

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
VIA ZOOM
35 Main Street
Monday, June 1, 2020**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:34 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: Richard (Dick) Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), David Boutin, Christopher Stelmach, Matt Reed, Paul Scarpetti (arrived at 7:17 pm) and Robert Duhaime (Town Council Representative)

ALTERNATES: Brett Scott

EXCUSED: Paul Scarpetti

STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)

D. Marshall: Brett Scott will be a voting member.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2020

May 18, 2020 Meeting – David Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the May 18, 2020 meeting with one amendment. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Page 14, Line 642 should read: D. Marshall: Prohibit a left turn in and a left turn out.

Roll Call

D. Boutin - Yes

M. Reed - Yes

T. Walsh - Yes

C. Stelmach - Yes

B. Scott - Abstained due to not being in attendance at the May 18, 2020 meeting.

R. Duhaime - Yes

D. Marshall - Yes

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING

1. SPRINGWOOD HOMES AND DEVELOPMENT CORP. #2020-13

44 **96 Farmer Road, Map 26, Lot 39-1**
45 **2 lot subdivision**

46
47 D. Marshall: Is plan complete?

48
49 N. Williams: Yes.

50
51 ***T. Walsh motioned to find the plans complete for Springwood Homes and Development Corp.,***
52 ***#2020-13, 96 Farmer Road, Map 26, Lot 39-1, 2 lot subdivision. Seconded by D. Boutin.***

53
54 D. Boutin: The Town Planner said the plans are complete. We have a memorandum from our Town
55 Engineer that has a list of seven items that need to be addressed. In my opinion, that raises questions
56 about the completeness of the plan. Unless our Town Planner says these items have been addressed I
57 cannot see how we can vote that they can be complete.

58
59 N. Williams: If he is referring to the memorandum from Bruce Thomas, dated May 14, 2020, those
60 items are recommendations for revised plans. A motion for completeness is stating the applicant has
61 submitting everything that we require in order to conduct a full review of the plans.

62
63 D. Boutin: I would challenge that. Based on the items listed on the memorandum, I cannot vote for
64 completeness having all of those items missing. Those items would require a significant amendment to
65 the sub-division before it can be approved. I cannot vote for completeness having all of these items
66 missing and think we should table this plan.

67
68 N. Williams: The applicant has been provided with a copy of that memorandum. It may be that they
69 have corrected those items on the plan that are being presented to you.

70
71 T. Walsh: If everything for completeness is there then we move on to the approval process, look at the
72 memorandum, and make sure those items have been addressed before approval.

73
74 D. Marshall: If this is approved it would be with the condition that the items in the memorandum
75 would have to be met and the plans would not be signed until they were addressed.

76
77 **Roll Call**

78
79 D. Boutin - No

80 M. Reed - Yes

81 T. Walsh - Yes

82 C. Stelmach - Yes

83 B. Scott - Yes

84 R. Duhaime - Yes

85 D. Marshall - Yes

86
87 **Motion carries with a vote of 6-1.**

88
89 ***D. Boutin motioned to table Springwood Homes and Development Corp., #2020-13, 96 Farmer Road,***

90 **Map 26, Lot 39-1, 2 lot subdivision.**

91

92 **Motion fails due to no second.**

93

94 Jonathan Crowdes (T. F. Bernier Surveying, Inc.): We prepared the plans. One of the lots in the recent
95 subdivision got a variance for frontage. This application is to sub-divide these two lots roughly in half.
96 They will have a common driveway and split at the top. They will have town sewer. The driveway is in
97 the same general location as proposed when it was a single lot. No waivers are required. The lots
98 meet all other zoning requirements. We saw the comments by Bruce Thomas. A lot of the notes are
99 simple revisions that we have addressed. One of the items we are working out with Bruce Thomas and
100 the sewer department.

101

102 D. Marshall: If this is approved it will be with the condition that the items in the memorandum are
103 addressed. The driveway will have to be named a private drive for 911 purposes and there has to be
104 an adequate turn around for EMS vehicles. Do we have anything in our records that the fire
105 department has approved this?

106

107 N. Williams: The fire department made the request. They are aware of the driveway. If this is
108 approved, I would recommend a condition that there would be a driveway detail provided on the
109 plan. There is some detail on the last page of the plans, but that we also have something in writing
110 from Steve Colburn indicating the turn around is appropriate for the fire apparatus.

111

112 T. Walsh: How may other people's driveways have a turn around for an EMS vehicle? They can back-
113 up. I am not going to leave that up to Steve Colburn. On the plan it looks like an adequate driveway. It
114 is easy enough to back out of the driveway.

