

Unofficial

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, June 17, 2019**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: Richard Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), P. Scarpetti, Christopher Stelmach, and Robert Duhaime (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES:

EXCUSED: T. Prasol, David Boutin and Alternates Brett Scott and Matt Reed

STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner) and Andre Garron (Town Administrator)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 3, 2019

June 3, 2019 Meeting – P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2019 meeting. Seconded by R. Duhaime. T. Prasol abstained due to not being in attendance at the June 3, 2019 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

1. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES/REVIEW ORDINANCE

Discussion of proposed architectural design review subcommittee

Discussion of a potential zoning amendment requiring architectural design review

N. Williams presented documentation and materials from several other towns for reference. He stated that the Board needs to be clear as to what districts in the Town they will be focusing on.

R. Duhaime: There were complaints in Manchester when people were selling garden lots and the neighbors wanting the homes to look a certain way with eaves, etc. to make it conform to the area. It could be put in that in certain areas there should be a certain look to the buildings.

N. Williams: We have it but it doesn't have any teeth and is not explained in any detail.

P. Scarpetti: Hopkinton sends the plans to an architect.

N. Williams: They have that as part of their review process. We could add that but the applicant would bear the cost of the review. We could inquire as to the cost of those services.

P. Scarpetti: It goes to the TRC, but is up to Nicholas to tell the applicant the Planning Board may not approve it. Should that be up to Nicholas? There could be different guidelines for industrial, commercial, etc.

T. Walsh: I am torn on this. I was opposed to the bubble. I think something could be added to our regulations to say that something unconventional needs to be reviewed. We could replace some wording and that would give the ordinance teeth. People in the town have rights as to the esthetics of the properties, however, property owners have rights as well. As far as O'Reilly's, the front has some character and the sides are plain. In the old days that is how it was.

P. Scarpetti: There is a fine line where we need to give direction. O'Reilly saved money, but if they could have done what they did in Londonderry it would have not cost them much more money.

T. Walsh: Granted. If our ordinance and regulations were working. The reason O'Reilly's made it as far as it did was we did not have a Town Planner. They read the regulations by the word and set a plan up. By the time they came to us it would have been a hardship for them to change. If you look at everything else, there was compliance without us having to change anything.

A. Garron: Whatever standard that you put in place, hopefully, will be what you envision Hooksett to look like. At first it will be Nicholas, but the Planning Board will be the ones that are making the decision. Whatever you come up with Nicholas needs to know that the Planning Board will back him up. Londonderry had standards that everyone bought into. We had an architect look at the regulations. These regulations have to embody Hooksett no matter what district.

T. Walsh: Of all the towns you have drawn this information off of, do they have impact fees?

A. Garron: Londonderry does but I don't know if they move forward with them.

N. Williams: Derry and Exeter do.

T. Walsh: I am concerned about raising the cost to do business in Hooksett. If it is too expensive here businesses will not come.

R. Duhaime: No rule will work one hundred percent. The rules have to be the rules, but there need to be things that can lead to negotiation. Currently, interpretation is where the problem lies. It is the cost of doing business and making the building fit the site. An applicant is going to give us their most cost effective plan for them to do business.

T. Walsh referenced page 80, Sections D and E from the Town of Derry's regulations. I don't think we should be a negotiating business.

P. Scarpetti: Referring to Derry some of the regulations use the word "encouraged." I believe the applicant should show pictures of the existing buildings and the locations so that the Planning Board can see what the neighbors buildings look like. As far as impact fees, I think the more people put into a building the assessed value will be higher.

T. Walsh: Say you put so much teeth into this that people will be forced to be reminded of the cost of Hooksett each year when they get their tax bill. I think we should look at impact fees and tread cautiously on how much we are going to increase the cost to the applicant.

C. Stelmach referred to the Town of Lincoln's regulations, Paragraph B.

D. Marshall: Lincoln also is careful to put in wording with regard to alterations and exemptions to existing structures. Lincoln also liberally uses the word "shall." My question is what are you trying to protect? We have no historic districts. We have historic buildings. If Rt. 3 is our main target, Rt. 28 is secondary, and Rt. 3A is third, you need to develop regulations that have some teeth. No town can survive long if it doesn't continue to grow. About 1/3 of a community should be under construction at any given time. Rt. 3 needs to be protected, but it is a question of how aggressively you want to do it. If you want to be aggressive you need to be ready to apply those regulations. Negotiation is a dangerous thing. The Performance Zone regulations lack teeth. If trying to protect Rt. 3 is your first goal you need to be aggressive. We need to decide what our goal is in addressing architectural standards.

