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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: Richard (Dick) Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman) (arrived at 6:06 pm), Chris Stelmach, Paul Scarpetti, Brett Scott, and David Boutin (Town Council Representative)

ALTERNATES: Mike Somers (Alternate) arrived at 6:05 pm.

EXCUSED: Matt Reed

STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 17, 2020

August 17, 2020 Meeting – This item is being postponed until the next meeting due to not enough voting Board members present that attended the meeting.

EXTENSION REQUEST

1. EIP COMMUNICATIONS I, LLC (Formerly VWI Towers) #2020-26
   180 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43, Lot 4
   Site plan extension for a wireless communications tower

Attorney Daniel Klasnick (Duval & Klasnick LLC): The installation was approved November 13, 2018 to allow a wireless communications facility by special exception in the commercial zoning district in compliance with the zoning ordinance. There will be no changes proposed to the approved telecommunications facility. The reason we are requesting the extension is because, although EIP has been pursuing this project, the initial customer, Sprint, went through a merger with T-Mobile. That has been finalized but there is on-going analysis and adjustments as the companies combine their networks and decide how best to allocate their resources. Although EIP is continuing to pursue that with its customers, they need additional time to complete the integration and finalize things with its customer.

D. Boutin motioned to approve the site plan extension for a wireless communications tower for EIP Communications I, LLC (Formerly VWI Towers) #2020-26, 180 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 43,
Lot 4 until November 13, 2021. Seconded by B. Scott. Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

WAIVER REQUEST

2. GUYLAIN & KIMBERLY PHILIPPON
   33 Churchill Drive, Map 12, Lot 24-21
   Well radius waiver

G. Philippon: Our well is about 3 1/2’ over the property line.

N. Williams: We are fine with it as long as the waiver request is recorded with the deed.

D. Boutin motioned to approve the well radius waiver for Guylain & Kimberly Philippon, 33 Churchill Drive, Map 12, Lot 24-21 with the condition that it is recorded with the deed. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN DISCUSSION

3. CNC INVESTMENTS, LLC
   1 Goonan Road, Map 37, Lot 30
   2 lot subdivision

This item has been postponed until the October 4, 2020 Planning Board meeting. This serves as public notice.

4. NICK GOLON, TF MORAN AND PETER BARTASH, PORT ONE COMPANIES
   Development proposal for Exit 11

Peter Bartash (Managing Partner, Port One) made a presentation that is attached to these minutes. He showed a rendering of what the building would look like and stated they feel this is a strong time to bring together the needs of the market and the community.

D. Boutin: I don’t think it is fair to say this is something the Town of Hooksett wants. I am opposed to it. I don’t think it fits in with the community at all. There are 500 parking spaces. Does that mean there would be 500 employees?

P. Bartash: It depends on who the end user is. We think there could be as many as 500 employees. Our goal is to have less than that and generate fewer trips to and from the site.

D. Boutin: Say you require 500 employees. How are you going to get 500 cars through the intersection of Rt. 3A and Hackett Hill Road and off of I-93 and into that site?

P. Bartash: We look at the trip generation of a mixed use property that was initially proposed and how that would compare with this use. I do not have the exact numbers, however, this would cause less generation than mixed use. This would have multiple shifts that are staggered. We have heard loud and clear that this intersection is a concern.
D. Boutin: How many trucks will you have entering and leaving the facility during the day?

P. Bartash: I don’t know. I would like to get a better handle on that.

D. Boutin: It is disappointing that you don’t have an answer to that. It seems as if you are hiding something. Based on a 500,000 sq. ft. facility, you are going to have a lot of trucks coming in and out of that site.

P. Bartash: I do not disagree.

D. Boutin: If this was mixed use you would not have hundreds of tractor trailers coming in and out of there.

P. Bartash: Over the course of a full 24 hours there may be more than 200 trucks coming in and out of this facility.

T. Walsh: This is a commercial site. No one was imagining warehouse buildings on that site which is why it is commercial. We are already known for a toll booth. We don’t want to be known for a toll booth and some warehouses. I know what building things on speculation is but I have never seen anyone build on speculation buildings of this size. When I hear that there are no tenants, I question that. In fairness, we just had an approval come out of this Board in which the tenant was not disclosed and that made regional news criticizing this Board. Fortunately I was one of the ones that voted against it.

In terms of my approval, or even recommendation to the ZBA to change the zoning, it is an absolute no for me unless I know who the tenants are. That is also very important when doing a traffic study. Until you know who the end user is, and what they are going to be generating, I do not know what a traffic study will do. In terms of the grade, you say the building will be 40 to 45’ high. What would be seen heading south on Rt. 93?