115

116 R. Duhaime: When we approved the sub-division it was one lot and it showed the driveway. I am
117 looking at the wetlands along Farmer Road. What is the impact on those? Is that a primary wetland? I
118 have never been a believer in shared driveways. What is the quality of the wetland and why is there a
119 shared driveway?

120

121 J. Crowdes: Springwood Homes went to the Zoning Board on their own. I don't know much about
122 that. The lot can support two houses. I think he is trying to get what he could. There are no wetland
123 impacts and that is the reason for a common driveway. Two driveways would be double the impact
124 and be more impervious. It is more efficient to have a common driveway.

125

126 D. Boutin: I would suggest they are doing the shared driveway so that they do not have to cross
127 wetlands.

128

129 Open public hearing.

130

131 Jim Stencavage (10 Spruce Court): I have some concerns with the position of the driveway in the lots
132 and that the cars that will be shining their lights into the back of our house. I am hoping the Planning
133 Board and builder can provide a solution to block the lights from shining into my house when there

134 are no leaves on the trees. I am wondering if Evergreen's would block the light from the back of my
135 house.

136
137 D. Marshall: We may have 20 subdivisions in this town that have parallel streets which means there
138 are lots on both sides with each having a driveway.

139
140 Jim Stencavage: These houses are pushed way back. If they were closer to Farmer Road I would not
141 have an issue. My house is pushed way back as well due to wetlands.

142
143 T. Walsh: Is there any existing buffer on your property or is it cleared to the property line?

144
145 Jim Stencavage: When there are no leaves on the trees I can see Farmer Road.

146
147 D. Boutin: One of the issues we have is we don't know where the house will be placed on the new lot.
148 Depending on where it is placed there may be no headlights onto the abutting property. Without
149 knowing that information I would be reluctant to require the applicant to put in landscaping. We don't
150 know the degree of the problem without knowing where the buildings are located.

151
152 R. Duhaime: On page three it shows the driveway elevations and the houses.

153
154 Close to public comments.

155
156 Close public hearing.

157
158 **D. Boutin motioned to approve Springwood Homes and Development Corp., #2020-13, 96 Farmer**
159 **Road, Map 26, Lot 39-1, 2 lot subdivision with the following conditions: 1) The notes from Bruce**
160 **Thomas are addressed; 2) The additional conditions of the Fire Department are addressed including**
161 **the name of the driveway, turn around and driveway detail. Seconded by R. Duhaime.**

162
163 T. Walsh: I have no problem with labeling this as a private way, but there is no need for further
164 conversation regarding input from the fire department. That is our job.

165
166 D. Marshall: Was the Fire Department looking for more detail than what is on page 3? That shows
167 EMS detail.

168
169 C. Stelmach: The driveway is 20' wide. That is pretty wide.

170
171 D. Boutin: Will they be able to turn around?

172
173 T. Walsh: What if what the fire department is looking for is a severe hardship on the applicant?

174
175 D. Boutin: Then the applicant can come back to us.

176
177 T. Walsh: We don't require this from anyone else in town that builds a house. Why are we requiring it

178 now? The trucks have reverse. Enough is enough.

179

180 C. Stelmach: It is because of the length of the driveway?

181

182 B. Scott: I agree with Tom. This is a driveway not a road.

183

184 **Roll Call**

185

186 D. Boutin - Yes

187 M. Reed - Yes

188 T. Walsh - No

189 C. Stelmach - Yes

190 B. Scott - No

191 R. Duhaime - No

192 D. Marshall - No

193

194 **Motion fails with a vote of 4-0.**

195

196 *T. Walsh motioned to approve Springwood Homes and Development Corp., #2020-13, 96 Farmer*
197 *Road, Map 26, Lot 39-1, 2 lot subdivision with the following conditions: 1) The notes from Bruce*
198 *Thomas are addressed; 2) The driveway is named for emergency purposes. Seconded by B. Scott.*
199

200 D. Boutin: What is the point of asking the fire department for their input on these plans if we are
201 going to go against them? What if there is a blizzard? They should know the conditions they have to
202 operate under. It is a simple design of the driveway.

203

204 D. Marshall: If you look at page 3 that is all the detail they need they need to make a comment. I don't
205 see anything from the fire department that comments on this driveway.

206

207 T. Walsh: They have the details. There are built in turn arounds in the driveway. There are two
208 hammerheads.

209

210 D. Boutin: I don't think we are giving them the detail they need. That is a schematic which is different
211 than a detailed driveway. We are doing the fire department a disservice if we don't require it. To not
212 require this is not the right thing to do.

213

214 R. Duhaime: There are a lot of older homes around here that the fire department handles on a
215 regular basis. I would hope that in the future the fire department moves faster so that this is not an
216 issue.

