

**Official**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**Hooksett Municipal Building  
35 Main Street  
Council Chambers, Room 105  
Monday, December 21, 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) (via Zoom), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman),  
Chris Stelmach, Paul Scarpetti (via Zoom), and David Boutin (Town Council Representative)**

**ALTERNATES: Don Winterton and Denise Prichette (via Zoom).**

**EXCUSED: Mike Somers, Matt Reed, and Robert Duhaime (Alternate).**

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

**D. Winterton will be a voting member for this meeting.**

**D. Marshall introduced Denise Prichette as a new alternate member of the Planning Board.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 7, 2020**

**December 7, 2020 Meeting – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the December 7, 2020  
meeting. Seconded by D. Winterton.**

T. Walsh: Line 518 should read “last” mile facility.

**Roll Call**

**T. Walsh - Yes**

**C. Stelmach - Yes**

**P. Scarpetti - Yes**

**D. Winterton - Yes**

**D. Boutin - Yes**

**D. Marshall - Yes**

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

**PUBLIC HEARING**

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86

**1. PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS**

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:

- Tax Map 30 Lot 14
- Tax Map 30 Lot 15
- Tax Map 30 Lot 16
- Tax Map 30 Lot 18
- Tax Map 30 Lot 21
- Tax Map 30 Lot 22
- Tax Map 30 Lot 23
- Tax Map 30 Lot 24
- Tax Map 30 Lot 27
- Tax Map 30 Lot 28

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

- Open public hearing.
- No public comments.
- Close public hearing.

- D. Boutin: I believe that the owner of Map 30 Lot 24 did not want his zoning changed.
  
- T. Walsh: There were questions about that lot. The owner testified and we put it off to a continued public hearing so that we did not act on it immediately and had a couple of weeks to revisit it. I have done that and am fine with the amendment the way it is.
  
- D. Boutin: I think the owner of the property left the meeting thinking his issue was going to be addressed. I am proposing that we amend this article by taking Map 30 Lot 24 off of the list.
  
- D. Marshall: An action has not been taken on that and it is still on the list. The Board needs to decide what it is going to do.
  
- T. Walsh: I had my reservations after the property owner’s testimony. I have since revisited the property and looked at where the driveway location is. It would be a terrible location for a busy driveway at the crest of that hill. I think it needs to residential, probably always should have been residential, and do not know how it became commercial in the first place. I will supporting the amendment the way it is. I think we are righting a past wrong. I am glad we had the couple of extra weeks to revisit it.

87 D. Boutin: I visited the site as well and respectfully disagree. If we zone this residential it will be worth half of  
88 what the property owner paid for it. I will continue to support taking this off of this list.

89 ***D. Boutin motioned to remove Map 30 Lot 24 from the list.***

90 ***T. Walsh motioned to submit Amendment 1 to the warrant. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.***

91 D. Winterton: My suggestion is to push this off for a year due to there not being any urgency. I don't think  
92 changing the zoning affects any of the other lots.

93 N. Williams: There are two lots that are vacant.

94 D. Marshall: We are going to be walking a slippery slope if the Planning Board starts taking into consideration  
95 what people pay for their land.

96 D. Boutin: My intent was only to highlight that point. It is the responsibility of the Planning Board to be fair to  
97 the property owner.

98 D. Winterton: I don't care what the property owner paid for the property, but he did have intentions of using the  
99 property in a different manner.

100 **T. Walsh - Yes**

101 **C. Stelmach - Yes**

102 **P. Scarpetti - Yes**

103 **D. Winterton - No**

104 **D. Boutin - No**

105 **D. Marshall - Yes**

106

107 **Motion carried with a vote of 4-2.**

108 **Amendment No. 2:** Moved to warrant by Hooksett Planning Board. See minutes of 12/07/2020.