P. Bartash: For the first quarter of a mile the existing trees. Then it would be the solar panels. The building will be 5 to 10’ lower than the berm. You are correct that is is unusual to see buildings of this size built on a speculative basis in this sub-market. In western and southern Massachusetts we often see speculative buildings that are anywhere from 750,000 to one million sq. ft. being built and delivered to the market. Speculative is a good word when it comes to these projects because there is a lengthy process in working with the community to understand how and where to shape these projects. The needs of the tenants are constantly changing. You may be working on a project like this on a speculative basis while also having parallel discussions with tenants with the obvious goal of having a tenant in place. It is a significant investment risk on our part as well and a risk that we want to measure carefully. We have looked at this site in multiple ways to understand what the options are and have a variety of approaches that would be appealing to a wide set of tenants. Part of the nature of not disclosing tenants along the way is their confidentiality requirements and provisions. It is a highly competitive market. If and when we can disclose that I will be the first one celebrating. I hear that concern loud and clear.

T. Walsh: I am not dismissing anything. I am here to learn myself. The first thing you led into is what raises even more questions for me. You said you were looking at mixed use and that it will be three to five years before the market might even recover in those sectors. Three to five years on something that
we have been looking at for 35 years does not seem like a long time for something that we really want
to see there.

C. Stelmach: The end user. Is it a race to each side of the highway to see who can get in there first?
P. Bartash: The overall level of demand for this type of space goes well beyond the gorilla in the room.
If there weren’t substantial depth to the market we would not even be here.

C. Stelmach: Have there been any improvements made to Hackett Hill or Rt. 3A and Hackett Hill?
P. Bartash: Regarding the existing roadway?

C. Stelmach: Yes.
P. Bartash: We have not had our first scoping session yet with the TRC but that is coming. We have
heard from the Town Engineer the desire to extend the capacity of the sewer and municipal water sys-
tems which we will be discussing and are aware that it is in the TIF district. We are also aware of the
improvements that have been proposed at the intersection of Hackett Hill and Rt. 3A. We are working
through that process now.

C. Stelmach: As far as the other entrance on Hackett Hill Road, it will not be paved and there will be
no gate? There will be no access?
P. Bartash: We have no need for it. It would only be paved if the Fire Department needs access to the
site. We want to keep the project separate from impacting further down Hackett Hill Road.
P. Scarpetti: What is being done with the elevation? Have you established a grade for the building? Is
there more material being brought in?

Tom Burns (TF Moran): There is a large portion of the disturbed open area that is leveled out. That
elevation is 40+ feet below the highway. The intent would be to try to put the finished floor at that
grade.
P. Bartash: We are running the calculations now to see if any fill needs to be brought in. There is a sig-
nificant amount of material already on site.
P. Scarpetti: Would you want to have septic and sewer on the site?
P. Bartash: Most tenants will want to have sewer on the site. We are in the process of discussing that
now.
T. Burns: We have a meeting planned with the Sewer Commission.
P. Scarpetti: Are you aware of the architectural design requirements we have just put in place with the
town?
P. Bartash: No.
P. Scarpetti: You need to take a look at that.

D. Marshall: The issue of building something like this on speculation goes beyond the comprehension of this Board that you would even consider that. I don’t care what they are doing in MA. We need to know the end users. This is not a one shift operation. This is 24 hours a day. Those 500 parking spaces will be used around the clock. That is a lot of traffic. I don’t know what any company that talks about something of this size is prepared to put into the intersection of Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A and 3A itself, but you better have some serious dollars to even contemplate handling that kind of traffic. If you come in front of this Board and say 90 percent of this traffic is going to be using the turnpike you are kidding. Right now the truck traffic on Rt. 3A is because there is a toll booth there. You are telling me that all the vehicles for this site are prepared to pay a toll every time they use the facility? We would find that hard to believe. I have been on record and continue to be on record saying I detest land use variances. The people voted for this land to be used for a specific use. They and they alone, in my opinion, are the only ones that can change that. You can go by petition to change this from use to another, but you get one shot a year at doing that in March. Petition articles in this town have not been very successful when dealing with Planning Board issues. I cannot conceive this, unless we understand who the users are going to be. You are talking multi-million dollar investments in sewer and multimillion dollar improvements in traffic before you even get any building started. This was not the concept that the people in the Town of Hooksett had for this area. We have been playing with this and contemplating significant changes to rezone this ourselves or recommend to the voters that it be rezoned to a multi-use, which includes commercial, service industry, and residential. A mixed community. Based on the comments we have heard from this Board, you have an uphill battle.

