

**Official**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**Hooksett Municipal Building**

**35 Main Street**

**Council Chambers, Room 105**

**Monday, December 7, 2020**

**6:00 PM**

**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), Chris Stelmach, Paul Scarpetti, M. Reed, and David Boutin (Town Council Representative)**

**ALTERNATES: Mike Somers and Don Winterton**

**EXCUSED:**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 16, 2020**

**November 16, 2020 Meeting – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2020 meeting. Seconded by T. Walsh. M. Somers abstained due to not being in attendance at the November 16, 2020 meeting. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**1. PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS**

- a. Performance Zone to Medium Density Residential**
  - i. Map 30, Lots 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, & 28**
- b. Remove verbiage relative to gasoline filling station locations**
- c. Add verbiage authorizing the Planning Board to review the minimum parking standards for proposed multi-family residential dwellings**

N. Williams: The proposed amendments are as follows:

Amendment No. 1

Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #1, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to remove the following lots from the Performance Zone and to subsequently re-zone said to Medium Density Residential:

- 47 Tax Map 30 Lot 14
- 48 Tax Map 30 Lot 15
- 49 Tax Map 30 Lot 16
- 50 Tax Map 30 Lot 18
- 51 Tax Map 30 Lot 21
- 52 Tax Map 30 Lot 22
- 53 Tax Map 30 Lot 23
- 54 Tax Map 30 Lot 24
- 55 Tax Map 30 Lot 27
- 56 Tax Map 30 Lot 28

57

58 The proposed re-zoning will remove the Performance Zone layer from the above mentioned lots and  
59 subsequently re-zone these lots to Medium Density Residential for the purpose of maintaining the resi-  
60 dential character of Martins Ferry Road.

61

62 Open public hearing.

63

64 Open to public comments.

65

66 Susan Martin: (28 Benton Road): My lot is involved.

67

68 N. Williams: 28 Benton Road is not part of the proposal.

69

70 Susan Martin: Lot 13 is on the email notice.

71

72 N. Williams: Lot 13 should not be listed on the agenda. It is currently zoned MDR. It is not on the  
73 public notice.

74

75 D. Marshall: That was an error.

76

77 Norris Viviers: (1361 Elm Street, Manchester): I own Map 30, Lot 24. It is the site between McDon-  
78 alds and a residential site. I was here several months ago with a proposal that was not acceptable to this  
79 Board. I bought this site because of it's performance zoning. I am here to object to the zoning on my  
80 site being changed. My site is a transitional site between commercial and residential use. West of my  
81 site many of the lots are developed as residential and east is McDonalds. If all else fails Performance  
82 Zoning will allow me to put a self-storage, some type of industrial building there, or maybe a complex  
83 for contractors. In Hooksett it makes sense for a two acre lot to be residential, but with commercial  
84 abutting it, it doesn't. I have been talking to my engineer and attorney about coming in with a lesser  
85 density proposal. The site does not lend itself to a single family, \$400,000 to \$500,000 typical Hooksett  
86 home. It lends itself to something that would be transitional which could be multi-family age-restrictive  
87 housing which would not intensely impact the town versus any other residential use. My site is not de-  
88 sirable as a single use residential site. If that site is rezoned it will cut my value in half from what I paid  
89 for it based on the zoning. We are planning to go before the ZBA with a lesser density proposal than  
90 we previously proposed.

91

92 T. Walsh: If this was MDR, based on the size of the lot, would it be limited to a single family or would  
93 there be other options as far as density?

94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139

N. Viviers: The frontage is 175' and it is a 2 acre lot which makes it a single family lot. Even a duplex would require a variance. Even with a duplex the value is not there as far as the value of the lot when I purchased it versus what it would be with the change in zoning.

Close to public comments.

Close public hearing.

***D. Boutin motioned to send Amendment 1 to the voters.***

T. Walsh: Does this need to be acted on tonight?

D. Marshall: This is a public hearing so a decision needs to be made. If you elect to not send it to the voters you have to go to another public hearing.

M. Somers: Can we amend this to leave out Lot 24?

D. Marshall: That will require another public hearing.

T. Walsh: To make a decision like this on someone else's property with no time to think about it is not fair.

D. Boutin: I am sympathetic to the property owner, but if we change the zoning to what he wants you will have storage, industrial, or a contractor yard. These are all uses not compatible to residential. I would urge the Board to vote to approve.

T. Walsh: This man purchased this in the Performance Zone. For us to change it on him is the unfairness that I see. We are the ones recommending the change when he purchased it with a specific expectation. That is my issue and I would like to take more thought and take another look at the place.