217

218 N. Williams: The fire department reviewed the plans. We had an in house review.

219

220 D. Boutin: Nick did you ask them about their comments?

221

222 N. Williams: The turn around they are asking for is one where they connected the two ends of the
223 driveway.

224
225 T. Walsh: Can a ladder truck turn around in any of your driveways?

226
227 D. Boutin: Nick, is the information they provide the information the fire department needs?

228
229 N. Williams: I don't want to speak for them. I think the recommendation is that they review this and
230 sign off on it ultimately as a condition of approval.

231
232 T. Walsh: It sounds like a no response from them.

233
234 D. Boutin: They obviously have not had a chance to respond to this.

235
236 R. Duhaime: The elevations are on the plan.

237
238 J. Crowdes: It is relatively flat.

239
240 D. Boutin: Did you work with the fire department at all?

241
242 J. Crowdes: No. I knew the common drive would need a name. This design was to our best
243 guesstimate of how to build these houses so they would work elevationally with sewer.

244
245 D. Boutin: You have not drawn this plan in accordance with what the fire department wanted?

246
247 J. Crowdes: We don't know what they want.

248
249 T. Walsh: This is a house, not a commercial building.

250
251 D. Marshall: We already have input from the fire department. They stated what they want to see. As
252 far as I can see these plans provide what they need to see. There is not a single engineer working for
253 the fire department. The fire department comes in as advisers.

254
255 D. Boutin: They ask the fire department what they want, the fire department tells them, and they
256 design it.

257
258 D. Marshall: There are several cases where the fire department wanted sprinklers and we did not
259 require them. They come in as advisors and unless they can show a law or regulation that requires a
260 certain thing it is not required.

261
262 D. Boutin: Our concern is the safety of the public and are disregarding the safety of those
263 homeowners by allowing something to be built that won't meet the requirements of the fire
264 department.

265

266 C. Stelmach: To put this in technical prospective, I drive a commercial truck and I could get that truck
267 in this driveway and turned around with no problem.

268
269 D. Boutin: We don't know the exact dimensions of the driveway.

270
271 D. Marshall: It is on the plan.

272
273 **Roll Call**

274
275 D. Boutin - Yes

276 M. Reed - Yes

277 T. Walsh - Yes

278 C. Stelmach - Yes

279 B. Scott - Yes

280 R. Duhaime - Yes

281 D. Marshall - Yes

282
283 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

284
285 D. Marshall: Paul Scarpetti has joined the meeting and, therefore, Brett Scott will no longer be a vot-
286 ing member.

287
288 **2. SPRINGWOOD HOMES AND DEVELOPMENT CORP. #2020-14**
289 **Goffstown Road, Map 22, Lot 32**
290 **6 lot subdivision**

291
292 D. Marshall: There a two waiver requests. 1) Item 2.03 (1A)(11) - a waiver to not show site Specific
293 Soil Mapping by a licensed soil scientist, as test pits have been dug on each lot at the location of each
294 4K area. Soils information is from USDA NRCS web soil survey; 2) Item 2.03 (1C)(4) - a waiver to
295 not show a storm water drainage report with calculations, as the lots will be individually developed and
296 have minimal runoff, adequate upland and forested areas in between each developed lot. Sheet flows
297 through vegetative buffers..

298
299 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the waivers for a 6 lot subdivision for Springwood Homes and Devel-***
300 ***opment Corp., #2020-14, Goffstown Road, Map 22, Lot 32. Seconded by T. Walsh.***

301
302 **Roll Call**

303
304 D. Boutin - Yes

305 M. Reed - Yes

306 T. Walsh - Yes

307 C. Stelmach - Yes

308 P. Scarpetti - Yes

309 R. Duhaime - Yes

310 D. Marshall - Yes

311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

D. Marshall: Are the plans complete?

N. Williams: Yes.

D. Boutin motioned to find the plans complete for a 6 lot subdivision for Springwood Homes and Development Corp., #2020-14, Goffstown Road, Map 22, Lot 32. Seconded by Paul Scarpetti.

Roll Call

- D. Boutin - Yes
- M. Reed - Yes
- T. Walsh - Yes
- C. Stelmach - Yes
- B. Scott - Yes
- R. Duhaime - Yes
- D. Marshall - Yes

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

N. Williams: In Bruce Thomas’s memorandum of May 14, 2020, he addressed the proposed shared driveway easement. He mentions that the plans don’t have the detail that was provided on the Farmer Road sub-division which the fire department requested with adequate turn around. On Map 22, Lot 33-1 the protective well radius will be encroaching onto the newly created Lot 32-1. Typically that requires a waiver from the Planning Board and the waiver would have to be recorded with the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds. It is an existing condition but, I think, since now it is proposed to put a house on the lot the resident at Map 22, Lot 33-1 should be notified on that non-conformance. It appears that each lot being proposed has adequate site distance of 200’ in either direction, however, Goffstown Road in places on the right-of-way is narrow from the stone wall and foliage. The site distance needs to be looked at.

