

1 **Official**

2

3 **AGENDA**

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

6 **35 Main Street**

7 **Monday, February 7, 2022**

8 **6:00 PM**

9

10 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 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, Mike Somers, Matt Reed, and David Boutin (Town Council Representative)**

19

20

21 **ALTERNATES: Sheena Gilbert, Denise Pichette Volk, and Robert Duhaime (arrived at 6:16 pm)**

22

23 **EXCUSED: Paul Scarpetti**

24

25 **NOT PRESENT:**

26

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

28

29 **D. Pichette Volk will be a voting member this evening.**

30

31 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2021**

32

33 **December 6, 2021 Meeting – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the December 6, 2021 meeting. Seconded by M. Somers.**

34

35 **Line 127: Should read “Across the street from Park Place is now being developed.”**

36 **Line 192 - 193: Remove “Those are done by groups of people” and add “They put that in the codes because not every code can apply to every situation and we know situations change. That is why we have a waiver process and a ZBA. That is why we have an amendment process in the legislature. Those are all done by groups of people, not an individual who can just say nope I want that.”**

37

38

39 **Line 216: Remove “They even went to TRC to” and add “The Fire Department even went to TRC and nothing was mentioned.”**

40

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

42

43

44 **January 3, 2022 Meeting** – *D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the January 3, 2022*
45 *meeting. Seconded by D. Winterton.*

46 **T. Walsh:** Line 314 - 315 - “Designed” should be changed to “zoned.”

47 *M. Reed abstained due to not being present at the January 3, 2022 meeting. Motion carried with a*
48 *vote of 6-0.*

49 **SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS/BOARD DISCUSSION**

50
51 **1. MATT BARRETT – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
52 **Housing Needs Assessment**
53

54 Matt Barrett: We are here to get more affordable housing into Hooksett. We think it is an important
55 thing Hooksett needs to look at. We would like the board to consider bringing more apartments into
56 Hooksett. Every week we see in the Union Leader there is an affordable housing crisis in NH. Our
57 opinion is Hooksett has the resources and land, and we could do a better job of bringing in more afford-
58 able housing into town. I have talked to developers and realtors. We could get people here to do this.
59 There is a need. If I was a larger employer I don’t know if I would bring them to Hooksett. They would
60 not have a place to live. We lose young people because we don’t have a high school in town and they
61 don’t come back because they don’t have a place to live. The elderly are downsizing and we lose them
62 because they don’t have a place to go. The town suffers because we don’t have affordable hous-
63 ing/apartments. When we are talking to an employer about bring 100 - 200 people into town they are
64 not going to buy \$500,000 - \$600,000 houses. They want \$1,400, \$1,600, \$2,000 apartments. If you go
65 to University Heights anytime of the day it is quiet and nice. I hear people talk about negative things
66 about apartments but I don’t see any of it. I don’t know the ramifications of the tax structure and that
67 stuff. These are one and two bedroom apartments that are not attracting families. They are not going to
68 overrun the schools with kids. I don’t think we would see a detriment to our tax rates. We would like to
69 see these projects approved in town.
70

71 T. Walsh: I thought we were going to talk about the details of this assessment.
72

73 N. Williams: I invited a representative from EDAC in to talk about this because the town was ap-
74 proached by SNHPC. They are on the receiving end of some federal monies from ARPA. They perform
75 a regional housing need assessment every five years for each of the 18 municipalities in their jurisdic-
76 tion. SNHPC has received some additional funding through ARPA this year that is earmarked to aid
77 individual municipalities in developing these needs assessments for their own communities. Given the
78 current state of housing we keep hearing about, I thought that this would be a good opportunity to po-
79 tentially retain SNHPC to work with the town to develop the housing needs assessment and work with
80 all of our land use boards to subsequently identify recommendations that would then go into the master
81 plan. I asked a representative from EDAC to come in because we are starting to look at the ramifica-
82 tions of not having affordable housing and the challenges that presents to our local communities in
83 maintaining a viable work force. As a town, once the funding is available, I think it would behove us to
84 take advantage of their services.
85

86 D. Boutin: I assume you are here representing the EDAC.
87

88 M. Barrett: Yes.

89

90 D. Boutin: Do you know where the Hooksett Chamber of Commerce is on this issue?

91

92 M. Barrett: I have not gotten any input from them. In my talks with people they are proponents of af-
93 fordable housing.

