

1 **Official**

2 **AGENDA**

3 **HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
4 **HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**

5 **35 Main Street**

6 **Monday, October 18, 2021**

7 **6:00 PM**

8  
9  
10 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:04 P.M.**

11  
12 **PROOF OF POSTING**

13  
14 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

15  
16 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

17  
18 **PRESENT: Tom Walsh (Chairman), Chris Stelmach (Vice-Chairman), Don Winterton, Matt**  
19 **Reed, Mike Somers, Paul Scarpetti, and David Boutin (Town Council Representative)**

20  
21 **ALTERNATES: Sheena Gilbert, Robert Duhaime, and Denise Pichette Volk**

22  
23 **EXCUSED:**

24  
25 **NOT PRESENT:**

26  
27 **STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)**

28  
29 **S. Gilbert and R. Duhaime will be a voting members this evening.**

30  
31 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 2021**

32  
33 **October 4, 2021 Meeting – P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the October 4, 2021**  
34 **meeting. Seconded by M. Somers with the following amendments:**

35 ***Line 29 - D. Pichette Volk and S. Gilbert were voting members. R. Duhaime should be removed.***

36  
37 ***Line 214 - add “maybe they would have to put in signage to not block the intersection.”***

38  
39 ***C. Stelmach and M. Reed abstained due to not being in attendance at the October 4, 2021 meeting.***

40  
41 **Motion carried with a vote of 5-0.**

42  
43 **CONTINUED APPLICATION**

44  
45 **1. DONALD C. & SONIA A. PARE #2021-20**

46           **279 Hackett Hill Road, Map 28, Lot 2**  
47           **2 lot subdivision**  
48           **(Public hearing was closed on September 20, 2021)**  
49

50 N. Williams: At the last meeting an abutter was disputing the property boundary. I have spoken to Pe-  
51 ter Holden, who is providing the survey, and he has not had a chance to do that.  
52

53 *D. Winterton motioned to continue the 2 lot subdivision for Donald C. & Sonia A. Pare, #2021-20,*  
54 *279 Hackett Hill Road, Map 28, Lot 2 until the November 1, 2021 Planning Board meeting. Se-*  
55 *conded by C. Stelmach. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*  
56

57 **COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**  
58

59           **2. RIDGEBACK SELF STORAGE #2021-19**  
60           **1461 Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 49-D**  
61           **Site plan for parking lot for larger vehicle storage**  
62

63 T. Walsh: At the last meeting we were lacking a landscape plan and we have that now.  
64

65 *P. Scarpetti motioned to find the site plan for a parking lot for larger vehicle storage for Ridgeback*  
66 *Self Storage, #2021-19, 1461 Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 49-D complete. Seconded by D. Winterton.*  
67 *Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*  
68

69 Doug MacGuire (Dubay Group): Dave Grappone is here with me. This has a small access point coming  
70 off of Hooksett Road next to Hooksett Fire Works. It was approved for climate controlled self storage in  
71 2009. The main issue was a large amount of cost for drainage and crossing of the wetlands. This is a  
72 unique shaped piece of property originally having access off of Rt 3. The plan was to cross the wetland  
73 and put additional buildings on the other side. Mr. Grappone rethought that process. We are here to work  
74 on the southern portion of the site and are proposing a simple self storage lot for vehicles. Mr. Grappone  
75 thought there is potential need in this location for storage of larger vehicles, such as RV's and boats,  
76 especially being next to Granite Hill. This is a low impact use, and will not be an occupied area. The  
77 people keeping their RV or boat there would be given an electronic access to a fence to take them in and  
78 out. We are proposing 40 spaces. Most can accommodate the RV size campers. We are proposing a three-  
79 sided car port for coverage from the elements. Drainage will be from a small infiltration system that is  
80 proposed in the parking lot. Water will be collected and discharged to where it goes today. We are pro-  
81 posing to curb this section of paved area so the run-off will not go to the wetland as it does today. There  
82 would be a basic lighting plan for security inside of the structure, as well as pole mounted lights in the  
83 parking lot. This will be landscaped as it is in the Performance Zone, and has frontage on Rt. 3. It does  
84 not have much frontage and only 50' of access. There would be plantings along the rear residential com-  
85 munity to break up facade of the car port. We are proposing a wildflower mix on all of the slopes to  
86 restabilize them.  
87

88 T. Walsh: Nicholas, do we have anything from the town engineer?  
89

90 N. Williams: All of his items have been addressed.  
91

92 C. Stelmach: You said this is mostly for the residents of Granite Hill?

93  
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

D. MacGuire: It would be open to any customer. They would have access to Thames Road and that goes to a signal at Granite Hill.