J. Crowdes: All of the lots will have their own septic and well and one common driveway that will serve Lots 32-2 and 32-1. On sheet 3 of the previous project we had all that detail because we had the sewer. We get into the same question of the fire department needing enough of a hammerhead to turn around. The previous sub-division from a year ago said they would work with the fire department. Lot 32-6 will require DES wetland permits due to two small wetland crossings. It is a minimum impact to get to the building envelope out back in an area that is not able to be developed on our lot. It precludes any development in that radius that would matter. As far as well location it is 8’ over the line. DES regulations are 10’ over the line. Lot 32-4 has a curve on the road. I analyzed the site distance going to the right going east. The terrain is not a problem but there is vegetation. I have added on the plan the vegetation will be cut back. Looking at some of the other lots some of the vegetation may have to be cut back. The lot shape of Lot 32-1 is weird. Lot 33-1 crosses what is

355 effectively part of our lot. We thought it would be good to quit claim that piece to clean it up.

356

357 R. Duhaime: It is fortunate on the previous plan that we had more detail. Looking at the elevations on
358 Lot 32-2, there needs to be a turn around in that driveway for the fire department. I would like to see
359 more detail and make sure it meets the fire department comments. This is a scenic road so you cannot
360 cut down a lot of trees. I would like more detail on that.

361

362 T. Walsh: I agree with Rob. This one needs more detail. I would support a table on this so that we can
363 see a plan with more detail.

364

365 D. Boutin: Have you gotten these driveway plans reviewed by the fire department?

366

367 J. Crowdes: If there was any discussion I was not involved in that.

368

369 D. Boutin: Will you do that between now and the next meeting?

370

371 J. Crowdes: Yes.

372

373 D. Boutin: A section of Goffstown Road has a hump in the road which means that the visibility coming
374 up the road is limited and Lot 32-3 is limited. In addition you have vegetation which, I believe, is on
375 town-owned land and they would need town approval in order to cut it down. Have you checked that
376 out? Is the driveway on Lot 32-2, the actual configuration that will serve those two lots?

377

378 J. Crowdes: There is an easement that is 25' wide. The easement goes to the property line. Going to
379 Lot 32-2 it will split somewhere off of the easement, but I don't know exactly where.

380

381 P. Scarpetti: I think it would be helpful if they could locate the well radius's for us. I thought they could
382 do a waiver up to 5'. Who would maintain the vegetation so they continue to get the 200' site
383 distance. That should not be a requirement of the town.

384

385 J. Crowdes: It is close with some of these lots. Lot 32-4 cuts through the lot itself. I would assume the
386 owner would be responsible for cutting back the vegetation. I don't know who it would be when it is
387 in the right-of-way in the road. As far as the well radius we have always gone by 10' but I think they
388 have changed it to 5'.

389

390 P. Scarpetti: I think it would be helpful to show us the driveways, even if they are proposed, and the
391 well radius's.

392

393 D. Marshall: Each one of these lots shows a well radius, DES's 4000 sq. ft. requirement, and the
394 development regulation box that is required to prove the lot has the building.

395

396 J. Crowdes: The towns 75 x 100 box shows there is adequate area to build the house.

397

398 T. Walsh: On Lot 32-6 you have the 4K area and the buildable area in the same place. How does that

399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
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

work?

D. Marshall: Let's go through the comments.

R. Duhaime: Nick, you are aware this is a scenic road so there is criteria that has to be met?

N. Williams: I am aware of the limitations on cutting trees.

R. Duhaime: There is nothing on the plan showing the 200' site distance.

N. Williams: He has shown it in writing. It says on the plan, in front of every lot, 200' site distance.

D. Marshall: Some of the driveways cannot function with the 200' site distance without the removal of brush and trees. That begs the question of a maintenance issue on the town and that has to be taken into consideration.

R. Duhaime: This could cost the town money to maintain and the homeowner and the town could end up in conflict over who is maintaining the upkeep.

T. Walsh: Would you be okay with a continuance or do you think you need more time?

J. Crowdes: A continuance is fine.

D. Marshall: The issues you are facing are: 1) the driveway design needs to be more detailed; 2) Tree and brush clearing needs to be addressed as initial and long term maintenance; 3) Our town engineer will need to verify all of the site distances; 4) The proposed driveway turning sharply into Lot 32-2 needs to be shown in detail.

T. Walsh: I would like to see the house locations and getting the buildable lot off of the septic tanks would be good information and make it easier for me to give an approval.