D. Boutin: Are you planning to bring water to this site?

P. Bartash: Yes.

D. Boutin: When you add that to the sewer and traffic cost you talking about multi million dollars. Are you prepared to put that kind of money into off site improvements?

P. Bartash: That is something we discussed and understand.

D. Boutin: Are you prepared to do that?

P. Bartash: Yes. I am on the phone everyday talking with potential tenants. The first question they ask is when we think this project could be approved?” They need to know certainty of execution which is important for anything that gets brought to a land use board. They also want to know the path to approval. The Boards want to know the tenant. No one wants to pull the trigger before the other person. We understand this is a long process and there is a lot of dialogue and understanding. We are here for the long haul.

D. Marshall: Process length is always a question we get from developers. In your case, this is in front of the ZBA is to issue a use variance. If they do that it represents one kind of time frame. If they don’t it represents a much longer time frame. With something of this significance and, from what I understand, the other shoe that is going to drop with the other two buildings, you are going to be looking at at least a year to get those things resolved and you will be looking at a major traffic study. A traffic study
for something like this will go third party. We will pick the consultant and they will do the study which will be at your cost as the state law allows. You said the nearest residence is 500’ away. You are talking about trucks. The sound in that area carries like crazy. Some of those residents can here the turnpike and you will be closer to them.

D. Boutin: Before the trucks go on the highway will they be sitting and running? That would have a significant impact on the neighborhood.

P. Bartash: I believe there are federal regulations in place against idling. I can look into that.

T. Walsh: There is a time limit but when you have several trucks it is constant.

D. Boutin: They would also need to get approval from the ZBA for an excavation permit.

D. Marshall: That is true for any work they are going to do in that area.

Silver City NH LLC #Z20-11
39 Hackett Hill Road, Map 13 Lot 51

N. Golon (TF Moran): We inadvertently got lumped into this agenda item. There are two separate proposed projects. This property is comprised of approximately 54 acres and is located on Hackett Hill Road on the east side of Rt. I-93. This site was formerly the home of Ritchie Brothers. In the 1950’s it was the Palazzi Corp. There was an industrial variance granted for Ritchie Brothers to clean their equipment before it was auctioned. There is currently a flat plateau with approximately 24 acres of developable area. We are proposing to lower that grade to accommodate the proposed structure. The access is on the northern portion of the site. The existing buildings will be removed. There is an existing groundwater well. On the plan Hackett Hill Road is to the north. To the south the site was previously bisected by an access road to Rt. 3A. To the left is an existing reclaimed stabilized base which is gravel. There is an existing parking lot to the northeast quadrant of the site. Access would be required for oversized vehicles going into the proposed distribution center. We have accommodated that with the driveway design. Intent is the passenger vehicles would drive to the right into the parking lot. The oversized vehicles would drive to the left to the loading docks headed to the east closest to West River Road. We are proposing 225 parking spaces based off of the initial trip generation that has been done for this facility.

The parking generation would necessitate 210 parking spaces. There is the ability to add an additional 50 spaces. We provided the layout of the two structures being proposed. This is our conceptual master plan. There are two phases to this project. The first phase is the distribution center which would be 595,000 sq. ft. There is also a future proposed industrial non-nuisance building to the south comprised of 150,000 sq. ft. Parking is located to the south. To the east is the loading bays.

N. Golon spoke about how a traffic study is done on a use like this with no end user and what the trip generation would be comparatively to mixed use.

N. Golon: This project will have the opportunity to extend municipal sewer and water. The expectation is to use TIF district funds to help fund some of these improvements. Where some people see hurdles we see possible solutions to provide improvements to the community. There needs to be studies done to
come to resolutions and answers. There are significant benefits to a project of this size. We are working on graphics to present to the ZBA. Based on ZBA comments we are evaluating placement of the build-
ing.

T. Walsh: You have no end user?

N. Golon: We do not.

T. Walsh: I think the people of this town are onto these traffic studies. They have been coming to the meetings and have been doubtful of the traffic studies and I do not blame them. If you go by Amazon I am boxed in by their vans. The traffic study we received from them was inaccurate.

P. Scarpetti: As far as your elevations we were told it is 25 to 30’. What is the difference on building to the south?

N. Golon: A potential future phase would be an industrial non-nuisance type use. Basically the same thing. Elevationally we are at about 206 for Rt. 3A. We are proposing an elevation in the area of 260. That is about 55’ to 60’ of grade change between 3A and the plateau that would be proposed for the future building.

