

1 **Official**

2

3 **MINUTES**

4 **HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**
5 **HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**

6 **35 Main Street**

7 **Monday, October 3, 2022**

8 **6:00 PM**

9

10 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:23 P.M.**

11

12 **PROOF OF POSTING**

13

14 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

15

16 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

17

18 **PRESENT: Tom Walsh (Chairman), Chris Stelmach (Vice-Chairman), Mike Somers, Paul**
19 **Scarpetti, Don Winterton, Denise Pichette Volk, and David Boutin (Town Council**
20 **Representative)**

21

22 **ALTERNATES: Robert Duhaime and Sheena Gilbert**

23

24 **EXCUSED: None**

25

26 **NOT PRESENT: None**

27

28 **STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)**

29

30 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 09/12/22 & 09/19/22**

31

32 *D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the September 12, 2022 meeting. Seconded by D.*
33 *Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*

34 *D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2022 meeting. Seconded by D.*
35 *Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*

36 **PUBLIC HEARING**

- 37
- 38 **1. STRATEGIC CONTRACTING COMPANY, LLC**
39 **6 Bernice Street & 1794 Hooksett Road**
40 **Tax Map 6 Lots 96 & 114**
41 **Application for Lot Line Adjustment**
42

43 ***D. Boutin motioned to find the plan complete for an application for a lot line adjustment for Strategic Contracting Company, LLC, 6 Bernice Street & 1794 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 6 Lots 96 & 114.***
44 ***Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***
45

46
47 Doug MacGuire (The Dubai Group, Inc.): This is a simple lot line adjustment involving the Webster
48 Woods sub-division. Over 2 years ago the board approved a multiple single-family development off of
49 Bernice St. that extended in behind the old Webster Woods project. After that project was approved by
50 this board, it was appealed in court and got stuck there for a while. One of the items to provide closure
51 to assist in getting this back on track is to perform this proposed lot line adjustment.
52

53 D. MacGuire showed an overview of the prior plan and gave a description of the proposed lot line ad-
54 justment.
55

56 D. MacGuire: The owners offered to give this portion of land to this abutter to round out his lot and a
57 little in the rear. There are existing sheds and structures on the property that were on the abutting prop-
58 erty and this will clean that up. This would be a minor lot line adjustment between Lot 96 and Lot 114,
59 the parent lot.
60

61 T. Walsh: Could you please explain a little bit more about who is getting what.
62

63 D. MacGuire: The existing lot is at the corner of Bert, Bernice and an undeveloped piece on Granite.
64 We are proposing to eliminate some frontage and a 50' right-of-way to extend Bert into the parcel from
65 the rear of this property. One lot will go from 15,000 sq. ft. to 29,000 sq. ft. The parent lot is signifi-
66 cantly larger and will be going from 40.9 acres to 40.6 acres.
67

68 R. Duhaime: Nicholas, with these percentages does this work with our requirements for the sub-divi-
69 sion?
70

71 N. Williams: It does. All of the lot dimensions are met.
72

73 Open public hearing
74

75 Marian Kolesar (21 Cedar Street - Webster Woods) asked to see the overview as the audience was not
76 able to see.
77

78 D. MacGuire explained the proposed lot line adjustment.
79

80 M. Kolesar: What happens with Webster Woods on the back side?
81

82 D. MacGuire: Nothing is changing from the preciously approved parcel. The goal is that after this
83 closes any remaining issues from a litigation standpoint we will be moving forward with the develop-
84 ment as was approved.
85

86 M. Kolesar: In 2019 you had 50' from the corner of the foundation to where the lot line would begin
87 for the deeds. Does that still remain?
88

89 D. MacGuire: Yes.

90
91 M. Kolesar: Will that be measured out and be marked where it will be?
92

93 D. MacGuire: Absolutely. There is no change to that area. This small tract of land is the only thing that
94 is being adjusted.
95

96 M. Kolesar: It has been so long we don't remember how many feet we were from the edge of the prop-
97 erty to where the rezoning would be for the deeds for the other development.
98

99 D. MacGuire: The board still has to do a final review of those sub-division plans and that would hap-
100 pen after this.
101

102 Frederick Royer asked for D. MacGuire to provide another explanation to the entire audience which he
103 provided.
104

105 Frederick Royer (47 Granite Street): Why are we giving this land away? What are we getting for com-
106 pensation? Is it a free land give?
107

108 D. MacGuire: No. This property has been in litigation for two years.
109

110 Frederick Royer: I need to know the reason you are giving this land away. There has to be a reason.
111 You just don't give away land.
112

113 D. Boutin: It is a private deal and doesn't concern you.
114

115 Frederick Royer: Do you want to go at it?
116

117 D. Boutin: No. I don't want to listen to you.
118

119 Frederick Royer: I want to know why land is being given away and am not being given an answer.
120

121 T. Walsh: Are you saying you can't explain why you are doing this because of litigation?
122

123 D. MacGuire: Mr. Vallencourt's property filed litigation with this property. They are coming to some
124 type of agreement. I don't know what the compensation for pricing is or any of that. They are doing
125 this to satisfy the concerns of the plaintiff of the case. I am not the attorney on the case.
126
127

128 T. Walsh: I am having a hard time understanding why we can't know. If it is in court it is not secret.
129 Why did they take the parent company to court in the first place? Why are you giving away your right-
130 of-way?
131

132 D. MacGuire: They are contesting the extension of Bernice. It has taken this long to get through the
133 court process. There were a ton of delays with covid and they are looking to move forward. This will
134 solve their concerns.
135

136 Diane Humelsine (3 Beach - Webster Woods): If you are giving away the right-of-way how are these
137 people going to get into this development?
138

139 D. MacGuire: Bernice was always the planned access to the sub-division and that is not changing. This
140 piece of land has no development implication to what we are proposing. This is all the way to the cor-
141 ner of Bert and Bernice. Bernice continues to the property and we were going to extend Bernice into
142 the property. This is a separate land deal. A settlement.
143

144 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve an application for a lot line adjustment for Strategic Contracting***
145 ***Company, LLC, 6 Bernice Street & 1794 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 6 Lots 96 & 114. Seconded by P.***
146 ***Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***
147

148 **2. RIDGEBACK SELF STORAGE, LLC**
149 **1461 Hooksett Road**
150 **Tax Map 18 Lot 49-D**
151 **Amended Commercial Site Plan – Addition of 10,080 SF Commercial Building**
152