109 **Amendment No. 3**

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

112

113 *“In any district which permits the development of multi-family residential dwellings as defined by the*  
114 *Town of Hooksett Development Regulations, or in any district which the Zoning Board of Adjustment or*  
115 *the Planning Board grant use entitlements to develop multi-family housing as defined by the Develop-*  
116 *ment Regulations, the Planning Board shall require a minimum of two and one-half (2.5) parking spaces*  
117 *for each dwelling unit. See Section 15 of Town Development Regulations.”*

118

119 ***The purpose of this addition to the Zoning Ordinance is to require adequate overflow parking in multi-***  
120 ***family developments.***

121

122 Open public hearing.

123 No public comments.

124 Close public hearing.

125

126 *D. Bouton motioned to submit Amendment 3 to the warrant. Seconded by D. Winterton.*

127

128 **T. Walsh - Yes**

129 **C. Stelmach - Yes**

130 **P. Scarpetti - Yes**

131 **D. Winterton - Yes**

132 **D. Boutin - Yes**

133 **D. Marshall - Yes**

134

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

136

137 **Amendment No. 4**

138 Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #4, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the  
139 following verbiage in Article 5, Section 8(c) - Medium Density Residential District, of the Hooksett  
140 Zoning Ordinance:

141

142 **Existing:**

143

144 A minimum of two (2) parking spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit. No parking shall be  
145 allowed in the required front yard. All parking shall be shown on a site plan approved by the Planning  
146 Board.

147

148 **Proposed Amendment:**

149

150 *A minimum of two (2) parking spaces shall be provided for each single family dwelling unit, and a min-  
151 imum of two and one-half (2.5) parking spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit within multi-  
152 family developments. No parking shall be allowed in the required front yard. All parking shall be  
153 shown on a site plan approved by the Planning Board.*

154

155 *The purpose of the proposed amendment is to require adequate overflow parking for multi-family  
156 residential developments.*

157 Open public hearing.

158

159 No public comments.

160

161 Close public hearing.

162

163 *D. Boutin motioned to send Amendment 4 to the warrant. Seconded by C. Stelmach.*

164

165 **T. Walsh - Yes**

166 **C. Stelmach - Yes**

167 **P. Scarpetti - Yes**

168 **D. Winterton - Yes**

169 **D. Boutin - Yes**

170 **D. Marshall - Yes**

171

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

173

174 **Amendment No. 5**

175 Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #5, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the  
176 following verbiage in Article 6, Section 5(c) - High Density Residential District, of the Hooksett Zoning  
177 Ordinance:

178

179 **Existing:**

180

181 A minimum of two (2) parking spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit. No parking shall be  
182 allowed in the required front yard. All parking shall be shown on a site plan approved by the Planning  
183 Board.

184

185 **Proposed Amendment:**

186

187 *A minimum of two (2) parking spaces shall be provided for each single family dwelling unit, and a min-  
188 imum of two and one-half (2.5) parking spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit within multi-  
189 family developments. No parking shall be allowed in the required front yard. All parking shall be  
190 shown on a site plan approved by the Planning Board.*

191

192 *The purpose of the proposed amendment is to require adequate overflow parking for multi-family  
193 residential developments.*

194 Open public hearing.

195 No public comments.

196 Close public hearing.

197

198 *D. Boutin motioned to send Amendment 5 to the warrant. Seconded by D. Winterton.*

199

200 **T. Walsh - Yes**

201 **C. Stelmach - Yes**

202 **P. Scarpetti - Yes**

203 **D. Winterton - Yes**

204 **D. Boutin - Yes**

205 **D. Marshall - Yes**

206

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

208

209 **2. MANCHESTER WATER WORKS #2020-33**

210 **18 Kimball Drive and 700 Quality Drive, Map 37, Lot 11, Map 29, Lot 64-2**

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

212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258

Jeremy Belanger (TF Moran): We notified abutters of the project and are here to give a more in depth review of the project.

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

C. Stelmach: Residents on Kimball Drive can be supplied by this if they want to be?

D. Miller: There is an 8" main on Quality Drive. I am not sure how many of the residents can be served and there would be a cost associated with it.