C. Stelmach: Have you gotten feedback from the residents of Granite Hill?

D. MacGuire: We have not gotten feedback either way. This is lacking visibility so we thought this was a good use.

S. Gilbert: How big are the trees facing Gary Avenue?

D. MacGuire: The planted height is 6'. They are deer tolerant abortive, and can grow up to 3' per year. The car port is 12' high on that side.

D. Boutin: Is the side of the car port that is opposite from the parking lot, closed or open?

D. MacGuire: The part facing the parking lot is open. The side facing the abutters is closed.

P. Scarpetti: How are you capturing and treating roof drainage?

D. MacGuire: The roof system goes into the header and that goes into an infiltration system.

T. Walsh: How far away from the building are those homes? About 30'?

D. MacGuire: About 35'.

T. Walsh: Is there a natural buffer there now?

D. MacGuire: There is tree cover now. I don't know the mixture of deciduous vs. evergreen.

T. Walsh: My goal is that the residents do not have to look at a big green wall. Will there be light wafting into the neighbors windows?

D. MacGuire: The wall packs are blocked by the building itself. Because there is a rear wall, the light coming from underneath is not going to the rear. We are zero across the back.

D. Winterton: Will there be electricity available for each unit?

D. MacGuire: No. The only electrical service to the property is the lighting. This is only for storage.

C. Stelmach: Will there be any signage?

D. MacGuire: At this time no. Mr. Grappone can decide if he wants to utilize some of his existing frontage. If we are going to do that, we would have to come back with a signage plan. We also don't have permission to put a sign on Thames Road.

Open to public comments.

140 No public comments.

141 Close to public comments.

142

143 Close public hearing.

144

145 ***P. Scarpetti motion to approve the site plan for parking lot for larger vehicle storage for Ridgeback***  
146 ***Self Storage, #2021-19, 1461 Hooksett Road, Map 18, Lot 49-D. Seconded by M. Somers. Motion***  
147 ***carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

148

149 T. Walsh asked D. MacGuire to please clean up the lighting plan.

150

151 D. MacGuire stated he would eliminate the lines.

152

### 153 **COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING**

154

#### 155 **3. WUH PROPERTIES, LLC #2021-26**

156 **1129 Hooksett Road, Map 41, Lot 11**

157 **Amended site plan for drainage and stormwater management**

158

159 T. Walsh: Nicholas, are we all set for completeness?

160

161 N. Williams: Yes. This is an amendment to their existing plan. This is an amended drainage easement  
162 which, by state statute, this board has to approve.

163

164 ***D. Winterton motioned to find the amended site plan for drainage and stormwater management for***  
165 ***WUH Properties, LLC, #2021-26, 1129 Hooksett Road, Map 41, Lot 11 complete. Seconded by M.***  
166 ***Somers. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

167

168 Jon Rokeh (Rokeh Consulting): When we did the original site plan we contemplated having a deten-  
169 tion basin on our own property. Once we started the project we found out all of the drainage that goes  
170 into this goes into the pond. This pond can handle drainage as it without changing anything. It works  
171 out better for the State of New Hampshire. We do not have to do any new connections and things can  
172 stay as is.

173

174 D. Boutin: Can you point out where the easement is?

175

176 J. Rokeh showed the easement on the plan.

177

178 D. Boutin: For future reference there should be a notation on the plan around the blue lines that this is  
179 an easement.

180

181 P. Scarpetti: Right now the only structures on the site are on the driveway. Everything is enclosed and  
182 there is no more sheet drainage?

183

184 J. Rokeh: All of the drainage will pass through where the pond was before, and go past, and into the  
185 pond.

186

187 Open public hearing

188

189 David Ross (56 Sherwood Drive): Who owns the pond? If you have two separate property owners get-  
190 ting benefit from this what will happen int the future.