94

95 D. Boutin: You have been a business man in Hooksett close to 30 years. I am sure you have contacts
96 with a lot of business owners. What kind of input do you hear from them in terms of the housing is-
97 sue?

98

99 M. Barrett: The lack of housing and the expense of new housing. When companies are bringing work-
100 ers into town they are paying them \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 salaries they are not buying \$500,000 -
101 \$600,000 houses. They are looking for market rate apartments. Hooksett doesn't have any.

102

103 D. Boutin: I agree with that.

104

105 D. Pichette Volk: What body would give the assent for us to engage with SNHPC.

106

107 T. Walsh: I would assume Town Council because we have no authority to spend money. It says retain
108 the SNHPC and the funds might be an offsetting cost. What is the total on this?

109

110 N. William We do not know yet. We are being preemptive in coming to our land use boards and the
111 land use decision makers prior to engaging further discussions with them. That is why we are coming
112 to all of our boards. It might be available via grant funding and we would not need the authorize the use
113 of any additional funding. When you are engaging in a study of this magnitude, I think that would fall
114 under the purview of the planning Board. I would think you would want myself, and representatives of
115 this board to be involved in administering the study itself and subsequently incorporating it into our
116 land use decisions. Our next step with a representative from EDAC is in front of the zoning board. We
117 wanted to get in front of everybody and make sure we are being as transparent in the event we decide to
118 retain them. Ultimately, this would require input from the public, planning board, zoning board, and all
119 of our land use boards.

120

121 T. Walsh: So this is just an early conversation?

122

123 N. Williams: Yes.

124

125 D. Pichette Volk: Cost aside, there appears to be a to do; a robust program of public outreach and edu-
126 cation. Who would you imagine would do that?

127

128 N. Williams: We touched on that at the EDAC meeting. I think that would be part of the service that
129 would be provided through the ARPA funding. I spoke to SNHPC briefly. They like to have all of the
130 land use authorities involved. They also would potentially bring in some of the larger employers and
131 other interested parties in town, including having NH Housing and Finance come in to talk with the
132 municipalities. That component would be part of what we would be retaining them to aid in.

133

- 134 D. Pichette Volk: I am in favor of this but it seems like this would create a large administrative to-do.
135 Someone needs to be the ring leader and it feels like you would be central to that effort.
136
- 137 N. Williams: That is something I am prepared to do. I just want to make sure we are getting the bless-
138 ings of the decision makers.
139
- 140 D. Boutin: SNHPC has the capacity to do this kind of work. That is what they are there for. We should
141 take advantage of their staff and resources to address the housing issue.
142
- 143 M. Barrett: The economic development committee would be engaged as well.
144
- 145 C. Stelmach: Is there a spreadsheet for the town, for recent years, of the number of people who bought
146 and sold their homes and the reasons why? Is not having a high school a contributing factor for prop-
147 erty sales or other town problems?
148
- 149 N. Williams: I am sure we can compile a statistic on the sale of the properties, but not why.
150
- 151 D. Winterton: We have gotten data there have been over 70 housing permits issued over the last two
152 years.
153
- 154 N. Williams: 78 last year.
155
- 156 D. Winterton: That is about 140 new houses built. They are all filled. I don't think not having a high
157 school is a negative.
158
- 159 M. Reed: Is anyone engaged in the state for the infrastructure for the Rt. 3 and the widening?
160
- 161 T. Walsh: The Rt. 3 project for the expansion is on the 10 year plan. We have a hearing coming up on
162 that very soon.
163
- 164 N. Williams: The first public meeting for that project is scheduled for Tuesday, February 22, 2022 in
165 this room at 6:00 pm.
166
- 167 T. Walsh: Hackett Hill and Main Street is back on the 10 year plan for 2026. I have reached out to try
168 to get it moved up, but I cannot guarantee anything.
169
- 170 R. Duhaime: I worked on the north shore of Boston today. Town houses, apartment complexes, multi
171 units, side by side townhouses, houses with less than 25' between them. Seven million people in Mas-
172 sachusetts. Where can we build next? Why not Hooksett, NH?
173
- 174 D. Boutin: That is real intelligent.
175
- 176 T. Walsh: I know you are here recommending something on behalf of EDAC. You are looking at
177 housing as an impediment to economic growth in Hooksett. Does EDAC look at other things? Do they
178 survey businesses on other issues Hooksett may have in terms of the reasons why economic develop-
179 ment seems to have slowed on Rt. 3? I talk to business owners all the time and have not heard them talk

