
1144 what it will cost for what they would like to have for off site improvements. How did you come up with
1145 the \$491,000 volunteer amount?
1146

1147 P. Bartash: We relied on some historical knowledge around the potential costs for the round about im-
1148 provement and also estimated potential costs to intersections to the toll plaza. There were other prior
1149 projects that did explore those improvements. We also looked at the gap between what the regulatory
1150 requirements are for the impact fees and what the costs would be to the town and established a delta
1151 between those two and assigned that as the value for the voluntary contribution. We are trying to fill
1152 the gap for the town.
1153

1154 D. Winterton: When we talked about the round about I was on the Town Council when it came and
1155 was on the Town Council when it was voted not to do it because of the incredible cost increase from
1156 the time it was proposed, the state was dragging it's feet and never got involved, and the cost exploded.
1157

1158 N. Golon: I was the senior project manager responsible for that. The last budget evaluation we did for
1159 those improvements is how this number was arrived at. The town's cost of that project was just south
1160 of 1.2 million and these contributions equate to that. Those numbers could change. The town could de-
1161 cide to go with another type of improvement. This provides a funding source.
1162

1163 D. Winterton: The utility infrastructure improvements for \$1.2 million, is that money that you are
1164 thinking will go to the pump station?

1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210

P. Bartash: I am thinking that money goes into the TIF district on day one which allows the TIF district the capacity to fund the work to build its own pump station. The TIF district can then point to this project and its future tax revenue as surety against those bonds.

D. Winterton: I think the TIF district is generating over a half a million dollars per year now.

C. Stelmach: Do you think the state's decision on what they will contribute will depend on what the traffic count will be?

N. Golon: It is a 1/3 - 2/3 split so that won't change. It comes down to when the project gets bid what the final number is.

Open to public comments.

No public comments.

T. Walsh: When would you like to come back?

P. Bartash: I think it would make the most sense to come back to the August 16, 2021 meeting.

N. Golon: I want to make sure the agenda item we want to discuss the next time will be centered around the traffic and provide an update on water and sewer.

P. Bartash: Water, sewer, and traffic are district wide matters. We are working to solve those as quickly and efficiently. I do not know if this project alone will solve all of those issues, but I know it will seed those issues getting solved. I would like the board to see the time line we are on and the need to move this project forward.

D. Boutin motioned to continue the public hearing until August 16, 2021 for Port One Companies #2020-29, 47 Hackett Hill Road, Map 17, Lot 7, 500,000 sf warehouse/distribution building. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

T. Walsh: This is the public's notice that the public hearing will be continued at the August 16, 2021 Planning Board meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

CHANGE-OF-USE

N. Williams stated the change-of-uses that have happened within the Town of Hooksett and upcoming projects.

264 Londonderry Turnpike Jonathan Dority and Company

1346 Hooksett Road - Giraffe Holding LLC

230 Londonderry Turnpike - Trashcan Willys

1234 Hooksett Road - Pro Technologies Safety Security and Comfort

- 1211 114 Londonderry Turnpike - The Darbster Foundation (they relocate abused animals from South Flor-
- 1212 ida to here)
- 1213 171 Londonderry Turnpike - Neurodevelopmental Institute of New Hampshire
- 1214 7 Dartmouth Street - Granite State Dog Recovery
- 1215 11 Bemis Savoie Road - Amazon parking and office space
- 1216 1109 Hooksett Road - Kool K-9, LLC
- 1217 1100 Hooksett Road - Second Brook Tavern
- 1218 35 Londonderry Turnpike - J & L Communications
- 1219 1568 Hooksett Road - Woody's Tire Service
- 1220 21 Londonderry Turnpike - Mikey's Roast Beef and Pizza

1221

1222 There are some big projects coming down the pike. There will be a regional 16 pump gas station at the

1223 site of Dude's Barber Shop and the sign company with aa drive thru restaurant facility. We have pre-

1224 liminary plans for a 2,000 to 3,000 sq. ft. distribution and warehouse facility at 10 Eastpoint Drive

1225 which is the former site of Ravinia Cold Storage.

1226

1227 R. Duhaime: JoAnn Duffy would show us the change-of-uses that were recommended. Can we get that

1228 in our packet for every meeting?

1229

1230 ***R. Duhaime motioned to have the Town Planner give the Planning Board notice of upcoming***

1231 ***changes of use on the agenda. Seconded by C. Stelmach. Motion carried unanimously with a vote***

1232 ***of 7-0.***

1233

1234 **ADJOURNMENT**

1235

1236 ***D. Boutin motioned to adjourn at 9:40 pm. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously***

1237 ***with a vote of 7-0.***

1238

1239 **The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held August 2, 2021 at 6:00 pm.**

1240

1241 **Respectfully submitted by,**

1242

1243 **/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

1244

1245 **AnnMarie Scott**

1246 **Recording Clerk**