153 T. Walsh: Is the application considered complete?
154

155 N. Williams: I talked with the applicant's site engineer about sheet 5 of 13 under the landscaping
156 notes.. An updated landscaping detail was provided this evening. If you want to consider that as part of
157 the application package then they are complete.
158

159 ***D. Boutin motioned to find the plan complete for an amended commercial site plan – addition of***
160 ***10,080 SF commercial building for Ridgeback Self Storage, LLC, 1461 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 18***
161 ***Lot 49-D. Seconded by C. Stelmach. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***
162

163 D. MacGuire: This property was before this board about a year ago. We were proposing development
164 of a rear portion of the property to be used as vehicle storage. That portion of the property has not
165 changed. Going through the process of getting those approved plans and financing, Mr. Grappone has
166 come to the conclusion that doing both phases as a package deal might be necessary to make this via-
167 ble. We are before you to expand the plans to accommodate development on the other portion of the
168 buildable area of the property which is the northern section. We are proposing a seven-unit commercial
169 building in that location. Access to the commercial building is the same as the other parking area
170 through Thames Road. That is a private development and roadway of which this property has legal
171 rights of access. We are not proposing to utilize Hooksett Road for access. That would remain undevel-
172 oped. This building tucks in nicely behind the existing fireworks building. We have access to all public
173 utilities. There is an easement that was part of the negotiations with Granite Hill to allow for utilities to
174 be brought to this property. We will be accessing sewer and water thorough the existing access ease-
175 ment. We made some minor adjustments to the parking area. We eliminated the three-sided structure
176 that was proposed. We revised the layout to eliminate an underground recharge system in lieu of an
177 open infiltration pond. We have an open drainage system for the proposed commercial section and an
178 infiltration pond in that area. We did test pits to verify there are good soils on site. There are two sepa-
179 rate access points eliminating the need to cross the wetland channel which was part of a previous pro-
180 posal. There is a significant reduction in impacts and associated costs. Technically speaking this in
181 within the PZ because it has that small amount of frontage on Rt. 3. Previously this board agreed the
182 more robust development standards with regard to landscaping would not be warranted because of its

183 lack of access on Rt. 3. We added some additional plantings for the commercial building; three decidu-
184 ous trees, sugar maples along the frontage and arborvitae in clusters behind the building to break up
185 that facade. This backs up into the Ambrose development area and there is no impact on that user. We
186 still have the breaking up of the parking lot area and the arborvitae proposed to the rear of that.

187
188 R. Duhaime: The parking lot goes outside the lines. Can you explain that?
189

190 D. MacGuire: Mr. Grappone had his legal counsel review this and, at the time, instructed us that we
191 had rights of access to Thames Road. Subsequent to that conversation we pulled the deed information.
192 The intent of the easement is very broad. There is a dotted line that extends to the edge of Thames simi-
193 lar to what a right-of-way line would be. That easement extends to the north above the property and the
194 entire eastern side to the edge of Thames. Any use productive to the development of this parcel is al-
195 lowed. That allowed us to square off the parking lot and provide better turning radii. We have the ease-
196 ments to show that and we are working within the limit of the easement. This was approved by the
197 town as part of the Granite Hill property. The board called out the edge of that easement as essentially
198 the right-of-way line and did their setbacks off of that. A building could physically be over the property
199 line the way it is shown but we did not want to do that. That is covered in detail in the agreement.
200

201 D. Boutin: I live at Granite Hill so I won't be voting on this. Have you spoken with the people at Gran-
202 ite Hill about this project?
203

204 D. MacGuire: They have been notified of this development and there has been some tree clearing that
205 was done. The property manager came out and discussions were had. I have not had any follow up dis-
206 cussions specifically on this proposal.
207

208 D. Boutin: What kind of traffic will be coming in and what impact will that have on the residential
209 traffic?
210

211 D. MacGuire: This is not in a visible portion right off of the main road. It is more of a destination spot.
212 I would categorize both of these uses as very low traffic generators. One is a vehicle storage lot. The
213 commercial portion is for contractors or commercial entities that need storage space for their materials.
214

215 D. Boutin: You said this could be contractor units being leased. Those could be any type of contractors
216 correct?
217

218 D. MacGuire: These at 1,500 sq. ft. units. They are not large-scale operations. They would be for peo-
219 ple such as a small electrical contractor or plumber to store items for their business and maybe a space
220 for a bookkeeper.
221

222 D. Boutin: What happens at 6:00 am when one of your contractors starts drilling or cutting?
223

224 D. MacGuire: This is not a fabrication type business.
225

226 T. Walsh: It is a contractor bay not an industrial zone so there will not be cutting and drilling outside
227 of the building.
228

229 D. Boutin: Can we make that a condition of approval?

230
231
232
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

D. MacGuire: Yes.

T. Walsh: He seems to be fine with it. No outside work.

C. Stelmach: Will there be a sign on the easement on Rt. 3 advertising the seven units?

D. MacGuire: We do not have plans to do that and are not sure the benefits of the easement extended to that.

C. Stelmach: Will there be any advertising on Thames into the driveway?

Dave Grappone (Owner of the property): No. We want to keep it low key.

D. MacGuire: These would be for contractors that are not expecting to have a lot of customer base coming to the facility.

R. Duhaime: You put the drainage release/retention pond toward the wetland. Can you explain your design?

D. MacGuire: Wetlands usually end up at the lowest point of the site and that is the case on this site. There is a V channel of where this wetland comes through and it drops significantly in grade. If you look at the access, the entrance driveway is at 336, the finished floor elevation of the building is at 332, and the wetlands are at 316. The back of the fireworks store is at 324. A good portion of this site drains naturally toward the wetland channel anyway. We are using that as our discharge point and are treating all of this water. These are infiltration ponds so you are getting holding of this water and promoting of infiltration and it is not discharging anything unless there is a very large rare storm event. To be able to get treatment through infiltration you can't pipe at the bottom. No water in that initial flush is being held and infiltrated.

R. Duhaime: What is to the north?

D. MacGuire: That is a sediment fore-bay. That is where the water of the closed drainage system on that site is collected and drains to. Because it is our discharge point, we need some type of a rip rap outlet. When you get this bowl sediment it makes more sense to line the bowl instead of trying to cut a shape into a bowl.

P. Scarpetti: When we first approved this that line to the north was all trees. Now you have a fence and parking. You have houses across the street. You will have boats and other storage. I would expect you to landscape that. It is only fair to the people across the street.