D. Boutin: Would you, at your expense, provide the water main in the road and then have the residents pay to connect.

D. Miller: The radial collector well is about 3/4 of a mile/ 3,400' down Kimball Road from where the treatment plant site is going to be. We are going to run a 20' well water main from the radial collector

259 well to the treatment plant. You can't tap off of that because it will be untreated water. When we put in  
260 the radial collector well one of the neighboring homes on Kimball Drive had concerns about their well  
261 being impacted. We ran an 8" water line from Quality Drive and through the woods to service that one  
262 home and paid for that. There is currently an 8" line in Kimball Drive about 100' from our well site,  
263 going south, with a hydrant. Any home would have to apply for service and pay for any extension. For  
264 example, if you live five homes up they could pay for the extension of that 8" line to their home. We  
265 would assess all of the properties in between and they could recoup some of their money if any of the  
266 homes along the way wanted to get service from that water main.

267  
268 D. Boutin: Are those other homes required to tap in?

269  
270 D. Miller: No.

271  
272 D. Boutin: Could you explain the purpose and how it functions.

273  
274 Phil Croasdale (Director of Manchester Water Works): Inside of the building are pressure filters. They  
275 are going to be removing some trace contaminants and metals. When the filters are backwashed the  
276 backwashed water, which will contain a very minute amount of particles, will go into one of those la-  
277 goons. Those particles will settle and the clarified water in the lagoon will drain directly back into the  
278 river. The lagoons are to detain a large quantity of water after a backwash so that it can be lowered  
279 slowly until the next backwash.

280  
281 D. Boutin: Do you come in to clean it out the particles?

282  
283 D. Miller: Yes.

284  
285 D. Boutin: How often?

286  
287 D. Miller: I am not sure. With the water coming from the river, there is going to be a very minute  
288 quantity. I would not be surprised if we are cleaning them ever third or fifth year.

289  
290 D. Winterton: Is this a two year building project?

291  
292 D. Miller: We are anticipating finishing the summer of 2023.

293  
294 D. Winterton: Are there state or federal funds.

295  
296 D. Miller: We are bonding a large percent of it. Through charges over the years we have collected an  
297 amount that is in an account that is another portion of that funding.

298  
299 P. Croasdale: We have been building an account since 1987 that was approved by the PUC. A devel-  
300 opment charge has been collected from new customers that take water from Manchester Water Works.  
301 There is a net of \$17 million in that account and have additional funding of \$18 million. We believe  
302 we have an adequate level of funding from two funding sources.

303  
304 D. Winterton: It is a wonderful project and I think you for bringing clean water to NH.

305

306 P. Croasdale: We have has some discussions with Hooksett Village about potentially taking water  
307 down Rt. 3A in the future. We will be selling water to the southern part of New Hampshire but we will  
308 have a lot more water than to just supply that. This additional water source will be able to carry us an-  
309 other 40 or 50 years. It allows us 7 million gallons of additional water.

310  
311 T. Walsh: I was on the Board when we approved the pumping station and you were helpful at doing a  
312 buffer between one of the neighbors. Why was the building not designed like the one on Island Pond  
313 Road?

314  
315 P. Croasdale: We wanted to keep the cost down. It is situated in an area where there is going to be little  
316 traffic.

317  
318 J. Belanger: We can run through the site components if you would like.

319  
320 T. Walsh: I think the landscaping is a little sparse. I got an answer that they will be working with the  
321 abutters and I am okay with that. Any screening you can do in a case like this I would appreciate it.

322  
323 P. Croasdale: We are going to work with the town and the abutters on the road.

324  
325 N. Williams read a memorandum from the Hooksett Town Engineer that is dated September 21, 2020  
326 into the record.

327  
328 P. Croasdale: We do not object to any of the requirements the Town Engineer has made.

329  
330 *D. Boutin motioned to have Manchester Water Works add a note to the site plan regarding the com-*  
331 *ments by the Town Engineer regarding the trench and the paving of the street. Seconded by D. Win-*  
332 *terton.*

333  
334 **Roll Call**

335  
336 **T. Walsh - Yes**

337 **C. Stelmach - Yes**

338 **P. Scarpetti - Yes**

339 **D. Winterton - Yes**

340 **D. Boutin - Yes**

341 **D. Marshall - Yes**

342  
343 **Motion carried with a vote of 6-0.**

344  
345 Open public hearing.