D. Boutin motioned to continue the public hearing for a 6 lot subdivision for Springwood Homes and Development Corp., #2020-14, Goffstown Road, Map 22, Lot 32, until July 6, 2020. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Roll Call

D. Boutin - Yes

M. Reed - Yes

T. Walsh - Yes

C. Stelmach - Yes

B. Scott - Yes

R. Duhaime - Yes

D. Marshall - Yes

443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

D. Marshall noticed the abutters that the continued public hearing for a 6 lot subdivision for Springwood Homes and Development Corp., #2020-14, Goffstown Road, Map 22, Lot 32, will be held on July 6, 2020 at 6:00 pm.

**3. NORTHSIDE ANIMAL HOSPITAL #2020-16
574 Arah Street, Map 43, Lot 31
Amended site plan**

N. Williams: There are no changes with the existing signage and landscaping. Adjustments need to be made to the building and sprinklers will need to be installed. They are removing some of the existing landscaping to comply with the fire lane ordinance.

D. Marshall: Is the plan complete?

N. Williams: Yes.

T. Walsh motioned to find the amended site plan complete for Northside Animal Hospital, #2020-16, 574 Arah Street, Map 43, Lot 31. Seconded by D. Boutin.

- D. Boutin - Yes
- M. Reed - Yes
- T. Walsh - Yes
- C. Stelmach - Yes
- P. Scarpetti - Yes
- Robert Duhaime - Yes
- D. Marshall - Yes

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

Aaron Mackey (Allen and Major Associates): Robert Clark from our office, Susan Allen from TC Architects, and Winnie Krugman, the owner and applicant, are on the line.

Aaron Mackey showed a presentation of the building, area, and lot.

A. Mackey: The applicant is proposing an 810 sq. ft. building expansion to support the current surgical operations, have a larger recovery area, x-ray room, and exam room. The applicant is also proposing to stripe the existing parking lot. We appeared before ZBA on April 14. A variance was granted to allow for the side yard set back and non-conforming building. We are proposing the addition to the rear of the building. We received five minor comments from the Town Engineer which were notes to the plans. We have addressed those. We received an approval letter from Town Engineer. The addition is to the north of the building. Fifteen parking spaces are required and we have twenty. The access to the back will remain the same.

488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531

S. Allen: The building is currently a very white on white building. The doctor wanted to upgrade the exterior materials. There will be stone around base of the building and two colors of vinyl. We will be extending some roof lines and adding some porches. The colors will be neutral grey tones. There was concern about the fire lanes. Assistant Chief Steve Colburn felt with trimming some of the vegetation on the west side and the removal of a tree in the front yard, we would be able to meet the three sided access requirements. We would take a few of the parking spaces shown on this plan, because on the north side of the building in the rear he would want a 30' fire access lane with no parking.

D. Boutin: Susan, is the existing building color going to be changing?

S. Allen: Yes. There will be two different tones of a warm gray color. It will all get new siding.

D. Boutin: You took landscaping out?

S. Allen: We have not. Assistant Chief Colburn wanted us to remove the tree. Landscaping in the front of the yard will not change.

T. Walsh: With the agreement of the tree removal you will no longer be required to sprinkler the building?

S. Allen: We were looking for clearing or sprinkling. I was told that outside fire access would eliminate the need of the sprinklers.

N. Williams: The requirement is three sided access without sprinklers or two sided with. With the removal of the tree they would meet the requirement of the three sided access.

R. Duhaime: Thank you to the applicant for the siding and landscape. I am sure the rest of the neighborhood will enjoy looking at that building. Does the applicant own the building to the west?

S. Allen: Yes.

Open Public Hearing.

Open to public comments.

No public comments.

Close to public comments.

Close Public Hearing

D. Boutin motioned to approve the amended site plan for Northside Animal Hospital, #2020-16 574 Arah Street, Map 43, Lot 31. Seconded by T. Walsh.

T. Walsh: So long as the agreement with Assistant Chief Colburn is met.

532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577

- D. Boutin - Yes
- M. Reed - Yes
- T. Walsh - Yes
- C. Stelmach - Yes
- P. Scarpetti - Yes
- Robert Duhaime - Yes
- D. Marshall - Yes

Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

**4. ROBERT HEBERT, ELAINA HEBERT, AND TAMMY NAGLE #2020-17
19 Dundee Ave, 25 Dundee Ave and 64 Merrimack Street, Map 5, Lots 35, 36 & 37
Lot line adjustment**

D. Marshall: Staff, is the plan complete?

N. Williams: The only issue is the side yard requirement of 15' cannot be met no matter how you do the lot line. Other than that the plan is complete.

T. Walsh motioned to find the plan complete for the lot line adjustment for Robert Hebert, Elaina Hebert, and Tammy Nagle, #2020-17, 19 Dundee Ave, 25 Dundee Ave and 64 Merrimack Street, Map 5, Lots 35, 36 & 37. Seconded by D. Boutin.