D. Boutin: We have to have another public hearing, regardless if you support my motion or not, because the posting the neighbors got is not consistent with the posting that was in the Union Leader.

Board discussion ensued on whether or not a new public hearing had to be held due to the public posting being correct, but the agenda mentioning Lot 13.

***D. Boutin motioned to drop Amendment 1. Seconded to T. Walsh.***

T. Walsh: Preserving the characteristics of our roads is of utmost importance to me. Living next to a business is not always a bad thing.

P. Scarpetti: Why don't we just hold this site out?

D. Boutin: There are two mistakes on the posting.

140 M. Somers: If we are to amend it to remove Lot 24, we would only have to have one more public hear-  
141 ing.

142  
143 D. Boutin: Lot 13 as well.

144  
145 N. Williams: Lot 13 was not on the official public notice that was in the newspaper and it is already  
146 zoned MDR.

147  
148 T. Walsh withdrew his second.

149  
150 ***D. Boutin motioned to move Amendment 1 with all ten lots as stated to a seconded public hearing.***  
151 ***Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

152  
153 Amendment No. 2

154  
155 Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #2, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to remove  
156 the following verbiage from the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance:

157  
158 Article 3: General Provisions, Section O, “In any district where gasoline filling stations are allowed, the  
159 lot on which any new gasoline filling station is to be situated shall be located at least one thousand  
160 (1,000) feet from any lot on which there is an existing station.”

161  
162 The purpose of this proposed omission is to enhance economic development opportunities for the Town  
163 by allowing the free market to dictate the placement of gasoline filling stations in zones where they are  
164 permitted by right.

165  
166 Open public hearing.

167  
168 Open to public comments.

169 No public comments.

170 Close to public comments

171  
172 Close public hearing.

173  
174 ***T. Walsh motioned to move Amendment 2 forward to the warrant. Seconded by D. Boutin. Motion***  
175 ***carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

176  
177 Amendment No. 3

178  
179 Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #3, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to add the  
180 following verbiage to Article 3, General Provisions of the Town of Hooksett Zoning Ordinance:

181  
182 “In any district which permits the development of multi-family residential dwellings as defined by the  
183 Town of Hooksett Development Regulations, or in any district which the Zoning Board of Adjustment  
184 or the Planning Board grant use entitlements to develop multi-family housing as defined by the Devel-  
185 opment Regulations, the Planning Board shall review minimum proposed parking standards to include

186 adequate parking for residents as well as an agreed-upon amount of overflow parking for all other vehi-  
187 cles. See Section 15 of Town Development Regulations.” The purpose of this addition to the Zoning  
188 Ordinance is to require adequate overflow parking in multi-family developments.

189  
190 Open public hearing.

191  
192 Open to public comments.

193  
194 A member of the public asked to elaborate on the proposed amendment.

195  
196 D. Marshall: We will be reviewing the visitor parking spaces and the need to supply them.

197  
198 Close to public comments.

199  
200 Close public hearing.

201  
202 D. Boutin: What is the language agreed upon for the parking requirement for people visiting an apart-  
203 ment complex?

204  
205 N. Williams: It would be a condition of the approval of the site plan. If someone comes in and they are  
206 looking to meet the minimum parking standards as they are written within the zoning ordinance now,  
207 this provision Article 3, which is the general provision, would give the Board the flexibility to review  
208 and proposed visitor parking they do or do not have and a condition would be placed upon the plan ap-  
209 proval.

210  
211 D. Boutin: That strikes me as arbitrary. Most zoning ordinances have a specific number. We should  
212 have a specific number which is what most zoning ordinances have across the state.

213  
214 P. Scarpetti: We had it specific at one time.

215  
216 N. Williams: I proposed the Board determine a threshold in which the Board would begin requiring  
217 two and a half for multi-family because we were running in issues with applicants not providing any  
218 overflow parking.

219  
220 *D. Boutin motioned that Amendment 3 is tabled until the Town Planner can come back to us with a*  
221 *specific number of spaces per unit that will be required which is fair to the applicants instead of hav-*  
222 *ing the Planning Board make that decision.*

223  
224 N. Williams: The two and a half is standard but it is not clear the number of units within a single de-  
225 velopment that this would kick in.