D. MacGuire: We are not showing any additional encroachment. This is what you previously approved.

P. Scarpetti: No it isn't. You have cleared all the way to the road and put a fence along there.

D. Grappone: There are no houses there.

277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323

P. Scarpetti: You did not show any landscape on that but you show it on the building. There is no elevation for the building. We should have an elevation to show what the detail is of the building.

D. MacGuire handed out the elevations.

T. Walsh: I thought they were supposed to be part of the plan set.

N. Williams: The way it is worded in the regulation states “if it is visible from a public street”.

D. Boutin: The memorandum from the fire department mentions a Knox key if there is a gate and I would like to know if that has been addressed?

T. Walsh: We will but I want to clarify the gates first and then we will make sure the Knox box is there.

D. Boutin: Can we do it now?

T. Walsh: Let’s finish Paul’s questions first.

P. Scarpetti: How are you handling the water flow off of the building off the back?

D. MacGuire: The roof will have gutters attached from west to east and those will be directed into the infiltration system pond.

P. Scarpetti: I am assuming this is a metal building.

D. MacGuire: It is.

T. Walsh: Dave just brought up a point. I don’t see the gates. Are there gates on these entries?

D. MacGuire: The only gate being proposed is to secure the parking area at the entrance. It will be activated via electronic code to be able to open it. Bruce Thomas requested it be labeled and it is now labeled on the plan set.

D. Boutin: That means the fire department wants to have a Knox key.

T. Walsh: Have you gotten the memo from the fire department?

D. MacGuire: Yes and we have no issue providing that.

D. Boutin: That needs to be part of the site plan.

D. MacGuire: Absolutely.

T. Walsh: I did not hear a resolve to the landscaping on Thames Road and we will get back to that. What are you doing to Marlette Street? When we approved this the first time there was the back of a

324 building for storage that the people in the mobile homes with a few trees would not care much about.
325 Now what are we going to have there? I do not see a full line of arborvitae or anything. What is the
326 grade and what is the screening going to be to park campers and boats when the wind is rattling canvas
327 and tarps all winter to the back windows of these mobile homes?
328

329 D. MacGuire: The fencing can have privacy slats in a natural forest green color that would help cam-
330 ouflage that area. We could add that to the plan for an added level of buffering from a visual stand-
331 point. We could add additional arborvitae.
332

333 T. Walsh: If you have never lived next to a storage yard like this you would be amazed how loud those
334 canvases can be rattling all winter and there is close proximity to these bedrooms. I would like to see
335 improved screening between all those mobile homes. I am fine with the slats and if you want to add
336 more vegetation that would be good to to hide the slats.
337

338 S. Gilbert: The mobile homes are on Gary Street.
339

340 D. Boutin: What kind of screening will be at those driveways and along the frontage of those lots? I
341 don't see anything and am curious as to what the Granite Hill people will have to live with.
342

343 T. Walsh: I thought he already addressed that with the landscaping plan. Although he didn't answer
344 your question about cutting them all down.
345

346 D. MacGuire: I did not think of the potential of the southern portion of the parking lot area. We fac-
347 tored in on the commercial piece to have street trees along that area. I think a treatment of that in a sim-
348 ilar fashion would break up that facade as well.
349

350 D. Boutin: That has frontage on Thames Road.
351

352 D. MacGuire: Exactly.
353

354 D. Boutin: So that means all the people who live on that end of Granite Hill will have some level of
355 visibility unless you screen it and you have not proven to me that you will adequately screen it.
356

357 D. MacGuire: We can add additional street trees. What I will probably do is pull back the parking a bit
358 and give more room to plant some street trees in that area. I think that will break up and screen the
359 parking lot in addition to the commercial section.
360

361 D. Grappone: Are you talking about where the swimming pool and the rec area is?
362

363 D. Boutin: Yes.
364

365 D. Grappone: They don't come up that far. The street goes up the other way.
366

367 D. Boutin: They most certainly do. I live there.
368

369 D. Grappone: But you do not go up into the area. The rec area is where it is going to be.
370

371 T. Walsh: We are moving forward. We want to see some screening. We are not going to have any ar-
372 guing.

373
374 S. Gilbert: The trailer homes are on Gary Street. When you were previously here you mentioned lining
375 that entire are with trees that could grow over 50' tall and that, over the course of years, would com-
376 pletely cover the structure that would be there. I think that is the piece that is missing.

377
378 D. MacGuire: The same arborvitae that we were proposing previously are still there. We can spread
379 them out further add more. I didn't know the concern about the rattling or the sound issues. We tried to
380 space those out to provide more of an aesthetic rather than a wall of green, but if we are looking for the
381 wall of green we can do that too and put the privacy slats in.

382
383 T. Walsh: Vehicle storage sounds simple but is not that attractive and noisier than you think.

384
385 R. Duhaime: At one time Thames was supposed to continue through. If that happens people are going
386 to wonder what planning board member allowed them to put that in there without a screen.

387
388 Open public hearing.

389
390 Allan O'Brien (Cedar Management Group, Property Management Firm for the Villages at Granite Hill
391 Condominiums): I have been at the Granite Hill development since June, 1986. There were no negotia-
392 tions with the association for easements on this land. Mr. Grappone has the right to build and construct
393 on this property. There was no discussion with the association regarding easements or change of plan
394 for this commercial. I am glad to hear the screening with vegetation has been added and should be
395 mandated. Thames, along these properties, is dense with young vegetation. It provides screening so you
396 do not see these properties. Once this development happens all of this land will be open. People look-
397 ing at a commercial building is not as much of a problem. Next to that building is a company that sells
398 equipment. That equipment does run in their yards and will be visible if all of these trees are cut down.
399 I would strongly suggest an arborvitae screen on that road for the commercial and the storage facility.
400 The residents of Granite Hill do utilize that rec area during spring, summer, and fall quite extensively. I
401 went to town hall and reviewed the file. There are a number of questions that were brought up by the
402 town engineer and fire department. When you are dealing with a commercial development the parking
403 regulations say you are supposed to have one space for every 200 sq. ft. On a second floor one space
404 for every 400 sq. ft. On the plan I reviewed it is only showing 43 parking spaces for this entire com-
405 plex. How did they go from 56 to 43 with no questions?

406
407 T. Walsh: Nicholas, have you run the calculations on the parking? Are you including the mezzanine?

