

1 **Official**

2

3 **MINUTES**

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

6 **35 Main Street**

7 **Monday, July 17, 2023**

8 **6:00 PM**

9

10 **NON-PUBLIC SESSION NH RSA 91-A:3 II AT 5:00 PM**

11

12 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:18 P.M.**

13

14 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

15

16 **PROOF OF POSTING**

17

18 **NOMINATIONS & APPOINTMENTS**

19

20 *M. Somers nominated C. Stelmach to the position of Chairman of the Planning Board. Seconded by*  
21 *D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.*

22

23 *P. Scarpetti nominated M. Somers to the position of Vice-Chairman of the Planning Board. Se-*  
24 *conded by S. Gilbert. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.*

25

26 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

27

28 **PRESENT:** Chris Stelmach (Chairman), Mike Somers (Vice-Chairman), Sheena Gilbert, Paul  
29 Scarpetti, D. Winterton, and James Sullivan (Town Council Representative)

30

31 **ALTERNATES:** Wayne Russell, Robert Duhaime, David Russell, and Denise Pichette Volk

32

33 **EXCUSED:** None

34

35 **NOT PRESENT:** None

36

37 **STAFF:** Andre Garron (Town Administrator)

38

39 James Sullivan will be abstaining from any discussion, participation, or voting on the Ridgeback Self-  
40 Storage matter as he is an abutter. R. Duhaime will be abstaining from any voting this evening due to  
41 business affiliations with sub-contractors. D. Pichette Volk will be a voting member this evening.

42

43 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES 06/19/2023, 6/28/2023**

44

45 *M. Somers motioned to approve the minutes of the June 19, 2023 Planning Board meeting.*  
46 *Seconded by D. Pichette Volk.*

47 Line 200 and 206: J. Sullivan should be replaced with the developer.

48 Eliminate line 906 as D. Winterton is no longer resigning from the Planning Board.

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

50 *D. Winterton motioned to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2023 site walk. Seconded by D.*  
51 *Pichette Volk. M. Somers abstained as he was not present at the site walk. **Motion carried***  
52 **unanimously with a vote of 6-0.**

53 Ridgeback Self-Storage will move to the first item.

54

55 **CONTINUED FROM 06/19/2023 – BOARD DISCUSSION**

56 **1. ESTATE OF PATRICIA A. MARTINEAU represented by T.F. BERNIER**

57 **18 Hunt Street**

58 **Tax Map 18 Lot 26**

59 **Minor Subdivision & Performance Zone Waiver**

60

61 The public hearing was reopened as there was talk with the abutter that should not have happened.  
62 Granite State Dog Recovery provided a letter that has been read by the Planning Board members and  
63 will be in the record.

64

65 Jerome Flaherty (Granite State Dog Recovery) read into the record.

66

67 C. Stelmach: When you purchased the property in 2020 did you have it surveyed?

68

69 J. Flaherty: No.

70

71 C. Stelmach: You should have done that. You are going by your property line from what the realtor  
72 told you it was?

73

74 J. Flaherty: Yes in addition to the use. They had an ingress and egress around the building that they  
75 used to drive commercial vehicles around and we went with that property line and the one we believe is  
76 probably accurate.

77

78 C. Stelmach: Looking at the picture of the front there seems to be 15 to 20' to the left side of the  
79 house. Then there is a big row of trees. Correct?

80

81 J. Flaherty: Correct. That is where the vehicles were that would drive around the property.

82

83 C. Stelmach: Is that where the stairs are currently?

84

85 J. Flaherty: Yes.

86

87 C. Stelmach: If the stairs are where they used to drive around, how can they be encroaching into the  
88 neighbor's property?

89

90 J. Flaherty: When they came and drew the property line, the property line is inside by several feet.  
91 That is one reason why we object to the current assessment.

92  
93 C. Stelmach: Going by what you thought was the property line that you should have had surveyed?  
94

95 J. Flaherty: As adverse use is clearly documented with a signed affidavit from the prior owner, includ-  
96 ing prior employees, we are in a good position to win that argument.

97  
98 C. Stelmach: Looking at the stairs on the plan there seems to be a landing off the back, then a set of  
99 stairs to another landing, then more stairs to the ground. Was there a way to put a 4x4 landing and a set  
100 of stairs to the ground?

101  
102 J. Flaherty: The Fire Department required this because of the windows on the side on the home. We  
103 subsequently met with the current fire chief and talked with him about alternatives. We have a potential  
104 alternative but that is a civil matter outside of this.

105  
106 C. Stelmach: There is no way you could have went in from the garage or inside of the house?  
107

108 J. Flaherty: There are two commercial air conditioning units he did not want the stairs directly over. It  
109 cost an extra \$10,000 to do it this way. We are not builders and went by what the Fire Department, in-  
110 spector and the commercial builder told us. Subsequently we are talking with them about alternatives  
111 and we may have some with new representation in the Fire Department.