P. Scarpetti: What is the difference in the existing condition that is on the property?

N. Golon: 20’.

P. Scarpetti: It is 44’ down. You have a benchmark of 304.

N. Golon: You are correct. That is higher. The grade bi-sects across that component. Half of the site is down on elevation.

P. Scarpetti: There are no other grading lines in that area on your topographical map.

N. Golon: The area that we are speaking to, there is an elevation that is higher and then it drops off. On average it is a 25 to 30’ drop. In certain locations it drops. You made an accurate statement.

P. Scarpetti: Going to the east on the slope going down, what would that slope be?

N. Golon: It is variable. There are portions that are 2.5:1, but it is mostly 2:1.5. They are steep.

P. Scarpetti: Along the highway, what would they propose if you drop the grade.

N. Golon: It is variable. Between 2:1 and 3:1.

P. Scarpetti: By lowering the grade you will be coming further away from the highway faster because it is a steeper slope.
N. Golon: From a grade transition we would need to be at a lower elevation. These grades are not set in stone. We have to go through that process with the ZBA. If they think we need to be higher we need to make adjustments to that.

P. Scarpetti: The state is going to make you do a slight grade where you are dropping off at the other end. When you lower the grade you are not going to gain any square footage.

N. Golon: The primary focus for that is the northern end of the site.

P. Scarpetti: You are going another 34’ down.

N. Golon: It is variable. It is an average.

P. Scarpetti: You will be creating another hole.

N. Golon: We have had prior conversations with your town staff regarding the use and elevation. We stated we need to bring the grade down. There is no bait and switch as far as excavation. We have been very transparent.

P. Scarpetti: It will take two years to get all of that material out of there. This is a mining/excavation permit.

N. Golon: We ball-parked this to a 6 to 8 month time frame to move the material. If someone wants to get in sooner we can move it faster. Our intent is to not only have an area to have our use but a lay down to build the use.

D. Boutin: I was the Chairman of the TIF and this kind of use was never contemplated. Our Master Plan says this area should be developed in a commercial way. I am very much opposed to this project. When you compare the level of traffic to this site and the other site you will have over 100 trucks and tractor trailers driving in and out of this neighborhood along with over 700 cars. How will this quiet neighborhood survive that?

N. Golon: The prior approval had more traffic. This would require a minimum of widening Rt. 3A. That was a condition of that approval. An improvement would need to take place. This project might be the catalyst to provide the funding for it. I understand the TIF was not planning on this use, but things evolve.

D. Boutin: If a round about is built, what happens if all of these trucks are going to the round about?

Paul Roy (ProCon): The majority of our truck traffic is anticipated to go onto the highway.

N. Golon: 30 percent of our traffic will go onto 3A.

D. Boutin: How do you think that level of traffic will operate?

N. Golon: This project could provide the tax base to make those improvements.
D. Marshall: Did the round about go before the voters?

N. Williams: The round about went before the voters and failed three times.

D. Boutin: I don’t want you to get TIF district funds for this project.

C. Stelmach: On the footprint, if you went down 20 to 30 wouldn’t you be losing sub-grade footprint?

N. Golon: No. We have to look at the set-backs.

C. Stelmach: If it is down 30’ along the highway, 93 would be a natural bridge with ravines on each side? You would be looking at the top of the building?

N. Golon: That is a tough question. I would hope people would be looking at the road. These structures are not always of the highest aesthetic quality. I don’t know if people want to see this from the highway.

P. Roy: The building would consist of 44 precast insulated panels. It would be concrete with a painted finish and some design elements and would accommodate the new racking system. Due to sprinkler heads this building allows for stacking to a higher height. There is a shortage of this type of space in New Hampshire and there is a demand for it. The mezzanine in the front can be subdivided into bays or have one tenant. Sewer will be in the front. Offices are in the front of the building. The logistics portion would be on the back. It is an attractive building and has a lot of strength.

T. Walsh: The best looking distribution center is in Raymond and that is because you cannot see it.

N. Golon: We will double our efforts to determine which path to take.

T. Walsh: Is there a mutual funding to these projects?

N. Golon: These projects should be seen on their own merits and should not be grouped together.

P. Roy: This is not a commercial site that would be a viable one.

D. Boutin: Yes it is. I disagree.

P. Roy: In the state right now there is a real shortage of structures of this type that have 44 clear inside their building space. That is why you have these coming before you now.