T. Walsh: Is this to correct a past wrong about the lot line going through the garage?

N. Williams: The lot line does currently go through an existing structure on the site. I am assuming that is the reason.

Open Public Hearing.

Open to public comments.

No public comments.

Close to public comments.

Close Public Hearing

D. Boutin motioned to approve the lot line adjustment for Robert Hebert, Elaina Hebert, and Tammy Nagle, #2020-17, 19 Dundee Ave, 25 Dundee Ave and 64 Merrimack Street, Map 5, Lots 35, 36 & 37. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.

- D. Boutin - Yes
- M. Reed - Yes
- T. Walsh - Yes
- C. Stelmach - Yes
- P. Scarpetti - Yes

578 Robert Duhaime - Yes

579 D. Marshall - Yes

580

581 **Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

582

583 **5. 124-128 MAMMOTH ROAD REALTY, LLC #2020-18**

584 **1253 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 91**

585 **2 lot subdivision**

586

587 C. Stelmach stepped down. B. Scott will be a voting member.

588

589 D. Marshall: Two waivers are being requested. 1) Waiver request from Item 22 - Plan requirement
590 checklist for sub-division. The intent of the checklist is to provide a picture to the Board of potential
591 impacts of development to abutting properties, which would be viable for a large sub-division on a
592 vacant parcel of land. This proposal is the creation of one new lot in a mainly commercially developed
593 area. Omitting the locations of buildings within 200 feet of the proposed 2 lot subdivision will provide
594 no additional benefit to the Board and would require a plan at a smaller scale, reducing the plan
595 detail. The single-family residential buildings are located on the north side of Whitehall Road and to
596 the east of the property boundary and will be buffered by the required 50-foot residential buffer and
597 the existing wetland. Aerial photos can be provided in lieu of adding the information to the plans, thus
598 carrying out the spirit and intent of the regulations; 2) Waiver request from Item 27 - Plan
599 requirement checklist for sub-division review. The intent of the checklist is to provide a picture to the
600 Board of potential traffic impacts to abutting properties. At this time there are no proposed site plans
601 associated with this sub-division. At the time that proposed site plans are submitted, it may be
602 necessary to provide additional information. Omitting the locations of driveways within 200 feet of
603 the proposed 2 lot sub-division will provide no additional benefit to the Board and would require a
604 plan at a smaller scale, reducing the plan detail. Aerial photos can be provided in lieu of adding the
605 information to the plans, thus carrying out the spirit and intent of the regulations.

606

607 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the waiver request from Item 22 - Plan requirement checklist for sub-***
608 ***division a 2 lot subdivision for 124-128 Mammoth Road Realty, LLC, #2020-18, 1253 Hooksett Road,***
609 ***Map 31, Lot 91. Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

610

611 R. Duhaime: They mentioned they would give us ariel photos. I would like to see that condition added
612 to the motion.

613

614 D. Boutin - Yes

615 M. Reed - Yes

616 T. Walsh - Yes

617 B. Scott - Yes

618 P. Scarpetti - Yes

619 Robert Duhaime - Yes

620 D. Marshall - Yes

621

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

623

624 *D. Boutin motioned to approve the waiver request from Item 27 - Plan requirement checklist for sub-*
625 *division review for a 2 lot subdivision for 124-128 Mammoth Road Realty, LLC, #2020-18, 1253*
626 *Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 91. Seconded by R. Duhaime.*

627

628 D. Boutin - Yes

629 M. Reed - Yes

630 T. Walsh - Yes

631 B. Scott - Yes

632 P. Scarpetti - Yes

633 Robert Duhaime - Yes

634 D. Marshall - Yes

635

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

637

638 D. Marshall: Does staff have any comments?

639

640 N. Williams: The property in question has substantial wetlands in the center and rear. The new
641 proposed property line is created so as not to deal with any wetland encroachments or crossings. It
642 meets all of the regulations in terms of the zoning. We have no further comments on this.

643

644 *R. Duhaime motioned to find the plans complete for a 2 lot subdivision for 124-128 Mammoth Road*
645 *Realty, LLC, #2020-18, 1253 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 91. Seconded by M. Reed.*

646

647 D. Boutin - Yes

648 M. Reed - Yes

649 T. Walsh - Yes

650 B. Scott - Yes

651 P. Scarpetti - Yes

652 Robert Duhaime - Yes

653 D. Marshall - Yes

654

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

656

657 Matt Routhier (Bedford Design Consultants): We have a commercial lot between Whitehall Road and
658 Hooksett Road. The intent is to break this into two lots. One along Whitehall Road with frontage and
659 one along Hooksett Road.