226  
227 ***Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

228  
229 **PROJECT NOTIFICATION**

230  
231 **2. MANCHESTER WATER WORKS #2020-33**  
232 **Kimball Drive, Map 37, Lot 11**

**Merrimack River Water Treatment Plan and Raw Water Pumping Station**

233 Dave Miller (Deputy Director of Manchester Water Works): I am here to give you a history of how we  
234 came to develop the Merrimack River Water Treatment Plan and Raw Water Pumping Station. Man-  
235 chester Water Works was established in 1871. We have been pumping water out of Lake Massabesic,  
236 our sole water supply, since 1874. About 100 years later we built a filtration plant on Lake Shore Road.  
237 In 1985 there was a study on how much water can be taken from Lake Massabesic safely especially in  
238 times of drought. That was a little over 20 million gallons per day. Currently our average use is 18 mil-  
239 lion gallons per day which is about 90 percent of the safe yield. We have know for a long time that we  
240 need an additional supply. That supply was also determined through studies that it would come from  
241 the Merrimack River. Manchester Water Works purchased property on the river bank. The original plan  
242 was to transfer water from the Merrimack River up to Dubes Pond and have it trickle down the water  
243 shed. In 2000 - 2001 the plant was getting old and needed some substantial upgrades. We also looked at  
244 the new source issue. We came up with three alternatives: 1) To transfer the water directly from the  
245 Merrimack River to the water shed and have it trickle down; 2) Pipe it from the river into the treatment  
246 plant; 3) Build a new treatment facility and treat the water from the river instead of trying to get it to  
247 the existing treatment plant. The third was the alternative that was chosen. The next challenge was how  
248 to get the water out of the river and into this new treatment facility. We looked at a traditional pipe in  
249 the river like we currently have in the lake. We pump the water in and it goes through the treatment  
250 process. There is another idea that is dependent on the hydrogeology of the soil around the river. If  
251 there is good sand and gravel river bank filtration can be done. The sand and gravel acts as pre-filtra-  
252 tion and pre-treatment. We have that kind of geology here in Hooksett at the site that we purchased just  
253 down stream from the I-93 interchange on Kimball Drive. We did a test well there and found that, due  
254 to chemicals in the area, we were going to abandon that area and look upstream. We found another lo-  
255 cation at 700 Quality Drive where the groundwater and runoff quality was more favorable. We did test-  
256 ing there, constructed a radio collector well, which is a concrete pipe that is 16' in diameter standing on  
257 end and sunk down to the bedrock about 70' below the surface. Out from that there are horizontal lat-  
258 erals that protrude out underneath the river into that sand and gravel area. There are pumps inside that  
259 cason and the water is pulled through the laterals which is pulling about 25 or 30 percent groundwater.  
260 The rest is induced flow from the river through the soil into the well getting all of that pre-treatment.  
261 That radio collector well is what we have constructed to date. This will provide about 7.2 million gal-  
262 lons per day over and above what we produce from the lake. We will be down to about 12 or 13 million  
263 gallons per day from the lake and would get the rest from the river. That would preserve the integrity of  
264 the lake for decades to come.

267  
268 D. Boutin: Why is it called raw?

269  
270 D. Miller: Water before it goes through a man-made treatment process. Lake Massabesic is an example  
271 of a raw water source.

272  
273 D. Boutin: Will you be paying taxes to Hooksett?

274  
275 D. Miller: That is a good question. We provide water to 165,000 people in Manchester and six sur-  
276 rounding communities including portions of Hooksett. I honestly do not know what the tax situation is.  
277 We pay taxes on the two parcels of property that we own in Hooksett.

278  
279 D. Boutin: Will Hooksett benefit from this water system?

280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326

D. Miller: Yes. I am on the treatment end, not the distribution end, so I am not an expert on where the water flows.

D. Boutin: We just did something by Exit 11 which is bringing more water down Rt. 3A. It would make sense if those two dots were connected so that there is water both north and south along Rt. 3A from the Manchester line to up Exit 11. Have you explored that?

D. Miller: To my knowledge we have not but we would be happy to meet with any planners to talk about it.

D. Boutin: I think you should speak with the Town Administrator.

D. Winterton: I have seen the well. It is my understanding that all of this water is going south to the Manchester system, under the river, and to the area of the Amoskeag Bridge. None of that water from that well is going straight to be distributed. It is going back into the system.

D. Miller: It is going into our high pressure system.

D. Winterton: Any thoughts of grabbing some of that and heading it north does not fit into the plan. I have see the well and tasted the water and it is spectacular. It is important that this Board know that Manchester Water Works services a number of other communities and there are huge projects bringing Manchester Water Works to Plastow and Salem. That is where a lot of this water is going to go.