112  
113 C. Stelmach: Mr. Bernier, did you have your lot surveyed?  
114

115 T.F. Bernier (T.F. Bernier, Inc., Surveyor): Yes as well as the property on the other side of the kennel.  
116 This lot was sub-divided in 1914. All of the lots from Rt. 3 up were sub-divided Everybody got exactly  
117 what their deed says from Rt. 3 up. The surveys coming from the north down also go what their deeds  
118 say. This lot was two lots in 1914. When it was sold it was sold as two lots but had a single description.  
119 It was always in common ownership. When the tax maps came out it got drawn as one lot. We are here  
120 to get it sub-divided back to two lots. It is the same size as the other lots in the neighborhood.

121  
122 C. Stelmach: Were you able to find a pin or a stake?  
123

124 T.F. Bernier: Not on this line. Farther down and up we found some. It is cut and dry. The lots are 108'.  
125

126 A. Garron: You mentioned adverse possession. What was that revolving around?  
127

128 J. Flaherty: The current property they are requesting a waiver for we were planning adverse possession  
129 for?

130  
131 A. Garron: That adverse possession relates to what?  
132

133 J. Flaherty: The left side of the house that this area that abuts to. If we win that case I don't know what  
134 that means as far remaining square footage for them to build a home or getting the appropriate set-back.  
135 It seems like moving the property line will congest that area.  
136

137 J. Sullivan: There is a question on whether the property line is the line from the developer or abutter.  
138 Regardless of that is it within the authority of the Planning Board to allow a residence in this PZ?

139  
140 C. Stelmach: Yes, by waiver. Is there general guidance on waivers in the PZ. What would be the re-  
141 quired set-back or buffer between one piece of property or another?

142  
143 R. Duhaime: 25' in the PZ.

144  
145 J. Sullivan: Is everything around GSDR residential?

146  
147 C. Stelmach: Yes. GSDR was residential before they bought it.

148  
149 T.F. Bernier showed what the uses are on the site plan.

150  
151 J. Flaherty: This was a commercial property and there were no residents living there. The properties  
152 that are now being described as residential have become that was from this same applicant getting  
153 waivers on the existing properties.

154  
155 D. Pichette Volk: They became residential recently by waiver. I am struggling with what to do here.  
156 GSDR has worked hard to obey the rules and have done what they have needed to do in the PZ. We  
157 have this current history where we have changed things by waiver to allow residential. It seems the way  
158 to go is to accept the stipulations for the proposed residential development.

159  
160 R. Duhaime: I was on the Planning Board when the PZ went in and it was very mixed use.

161  
162 M. Somers: How far does the PZ go?

163  
164 R. Duhaime: Up to those lots. We were hoping for redevelopment.

165  
166 T.F. Bernier showed the zone boundary that is just north of the proposed lot.

167  
168 J. Flaherty: Further north is a large 55+ development that was also given a waiver. By continuous ap-  
169 proval you are rezoning this area away from its original intent by one waiver at a time.

170  
171 W. Russell: There was discussion about the giving and taking of some land between the property own-  
172 ers. Now you are taking about taking it by adverse use?

173  
174 J. Flaherty: We have an adverse use claim and are also looking at redoing the stairs.

175  
176 W. Russell: If the survey is right, you are going to take the land the stairway is on because you have  
177 been using it for three years?

178  
179 J. Flaherty: It has been in contiguous use for over 20 years.

180  
181 W. Russell: I think it could be like that forever and it would not matter. The property line is deter-  
182 mined by where the line is.

183

184 J. Flaherty: I do not know of adverse possession is based on contiguous use. We asked that R.  
185 Duhaime be removed from the discussion because he has previously represented the applicant in addi-  
186 tion to other relations with the applicant. I prefer he not be weighed into the conversation.  
187

188 W. Russell: If the adjustment to the property line was worked out, would that solve the problem?  
189

190 J. Flaherty: It would solve that one problem, but what is the traffic and sewer going to be like with so  
191 much residential property? It also doesn't solve the high likelihood that the people who buy that home  
192 are immediately going to come after us for noise complaints.  
193

194 W. Russell: That is on the buyer for buying a home next to a pre-existing dog kennel.  
195

196 J. Flaherty: I strongly anticipate being surrounding by residential and being drawn into constant chal-  
197 lenges with noise. Once they purchase that property they don't have recourse against the builder and  
198 only have recourse against us.  
199

200 M. Somers: The conditions in here are not terrible except for a 15' high barrier. That is a really high  
201 fence.  
202