180 about apartments. Impact fees are number one on the list as well as regulations the fire department im-
181 poses that nobody else does. Those are the things that come up with the business owners I have talked
182 with and they say that if they only knew what they would be dealing with they never would have come
183 here. Housing never seems to come up with any of the people I talk to. I wonder if you look at the
184 whole umbrella.

185
186 M. Barrett: We look at the whole umbrella. We have talked to business owners in the past. We were
187 involved in the whole survey deal when Andre did it a couple years ago. I think it is an impediment to
188 bringing big business into town. Where are people going to live?

189
190 R. Duhaime: The is economic development's analysis. You really think that is the case? You think we
191 can't get economic development unless we get housing?

192
193 M. Barrett: I am not saying that. I am saying it is a impediment like everything else and I think it is a
194 necessary component.

195
196 R. Duhaime: Housing is one thing we can always sell in Hooksett. That is not an issue. It is everything
197 else.

198
199 M. Barrett: Granted there will be traffic problems. How do you deal with the traffic problems. You
200 need money. How do you get money? You need business to come in and pay taxes. It is part of the
201 whole process. I am not saying we need a thousand or two thousand housing units in Hooksett. A cou-
202 ple hundred would be nice.

203
204 R. Duhaime: Going through a housing analysis and looking at our master plan, this is trying to put a
205 round peg in a square hole. You have got to put so many limitations on that housing to leave it afforda-
206 ble. You are never going to be able to do it. It will be eaten up by people who will be going to work in
207 Massachusetts any any place else but Hooksett, unless we get the businesses here.

208
209 M. Barrett: It is a catch 22.

210
211 T. Walsh: What is the acceptable commuting distance for a business? We live next to a city with prob-
212 ably 150,000 people. There is an accepted commutability.

213
214 S. Gilbert: I worked for Fidelity Investments and theirs was within an hour. The company I just ended
215 up with is out of Dover, NH and Bedford, MA. Either office I go into is about an hour. A lot of the time
216 I work from home. I think we need to take into consideration that a lot of companies have moved their
217 work force to home.

218
219 D. Pichette Volk: Are we looking for an action on this tonight?

220
221 T. Walsh: No. This is for information and discussion.

222
223 R. Duhaime: Do you know how much work force or affordable housing in Auburn, Candia, and Bow?
224 Do you know Hooksett's numbers are higher than all of those towns? We have our fair share. Your
225 housing restrictions in MA are so stringent and expensive it is cheaper to build in NH. They are going
226 to keep coming here. What do we want this town to look like?

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
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273

D. Boutin motioned to send a recommendation to the Town Council to move forward with the regional housing assessment. Seconded by D. Pichette Volk.

D. Winterton: What other communities would be involved so we can see there assessment and where Hooksett stands?

D. Boutin: That would be done as part of the study.

N. Williams: We will be in front of the zoning board next month. Once we have information on the ARPA funding, and how that will work with the SNHPC, I will invite a representative from the SNHPC to come in to talk with the board about what it will entail.

R. Duhaime: What are we really looking for in this housing assessment? What do you want to hear? How many units we should have? How many we could have? That is the buildout of Hooksett. Back in 2008 we had 1,000 approved units. If housing it what you are after, try to picture what you want to get. You open that door and it is going to run right in.

T. Walsh: I think I am starting my 12th year on this board and I have always said the same thing. I am hear for responsible residential growth and will do everything I can to get the non-residential sector going. These things terrify me. I understand why some people would want to get the assessment, but I don't know whose needs they are. I cannot approve anything tonight. I think it is way too early. We don't have any of the details. We don't know what the cost will be. We don't have any of that yet. I thought this was a discussion. I will be voting no on a recommendation at this point. I am not saying I will vote no on one in the future. I would like more information like what this is going to cost.