D. Miller: That is not correct. The water that goes to the southeast gets fed from our low service system which is a totally separate system. The systems do not mix except under extreme emergency conditions which are extremely rare. The water that we are producing at this plant will go into our high service system which, I believe, Hooksett is part of.

D. Winterton: Are you asking for permission to build the pump station?

D. Miller: We are here tonight to provide information to the Board and bring you up to date. We will be ready to put this project out to bid in about a week.

D. Winterton: I think this is a fantastic way to get water to the citizens of New Hampshire. It is clean, high technology, and I wish you good luck with your project.

D. Miller: If there are specific questions about distribution and where we can bring water those questions should be directed to our distribution engineer or our director. If it is a feasible project we would be happy to have a discussion about how we can make it work.

D. Winterton: Phil has been in on-going discussion with Hooksett Sewer because part of that land hits together.

T. Walsh: You mentioned the soils and silt were the filter. Is there a duration for that. Does the soil and silt get contaminated over time or is there enough replenishment naturally from the currents to replace the filtering. Is there is useful life?

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  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373

D. Miller: It does have useful life. Over time the well will become less productive but there are methods to redevelop it where you can purge the immediate soil around the well in a certain way to restore it. You will never get the original production out of it. If a well gets clogged it reaches out further and further until it can't reach anymore. This soil is hydraulically transmissible. We don't expect to have any problems for decades. It will probably require some redevelopment every 15 to 20 years.

D. Boutin: Why would this not go through site plan review?

D. Marshall: Staff, what is our role as a Planning Board with this issue.

N. Williams: They fall under the RSA for Governmental Use of Land and Public Utility Provider. If the Board decides that they would like to have a notice for a public hearing on this we can do so and they would be required to come back with a site plan. As a public utility provider they are exempt from the site plan processes and land use entitlement.

D. Boutin: I accept that explanation, but for future development in that area I think we should have a site plan on file. It is possible that they don't have to do as extensive of a plan as it normally required but at least we will have something on file for future reference.

N. Williams: We are putting the plans through an internal review process with the Town Engineer as well as a life safety review with fire personnel and code enforcement once one is hired. We will have the as-builts on file with the town as well as any copies of permits that are required.

D. Boutin: That is not the same as having it come before the Planning Board.

D. Miller: We had a public hearing on the pumping station a few years back. We have not had one on the treatment plant.

***D. Boutin motioned to have a public hearing on the site plan for Manchester Water Works, #2020-33, Kimball Drive, Map 37, Lot 11, Merrimack River Water Treatment Plan and Raw Water Pumping Station December 21, 2020. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.***

P. Scarpetti: Am I correct that you will not be able to supply water to the people on Kimball Drive?

D. Miller: There is a finished water main that goes down Quality Drive. When we did our pumping test we impacted one of the shallow dug wells near the site. That person is now on our water. They are paying the water bill but we hooked them up and took care of the charges to extend the pipe and add service to their house. Anyone in proximity to that pipe line would be able to apply to be connected to our system. There are costs to that but as long as that water is available some of those residents could benefit.

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

### **CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION**

#### **3. TONY FRANCIOSA**



**5 Whitehall Road**  
**Proposed Residential Use in the Performance Zone**

374  
375  
376  
377 C. Stelmach stepped down  
378

379 T. Franciosa: I am looking to have two duplex units on this property for a total of four three bedroom  
380 units. I would like them to have curb appeal and character. The property in that area is bordered by res-  
381 idential use to the easterly side. There is already a two family on the westerly side as well as residential  
382 across the street. The property has 460' of frontage and two acres and is a better use as residential.  
383 There are some wetlands on the larger piece of the property. The wetland runs across heading in a  
384 southerly direction which would allow us to leave a nice green buffer.  
385

386 D. Marshall: This was the lot that was broken off from the stone house correct?  
387

388 T. Franciosa: Yes.  
389

390 P. Scarpetti: This is not a use that is allowed so we have flexibility. I like the rendering you provided.  
391 If you change any of the elevation on the outside you have to come back before us. This should be an  
392 asset to the community not a liability where you end up with a box. I was going to suggest to make  
393 these two bedroom units. I like the shared driveway and the landscape in between the buildings as well  
394 as in the front.  
395

396 T. Franciosa: I have no problem picking one of the designs. I like the blue gray look. I like that the  
397 driveway is extended which allows for additional parking. With the garages, driveway and additional  
398 area there could be three parking spots per unit. With the buffer zones abutting the MDR I would like  
399 to provide some street plantings. It will provide a buffer from people exiting the CVS. The number of  
400 bedrooms is up for discussion. Three bedrooms would give me better rental or sale value. My short  
401 term plan is to hold onto the units and then possibly condoize and sell them.  
402