203 J. Flaherty: We are looking for tall evergreens.  
204

205 P. Scarpetti: There is a no cut 20' buffer. They can't do anything in that area. They can build the house  
206 at 25' but I do not see them building at 25'. They technically cannot go in there and touch that land  
207 when it says no cut. That is protecting GSDR. The 20' is a no cut. They can build the house at 25' but  
208 that is only 5' away from the no cut. They are not going to build that close. You cannot dig a cellar hole  
209 without being 5' beyond the cellar hole. I agree on the 25' and the 20'. I agree we should not ask them  
210 to put anything in there because they are going to disturb whatever else is there to put 100' of ever-  
211 greens.  
212

213 J. Flaherty: I suggest you do a site walk. They are stubs. It does not protect the future owner from  
214 noise. We need a visual and auditory buffer.  
215

216 P. Scarpetti: You show a tree line. What is there?  
217

218 T.F. Bernier: Tall pines that we were hoping would be taken down because they are dangerous and  
219 pavement. Everything up to the encroachment has been taken out as a result of the use of the land by  
220 the abutter. The theory was they would stop using that land and it would grow back. Beyond that it is  
221 mixed growth. It is thick beyond there. I think what is there if nobody touches it will be a dense vegeta-  
222 tive buffer. The owner that is buying this property has contacted GSDR twice and sent them a proposal  
223 to purchase the land. We never heard back. The price that he was asking for is a lot cheaper than sur-  
224 veying the property, hiring a lawyer, and going for quiet title and adverse possession.  
225

226 J. Flaherty: We received the notification and were advised by counsel to not respond directly. We in-  
227 cluded the proposal in the letter we shared with the board.  
228

229 T.F. Bernier: Adverse position is not transferable. It is a personal possession. You have to possess the  
230 property contiguously for 20 years and it is costly to pursue that. We also would still need to go

231 through a lot-line adjustment. What we are proposing is a reasonable use. I agree anyone buying that  
232 lot will be buying a lot next to a dog kennel. They will know what they are getting into. I think a 20'  
233 buffer is enough. If the board said 25' we can make that work. The lot is 21,000 sq. ft. The board has  
234 allowed for residential in this zone with 9,000 sq. ft. There is plenty of land. I think we will back in  
235 with a lot-line adjustment. My client has not received any input from GSDR about my client's offer.  
236 Whatever the board feels is an adequate buffer is fine with us there is plenty of room. Planting 15' tall  
237 evergreens on top of each other will not work. They need sun and space to establish themselves.  
238

239 D. Winterton: If there is on-going litigation with the adverse possession claim, I don't know how we  
240 can do anything.

241  
242 T.F. Bernier: There is no litigation currently going on. We have not been served or notified with any-  
243 thing.  
244

245 J. Sullivan: Based on the response and letter 25' minimum would be an agreement. The second item  
246 would be what that buffer would look like. Could there be a compromise? Could the board grant 25'  
247 specify the type of visual barriers?  
248

249 D. Russell: If there isn't good soil and good sun the trees won't grow. Unless the other trees are cut  
250 down it will take forever for them to grow and they may not survive.  
251

252 J. Flaherty: There are giant pines there and there is no obstructed view. It may be costly but you can  
253 buy a 15' evergreen.  
254

255 D. Russell: Unless you take the other trees down and the current acidity nothing will grow in there.  
256

257 J. Flaherty: We are wide open for an appropriate solution to provide a visual and auditory buffer. I care  
258 that the person next to me is not subject to constant dog barking and starts to call us on a constant basis.  
259 The existing vegetation that does not provide that kind of buffer.  
260

261 A. Garron: If going to talk about evergreens I was hoping to get the opinion on their survival rate from  
262 a person that deals with that on a daily basis and an opinion if something else should be looked at.  
263

264 J. Flaherty: I suggested evergreens but am open to other things.  
265

266 M. Somers: Can we ask R. Duhaime for his expertise?  
267

268 R. Duhaime: I have 39 years' experience as a landscaper. The evergreens are limited with the current  
269 root system.  
270

271 J. Flaherty: I'll take a berm with a fence.  
272

273 R. Duhaime: Berms turn into the desert and a swamp. Nothing will grow and it will shed water.  
274

275 J. Flaherty: I think it will hold a fence post.  
276

277 R. Duhaime: You could put a fence on top of the berm.

278  
279  
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

W. Russell: Can you work out something to alleviate the problem of the stairway?

J. Flaherty: I am confident we can work out a solution. If the applicant is hedging the idea that a non-profit with access to litigators does not have access to free legal they are making a grave mistake. However, we are happy to negotiate our way out of this. We just want to do the right thing. We were required to follow the rules of the Fire Department for egress. We did all of the right things yet here we are. We did not get a survey. We are not builders. We just save dog's lives.