660

661 D. Marshall: This is solely for comments on the sub-division. Uses will be discussed at a later time.

662

663 M. Routhier showed the property on Google Earth.

664

665 R. Duhaime: You said you went down the middle of the property. Is the idea to have the setbacks on
666 the current or former lot? It doesn't look like it is split down the middle to me.

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
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710

M. Routhier: The Hooksett Road parcel has a little more land.

Open Public Hearing

Open to public comments.

No public comments.

Close to public comments.

Close Public Hearing

D. Boutin motioned to approve a 2 lot subdivision for 124-128 Mammoth Road Realty, LLC, #2020-18, 1253 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 91. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Roll Call

D. Boutin - Yes

M. Reed - Yes

T. Walsh - Yes

B. Scott - Yes

P. Scarpetti - Yes

R. Duhaime - Yes

D. Marshall - Yes

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

C. Stelmach returned. B. Scott is no longer a voting member.

BOARD DISCUSSION

**6. CONSERVATION COMMISSION REQUEST
Letter of Support for the Recreational Trails Program Grant**

N. Williams: They are looking for a letter for support from the Planning Board.

L. Fuller: They are applying for the RTP grant. They are trying to work on getting Phase 3 completed for this trail. We are hoping to gather letters of support.

D. Marshall: We include these trails in our Master Plan.

T. Walsh: Does anybody know, as this area expands, if it is being posted for no hunting?

L. Fuller: I believe hunting is allowed in the easements.

711 T. Walsh: In my opinion recreation lands include everyone. I can't support this if hunting will not be
712 allowed.

713
714 L. Fuller: There was a sign that stated no hunting and that was covered. Hunting is allowed.
715

716 R. Duhaime: The Town Council gave a letter of support. The voters approved another \$10,000 towards
717 conservation which will be used along with the grants to facilitate this. This is something the towns
718 people want.

719
720 T. Walsh: Will this be developed any more?

721
722 R. Duhaime: No. The town has that easement.
723

724 ***D. Boutin motioned to provide a letter of support to the Conservation Commission for the Recrea-***
725 ***tional Trails Program Grant. Seconded by C. Stelmach.***

726
727 **Roll Call**

728
729 D. Boutin - Yes

730 M. Reed - Yes

731 T. Walsh - Yes

732 C. Stelmach - Yes

733 P. Scarpetti - Yes

734 R. Duhaime - Yes

735 D. Marshall - Yes
736

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

738
739 **7. JENNIFER MCCOURT**

740 **7 Martins Ferry Road**

741 **Residential Use in Performance Zone- Older Person/Elderly Person Housing**
742

743 J. McCourt: This is next to McDonalds and would have single family homes on the other three sides.
744 Kitty corner is the Eversource office building. We met with your Town Planner and Code Enforcement
745 Officer on how to move forward. We were directed to go to the ZBA. The ZBA wanted to get input
746 from the Planning Board on how to proceed. This in the Performance Zone. It would be a 12-unit
747 multi-family dwelling and use condominium documents to make it age restrictive. The age restrictive
748 would give a tax benefit. We are trying to put in a development to make a transition. There would be
749 fencing on three sides of the property with a turn around for the fire department. Age restriction works
750 due to a pharmacy being across Rt. 3 and the McDonalds being right there. We would like your input
751 about if we can do this and what your suggestions are.

752
753 T. Walsh: Did we get a site plan proposal?

754
755 J. McCourt shared the site plan.
756

757 J. McCourt: We have the site distance. These would be two six-unit buildings on either side. They are
758 single story units and have a storm water treatment area, fencing and landscaping out front. We want to
759 make a nice transition between Rt. 3A and the single family residences along Martins Ferry Road.

760
761 T. Walsh: How many square feet are those units?

762
763 Norris Viviers (996 Mammoth Road, Manchester - owner of property): 1100 sq. ft.

764
765 T. Walsh: You want to put 12 oversized ranches on 1.3 acres? What is included for parking?

766
767 J. McCourt: Each one has a garage. Each unit has two spaces.

768
769 T. Walsh: The 1100 sq. ft. must include the garage.

770
771 N. Viviers: The 1100 sq. ft. is conditioned space.

772
773 D. Boutin: Are these for elderly?

774
775 J. McCourt: Yes. 55+.

776
777 D. Boutin: We are going to have a housing committee in the next year to work on elderly and work
778 force housing so this might be premature.

779
780 P. Scarpetti: What is the distance to the property lines?

781
782 J. McCourt: 20'.

783
784 P. Scarpetti: That seems pretty tight.

785
786 D. Marshall: This is elderly housing. It annihilates the density requirements in our regulations. You
787 would need a waiver to build this inside the Performance Zone. We don't allowing housing within the
788 Performance Zone unless it is grandfathered. Had someone come in when the house was still there and
789 wanted to put one in the same footprint that would be different. If you look at the density requirement,
790 you might be able to fit five units into this space. A waiver would still be required and you would need
791 to go back to the ZBA. My opinion is I do not see this. I am going to ask a far out question.