403 T. Walsh: I think conceptually what you have is fine except for where it is. This has not been on the  
404 market commercially for that long. With the CVS you will need quite a bit of vegetation on the front of  
405 this, at least half way. My biggest problem is that I am not in favor of zoning by variance and for that  
406 main reason I am not going to be able to approve this. If you get it changed in zoning I will approve it.  
407

408 M. Reed: Nick, didn't you said that with 2 acres in MDR only one duplex would be allowed?  
409

410 N. Williams: Yes. This would be if the waiver were granted to allow the residential use within the Per-  
411 formance Zone. It would be a negation with the Board on the density requirement. In other sections of  
412 the zoning ordinance, such as the elderly housing, we allow up to six.  
413

414 D. Winterton: Could we put it on the warrant to make it MDR? I agree that zoning by variance does  
415 not work. The two-decker victorian house that is already there is in the Performance Zone and defines  
416 where the Performance Zone begins and ends. It would seem that anything to the east is MDR and any-  
417 thing south is acting like it is MDR.  
418

419 T. Franciosa: If it were to go to MDR, with what the asking price on the property is, I could not make  
420 it worthwhile with just one duplex and would eliminate me from the scenario.

421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467

M. Reed: I would not support this with two duplexes.

T. Walsh: I would be a no vote for a waiver.

M. Reed: I would only approve one waiver.

P. Scarpetti: I think this would fit with the frontage.

T. Walsh: The ZBA does what they do based on hardships and other criteria. I have not seen a hardship. This was recently created as a smaller commercial lot which is more affordable.

D. Boutin: Is this Board authorized to issue a waiver in the Performance Zone?

D. Marshall: Yes.

D. Boutin: A waiver to allow the construction of four duplex units would be okay?

D. Marshall: That is a matter of opinion. You can grant a waiver for almost anything.

N. Williams: There are no density requirements for residential within the Performance Zone so it would be a waiver request to allow for the residential use and the density he is asking for would be part of the approval.

D. Boutin: This is not about granting a variance. This is a waiver which is something we are allowed to do. Otherwise only the ZBA can grant a variance, not the Planning Board. This is not that busy of an area. This site is never going to get development commercially. I think it is a reasonable use of the property. We need this kind of housing in Hooksett. I think it is a reasonable use and otherwise may end up sitting there forever.

C. Stelmach returned.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **4. ALDEN BEAUCHEMIN Proposed Zoning Amendment Article 14-Mixed Use District 3**

A. Beauchemin (Keyland Enterprises): We are here to discuss property at Exit 10 and the parking issue. There is a problem and also a possible solution. As a business owner anything we do to help existing businesses survive is a good thing. There is some overflow parking that is being generated by the Amazon business. They are parking some cars on Technology Drive. Some people were concerned about Amazon. Personally I have not seen any problems. There are a few vans but it is barely noticeable. and the business they bring to Hooksett is huge. If we want to keep businesses in town, especially Amazon, we need to look at ways to help them be successful. There is a development group in town that is trying to address the parking issue on Technology Drive but there is a problem with the zoning the way it currently reads which is mixed use district 3. To do parking they would be required to get a

468 variance to have an allowed use. If they were in a commercial zone, like Exit 11, parking is an allowed  
469 use. I thought Exit 10 was commercial. Mixed use 3 and commercial is almost identical except it does  
470 not allow parking. I heard that the Planning Board was working on some potential zoning changes. I  
471 would like to request the Planning Board look at a simple zoning change to allow parking lots as a prin-  
472 cipal use in the mixed use 3 district. I am looking for guidance and support. This is something that does  
473 not just benefit Amazon but the community and other businesses in the area. It is my understanding  
474 there is a significant amount of parking already happening in that neighborhood. As far as economic  
475 development, I hope that we think Amazon is a good thing and we want to keep them in town. I have  
476 not seen the parking issue but I have heard it is 300 plus vehicles.  
477

478 D. Marshall: You are asking for another 500?  
479

480 A. Beauchemin: I am not sure. If the zoning gets changed, it requires a site plan so either way they  
481 would have to come before the Planning Board.  
482