191

192 J. Rokeh: Hooksett Car Wash owns the pond. The easement will run with the land for this property.

193

194 Close public hearing.

195

196 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the amended site plan for drainage and stormwater management for***  
197 ***WUH Properties, LLC, #2021-26, 1129 Hooksett Road, Map 41, Lot 11 with the condition that the***  
198 ***meets and bounds be documented on the site plan. Seconded M. Somers. Motion carried unani-***  
199 ***mously with a vote of 7-0.***

200

## 201 **PROJECT NOTIFICATION**

202

### 203 **4. EVERSOURCE ENERGY #2021-25**

204 **13 Legends Drive, Map 25, Lot 80**

205 **Paved stock yard**

206

207 Nick Golon (TF Moran): This is subject to several lease agreements with Manchester Sand and Gravel.  
208 The area of impact is approximately six acres. This is land that was acquired by Eversource as part of a  
209 lot line adjustment. The reason for this easement is that Eversource has a larger project in the works.  
210 They need a larger building. In the meantime their plan is to allocate the space is the lower paved stock  
211 yard for their needs. This has been expedited for Fish & Game Heritage Bureau review. We will submit  
212 our application for review with Nicolas Williams and Bruce Thomas. No items are outstanding. Are  
213 there any questions from the board?

214

215 T. Walsh: We got a memorandum from Bruce Thomas with a few minor things.

216

217 N. Golon: That was in relation to the rip rap area of fill limits of rebuild of the road. How we stabilize  
218 the roads is done in the best way possible. Some areas of impact will be rip rap.

219

220 T. Walsh: Will there be gravel road as well?

221

222 N. Golon: Yes. That is a haul road right now. It will be a full depth reconstruction.

223

224 T. Walsh: You are not seeking approval from us as this is a utility. It is a courtesy.

225

226 R. Duhaime: Part of the road is paved. This sub-divides between the roads and is not an approved town  
227 road.

228

229 N. Golon: It is a driveway. A private road that has appropriate frontage.

230

231 R. Duhaime: Is it being built to town specifications?

232

233 N. Golon: The town road was built to town specifications.

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  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278

R. Duhaime: Will that continue to the new property line?

N. Golon: Only a portion of the driveway is being paved to the site entrance. The rest will remain gravel at this time.

R. Duhaime: This is a commercial lot that will abut new lots in the future. No one is abutting them at this time except their own lots. Adding landscaping is futile, but this lot could be sub-divided so any landscape or screen is supposed to be on that lot.

N. Golon: The only lots that will abut at this time is Manchester Sand and Gravel.

R. Duhaime: Is the chain link fence within the setback?

N. Golon: There are no setbacks in relationship to this. That would not be applicable.

R. Duhaime: What about the existing slope?

N. Golon: That won't be touched.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**5. PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS**

**Amendment No. 1**

Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #1, as proposed by the Affordable Housing Subcommittee and presented for public hearing by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend Article 16-A, Workforce Housing, of the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Existing verbiage:

D. Applicability

1. The provisions of this Article shall have applicability in the following Districts: High Density Residential District; Medium Density Residential District; Urban Residential District; Mixed Use District – 2; and Mixed Use District – 5.

Proposed Amendment:

D. Applicability

1. The provisions of this Article shall have applicability in the following Districts: High Density Residential District; Medium Density Residential District; Urban Residential District; Mixed Use District – 2; and Mixed Use District – 5. Where multi-family dwellings are permitted by right, the provisions of this article shall require that a minimum of 10% of total units meet affordability criteria as defined by the

279 United States Department of Housing and Urban Development's Low Income Housing Tax Credit Pro-  
280 gram.

281  
282 ***The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide affordable housing options for Hooksett resi-***  
283 ***dents of all income levels and socioeconomic status, as well as to combat the State's current housing***  
284 ***affordability crisis.***

285  
286 Open public hearing

287  
288 David Ross (56 Sherwood Drive): If this is approved there will be problems. Regulations are the one  
289 thing everybody says are getting in the way. To lock ourselves into the federal government fed housing  
290 we are allowing someone else to interfere with our zoning. These decisions should be made on a case  
291 by case basis. How do we come up with these formulas? current or do we as far as the affordable hous-  
292 ing category.