408
409 D. MacGuire: The 1 per 200 is not what this use would be so it does not apply. Contractor bays are not
410 specifically listed. Your regulations say if it is not specifically listed to use something in kind and nego-
411 tiate that with the board. It is in your purview to discuss it. For a contractor yard we tried to add more
412 parking to add that flexibility if there were any concerns about parking. There are 43 spaces outside and
413 bays that could house a vehicle so that would be at least another 7. That would be 50 spaces on the site
414 for a 7-unit development. I think that is more than adequate and you could deal with half that. A com-
415 ponent of warehousing talks about employee count. An employee count for a 1,500 sq. ft. use is 1 to 2
416 employees maybe 3. If you factor in the mezzanine space from an office standpoint that would be an-
417 other 15 spaces so you are still well over that. The one per 200 is for retail and that is not what this is.

418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463

A. O'Brien: It is listed as office and retail, not retail. You have talked about drawing business in that would have accountants, bookkeepers and so forth inside these structures. You could have any use for these and you are talking about having the bay use. What is going to stop an automotive company or someone who wants to run a repair shop?

N. Williams: They will have to go through an occupancy review by myself and the town code enforcement officer to ensure the proposed occupancy meets the requirements of the zoning, what is approved and what was presented to the board.

T. Walsh: I haven't heard any restrictions on tenants yet. Most contractor bays and mechanics are allowed so that is something that will have to be brought up before we get into the approval.

A. O'Brien: As far as the number of spaces being required, that is at the discretion of the planning board?

T. Walsh: Yes.

A. OBrien: Regarding snow removal this is a very tight area and with fencing it will be very difficult to plow. The snow will go across the street onto our property. One of the things that needs to be addressed is either relocation or removal of fencing to allow for better snow storage on that property. As far as the buildings that are going to be put up, are there any restrictions placed that no food service industries/restaurants will be placed in these bays?

T. Walsh: In a contractor bay? We will be looking at what he has for proposed uses.

A. O'Brien: There is a proposed hydrant on the plan that is outside of the property line to service this property only. One of the items the fire department had noted is that it has to be within 75' of the structure.

T. Walsh: That has been corrected and there is a memo to that effect they have been notified of.

A. O'Brien: Will the hydrant be physically on their property?

D. MacGuire: They wanted to have hydrant access to the parking lot area. We may end up keeping that one and put another on the commercial property. I would argue a proposed hydrant will also be for the benefit of Granite Hill. From a life safety standpoint I don't see it as a negative having it against the road.

A. O'Brien: There is a hydrant located at the entrance of where the proposed commercial is. In a severe situation that hydrant could be utilized. The concern is the hydrant is going to be located on the Granite Hill property and it is not intended for Granite Hill. It could be a scenario where one of the residents hits it. That has happened on the property in the past. If it isn't for the benefit of any other property than this it should be on the commercial property. The town engineer identified 18 items on his review. Have all 18 items been identified?

464 T. Walsh: We have not approved anything yet. We will get to that when we go through the approval
465 process.

466
467 Close public hearing.

468
469 D. Boutin: Page 5 of the plan shows a proposed hydrant. It is supposed to be 75' from the building and
470 it looks like it is more than that.

471
472 D. MacGuire: We have not adjusted that based on the comment from the fire department. At the time
473 we did not have the commercial building. They wanted the hydrant for the parking lot area. They
474 wanted the hydrant on this side of the road so no one drives over the hoses. If they want one hydrant
475 within 75' of the property, which is sprinklered, we can have two hydrants.

476
477 D. Boutin: Two fire hydrants is insane. The property on Londonderry Turnpike has three within 75'.
478 The fire department is nuts. I would say that fire hydrant should be moved closer to the building so it
479 can better service it and we will only require one.

480
481 T. Walsh: The applicant will have to go back to talk with them. With all of the things that we talked
482 about tonight, the parking question, plowing, snow storage, the uses that you are planning on putting in
483 there, screening on both sides is there anything else from the board?

484
485 ***D. Winterton motioned to continue the application for an amended commercial site plan – addition***
486 ***of 10,080 SF commercial building for Ridgeback Self Storage, LLC, 1461 Hooksett Road, Tax Map***
487 ***18 Lot 49-D. until the October 17, 2022 planning board meeting. Seconded by C. Stelmach.***
488

489 D. MacGuire: I am not opposed to it being continued. I was looking for direction on the screening por-
490 tion. Is the consensus of the board to add additional arborvitae screening directly adjacent to the trailer
491 homes, the slats and deciduous street trees along Thames Road? I don't think the goal is to completely
492 block out access to the property on that road it is fronting on.

493
494 P. Scarpetti: I voted in favor of this before because on the plan you showed us the only thing there
495 were the entrances coming in. A self-storage is not very sightly. The people from the association travel
496 by this. I felt comfortable because there were mature trees all in that area. That has been cleared. You
497 said you will pull it back and I want to see some good screening. That is only fair to these people.

498
499 D. MacGuire: He has a right to develop that easement area. If we pull that 30' and put a 30' wall of
500 trees there he is not exercising his right to use that property.

501
502 P. Scarpetti: I am not asking for that. You are not going to be able to block everything, but you need to
503 come back to us with street trees and landscaping along there. It will be unsightly when you come
504 around that corner.

505
506 T. Walsh: Let's see what plan B looks like.

507
508 D. Boutin: I want to make sure this fire department issue is addressed in the revised plan with the
509 Knox box and Knox key.