483 D. Boutin: We do not have an amendment we can look at?  
484

485 N. Williams: The written verbiage is not as important as the use. It is important to understand the dif-  
486 ference of principal use as parking vs. accessory use as parking. There are only two commercial zones  
487 in Hooksett that permit parking as a principal use. One is the commercial zone such as Exit 11 and the  
488 other is the Performance Zone. This permits parking as an accessory use to the principal on the same  
489 lot. They would be looking to amend the permitted uses under Article 14 mixed use district 3, the per-  
490 mitted uses to allow for parking as a principal use.  
491

492 D. Boutin: How many other mixed use districts do we have in Hooksett?  
493

494 N. Williams: Five total.  
495

496 T. Walsh: Who needs these parking spots? Is it the people who drive the vans who need to park their  
497 cars?  
498

499 A. Beauchemin: I believe some of the employees come and park their cars to pick up their van. I be-  
500 lieve that there are cars being parked at Poultry Products. We are trying to make this legal.  
501

502 C. Stelmach: Amazon has every right to be here, but how many delivery vehicles do you need for that  
503 size facility. There are three lots on Technology Drive that are full of vans. They create a mess every-  
504 day. You can't even get gas at Irving because there are 20 vans filling it up every day. I came out of  
505 Home Depot the other day and I could not even get out due to all of the Amazon tractor trailers and  
506 vans. Everyday it is vans in little herds getting on and off the highway. They create traffic problems in  
507 that section of Hooksett. Then you want to add other vehicles to that in addition to what is being pro-  
508 posed off of Exit 11.  
509

510 D. Boutin: I would not encourage the Board to support a zoning amendment like this at this time with-  
511 out having the opportunity to consider the ramifications and how we might want to adjust it for the  
512 needs of Hooksett and not just one company.  
513

514 P. Scarpetti: I am sure Irving is very happy that Amazon is here. That is what we wanted. You have a  
515 lot of people in that area starving. The parking is not a perfect use. I think we could do this intelligently  
516 and there should be a sunset clause if something like this is done.

517  
518 T. Walsh: There is a difference between the list mile facility and a distribution facility. A distribution  
519 facility is not a last miles facility and just utilizes tractor trailers. Currently the BJ's facility is a last  
520 mile facility and that is what makes the difference. It is awful getting in an out of that shopping facility  
521 and it used to be a nice place to go shopping.

522  
523 M. Reed: So how do we address this going forward? How do we work together to come to a solution?  
524

525 D. Winterton: If we went with the proposal it will still have to go to the voters. Correct?  
526

527 N. Williams: If it is a zoning amendment it would go to the warrant. A public hearing would have to  
528 be held.

529  
530 P. Scarpetti: If you do that you have no rules to go by.

531  
532 N. Williams: None other than the rules that are in the zoning ordinance which govern the allowable  
533 impervious surface.

534  
535 T. Walsh: I agree with Dave. This is being done at the eleventh hour and could have serious conse-  
536 quences.

537  
538 P. Scarpetti: Would the parking be introduced specifically before it is put before the town?  
539

540 D. Marshall: This article could go in by petition, which means the petitioner has to write the wording  
541 for that article. That is dangerous. The other option is that the Board could instruct staff to present  
542 wording relative to Article 14, mixed use district 3. If Regal has closed all of their theaters we have an-  
543 other area for parking. We already have Polaris and they are not doing much so they are letting Ama-  
544 zon park on their lot. Then there is this one on the hill which is 500 more parking spaces. Mixed use  
545 district 3 could become a rather large parking lot.

546  
547 A. Beauchemin: This would make the site shovel ready. We have a site right now at the end of Tech-  
548 nology Drive that is unbuildable. We have a group of developers that are serious about leveling the site  
549 and getting it shovel ready. It may initially be a parking lot. At least it would open up the site and make  
550 it more shovel ready. That site is currently one big piece of ledge. It would be a massive expense to  
551 take that ledge out at this point and very few projects could justify that. This parking lot project is a  
552 possibility and the developers are serious about having it move forward, but they are getting held up  
553 with the formalities as far as the regulations. As a business owner I like to see businesses and traffic  
554 because that is good for the town.

555  
556 **OTHER BUSINESS**

557  
558 **5. 2021 MEETING SCHEDULE**

559  
560 Nick Williams presented the 2021 meeting schedule to the Board.

561

562 **ADJOURNMENT**

563

564 ***D. Boutin motioned to adjourn at 7:51 pm. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously***  
565 **with a vote of 6-0.**

566

567 **The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held December 21, 2020 at 6:00 pm.**

568

569 **Respectfully submitted by,**

570

571 **/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

572

573 **AnnMarie Scott**

574 **Recording Clerk**