T. Walsh: We have an industrial district in town that is close to the highway.

P. Roy: It is not as close to the highway.

T. Walsh: It is a half mile from the highway.

C. Stelmach: In theory, what would be the cluster mess of these both went in?
N. Golon: We are currently completing a traffic study for this project, including Chucksters. If the project on the other site moves forward they would do a traffic study. It is just a matter of timing and who comes first.

D. Marshall: I would ask staff to produce a map of both sites on the same map.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

5. PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS

Discussion ensued on the proposed zoning amendments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*D. Boutin motioned to adjourn at 7:35 pm. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.*

*Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.*

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held October 5, 2020 at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

/s/ AnnMarie White

AnnMarie White

Recording Clerk
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1. INTRODUCTION
At **PORT ONE COMPANIES**, our in-depth understanding of the value creation process, from project origination through operator onboarding and eventual exit, enables our team to skillfully manage risks while providing best-in-class service to our clients, partners, and investors.

- **2.855m GSF**
  - Active Design + Planning Efforts (Internal + 3rd Party)
- **+70%**
  - Design Practice YOY Growth
- **$965m**
  - Land Development Efforts In Permitting + Approvals Phase
- **$20.125m**
  - Assets Under Management (Various)
- **400+**
  - Design and Planning Projects To-Date

**INDUSTRIAL | MIXED-USE | WORKFORCE**
GRANITE WOODS COMMERCE CENTER

PROJECT OVERVIEW

GOALS
1. Develop a Revitalization Zone property into a vibrant new use.
2. Support an emerging regional commerce hub creating jobs and revenue.
3. Improve curb appeal of a highly visible open sand and gravel pit.
4. Maintain and enhance existing natural buffers to residential properties.
5. Capitalize on proximity to highway.
6. Set reasonable timeline to construction and delivery.
7. Provide state-of-the-art facility to meet substantial market demand for Class A space.
8. Utilize forward-thinking project strategy flexible to future changes in the rapidly-evolving marketplace.
DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES

1. Institutionally-Oriented Project Approach
   - data-driven decision making based on deep market research
   - clear, achievable business plan
   - carefully selected team of subject matter experts and top performers

2. Adapt to COVID-era Market Dynamics
   - no visible negative impact to demand for industrial space
   - Boston market expansion is fueling an emerging commerce hub in Hookset NH
   - positive market trends in Southern NH with clear, durable demand growth drivers

3. Acknowledge Site Opportunities
   - 0.5mi to Exit 11 on I-93 with North/South ramping
   - excellent access to regional airports (Manchester, Portsmouth, Boston, Portland)
   - large contiguous development area
   - existing natural buffers to screen residential abutters

4. Foster Positive Environmental and Social Impact
   - consider sustainable building materials and solar micro-grid at new facility
   - adaptively re-use a previously deforested site
   - community job creation in a period of economic dislocation
2. SITE + CONTEXT
ADDRESS = 47 HACKETT HILL RD, HOOKSETT NH 03106
TOTAL SITE AREA = 60.15 ACRES
DEVELOPABLE AREA = 51.6 ACRES
OPPORTUNITIES
OPTIMAL PARCEL SIZE AND GEOMETRY
FAVORABLE TOPOGRAPHY
DENSE EXISTING VEGETATIVE BUFFERS
ZONING COMPLIANCE

CONSTRAINTS
CENTRALLY-LOCATED WATER FEATURES
SINGLE USEABLE SITE ENTRY DRIVE
EXISTING EASEMENTS AND BUFFER ZONES
EVERSOURCE EASEMENT
3. CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN
### GRANITE WOODS COMMERCE CENTER

#### ZONING OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PROVIDED</th>
<th>COMPLIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning Designation</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Wholesale/Warehouse</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Zoning Designation</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use</td>
<td>Reclamation Gravel Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District</td>
<td>GRCD, WCOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>115 feet</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>90 feet</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>60 feet</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (max)</td>
<td>10% in GRCD unless approved by Town Engineer</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height (max)</td>
<td>35 feet (if no ladder truck access)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 feet (if ladder truck access)</td>
<td>40 feet</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area (no water/sewer)</td>
<td>44,000 square feet</td>
<td>2,608,341 SF</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Frontage (no water/sewer)</td>
<td>200 feet</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (min)</td>
<td>1 per employee (plus 5 spaces)</td>
<td>790 spaces</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer Zone (abutting residential)</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>60 feet</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Wetland Natural Vegetative Buffer (min)</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Vegetative Wetland Buffer (min)</td>
<td>40 feet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic/Leach Field Wetland Buffer</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Q&A