D. Boutin: It is not the purview of the planning board to decide how money is spent. It is responsible for the planning board to make a recommendation to the town council. The town council takes all the information into consideration before they vote. To make a decision on how much money it is going to cost and other factors, that is not your pervue.

T. Walsh: That was one example. I don't know enough about this thing. I got this thing Friday and have not even gone through it.

R. Duhaime: Nicholas, for SNHPC to do this would it come out of the planning board budget?

N. Williams: Potentially. It would depend on the cost. If there were a contract we would do a PO for it. As it is coming from ARPA, it could be that this is all grant funding and might be offered to us at no cost.

R. Duhaime: We do have a budget and the SNHPC is in our budget?

N. Williams: Yes.

T. Walsh: There are a lot of if's and a lot of questions.

R. Duhaime: It is not town council's pervue it is the planning board's pervue.

274
275 T. Walsh: I don't know why this is a rush. I would like to get more answers.
276

277 D. Pichette Volk: Rob asked what is it you want to get out of it. My sense is the outline that was pre-
278 sented tells us what we would potentially get out of it.
279

280 R. Duhaime: We have zoning and planning regulations. If you did the total build out the way it is now
281 how many units could we support? It is all zoned. Unless you change things there are only so many
282 units that can be built in this town. The whole idea is if you maximize it or change it. Can you change
283 it? Yes you can. That is the whole point. What do you really want? Do you want it the way it is? Why
284 would we need to do this assessment? If you want to change it then we are going change it. That is the
285 whole point of doing it. We need to tell everybody they should have a house and live in Hooksett.
286

287 D. Boutin: Mr. Chairman, call the question please.
288

289 **Roll Call**

290 **D. Boutin: Yes**

291 **D. Winterton: Yes**

292 **M. Somers: Yes**

293 **C. Stelmach: Yes**

294 **M. Reed: Yes**

295 **D. Pichette Volk: Yes**

296 **T. Walsh: No**
297

298 **Motion carries with a vote of 6-1.**
299

300 T. Walsh: In fairness to this planning board, we have been looked at lately as being anti-apartment.
301 This conversation makes it look the same way. It is not true. There are a lot of us that feel like we have
302 a wide variety of housing and we do. There are apartments all over the place. Maybe not as much for
303 some people, but we have them. We have also been the largest growing community in Merrimack
304 County over the last 10 years. Be careful what you wish for. We could double our population within 10
305 years.
306

307 **PLAN REVISIONS/AMENDMENTS**
308

309 **2. STEPHEN MAYER, ALLEN & MAJOR ASSOCIATES**

310 **Domino's Plaza NHDOT Driveway Permit**

311 **1562 Hooksett Road**

312 **Tax Map 13 Lot 45**
313

314 S. Mayer (licensed professional engineer in the State of NH): I am representing Allen & Major Associ-
315 ates. I am the land surveyor and engineer on the project and here to present the changes to the project,
316 compared to last year, that came up as part of the DOT review. We have had several rounds of review
317 with DOT. We have had to remove the northerly driveway from the site. They are requiring a paved
318 shoulder as a deceleration area. There is also a 10' wide maintenance area on the outside of the paved
319 area. On the northern driveway side they were going to require an easement across the abutters land.

320 The abutter was not willing to grant that easement. Ultimately, we had to remove the northerly drive-
321 way, and the southerly driveway has been converted into a standard entrance and exit. We kicked this
322 back to DOT. They have reviewed it and said this is an acceptable solution. We expect to hear back in
323 the next few weeks with any final comment before we get their approval. The town highway depart-
324 ment has reviewed they change. They requested the entrance lane be made 20' wide. The traffic circu-
325 lation shown on the current plan is comparable to the original traffic study. The conclusions of the orig-
326 inal traffic study are still valid and no further analysis is warranted.

327
328 C. Stelmach: With the northern driveway now non-existent, is there is still a problem with the deceler-
329 ation lane or is that distance enough from the northern driveway to the southern driveway.