792
793 J. McCourt: As far as the density, if this was multi-family, in your ordinance for high density regula-
794 tion you have 12 units per acre. This with the 12 is at 9. The applicant would be willing to go down to
795 10 which would put us down to 7. If need be the applicant's next choice would be to put in more of a
796 contractors building yard with 10 percent office and the rest warehouse.

797
798 D. Marshall: That is a commercial use and permitted.

799
800 T. Walsh: I am not thrilled with zoning by variance and I don't know if I want to change the zoning by
801 waiver. The people of this town chose that area to be commercial.

802

803 C. Stelmach: As much as I like the transitional housing, it will be noisy there for the elderly. As far as
804 the driveways is there any turn lane?

805
806 J. McCourt: We meet the site distance requirements. There is a driveway to the road. The elderly hous-
807 ing would be low volume.

808
809 R. Duhaime: This is a small lot and does not lend itself to this type of development. If we were going
810 to do a mixed use it would be on a large lot. If this lot was part Performance Zone and part residential it
811 might work, but seeing as it is in commercial, I would rather not see our limited commercial land used
812 up by residential.

813
814 P. Scarpetti: I think it is a nice idea because we need more residential as well as commercial, but I
815 think they might be able to get creative and have something like mixed use.

816
817 D. Marshall: That is not up to us.

818
819 P. Scarpetti: You're right because then it goes back to spot zoning.

820
821 J. McCourt: Just to the north of this the town just rezoned to residential.

822
823 D. Marshall: We made a mistake when we did not include this one. If we did it would have been a sin-
824 gle residential lot. A duplex could have been put in.

825
826 N. Viviers: When I bought this land I had a Plan A and Plan B. My first thought was the neighbors and
827 if they would want a self-storage facility of elderly housing. The problem with mixed use is the size of
828 the site does not lend itself to anything big. I thought this would be a good transition. Plan B is the al-
829 lowed use.

830
831 D. Marshall: Thank you for coming in.

832
833 **OTHER BUSINESS**

834
835 N. Williams: A sub-committee is being formed to look at elderly and workforce housing issues. I think
836 our ordinance needs to be looked at especially due to the fact that development and affordable housing
837 is shifting.

838
839 D. Boutin: We have three members from the Economic Development Advisory Board. We need three
840 members from the Planning Board to fill out the sub-committee. Brett Scott, Chris Stelmach, and my-
841 self have expressed an interest in sitting on this sub-committee. The goals are to: 1) Identify where it
842 might be appropriate to put in apartment housing; 2) The criteria; 3) Where elderly housing might go.

843
844 T. Walsh: Who's brain child is this?

845
846 D. Boutin: I brought it up at the last meeting.

847

848 D. Marshall: The father of this sub-committee is the Economic Development Advisory Committee and
849 they have asked the Planning Board to work jointly with them to add sub-chapters and articles to the
850 zoning ordinance and eliminate some things that cannot be in conflict.

851
852 *D. Marshall motioned to appoint Brett Scott, Chris Stelmach, and David Boutin to initiate and study*
853 *housing issues within the community. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.*

854
855 M. Reed: I think Jennifer McCourt could be useful as a advisor to this sub-committee.

856
857 T. Walsh: Be wary of the workforce housing. The Fair Housing Standards Acts of 1937 cannot pre-
858 clude those from turning into Section 8 property. If you build too many and you cannot sell them they
859 are going to turn into something else.

860
861 **Roll Call**

862
863 D. Boutin - Yes

864 M. Reed - Yes

865 T. Walsh - Yes

866 C. Stelmach - Yes

867 P. Scarpetti - Yes

868 R. Duhaime - Yes

869 D. Marshall - Yes

870

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

872
873 D. Marshall: Brett Scott, Chris Stelmach, and David Boutin are the Planning Board appointees to the
874 sub-committee formed the Economic Development Advisory Committee.

875
876 **ADJOURNMENT**

877
878 *T. Walsh motioned to adjourn. Seconded by R. Duhaime.*

879

880 D. Boutin - Y

881 M. Reed - Y

882 T. Walsh - Y

883 C. Stelmach - Y

884 P. Scarpetti - Y

885 Robert Duhaime - Y

886 D. Marshall - Y

887

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

889

890 **The meeting was adjourned at 9:13 pm.**

891

892 **The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held June 15, 2020 at 6:00 pm.**

893

894 **Respectfully submitted by,**

895

896 **/s/ AnnMarie White**

897

898 **AnnMarie White**

899 **Recording Clerk**