293  
294 T. Walsh: These are not specific to each project but it is encouraged under RSA 674.59.

295  
296 D. Ross: It is not smart to lock ourselves into a regulation. This town belongs to the people who al-  
297 ready live here, not the ones that want to be here. You are tying your hands if you pass this. Hooksett  
298 has a variety of housing. I think it should be up to you do decide how and where housing grows. I do  
299 not think it should be left up to the federal government.

300  
301 Close public hearing.

302  
303 D. Boutin: The Planning Board appointed a housing sub-committee and we spent a lot of time on this  
304 issue. The purpose of this is to come to a solution on workforce housing. If you had 200 apartments this  
305 would require 20 of them for workforce housing. There is a shortage of workforce housing. This is how  
306 we came up with the 10 percent.

307  
308 N. Williams: Sixty percent or below of the median income of the community and then 30% of that fig-  
309 ure is defined as affordable.

310  
311 D. Boutin: There is a formula that provides guidance. I would encourage the members of the board to  
312 approve this article.

313  
314 P. Scarpetti: The urban residential is included in here. How many units per acre can you put in an ur-  
315 ban residential. If you include workforce housing, and someone wants to put in a duplex, how would  
316 you calculate that? I see a need for the heavier use for the HDR and Mixed Use. I think we need to look  
317 at the MDR and Urban. It will not help the town by having one unit with a duplex and 50 percent of  
318 that has to go for workforce housing. I think we need to see examples.

319  
320 T. Walsh: What do you do with a duplex? This is silent on that.

321  
322 R. Duhaime: We just did the master plan update. The NH advantage is we have a quality of life. Now  
323 we are going to encourage urban high density residential? In Hooksett we have major highways and  
324 three highway ramps. Most people would not be interested in work force housing unless there is a

325 ramp. Just wait until you see what this will do as far as population. This complicates what the Planning  
326 Board has been able to handle for the past 30 to 40 years. We are not going to solve the housing crisis  
327 and starting this bureaucracy will end up with us having a mess on our hands.

328  
329 S. Gilbert: We have to have a variety of housing options and there are not. It is discussed in the master  
330 plan that there is not a variety of housing in Hooksett. I think we need a specific definition of what af-  
331 fordable housing means and then we can break down what the 10% applies too. I think this needs to be  
332 further defined.

333  
334 T. Walsh: That is an option. This is our first hearing on this. If you disagree with how it is structured  
335 right now, there is an opportunity for an amendment. This is amendable and it can return. We have time  
336 to bring this back.

337  
338 S. Gilbert: Do you think that makes sense and then we could try to make the committee and residents  
339 happy? Should there be a matrix? Do you agree?

340  
341 T. Walsh: As far as you interpret the 10% we can work on that. As far as if I agree with you, not nec-  
342 essarily.

343  
344 D. Boutin: High density residential is already in the zoning ordinance. I would offer to amend to take  
345 out the urban residential district and leave the rest there.

346  
347 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve Amendment 1 with the amendment to remove “urban residential dis-***  
348 ***trict.”***

349  
350 T. Walsh: I believe this board has always done things right. This board does not hold up applicants,  
351 We do not try to stop applicants from doing things. Dick Marshall explained to our abutters time and  
352 time again that, as a Planning Board, we only have a certain ability. We do not have the ability to say  
353 no just because we do not like it. We have the job to fairly apply our ordinance and regulations. Be-  
354 cause of that, I think we have a healthy mix of residential in this town. I also think we are still in the  
355 middle of a pandemic propagated housing crisis. Did anyone talk about what the eviction moratorium  
356 did to the housing. I think the same problems with this apply to Medium Density Residential.

357  
358 D. Boutin: It is correct this board conducts itself in a professional manner, and some of the issues in  
359 our packets do not apply. The issue at hand is housing opportunities. In that instance there is no ques-  
360 tion that we lack in housing opportunities. The Union Leader pointed out Hooksett in an article regard-  
361 ing housing. We have a very limited supply of alternative housing in this town. People will eventually  
362 move out of town. Where will our seniors go? The 10% was a number arrived at by the housing sub-  
363 committee. The 10% is what most use, correct Nicholas?

364  
365 N. Williams: Most in the area use the 10%.

366  
367 D. Boutin: Ten percent is a reasonable number. If you had 300 units, 30 would be affordable housing.