330
331 S. Mayer: Yes. We are providing the deceleration area. It will begin on our side of the property line.

332
333 C. Stelmach: So there is a deceleration lane there?

334
335 S. Mayer: It is a hardened shoulder. A 10' wide deceleration area.

336
337 D. Boutin: The deceleration area is not on the plan.

338
339 S. Mayer: I can add it darker with a note to make it more clear.

340
341 M. Reed: Will it be designated as a line or a shoulder?

342
343 S. Mayer: It is a hardened paved shoulder.

344
345 D. Boutin: The term deceleration lane says to me there will be a lane in the road so people can deceler-
346 ation to turn into this property. You are saying that is not the case, and it is just going to be a paved
347 shoulder and people will go onto that paved shoulder at their own risk because it is not an actual lane.
348 Is that correct?

349
350 S. Mayer: Yes. That is what was requested by DOT.

351
352 D. Boutin: They requested there not be a lane? Just a paved shoulder?

353
354 S. Mayer: Correct.

355
356 D. Boutin: That does not sound like much of a deceleration lane. I would find that unacceptable.

357
358 R. Duhaime: You were hear for the first presentation right?

359
360 S. Mayer: Yes.

361
362 R. Duhaime: Do you remember my comments? I was surprised the State of NH would give you two
363 entrances with no improvements to DW Highway. Do you remember that comment?

364
365 S. Mayer: I don't.

366

367 R. Duhaime: If you go back in the minutes, or maybe the recording, that was one of my comments.
368 Now, of course, that you don't have that other entrance I'll expect trees along the roadway in front of
369 the property and the sign to have proper landscaping. I did not see anything in the plan. I am sure Nich-
370 olas made that comment to you. Right Nicholas, now that there is more frontage with less pavement we
371 will have to add more landscaping to the front of this property. We are still going ahead with the 30'
372 sign?

373
374 S. Mayer: Yes.

375
376 T. Walsh: Did you say that you have not gotten the final comments from DOT?

377
378 S. Mayer: Correct.

379
380 T. Walsh: What action are we taking tonight?

381
382 N. Williams: Per town legal, we need an action from the board to determine if you think it is appropri-
383 ate to reopen the public hearing, based on the changes that have been made, the plans have been signed,
384 and permits have not been issued.

385
386 R. Duhaime: I would get another crack at it.

387
388 D. Boutin: I would not support a motion to reopen a public hearing. This plan reflects a response to the
389 DOT review. We have already done our review. It doesn't seem fair and reasonable to open it up to an-
390 other public hearing.

391
392 R. Duhaime: If there are too many changes to the site plan after the driveway has been changed, and
393 this board chooses to review it because they think there will be a substantial amount of changes once
394 the DOT gives their final approval (he thinks he has it but he doesn't), then the board can consider if
395 they want to bring it back and do a full review with a public hearing. Is that correct? The whole plan set
396 Nicholas?

397
398 N. Williams: If we were going to open it back for public hearing the full plan set would need to be
399 made available.

400
401 R. Duhaime: This will change now that we are changing the permitting process. Do they have a permit
402 for their water, a permit for their sewer, and a DOT permit so in the future this won't happen. Will it
403 Nicholas?

404
405 N. Williams: We are requiring those stamped plans for the utilities. The DOT permit is typically more
406 difficult to obtain, due to the wait time, before we get it out to the public for the public hearing. DOT is
407 involved with the technical review of the plans.

408
409 D. Winterton: With this change, has anybody evaluated that your original proposal might have been
410 safer than what is proposed now?

411
412 S. Mayer: We reached out to the traffic engineer and this plan is comparable to the original plan that
413 was submitted to the planning board.

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
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460

D. Boutin: I agree with Mr. Duhaime’s point of not requiring a public hearing at this time, but wait to see what the changes are. If it is significant and affect the interior of the site then we can have a new public hearing. Otherwise, I don’t think there would be a need for one, but I don’t think we should vote on that tonight.

T. Walsh: I agree. I don’t believe we need a public hearing just for the driveway change. I do think the board members would like to see a completion, on paper, of the changes now that other driveway is missing.

S. Mayer: I don’t anticipate any other changes to the site layout coming from DOT. What we have shown on the plan is well vetted. We can add the line-work to make it more clear with the pavement markings.

T. Walsh: What about the updated landscaping?

S. Mayer: We can provide the updated landscaping plan.

D. Boutin: On the plan, the red lines, how is that affecting the parking spaces?

S. Mayer: The original plan showed 62 and this one shows 65.

M. Reed: For Starbucks we required islands between parking spaces with landscaping.

R. Duhaime: They did not have the percentage of interior plantings.

T. Walsh: Because you don’t have your DOT approvals yet, is a couple of weeks going to hurt you timing wise? It would give you time to update the plans working with Nicholas administratively to make sure the wishes of the board on on paper. That would include the landscaping changes and delineation of the deceleration lane. If it is okay with the board, is it okay with Nicholas to take care of it administratively?

C. Stelmach: Coming out of the parking lot there are two arrows. Are there two designated lanes coming out onto Rt. 3 south from the parking lot?

S. Mayer: To exit the site there is a left hand turn lane and a right hand turn lane.

D. Boutin motioned to have the applicant supply the town planner with a revised site plan showing the deceleration lane clearly delineated, and the landscaping plan for Stephen Mayer, Allen & Major Associates, Domino’s Plaza, NHDOT Driveway Permit, 1562 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 13 Lot 45, and a hearing will be scheduled for the March 7, 2022 planning board meeting assuming the applicant submits the updated data. Seconded by M. Stewart. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

BOARD DISCUSSION

3. TIF DISTRICT PLAN AMENDMENTS

461
462 N. Williams updated the board on the TIF District Plan Amendments. Discussion ensued. The next
463 hearing will be March 23, 2022.

464
465 **4. MASTER PLAN DRAFT REVIEW – HOUSING CHAPTER**

466
467 Postponed until the March 7, 2022 meeting.

468
469 **OTHER BUSINESS**

470
471 **5. CIP COMMITTEE**

472
473 M. Reed and S. Gilbert volunteered to serve as members of the CIP committee.

474
475 **6. SOUTHERN NEW HAMPSHIRE PLANNING COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVE**

476
477 R. Duhaime and D. Winterton volunteered to be the planning board representatives of the SNHPC.

478
479 **7. NHDOT ROUTE 3 WIDENING PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL SESSION**

480
481 A public informational session regarding the NHDOT Route 3 widening will held on February 22,
482 2022 at 6:00 pm in Town Hall Chambers.

483
484 **BUSINESS OCCUPANCY/TOWN DEVELOPMENT UPDATE**

485
486 Nothing to report.

487
488 D. Ross (56 Sherwood Drive): I find the board directing the town council to spend taxpayer money for
489 outside interest to be troubling. The town council has not been approached by anyone saying we need a
490 study. I haven't heard anything about a need from the townspeople who leave here asking for this. You
491 are going to direct the to spend money at the behest of an outside interest. Why would you want to en-
492 courage them to spend money on things that have not been directly asked for by the townspeople. This
493 study by SNHPC doesn't benefit anyone in town. Their interests are statewide or regional, not about
494 Hooksett. I find that to be troubling. I wish you would reconsider it. There was no mention of that be-
495 ing an actionable item tonight. I find that irregular. Where is the impetus to say that we have to spend
496 money and do a study on if we have enough housing here. I think the people that live in this town
497 should be the impetus of anything that happens. The only behest I see on this housing issue is from out-
498 side interests. I live in Hooksett and have no interest in growing Hooksett. Our job is to maintain
499 Hooksett. Keep it Hooksett. Growth will come whether you want it or not. There is housing being built
500 all over the place in Hooksett. We have a lot of approved developments, apartments, condos, and single
501 family homes that are still waiting to be completed. I don't understand. I wish someone would make a
502 motion to reconsider.

503
504 **ADJOURNMENT**

505
506 *D. Boutin motioned to adjourn at 7:12 pm. Seconded by D. Winterton . **Motion carried***
507 **unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

508

509 **The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board will be held March 7, 2022 at 6:00**
510 **pm.**

511

512 **Respectfully submitted by,**

513

514 **/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

515

516 **AnnMarie Scott**

517 **Recording Clerk**