510

511 R. Duhaime will be a voting member for this matter as D. Boutin recused himself due to living in Gran-
512 ite Hill.

513
514 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

515
516 **Break at 7:20 pm. Reconvened at 7:30 pm.**

517
518 **3. PORT ONE COMPANIES**

519 **47 Hackett Hill Road**

520 **Tax Map 17 Lot 7**

521 **Warehouse and Distribution Facility**

522 **Request for Amendment of Conditions of Approval – Off-Site Roadway Improvements as**
523 **a Condition of Building Permits**

524
525 T. Walsh: Last September the Board gave Port One companies conditions of approval pending two
526 agreements with the town. One for water/sewer and one for the off-site improvements on the turn lane
527 by the highway/toll access as well as improvements to Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A. The applicant
528 spent 3-4 months with the town council going through the one prong dealing with water and sewer. A
529 memorandum of understanding was signed. I believe the final documents have already been signed as
530 well. A couple of months ago (rough numbers) the board was approached in terms of changing the con-
531 ditions of approval. Right now, according to the first approval, no building permits will be issued until
532 both agreements have been fulfilled and completed. Now we are being asked to change the conditions
533 of approval and provide building permits now. Originally we were asked about not doing a CO until the
534 improvements were done. Now it has developed a little further. We are being asked to change the con-
535 ditions of approval to issue building permits now and accept \$1.1 million as a one-time contribution to
536 the improvements at Rt. 3A and Hackett Hill because that intersection has been placed back on the 10-
537 year plan with the state budget. Out of that \$1.1 million they would be taking the money for the turn
538 lane going to the turnpike expected to be between \$250,000 and \$400,000. That will be subtracted from
539 the \$1.1 million. The difference will go towards the town's contribution for the improvements at the
540 intersection of Hackett Hill and Rt. 3A. They are offering us \$1.165 as their one-time contribution for
541 any of the off-site improvements. At our last meeting held a vote to move this forward to tonight be-
542 cause to change the conditions of approval we need to hold another public hearing. That is what we are
543 here for this evening. Did you need to add something or have I been accurate?

544
545 Attorney John Cronin (Cronin, Bisson, and Zalinsky): I think you gave an excellent summary of what
546 has happened. I looked at the conditions of approval. My memory is there was a lot of dialogue about
547 this and concern. The big issue was the town had been working particularly with Rt. 3A and Hackett
548 Hill for years with no success. They could not even get DOT to come to the table and also had some
549 issues with funding. There was some give and take on that. One of the comments I heard was we can-
550 not control what the state or town voters do but we can give you a lot of money that will satisfy your
551 contribution. Also for Peter to do what no one else was able to do was to get the DOT to pay attention,
552 sit down, meet, discuss the scope, timeline, and cost. He did all that to the extent that he got what he
553 could out of the state which is a condition of approval from them. More importantly the Rt. 3A and
554 Hackett Hill section has been a growing concern. Not predicated or not a nexus piece exclusively to
555 this project. Looking back at the traffic study the impact of this project location was pretty minimal.
556 Still a problem but it gives you the money you need and the state requires the 10 percent piece to get it

557 done. There was some discussion about whether there would be the round-about. There was some op-
558 position because of funding. The modified T is an alternative. My understanding in the conditions of
559 approval is the state has deferred that type of decision making to the town even though it is a state high-
560 way. From Peter's perspective he did a lot of work to get the funding. It is kind of the chicken and the
561 egg. Get your investors to part with a million and some change and they want to know they can build
562 the project and vice versa. Hence the modification Peter crafted. The words are small, but I agree with
563 the Chairman, they do make a difference.
564

565 T. Walsh: In my opinion it is unfair for me to say the DOT has never been cooperative. They were at
566 the table when we had the first attempt at the round-about. The only reason it failed is because the
567 town's portion fell short on the warrant, but the DOT has been involved in this.
568

569 R. Duhaime: Attorney Cronin, reading this letter tonight you are a little bit misinformed. I was in the
570 town council and made a point of getting this on the warrant article. Myself and some of the other
571 councilors had purposely put it on the article. We got it passed spent \$475,000. The state of NH asked
572 us what we want to design. We chose the round-about scenario because that was what the town wanted.
573 We had the state change engineering once and added another \$75,000 to the design. The state changed
574 the plans again. This went over two years. Costs went up and up. When it finally went to a warrant arti-
575 cle it was almost double the initial cost. The town said no. This is a state road and the town paid all the
576 engineering and it could not move forward. Now I have given your applicant a year to give me a rough
577 draft. Instead I get a letter like this that says "unfortunately". It is not unfortunately. We spent \$325,000
578 - \$350,000 and the engineers did a great job designing, but not good enough for the state to move for-
579 ward. Now we are supposed to come up with 10 percent to design their intersection on their road? You
580 can see how we were hoping you were going to gain something and now we have this letter. We went
581 through this with Cabelas. A million dollars for an easement the state wanted. A right-of-way they al-
582 ready started throwing plans at. That was 15 years ago. Now we are looking at this and it is a traffic is-
583 sue. We do not have a say because it is a state road on a state road. We need the DOT to partner with
584 someone because they are not partnering with the town of Hooksett. If they want this to move forward
585 you would think they would have been more informative with Peter letting him know the town chose
586 the round-about, the town spent the money engineering it, and the town does want to move forward on
587 this so this is what you need to do. That is not what I see here. I do not understand how you would
588 think we would just move forward, give you a building permit and let you move forward when you
589 have had a year. I see a left-hand turn lane onto Hackett Hill. That solves the problem? That solves a
590 problem for you to get on and off the highway. That does not help the town of Hooksett.
591

592 D. Boutin: Let's be realistic about this. DOT is not going to do this project for another 2 or 3 years.
593 The applicant has proposed executing a one-time payment in the amount of \$1.1 million when the
594 building permit is issued for the construction of the project of both the access to the highway and Rt.
595 3A and Hackett Hill. It is a one-time payment that will be put in escrow for the town of Hooksett. A
596 portion of payment, as it says in the letter, will be used to fund 100 percent of the left-hand lane project
597 and the remaining funds will be used by the town to fund the town's contribution for the Hackett
598 Hill/Rt. 3A improvement. I do not think it can get any simpler than that and there is nothing the appli-
599 cant can do about it. The state is not going to do the project. The governor talked to the DOT and the
600 DOT told him to go back to his office. We have to get this project moving or they are going to walk
601 and we are going to lose over \$500,000 in annual property tax revenue. We need to decide tonight.
602

603 D. Pichette Volk: I have thought a lot about this. I have listened and read and tried to take into account
604 everybody's point of view. I would be a favor of making a motion we accept the \$1.1 million, or what-
605 ever the amount is, and move forward with granting the building permit.

606
607 D. Winterton: We have sat here for over a year with this project. My history is I sat there getting
608 screwed by the people that sat here. I often equated it to the old western Esau where the new guy comes
609 into town and pushes the swinging doors open and he comes in and they shoot and make him dance.
610 They never shoot him but they make him dance. This applicant has done every single thing we have
611 asked. Some things we are asking him for are out of his control. I would not want to be part of this
612 board that five years from later they say wow you let that get away. I will vote tonight to not let it go
613 away.

614
615 P. Scarpetti: Nicholas, in the wording, when Dave said it's clear when we have the balance of the
616 money can we use that for design. I was under the assumption we can't use impact money for design. It
617 says for improvement.