368  
369 R. Duhaime: Hooksett led the State of New Hampshire in retirement housing. A lot of people sold  
370 their big family homes and moved into retirement housing. People who never lived in this town are

371 coming to Hooksett to retire for the quality of life here. The quality of life in Hooksett will change  
372 when you put in 300 apartments.

373  
374 N. Williams: This was sent to public hearing with a vote of 5-2. Urban Density Residential is one unit  
375 for every 5000 sq. ft.

376  
377 P. Scarpetti: If it is condos this does not apply?

378  
379 N. Williams: As it is written to multi-family it applies to anything three units and up.

380  
381 P. Scarpetti: If they build condos does someone get one for \$100,000 less than me because he is subsi-  
382 dized, and then mine goes up in price if I go to sell. The only way I can see this going through is for  
383 High Density Residential apartment rentals. This can't be for condos.

384  
385 R. Duhaime: This is a town that developed in the 60's. People bought ranches. There are mobile home  
386 parks. We have a wide array of housing currently. Putting something generic like this leads to town  
387 planning having to decipher this.

388  
389 D. Boutin: On the line where it says "a minimum of 10% of total units, could be revised to say "a min-  
390 imum of 10% of apartment rental units would meet affordable criteria." That way it would be clear it is  
391 for rental apartments. Does that work?

392  
393 P. Scarpetti: The Town Attorney would have to take a look at that to see if it can be done. It would be  
394 fine for me as long as it is clear this only applies to apartments.

395  
396 D. Boutin: Can we forward this to our Town Attorney for an opinion?

397  
398 ***D. Boutin motioned to table Amendment 1. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.***

399  
400 D. Boutin: I would like to add that this will be sent to the Town Attorney for input.

401  
402 T. Walsh: This would be amended for only apartment rental units.

403  
404 P. Scarpetti: For only high density residential.

405  
406 D. Boutin: I am not recommending that, Paul.

407  
408 R. Duhaime: This might work as long as the apartments can never be condoized. Once they were con-  
409 dos you will not be able to afford this.

410  
411 T. Walsh: I cannot have The United States Housing and Urban Development Ordinance become the  
412 one for the Town of Hooksett.

413  
414 M. Reed: There are a ton of homes that have been approved but not built yet.

415  
416 ***P. Scarpetti withdrew his second.***

417

418 M. Somers: Is this legal? I think we are going down the rabbit hole. Let's give the public something to  
419 vote for. They might vote it down.

420  
421 T. Walsh: Our job is to find out if this is workable.

422  
423 ***Seconded by M. Somers.***

424  
425 **Roll Call**

426 **D. Boutin: Yes**

427 **D. Winterton: Yes**

428 **M. Somers: Yes**

429 **P. Scarpetti: Yes**

430 **C. Stelmach: Yes**

431 **M. Reed: Yes**

432 **T. Walsh: Yes**

433  
434 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote 7-0.**

435  
436 The public hearing will be reopened with the new proposal.

437  
438 **Amendment No. 2**

439 Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #2, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to add the  
440 following verbiage to Article 3, General Provisions of the Town of Hooksett Zoning Ordinance:

441  
442 *In any district which permits the development of multi-family residential dwellings as defined by the*  
443 *Town of Hooksett Development Regulations, or in any district which the Zoning Board of Adjustment or*  
444 *the Planning Board grant use entitlements to develop multi-family housing as defined by the Develop-*  
445 *ment Regulations, the Planning Board shall require a minimum of two (2) parking spaces for each dwell-*  
446 *ing unit containing one bedroom, and shall require two and one-half (2.5) parking spaces for each dwell-*  
447 *ing unit containing two or more bedrooms. See Section 15 of Town Development Regulations.*

448  
449 ***The purpose of this addition to the Zoning Ordinance is to require adequate overflow parking in multi-***  
450 ***family developments.***

451  
452 M. Reed stepped out at 7:16 pm.

453  
454 Open public hearing

455  
456 David Ross (56 Sherwood Drive): Is this an increase in the current requirements?

457  
458 Close public hearing.

459  
460 N. Williams: No. This was on the warrant last year. This reduces parking for the single bedrooms from  
461 the 2.5 to 2. Before it was 2.5 for each unit.