R. Duhaime referred to the Town of Derry section of purpose, Line 5. It is being said that there will be more and more mixed use districts. I am looking at Derry and thinking we should adopt almost the whole thing. Why are we going to isolate the Performance Zone if we have the TIF district?

D. Marshall: You cannot creep into Hooksett with multi-use zoning because our zoning is limited and prohibits that.

T. Walsh: I don't want to see residential sprawl in this town, but I am all for commercial. I think we should look at zoning to make sure we can prohibit residential sprawl. I think we should look at all three corridors individually at first and then maybe we can overlap.

P. Scarpetti: The multi-use would work as well. I think we are being restrictive. If we had something like a multi-use we could see a store front downstairs and condos upstairs. I think we should have a sub-committee and have our attorney review it. The Master Plan is listed in a lot of the regulations of the towns.

T. Walsh: I don't think that a lot of people in the town want to see development on Rt. 3A.

P. Scarpetti: If we have steel buildings, over the years they will rust.

R. Duhaime: When applications come in on 3A, people that live behind it may come in and complain.

D. Marshall: I cannot think of anyone who would propose to change the western side of Route 3A. That is where your regulations are going to mean something. You can get all of the water and sewer you want there, but the state will do nothing to widen that road. 3A might be a natural deterrent to growth except for Exit 10 and Exit 11. Any regulations that you want to improve the quality of industrial and commercial should be the same. Hooksett has no downtown area and no historic district.

R. Duhaime: Bedford has mixed use, but it is well done and hidden. Their commercial and residential is intertwined.

T. Walsh: If you want to follow the Planning Commission's recommendations, it is expensive and hold on to your school budget.

D. Marshall: Does Bedford have arch standards?

N. Williams: They are intertwined within their development regulations. Their zoning regulation are more general.

P. Scarpetti: They write "encourage."

A. Garron: It comes down to the Planning Board that holds the applicant to the design and the Town Planner taking direction from them. The Planning Board holds them accountable to design standards. The people with businesses also hold the applicant's accountable.

D. Marshall: Were you in Bedford when they were negotiating with Walgreens?

A. Garron: Yes. There is a historic barn there.

T. Walsh: How is Bedford successful without having language to hold them accountable?

A. Garron: They do have language, but they have an area for negotiation as well. If you go by the wording of it you might have to have just brick when an applicant might want wood and brick.

R. Duhaime: There are no guarantees that we will be on the Board in the future, but we can guarantee that the regulations can evolve.

P. Scarpetti: At one meeting D. Boutin said that we were going to get sued by the applicant and that was not appropriate.

D. Marshall: Our attorney will tell us if we have a defense.

T. Walsh: I think it would be better to keep the Performance Zone in the Planning Board's hands.

D. Marshall: Not every member of the sub-committees has to be a member of the Planning Board.

R. Duhaime: I would like to see someone from the Economic Development Committee and someone from the public serving on the sub-committee.

It was a Board consensus to have a sub-committee and have three members at a minimum, five at a maximum, not including staff.

P. Scarpetti volunteered to serve as a Planning Board and Economic Development Committee representative. R. Duhaime expressed interest. Brett Scott and Tom Walsh expressed interest, however, not until the Fall.

N. Williams: We could mention this to the Heritage Commission as well.

2. OTHER BUSINESS

T. Walsh: Nicholas, could you please have someone look into the silt fence at Bluebird Storage?

N. Williams: I will check with Matt Lavoie tomorrow.

D. Marshall: Do we have anything proposed for zoning amendments?

N. Williams: Nothing currently.

C. Stelmach: I noticed a for sale sign in front of Supreme Industries.

N. Williams: I had a meeting this afternoon. They are currently under a confidentiality agreement.

D. Marshall: Anything on the dome?

N. Williams: They have cleared AOT and we are looking at the impact fees.

T. Walsh: Are the decibel measurements done?

N. Williams: One of the things I listed was that report needs to be provided to Matt.

T. Walsh: Before they start clearing?

N. Williams: No.

T. Walsh: It is my interpretation that it would be before and after the trees are cut.

N. Williams: I will look into that in the morning.

D. Marshall: Have they had a pre-construction meeting?

N. Williams: No.

ADJOURNMENT

*T. Walsh motioned to adjourn. Seconded by C. Stelmach. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk