

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, July 15, 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), Paul Scarpetti, David Boutin, Christopher Stelmach, Matt Reed, and Robert Duhaime (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Brett Scott

EXCUSED: None

STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)

Brett Scott was not a voting member this evening with the exception of Pike Industries.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 1, 2019

July 1, 2019 Meeting – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the July 1, 2019 meeting. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. T. Walsh abstained due to not being in attendance at the July 1, 2019 meeting. Motion carried with a vote of 6-0.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. PIKE INDUSTRIES #19-13
38 Hackett Hill Road, Map 13, Lot 69
Amended site plan for polymer asphalt plant**

C. Stelmach stepped down.

D. Marshall stated that Bruce Thomas received a letter dated 07/10/19 from TF Moran addressing his comments.

Eric Moreau (11 Saw Hill Road): We get quite a bit of noise. We want to be a good neighbor, but I am not sure of the ramifications.

Kevin Folkins: There will be approximately two trucks per hour. There will be a sheer mill that will operate 8 to 10 hours. The volume justifies the plant running two to three days per week. The pumps

will be taken off of the trucks. The truck noise will only be the noise of the truck. The plant operations will be inside a building.

Tom Thibeault (66 Hackett Hill Road): Pike has been a great neighbor. I want to see where this is going to take place.

K. Folkins and Hanna Giovannucci showed the location.

T. Thibeault: Will there be any smell?

K. Folkins: No different than there is now.

Close public hearing.

D. Boutin motioned to approve the amended site plan for a polymer asphalt plant for Pike Industries, #19-13, 38 Hackett Hill Road, Map 13, Lot 69. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

R. Duhaime: We met with Pike. They are willing to add trees to screen the residential abutters. One of my comments was that Pike has doubled and tripled the size of the quarry plant. We have more than our share of sand pits and quarries in this town. As land use changes and pits dry up we will start to see this changing. Getting some of this to start to reclaim would be nice. The buffer is on the existing lot. There should be a 50' buffer and that was one of the issues of Pike moving forward. Some land was given to Conservation, but there is no plan yet. With something like this the 50' buffer should be cleaned up and reclaimed. I wanted to satisfy some concern of the neighbors. Maybe Pike could give the town an easement for trails in the future.

D. Boutin: I want to thank Pike for adding the trees. With the discussion about berms, there was some suggestion about ZBA action. The last time Pike was before ZBA was 2015. I looked at the minutes and there was no discussion about blasting. Pike is complying with what the town has asked for. Every five years Pike has to revisit their property and plans with the state to make sure they are following the laws regarding mining pits. The Town Planner has indicated that all of the concerns of the Town Engineer have been addressed.

D. Boutin: I would like to add that the standard conditions of approval per the Planning Department must be met.

Motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

C. Stelmach returned.

**2. FOREST OAKS, LLC #19-15
49 Mammoth Road, Map 45, Lot 33-1
Site plan for 20 Multi-Unit Family Townhouses**

D. Marshall: We have received a letter from Bruce Thomas, addressed to Nick Williams, that states his comments on the plans and specifications have been met.

N. Williams: The Sewer Commission requested they meet with them prior to approval.

Doug MacGuire (The Dubay Group, Inc.): There were some outstanding engineering comments. We have provided revised plans and had the comments addressed. We also met with the Sewer Commission today. They were pleased with the plans. Bruce is still working out the details of the plan. They said they are familiar with this and stated they liked this layout the best that they have seen thus far. There were thirteen remaining permits that went with the land that they agreed to. There are seven more. The applicant will be paying for the additional seven which will cost another \$22,000. The property holder paid for the first thirteen.

B. Boutin: The Sewer Commission approved the plan today?

D. MacGuire: They did not vote today. It goes through their engineering review and then they sign off.

Open to public.

No public comments.

Close to public comments.

R. Duhaime: If the Sewer Commission denies them the units they cannot move forward.

T. Walsh: I know this is allowed building in MDR, but there are single family homes on Castle Drive. You are going to build a patio in the setback. Why didn't the whole thing get shifted 25 to 30 feet. Why are you favoring the setback vs the wetland buffer?

D. MacGuire: We have more buildings facing the inner part of the property versus the abutting properties. We tried to angle the properties. We buffered the units. There are a significant amount of plantings. I appreciate the thought of pushing toward the wetlands, but the Conservation Commission would not have liked that. We are using that area to grade because Hooksett has a no disturb buffer and we had to make sure we could clear that.

T. Walsh: I don't think this going to be esthetically pleasing to the nearest abutter when this is 15' from his property line. I think you could have shifted this. I will be happy to see this developed, but there could have been a minor adjustment to get some breathing room next to the neighbors.

D. MacGuire: There is a buffer on the other side and we are touching the grading on the setback of that area. There isn't enough room without encroaching the buffer.

R. Duhaime: There is a little drainage culvert. The grading has to start from that side. The snow should shed through the back of the property You would have no wetland crossings. It is a shame to stack it, but once you get close to wetlands, there would be arguments that properties are flooding. This way they won't be responsible for any of that.

T. Walsh: You aren't even going to have a deck on one unit because of the setback. It makes no sense to me.

D. Boutin: How much is the end unit closest to the wetland set back from the wetland?

N. Williams: 15' from the edge of the buffer.

D. MacGuire: If we move it we are going to encroach the setback buffer. We also had to give Mr. Maurais his legal frontage so the driveway has to come in at this angle. We are already swooping this angle to make that happen. If you are suggesting we could slide this a little to give a deck you are probably correct, but the applicant wasn't concerned.

T. Walsh: If you want a yes from me you have to get out of the set-back. A patio with pavers is allowed in the setback. It is a small adjustment and I think it is an easy one.

D. MacGuire: If we want to twist it so it feels like there is less force I think I can make that happen and still not encroach the buffer. We don't want to encroach the buffer. We can move it as much as we can while still working within the waivers.

N. Williams: Are you talking about a waiver of the lot frontage? That would be zoning.

D. MacGuire: We want to utilize our own frontage. We can shift it and I think we can make it work. I think it is a good suggestion.

C. Stelmach: Is it possible to take that unit and put it on the last building on the left?

D. MacGuire: No. That is too close to the infiltration pond.

D. Boutin: I recognize that Mr. Walsh would like the adjustment which I am okay with. We have a memorandum from the engineer that everything has been addressed.

N. Williams: All of Bruce Thomas's and Fire Department comments have been addressed. There was one issue with snow storage that was co-located with the propane tanks.

D. MacGuire: We can pull the tanks closer to the building to leave more of an open green space.

N. Williams: The condominium documents need to be reviewed by the attorney as well as any proposed signage.

D. MacGuire: We were going to come back to this Board if, and when, there would be a sign just for that purpose.

D. Marshall: That would be an amended site plan.

D. MacGuire: We could put a location on the plan. Our thought was to place it right before the shallow pond. A small monument type sign.

D. Marshall: That has to be indicated on the plan.

D. MacGuire: We can add that.

Open to public comments.

Glen Miller (14 Castle Drive): I appreciate your concern and I appreciate your being willing to move that over. In regard to the propane tanks, I thought they were going to be buried.

D. MacGuire: They are.

John Rioudan (22 Castle Drive): Has there been a decision on dumpsters and where they are going to be located?

D. MacGuire: We were going to do individual trash pick up and a company will come to pick it up on a select day.

Close to public comments.

Close public hearing.

D Marshall: If you are going to shift anything the plans have to be redone.

D. MacGuire: I would consider this a minor shift. You are bringing the shift 4'. If that needs to be redone we are not going to agree to it. We want to get this underway.

D. Marshall: If it is made a part of the record that the shift will occur it will be in the hands of the Code Enforcement Officer and it will be watched very closely to make sure it is done.

D. MacGuire: We have, at a minimum, 25' driveways. We may be able to lose some of that area and make the driveways 20'. That would give us extra room.