462  
463 M. Reed returned at 7:18 pm.

464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507

D. Ross: It is a common occurrence that dwellings occupied by two people have two cars. What if the unit has four bedrooms?

N. Williams: The baseline is 2.5. You could add more based on the project.

T. Walsh: Is it misleading the way it is written? I am in favor of the overflow parking. The way it is written is going in the opposite direction.

D. Winterton: What if it reads a minimum of 2 parking spaces for each unit containing one bedroom and a minimum of 2.5 parking spaces for 2 or more bedrooms Doesn't that give the Planning Board flexibility?

***D. Winterton motioned to have the amendment 2 read: a minimum of 2 parking spaces for each unit containing one bedroom and a minimum of 2.5 parking spaces for 2 or more bedrooms. Seconded by D. Boutin. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

***D. Boutin motioned to table the amendment as amended. Seconded by D. Winterton with the condition that the town attorney will be asked the the definition of minimums. D. Boutin accepted D. Winterton's second. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

**Amendment No. 3**

Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #3, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the following verbiage in Article 5, Section 8(c) - Medium Density Residential District, of the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance:

*A minimum of two (2) parking spaces shall be provided for each single family dwelling unit as well as for each multi-family dwelling unit containing one bedroom, and a minimum of two and one-half (2.5) parking spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit within multi-family developments containing two or more bedrooms. No parking shall be allowed in the required front yard. All parking shall be shown on a site plan approved by the Planning Board.*

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

N. Williams: This amendment would change the blanket 2.5 parking spaces per unit to require only the 2 for one bedroom units as discussed at the affordable housing sub-committee meeting.

T. Walsh: What was the thought process for re-doing the amount of parking in these zones?

D. Boutin: The current ordinance says 2.5 parking spaces per unit. The housing sub-committee thought that was not adequate.

Open public hearing

508 D. Ross: Reducing what the voters asked for is not very smart. This is misleading in the description.  
509 Single bedroom apartments have two cars. We should not be reducing the parking requirements. All  
510 around towns we see parking in the front yards. We are encouraging parking where it should be. If you  
511 are going to build something, build it right.

512  
513 Close public hearing.

514  
515 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve Amendment 3 to something unknown for the description. Seconded***  
516 ***by M. Somers.***

517  
518 P. Scarpetti: Two family houses have two cars?

519  
520 N. Williams: 2.5.

521  
522 P. Scarpetti: Before we adopted the 2.5 what did they have?

523  
524 N. Williams: Two.

525  
526 M. Somers: That was adopted six months ago.

527  
528 T. Walsh: This looks like you are increasing the parking. This is reducing the parking and is mislead-  
529 ing. The summary should be accurate.

530  
531 M. Somers: The reason to make the move on the one bedroom is not every one bedroom has two  
532 spaces and not every 5 bedroom has 5 people. If you require 2.5 for everyone in a 300 unit you are go-  
533 ing to have miles of parking. The intent of this is to balance it and reduce the footprint of the parking.

534  
535 D. Winterton: The amendment we are looking at replaces something the voters voted on last year.

536  
537 N. Williams: The verbiage will replace it but we need to be clear what is changing in the verbiage. The  
538 voters approved 2.5 spaces per unit and that was for over two bedrooms with the caveat that one bed-  
539 rooms will have 2 spaces.

540  
541 **Roll Call**

542 **D. Boutin: Yes**

543 **D. Winterton: No**

544 **M. Somers: Yes**

545 **P. Scarpetti: Yes**

546 **C. Stelmach: No**

547 **M. Reed: No**

548 **T. Walsh: No**

549

550 **Motion fails with a vote of 4-3.**

551

552 **Amendment No.4**

553 Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment #4, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the following  
554 verbiage in Article 6, Section 5(c) - High Density Residential District, of the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance:

555 *A minimum of two (2) parking spaces shall be provided for each single family dwelling unit as well as*  
556 *for each multi-family dwelling unit containing one bedroom, and a minimum of two and one-half (2.5)*  
557 *parking spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit within multi-family developments containing*  
558 *two or more bedrooms. No parking shall be allowed in the required front yard. All parking shall be*  
559 *shown on a site plan approved by the Planning Board.*

560  
561 ***The purpose of the proposed amendment is to require adequate overflow parking for multi-family***  
562 ***residential developments.***

563 Open public hearing

564  
565 D. Ross: This is the same thing. We are reducing what the voters want. All of the buildings should  
566 have adequate parking. We need to focus on what the people in town want. The people already living in  
567 the town are the ones that are more important than the people who want to be here. The voters already  
568 voted on this.

569  
570 Nancy House (7 Doris Drive): It is my understanding the 2.5 kids are part are living at the home they  
571 get their own cars. People have visitors. the half is meant to accommodate that.

572  
573 Close public hearing.

574  
575 P. Scarpetti: This is just High Density Residential. I am not here to create a problem. I don't want to go  
576 by High Density Residential to see a lot of parking not being used. We want to have clarification so  
577 that we don't have asphalt yards. I think this should be tabled to make sure the amendment is clarified.  
578 These should all be tabled to make sure the verbiage is done correctly.

579  
580 D. Winterton: Nicholas, have we had any feedback from developers on our parking?

581  
582 N. Williams: We have had feedback from the residents in a particular housing development with peo-  
583 ple parking on grass, and other places they should not be.

584  
585 M. Somers: This is for single bedrooms. I find it hard that a couple with a child old enough to drive is  
586 living in a one bedroom.

587  
588 ***P. Scarpetti motioned to table with the condition that the town attorney will be asked his legal opin-***  
589 ***ion on the verbiage. Seconded by D. Boutin. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

590  
591 **Amendment No.5**

592 Are you in favor of Zoning Amendment # 5, as proposed by the Affordable Housing Subcommittee and  
593 presented for public hearing by the Hooksett Planning Board, to rezone the 42-acre parcel of land lo-  
594 cated at 18 Legends Drive, Tax Map 25 Lot 80-3, from Performance Zone to High Density Residential?  
595

596 ***The purpose of the proposed rezoning is to provide housing development opportunities in order to***  
597 ***combat the State's current housing shortage crisis.***

598  
599 D. Boutin stepped out at 7:45 pm.  
600

601 D. Ross: My concern is this has been in planning for prime industrial property. Hooksett needs this  
602 commercial property especially for industrial. We have a clean shot from I-93. I think this is profitable  
603 for the Town of Hooksett. This is a area that will end up being industrial.  
604

605 Alyssa Ehl (27 Barberry Street): I would like to refer to the first paragraph of the minutes from the  
606 September 8, 2021 affordable housing subcommittee discussion. Why do we have to grow? Why more?  
607 More isn't always better. We talked about our school class sizes going down. That is a good thing for  
608 Hooksett. It will reduce class sizes and teacher burnout. We could not replace teachers that retire and  
609 use that extra money to retain our good teachers and administration, and pay them better wages. It  
610 looks like there could be 750 apartments that developers want to add. Apartment dwellers do not have  
611 stake in a town. They do not pay taxes. Homeowners pay taxes and have stake in the town. We need to  
612 take care of the residents who live here. Manchester Planning Board approved 350 apartments near the  
613 Manchester bridge. We have already approved 350 at Heads Pond. Why do we need more? Hooksett  
614 cannot handle the amount that are being proposed. We would have to hire more fire, teachers, and po-  
615 lice. If you are turning commercial into residential it is a lose lose proposition. I sat at Alice Avenue for  
616 three cycles to get on the highway to go north on a Saturday afternoon. Town Counsel and this board  
617 need to take that into consideration instead of creating more problems.  
618

619 D. Boutin returned at 7:49 pm.  
620

621 Nancy House: I would like to reiterate this has been going on for over a year. The traffic is horrible  
622 and a lot of us don't even want to to anywhere. With all of these apartments it will get worse. We want  
623 to grow when we are ready. We are not ready for it now. We worry about goods and services. We don't  
624 want to wait in long lines. We want the small town feel and the problems we have now solved, before  
625 we grow. We want more businesses. There are a lot of vacant buildings. Now we have to drive to other  
626 towns to get things. We want the things that drew us to the small community feel, without apartments,  
627 and adding businesses that will keep people active. Let's resolve the traffic first and utilities first, and  
628 plan accordingly. We do not want people in houses to leave because this is not what we came to  
629 Hooksett for.  
630

631 Mike Kowack (7 Grandview Drive): It is proposed to add 752 apartments with two accesses to the  
632 highway. Any time you want to go anywhere there is always traffic. There was just an accident off of  
633 Exit 11. There is a high probability of accidents. Add a little and evaluate, add a little more and evalu-  
634 ate. The housing crisis was not caused by Hooksett.  
635

636 Roger Duhaime (19 Sawhill Road): This housing crisis is a big issue in front of the town. When you  
637 change the character of the town, and add more apartment buildings, you change the value of the sin-  
638 gle-family homes. They are not adding apartments in Auburn or Candia. The pressure is on us. We  
639 have a lot of access to the highways. The state is going to spend almost \$15 million for Exit 4. They  
640 spent a lot of money at the Manchester Airport to get a highway in there for commercial development.

641 That commercial development is filling up quick and the land will be gone. They are going to be look-  
642 ing for more commercial land. If you change this to residential, it will not be there when they come.  
643 That is why I do not think it is wise to change this to residential.

644  
645 Close public hearing.

646  
647 R. Duhaime: Looking at the commercial zones, this is spot zoning. Do not do it. It does not belong.  
648 Putting this into residential would be a mistake. This does not abut any residential. This does not even  
649 have a residential buffer. It would reflect badly on this board if this moved forward.

650  
651 M. Reed: Exit 9 to the McDonalds is going to be expanded.

652  
653 S. Gilbert: Related to Exit 11, we need assistance from the state with the roads. I empathize with where  
654 the back-ups are, but understand that we have a lot of state roads in town and can not do anything with  
655 those.

656  
657 P. Scarpetti: They could put in 516 units with the size of this property this developer said, but 250 are  
658 open to do whatever he wants. I understand there is commercial around it, but we have a mall that is  
659 not doing well. We need people to frequent stores to have stores. If they came in with condos and  
660 apartments I might look at it. There is a fine line between the two. There is industrial behind GE that  
661 isn't doing so great. If something methodical came in to do there I would look at it. If it was mixed-use  
662 I would look at it to see if it would help the town.

663  
664 R. Duhaime: Mixed use is something for the future moving forward. Putting in the residential with the  
665 commercial land next to it is less desirable. In Hooksett we are uniquely situated in a crossroads. It is  
666 just a matter of time for industrial to come here. Once you create the residential they will not want to  
667 put in industrial next to it.

668  
669 T. Walsh: Part of doing something right is doing it for the long term. This is abutting industrial land  
670 that is signalized. It is prime industrial land. The expansion of Exit 9 is in New Hampshire's 10 year  
671 plan. Industrial is the stretch of Rt. 3. The employers look at the traffic and how it affects employees.  
672 Once that is expanded a lot of people will be looking at these sites differently. I cannot support this  
673 amendment.

674  
675 D. Boutin: Rt. 3 from Benton Rd. to Alice Ave. is being expanded. I sit on the working group with the  
676 state on that project. It is moving forward. The issue is whether it will be a three or five lane road. It is  
677 a road that people recognize as needing improvements.

678  
679 **D. Boutin motioned to table Amendment 5.**

680  
681 D. Winterton: Have the owner and abutters been notified?

682  
683 N. Williams: Yes.

684  
685 **D. Boutin motioned to approve Amendment 5. Seconded by M. Somers.**

686  
687 **Roll Call**

688 **D. Boutin: Yes**  
689 **D. Winterton: No**  
690 **M. Somers: No**  
691 **P. Scarpetti: No**  
692 **C. Stelmach: No**  
693 **M. Reed: No**  
694 **T. Walsh: No**

695  
696 **Motion fails with a vote of 6-1.**

697  
698 **BUSINESS OCCUPANCY**

699  
700 None.

701  
702 **OTHER BUSINESS**

703  
704 None

705  
706 **ADJOURNMENT**

707  
708 ***M. Somers motioned to adjourn at 8:09 pm. Seconded by D. Boutin. Motion carried unanimously***  
709 ***with a vote of 7-0.***

710  
711 **The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held November 1, 2021 at 6:00 pm.**

712  
713 **Respectfully submitted by,**

714  
715 **/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

716  
717 **AnnMarie Scott**  
718 **Recording Clerk**