618
619 N. Williams: I believe we can use the one-time voluntary contribution that is going into escrow for de-
620 sign. There are state statutes that govern how you can use the other monies that are involuntary impact
621 fees that will be assessed as part of the project which is a little different. For the earmarked funds I
622 would think that can be used for design.

623
624 P. Scarpetti: When we approved this with the conditions I always felt they would come back for an-
625 other bite because we were doing it so we could get to the DOT to show more of a sincere intent. We
626 have lived in the past. We have to go into the future to do this. The sewer is another component. That is
627 millions of dollars that are going to be done that will improve Exit 11. We have to think about that also.
628 It is not just the round-about. It is also this. We have a forward-thinking planner and administrator that
629 will get this thing done with DOT. I do not want egg on my face. This is the time to do it.

630
631 S. Gilbert: In relation to the cost of the left turn only lane, do you remember what the quote was for
632 that?

633
634 P. Bartash: The low end of the estimate was \$250,000. The high end was \$400,000.

635
636 S. Gilbert: This is still well covered by this contribution?

637
638 P. Bartash: Yes and the involuntary impact fees are the high end. The ranges are covered by involun-
639 tary impact fees. All of the voluntary money that we are contributing is really intended to go toward the
640 design or the ten percent match for the construction of the rotary.

641
642 S. Gilbert: I feel the applicant has done anything within their power to complete the request and if I
643 was voting I would vote in favor of it.

644
645 C. Stelmach: I know you put together an MOU for the sewer and water and the plans for the rotary are
646 years behind. Will there be plans in place for the turning lane to the highway pretty close in the future
647 that you can put together an MOU for the turning lane and the rotary?

648
649 P. Bartash: An MOU between whom?

650
651
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

C. Stelmach: Between you and the town for doing improvement for the turning lane your contribution towards the rotary and how it will all come together.

T. Walsh: With this letter they are not going back to town council. We are making the decision.

C. Stelmach: The paragraph where it says applicant shall continue to work with DOT to prioritize and reasonably cooperate; reasonably is a really scary word.

P. Bartash: I can clarify the intent of that statement. The conditions of approval from DOT requires that we complete the design and construction of the left turn lane for the town to grant an occupancy permit. Those two things are linked by that letter. One of the conditions we are not requesting to modify relates to the town's desire that we as the applicant facilitate a conversation with DOT. The intent of this specific language you quoted from the letter is say that even though we would be receiving a building permit for the project and making the one-time financial contribution to the town we are still willing and able to participate in facilitating a conversation with DOT and ensuring this will move forward. To Mr. Winterton's comment, we have been willing to dance with the town for two years and we are not going to just walk away once the check is stroked.

T. Walsh: I am in support of the project. I voted for the conditions of approval. It has been the procedure and the process since then that I am not so thrilled about. I keep hearing people say they have done everything they possibly could with the DOT and there is nothing they can do and it's not in their control. I do not agree with that. This is a TIF district. This stuff, in my opinion, should have been dealt with before the water and sewer because they can build this building by right with a well and septic. It happens to be a groundwater protection district and an aquifer. I know they can find water there. I said I was fine with this. I gave my approval for the conditions of approval. Now I am looking at the money. It was said that we negotiate all the time with other developers. I do not know that we do. To receive this money, which is procedural, is negotiating. We are accepting on the town's behalf \$1.1 million toward an \$8 million project. I still contend this should have been brought to town council. I do not know why it was not. We have gotten some legal advice from our town attorney that says we do have the ability to do this, but that does not mean we should.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

R. Duhaime: This is a small town. I have been saying since 2003 don't worry when they are done with Londonderry they are going to come to Hooksett. There is construction everywhere and traffic is picking up. You guys are just opening the door. I thought these gentlemen would be able to get a little press in and maybe get DOT to move things up. Instead I am disappointed. We gave them a year. I thought we would get somebody or some department somewhere to move it forward. Instead they come back and you are just going to give all the conditions. It seems to me this board should at least table it for two weeks. Make sure legal counsel is at our next meeting. Get some wording in here that if the cost goes up on the project of the round-about they will pick up the cost. \$1.1 million, you get a check, that is the end of it. Well maybe 2026. We have already been down this 10-year program with the state. With Walmart it didn't happen. \$750,000 for that little section. We were going to give it to the state. The state came in, gave access to a limited highway access ramp, gave no improvements to Walmart to

697 finish the road and then Market Basket was going in. What makes you think they are going to move
698 forward at all in the round-about unless you make it a condition of approval and hold their feet to the
699 fire. It is not going to happen. It was interesting with Cabelas. We were willing to give them every-
700 thing. Yet the state of NH wanted \$1 million for an easement because they had to protect the taxpayers.
701 What are you doing for the taxpayers to the town of Hooksett? I think if they knew tonight that you
702 were doing this they would be in that audience, but you do what you want.

703
704 D. Boutin: I want to acknowledge the tremendous amount of work this board and this applicant have
705 put towards this project.

706
707 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve Granite Woods Development will execute a one-time payment in the***
708 ***amount of \$1,1,624 at the time a building permit is issued for the construction of the project at 47***
709 ***Hackett Hill Road for the purpose of roadway traffic improvements. The one-time payment will be***
710 ***placed in escrow with the town of Hooksett. A portion of the payment will be used to fund 100 per-***
711 ***cent of the left-hand lane turn project and the remaining funds will be used by the town to fund the***
712 ***towns contribution for the Hackett Hill Road/Rt. 3A improvement. Further the board authorize the***
713 ***issuance of a building permit for the project at 47 Hackett Hill Road. Seconded by D. Pichette Volk***
714 ***(for the purpose of discussion).***

715
716 D. Pichette Volk: I want to make sure there is nothing missing.

717
718 M. Somers: The conditions have not changed on the plan based on that motion.

719
720 D. Boutin: Why would they have to?

721
722 M. Somers: The reason we are here is because they need a change to the conditions to attach to this
723 approval. That is what needs to be amended. Not just accepting the money.

724
725 P. Bartash: What amending the language would allow is what member Boutin just proposed. I am not
726 trying to involve myself in the discussion of the board but ultimately the amendment to Member Bou-
727 tin's motion would be that the board also accept the proposed changes to the conditions of approval and
728 that be inserted as an additional clarification.

729
730 D. Boutin: and it grants a building permit.

731
732 P. Bartash: Yes.

733
734 Attorney Cronin: In fairness to Mr. Scarpetti there probably should be some language to say the volun-
735 tary contribution can be used for design. We had no objection to that.

736
737 D. Boutin: Well I do. Don't amend my motion for me.

738
739 T. Walsh: Dave, are you going to amend your motion based on the advice of the applicant of the con-
740 ditional items and maybe to include the design?

741
742 P. Scarpetti: The money to be used in the design of the intersection at Rt. 3A and Hackett Hill.

743

744 D. Boutin: That goes without saying. Why do you need to say that?
745

746 P. Scarpetti: Instead of the actual improvement we want to use the money for the design. Impact fee
747 money cannot be used for design.
748

749 D. Boutin: Isn't that what you intended? Design?
750

751 P. Bartash: I would not object to clarification.
752

753 D. Boutin: I will accept that amendment.
754

755 T. Walsh: You are amending your motion to include the language for the design monies. The problem
756 with that, Paul, is if we use up all the money that the difference for design we are not going to have the
757 10 percent for the fair share.
758

759 P. Scarpetti: We have the impact fee money. We have \$600,000 for impact fees.
760

761 T. Walsh: But that is not enough. This is why we should not be doing this at this level.
762

763 R. Duhaime: Once the warrant article fails you can no longer appoint any money towards that direc-
764 tion. Once the voters in this town voted not to support that round-about you can't apply any money to
765 that. The article has failed.
766

767 P. Scarpetti: You are going to get the money for design. We have money in the TIF for the impact. We
768 have \$600,000. There is your 10 percent. Once in a while there is a calculated risk. You look forward
769 you do not look in the back. You have Nicholas and Andre. They are going to get this thing done.
770

771 D. Pichette Volk: We have David's original motion. I am requesting, David, that you amend your mo-
772 tion to include whatever is written on this piece of paper and a statement about the design. If those
773 things happen I would vote in the affirmative.
774

775 D. Boutin: At the bottom of this document it says all permits required by town building department
776 and code enforcement officer. What does that mean? Does that mean they get their building permit?
777

778 N. Williams: That is an administrative condition we place on all of them.
779

780 ***D. Boutin amended his motion to add that and add David's amendment. D. Pichette Volk seconded***
781 ***David's original motion plus the inclusion of this language plus "may" for the design (see attached).***
782

783 T. Walsh: 1) Remember the conditions of approval we are acting under right now was created by the
784 applicant's attorney. 2) I keep hearing a lot of people say they have done everything they could have
785 done. What would we be doing if this was not on the 10-year plan? That is probably why they entered
786 into the conditions of approval because nobody knew it was going to be on the 10-year plan and I hope
787 it stays on the 10-year plan. That is not guaranteed either. 3) My main opposition is dealing with it at
788 this level. The size of the scope of the project would have been best served with an agreement with
789 town council. They are going to be the ones dealing with the whole project.
790

791 M. Somers: I share your concerns that when we discussed this project from the very first days was the
792 traffic issue. What we are contemplating tonight will not resolve the traffic issue. I think it kicks the
793 can down the road I am also concerned that yes it is a good faith estimate from the applicant and I think
794 that is fantastic, but at the end of the day I have a great concern with the escalating construction costs.
795 We could be coming up quite a bit short with the town not necessarily being able to cover that delta of
796 whatever it might be. I have a great concern we are going to be in this weird spot where we have cre-
797 ated a bed of our own making. I am conflicted. I think if these intersections were not part of this we
798 would have all voted on this already. The traffic is a major issue for us, for the voters of the town, and
799 anyone who lives on that side of town. Ultimately I am conflicted. I want to see this project move for-
800 ward but I am torn that we are going to be in a situation where we have backed ourselves into a corner.
801 Nicholas is there a way, barring all of this moving forward, we can withhold the CO until something
802 happens at that intersection? It is one thing to say to the residents of the town we gave it a try and
803 nothing happened and another thing to say it won't be good for a year or two, but we will ultimately
804 have this resolved. I think residents would be more forgiving in that situation.
805

806 N. Williams: I think you can place that condition on there but I would advise you to consult with legal
807 counsel before you did it.
808

809 T. Walsh: That was the first attempt at changing the conditions of approval even from the applicant.
810 They said to give them a building permit now, but they would not get their CO until they had an agree-
811 ment with the town. That went away and we got this. If we decide to do this tonight this will be the first
812 time that I have been sitting on this board the safety improvements to the intersections around this
813 building are going to be years behind them opening the door. I have never seen it before. Usually they
814 go hand in hand. For that I have my reservations. We do have some explaining to do. In reality even if
815 they do 18 months ahead of time for design 2026 is when they are going to get the money for the con-
816 struction. We are looking at a couple of years without those improvements.
817

818 **ROLL CALL**

819 **D. Boutin - Yes**

820 **D. Winterton - Yes**

821 **M. Somers - No**

822 **P. Scarpetti - Yes**

823 **C. Stelmach - No**

824 **D. Pichette Volk - Yes**

825 **T. Walsh - No**
826

827 **Motion carries with a vote of 4-0.**
828

829 **PROJECT PHASING**
830

831 **4. NO LIMIT PIZZA INC.**

832 **1562 Hooksett Road**

833 **Tax Map 13 Lot 45**

834 **Domino's Plaza**

835 **Request to Phase Issuance of Certificates of Occupancy**
836

837 D. Boutin stepped out.

838
839
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

Keith Bell (Owner of Dominos Plaza with KAB Properties, LLC): I was not aware when we went the planning board for this I had to have both buildings done at the same time to operate either/or. I emailed Nicholas to find out if it was okay to put a base coat around the retail sector because we did not want to mess up the pavement when the excavator came in and he told me that they were expecting both to be built. We are looking to get approval to have the one until we can build the rear portion. The biggest obstacle is the financing. The lender will not lend until we have approximately 40 percent of it leased which is about 3,500 to 4,000 sq. ft.

R. Duhaime: One year, two years?

K. Bell: I have \$300,000 to \$400,000 tied up. I would say a year or two max. I want it done immediately but it is when we can get it leased. I have realtors working on it and there is nobody coming in. If it is not there it is hard to lease so we have been trying to get a larger tenant to have their stuff projected out.

D. Boutin returned.

R. Duhaime: The biggest thing is the timetable for the bond. I think the board would have had to approve that phasing plan when you first came to the board.