T. Walsh: How much hardship is it to change the final plan?

D. MacGuire: It has to come back here.

D. Marshall: If your condition is to approve it, I just won't sign the plans until the change is shown.

D. MacGuire: Can we say we should slide the 10 x 12 footprint to get it out of the setback?

D. Boutin: We need something specific for the Chairman to sign.

D. Marshall: You want a note on the plan?

D. McGuire: We will slide the six-plex alignment to get the patio out of the setback. I brought that concern up and it was stated that was not is an issue. If it is a concern now, I can modify it to get the patio out of the setback.

P. Scarpetti motioned to conditionally approve the site plan for 20 Multi-Unit Family Townhouses for Forest Oaks, LLC #19-15, 49 Mammoth Road, Map 45, Lot 33-1 as follows: 1) The six-plex being pushed so the patio or deck is out of the building set-back; 2) The propane tanks are moved to a

location approved by the Fire Department outside of the snow storage area; 3) The location of the signage will be put on the plan; 4) The condominium documents will be reviewed and approved by the town attorney; 5) A letter of approval is received from the Sewer Commission; and 6) The standard condition of approval list is met. The Chairman will sign the site plan once these conditions have been met. Seconded by D. Boutin.

R. Duhaime: This is one of those things that if you just look at the spacing on the plan I would have motioned more of this if I had the support of Mr. Walsh if he was here last week. I see the landscape screen. Who is going to maintain that? I would encourage the applicant to move that building as far away from this property line as possible.

D. Marshall: Once the Town Planner calls me I will ask if the conditions have been met. If he says yes I will sign the plans.

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

WAIVER

**3. SUMMIT VIEW #19-16
24 Churchill Drive, Map 12, Lot 24-34
Waiver for well radius**

N. Williams: If you reference the letter from Matt Lavoie, Code Enforcement Officer that is dated June 19, 2019, we have collected a bond and issued a temporary CO due to the hardship that would have been imposed on the new homeowner. We are looking for motion from this Board to approve the waiver request in order to have the necessary documentation signed off and reported with the deed, which is the waiver request form from NHDES.

Keith Martel: It appears from this letter the CEO is okay with this waiver request.

N. Williams: It is less than 2'. I am okay with it.

D. Boutin motioned to approve the waiver for well radius for Summit View, #19-16, 24 Churchill Drive, Map 12, Lot 24-34. Seconded by T. Walsh.

P. Scarpetti: Having lots this tight this can become a problem. Has this been staked?

K. Martel: Yes.

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

BOARD DISCUSSION

**4. COMMERCIAL ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES SUBCOMMITTEE
CHARGE**

The member of the committee are:

Anne Stelmach (Zoning Board of Adjustment)
Kathy Northrup (Heritage Commission)
Paul Scarpetti (Economic Development Committee and Planning Board)
Rob Duhaime (Town Council)
Brett Scott (Economic Development Committee and Planning Board)

D. Marshall explained the what the committee is tasked with and the process of keeping the changes in the Zoning Ordinance, moving them, or adding them elsewhere. D. Boutin gave suggestions on where he believes the regulations should be listed and how it should be done. He also gave suggestions on how things could be worded. Additional discussion occurred between the Board members.

A deadline of October 15 was set for the Committee to present the progress of the draft Guidelines to the Planning Board.

OTHER BUSINESS

D. Boutin motioned to nominate D. Marshall as Chairman. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Opposed by R. Duhaime. Motion carries with a vote of 6-1.

P. Scarpetti motioned to nominate T. Walsh as the Vice-Chairman. Seconded by D. Boutin. Opposed by R. Duhaime. Motion carries with a vote of 6-1.

N. Williams mentioned that a letter was received from the USPS dated 6/27/29 that states the USPC now requires centralized delivery of mail to “cluster box units” for all multi-family residential developments moving forward.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Scarpetti motioned to adjourn. Seconded by M. Reed. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-1.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**