346 No public comments.

347 Close public hearing.

348  
349 **DISCUSSION**

350  
351 **3. TONY FRANCIOSA**

352 **5 Whitehall Road**  
353 **Proposed rezoning**

354  
355 Removed from the agenda.  
356  
357  
358

359 **CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION**

360  
361 **4. KIM NEVILLE**  
362 **45 Mount St. Mary's Way, Map 14, Lot 1-4**  
363 **Change of Use/Amended Site plan**  
364 **Proposed conversion to 12 Residential Units**  
365

366 K. Neville: This property is in density D which requires 18 units per acre and the property is on two  
367 acres. We do not have access from Hooksett Road so we have to come up from the library. This would  
368 be much less traffic than the current child care.  
369

370 N. Williams: As a straight out proposal you are talking about taking an 11,000 sq. ft. building which  
371 makes each unit less than 1,000 sq. ft. each. This is part of a University Heights master plan and the re-  
372 striction on the number of housing units overall for the master plan has already been exceeded. To add  
373 12 more units would require some variances, entitlements, and other things. It is removing a commer-  
374 cial enterprise in an area that never came through with the number of commercial establishments. It is a  
375 discussion we can have but it would require some tricky maneuvering to have it happen.  
376

377 D. Boutin: Are 12 units going to be in that building?  
378

379 K. Neville: It was one building with two additions. Each building has separate entrances and plumb-  
380 ing. There is parking down below and behind the victorian. The architect thought that 12 units would  
381 fit. We are not married to 12 units. We would like to have two units a bit bigger. There are lot of 800  
382 sq. ft. units and smaller than that in Hooksett. The sewer and water is already hooked up. We are in a  
383 mixed use district. To give an idea of the size of the building, we are licensed for 158 children so it is a  
384 large building.  
385

386 D. Boutin: Have you discussed this proposal with the Fire Department and know if you meet their re-  
387 quirements.  
388

389 K. Neville: I don't think it would be a problem since it is currently a licensed child care.  
390

391 D. Boutin: Nick, did the Fire Department have any comments on this?  
392

393 N. Williams: This is conceptual. The building is sprinklered. I am just looking at what entitlements she  
394 would need to move forward with this?  
395

396 D. Winterton: Does this have more than one floor?  
397

398 K. Neville described the layout of the facility.

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  
443  
444  
445

D. Winterton: Each of these 12 units would have their own separate entrance?

K. Neville: Yes.

P. Scarpetti: As far as an egress you need two means for each apartment. That would include a hallway. What brought this about? How is the day care doing before and after the pandemic?

K. Neville: We have stayed open but are looking for another option. It is hard to find good help. The child care was there before the master plan. We didn't own it at that time. I feel like, as business owner, we should have the opportunity to make a change. If we go under we have nothing. A lot of people are working from home now. There are not a lot of people calling to enroll their children. We pay a lot of money in taxes. We have run the business for 20 years. I don't feel like we should be punished because the master plan did not take off like it was supposed to.

D. Marshall: There is no punishment. You would have a lot of work especially with design work and what you would need for entitlements.

K. Neville: What do you mean by entitlements?

D. Marshall: Variances, changes to the master plan would have to be lined up, the Board would probably stick tight to the master plan and if this is even allowed.

D. Boutin: You said this project would need a variance.

N. Williams: The maximum number of residential units in the ordinance is 425 units and the allowable number is 400.

D. Marshall: She needs to come before the Board with a clear plan.

N. Williams: If you were going to move forward with the proposal the first step would be to go before the Zoning Board. A lot of this will depend on the 65 pending for CO. That does not mean that all CO's will be issued. With the 65 outstanding we are still under the 400 that are on the ground in the zone.

C. Stelmach: Will you be the renter of these and not sell them as condo units?

K. Neville: That is conceptual for us as well. We looked at it as an opportunity for income as we get older.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Discussion ensued about self-storage facilities.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*T. Walsh motioned to adjourn at 7:20 pm. Seconded by D. Boutin.*

446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464

**Roll Call**

- T. Walsh - Yes**
- C. Stelmach - Yes**
- P. Scarpetti - Yes**
- D. Winterton - Yes**
- D. Boutin - Yes**
- D. Marshall - Yes**

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

**The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held January 4, 2021 at 6:00 pm.**

**Respectfully submitted by,**

**/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

**AnnMarie Scott  
Recording Clerk**