K. Bell: As a first-time builder I was not aware of that. I did not know the planning board gave the CO. There was a disconnect on my part on who approves or denies that.

T. Walsh: Was the potential of phasing done in TRC?

N. Williams: I do not recall that particular discussion. The section of the ordinance that used to govern project phasing was Article 32 of the zoning ordinance. The town deleted that from the ordinance in 2015. In the future I think we need to be more specific with conveying entitlements to structures on one lot.

S. Gilbert: There is nothing about phasing at all anymore?

D. Boutin: No. Gone.

C. Stelmach: Is there going to be any concrete in the ground and conduit ready to go for the rear pad site?

K. Bell: It will be a gravel sand mix. The pipes can be buried so it will be a level flat area that we can put seed on if that is requested. It will be paved around. The approximate footprint of what the retail building was which was 9,800 sq. ft.

C. Stelmach: Just for the winter's sake I don't want to have a plow come in and plow over all your conduit and break it all.

K. Bell: It will all be underground. That is not possible.

885 T. Walsh: The reason we have a hard time with these phases is we have seen it before. They come in
886 and build what they really want and hold up the carrot for the whole project and we never see the other
887 end of it. I am starting to hear a friendly opinion. How tall is that sign?
888

889 K. Bell: Until we get a tenant we will not put one up. What we sent to permitting was 20' high. It got
890 sent back to us a few times. It was designed to have four spots and that will look stupid if we have one,
891 two, or three tenants so we are holding off.
892

893 P. Scarpetti: Are you going with the 20' sign?
894

895 K. Bell: There is no plan for it but the one we got back was 20'.
896

897 P. Scarpetti: Will you commit to that?
898

899 K. Bell: Sure.
900

901 P. Scarpetti: So you are going to do base coat around the whole footprint of the retail which is the
902 back?
903

904 K. Bell: Correct.
905

906 P. Scarpetti: As far as the landscaping, you are going to do your perimeter landscaping and then you
907 are willing to loam the interior area where nothing will be for the winter?
908

909 K. Bell: If it was required we would put it in, but with the snow coming up I would rather do it in the
910 springtime if I have not secured a tenant.
911

912 P. Scarpetti: Can you put a timetable on it that if you decide to wait you will loam and seed in the
913 spring if you do not have a tenant.
914

915 K. Bell: I am fine with that. I do not want an eyesore.
916

917 D. Winterton: That means that we do not release any of the bonds at all.
918

919 K. Bell: My contractor holds the bonds and I would request some sort of phasing. The land work alone
920 was almost a million dollars with the exception of the paving and when we do the backfill. The street
921 work is done. Everything is done except for this building. I do not want my contractor's money held
922 up.
923

924 C. Stelmach: Did the telephone pole out front have to be relocated?
925

926 K. Bell: I am not sure if it is done yet. The pole is in but I am not sure if they moved the components
927 over. That will be done. We cannot open until it is done. Moving it was a condition to put the turn lane
928 in.
929

930 R. Duhaime: The town council will usually reduce the bond as long as there is a phasing plan.
931

932 N. Williams: What typically would happen is the town engineer, code enforcement officer, and myself
933 would go to look at it. We would then draft a memo to town council authorizing the release of the
934 funds. If the site work is completed and what is currently bonded is completed the bond will be re-
935 leased. We will not release for what is not completed unless the board authorizes us to do. As it was not
936 approved as a phased development, as they are working toward the interior fit-ups for the front building
937 they want the CO before they pull the permits on the back half. Once the interior fit-ups are done and
938 inspected would the board authorize us to do that without the foundation permits in for the second
939 building?

940
941 *D. Boutin motioned approve a phase issuance of certificates of occupancy for No Limit Pizza Inc.,*
942 *1562 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 13 Lot 45, Domino's Plaza. Seconded by D. Pichette Volk.*
943

944 **ROLL CALL**

945 **D. Boutin - Yes**
946 **D. Winterton - Yes**
947 **M. Somers - Yes**
948 **P. Scarpetti - Yes**
949 **C. Stelmach - Yes**
950 **D. Pichette Volk - Yes**
951 **T. Walsh - Yes**

952
953 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

954
955 **BUSINESS OCCUPANCY/TOWN DEVELOPMENT UPDATE**

956
957 None.

958
959 **OTHER BUSINESS**

960
961 None.

962
963 **ADJOURNMENT**

964
965 *M. Somers motioned to adjourn at 8:19 pm. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried*
966 *unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*

967
968 **The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board will be held October 17, 2022 at 6:00**
969 **pm.**

970
971 **Respectfully submitted by,**

972
973 **/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

974
975 **AnnMarie Scott**
976 **Recording Clerk**

977

978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012

CONDITIONAL ITEMS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION:

- Applicant shall pay all voluntary and involuntary impact fees/contributions to off-site improvements per the Town impact fee schedule and the applicant’s fee matrix titled Granite Woods Commerce Center Schedule of Contributions, presented to the Board on 09/01/2021.
- Applicant shall provide all fully executed agreements and/or documentation of coordinated efforts among and between all state and local agencies with respect to the anticipated scope, reasonable cost estimates, anticipated financial responsibility, and general timeline for all off-site improvements associated with the project, including but not limited to roadway and traffic improvements to the intersection of NH Route 3A and Hackett Hill Road, improvements to the Hackett Hill Tolled on-ramp, the extension of municipal water and sewer infrastructure to the site, and the associated sewer pumping station.
- Applicant shall continue to work with NHDOT to prioritize, schedule, and reasonably cooperate in the performance of roadway improvements associated with the project demand. The Town of Hooksett will be included in all future meetings and substantive discussions leading to decisions on roadway improvements.
- Applicant agrees to remit payment of all required bonds and escrow fees in full. These bonds and escrow fees may be determined after this notice of decision has been issued. Bond estimates for project site work will be provided to the Town, reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer, and the applicant will be notified in writing of the required surety amount.
- Applicant agrees to attend a required pre-construction meeting after (a) all sureties are submitted and approved, (b) site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place and the Inspection Funding Agreement is signed and submitted, (c) the plans are signed, and (d) contractors schedule of work is submitted. NOTE: Pre-construction meetings will ONLY be scheduled after all sureties/bonds and escrow fees are collected.
- All permits required by Town Building Department and Code Enforcement Officer.
- Applicant agrees to site plan compliance and construction monitoring by authorized Town officials.