M. Somers: It is not our purview to correct the stairway issue. That is private between them. We can deal with the sub-division request and any mitigation we feel is going to be required in order for this to either be approved or not approved.

S. Gilbert: We do not want to strong arm anyone into a decision. I find what GSDR does to be commendable. We appreciate you are in town and want to do what we can for you. This is a very unfortunate situation. You were given bad guidance. We do not want to make this difficult for either applicant. We are trying to help you find a solution.

J. Sullivan: Do we need to wait until they determine a resolution of the lot line? Regardless of where the boundary is we could require a 25' buffer?

P. Scarpetti: We could also propose a 20' no-cut buffer as well.

J. Sullivan: It does not seem like the current buffer will do anything and we do not know what the life of the new trees will be. Can we require trees of a certain height? The new people moving in will know a dog recovery is next door. I would like to see a resolution. What is the next stop.

M. Somers: Andre, today the property line is where it is with a 20' no cut zone and a 25' set-back. What happens if they move the property line a year from now? Now the 20' no-cut line could be 10' smaller. How is the 20' no-cut buffer maintained?

T.F. Bernier: We would have to come back to the board for a lot-line adjustment and address that issue at that time.

J. Flaherty: We would constantly have to defend our rights. The purchaser will know there is a dog shelter next door but how does that protect my rights from the property owner from showing up at my door? It doesn't protect my rights.

P. Scarpetti: A stockade fence would give more of a sound barrier than trying to plant something. What does the property line look like that you established?

T.F. Bernier: Once the pavement and stairs are removed you could put up a stockade fence. That could be done.

P. Scarpetti: As far as the dog kennel, are the dogs are in the back of the building?

J. Flaherty: The kennel is in the back of the building.

325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371

P. Scarpetti: Does it make sense where the encroachment starts, the fence would start and go to the back of the property? If they come to an agreement they have to come back here anyway.

***P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minor subdivision & performance zone waiver for the Estate of Patricia A. Martineau, represented by T.F. Bernier, 18 Hunt Street, Tax Map 18 Lot 26 with the condition that a 6' stockade fence is installed.***

J. Flaherty: That puts us in a more difficult position when negotiating that space.

P. Scarpetti: Respectfully, we gave you the time to negotiate the space before you came back.

J. Flaherty: The approach that the applicant used was neither female friendly nor appropriate to my spouse.

Holly Mokrzecki: The builder came to our shelter, stormed in, and said did you a make a decision yet and threw his car in reverse and said did you make a decision yet. Whoever sent this letter to us is bullying.

P. Scarpetti: This is why I am trying to help you by having the applicant put a fence up.

Susan Piche: If a fence was put in that goes along the property is it before or after the buffer?

P. Scarpetti: On the property line.

S. Piche: There is 25' of buffer and then they can build?

C. Stelmach: Correct.

H. Mokrzecki: How is a solid fence being there going to affect getting animals and people out of that building if we need to?

P. Scarpetti: It would go behind your stairs to the back of your property.

T. F. Bernier showed where the fence would go.

C. Stelmach: That is the most important spot you want the fence because the dogs are in the back.

H. Mokrzecki: The dogs are in the front of the building at night. The entire building is an animal shelter, not a house.

T.F. Bernier: The fence would be from the encroachment down.

S. Piche: We met with Chief Colburn to see if it was an option to change the stairs and he suggested for us to have them go the opposite way alongside the building that enters the backyard which might interfere with where the fence would start.



372 T.F. Bernier: The fence would be within our property line within the buffer zone.

373

374 W. Russell: If the property line does not change, the fence is on their property line, and you could  
375 modify the stairway to turn the other way and be on your land.

376

377 A. Garron: The assumption is that whatever takes place is being done on the property owners' prop-  
378 erty.

379

380 D. Winterton: It sounds to me like we are mediating some sort of agreement. No one respects what you  
381 do more than I do. If we put this off for two weeks and you had a chance to talk as professionally and  
382 honorably as you are now, could you come back in two weeks and tell us what you want?

383

384 T.F. Bernier: I don't think anything will happen because there are lawyers involved now. There are  
385 time constraints. I think JR got worried he was running out of time as he was trying to get you the in-  
386 formation in time. We meet zoning. This is a civil matter and this is putting a lot of pressure on both  
387 parties. If they do a lot-line adjustment it still meets zoning. These were pretty much all residential. I  
388 think 20'/25' is appropriate. If you put in commercial it will need a parking lot and there will not be  
389 any trees left. I believe this is an adequate transition.

390

391 A. Garron: The board could grant the waiver to allow residential. This is the PZ. The PZ was orga-  
392 nized with flexibility based on what the market is going to do within this area. The market has deter-  
393 mined the front part of this area will be commercial but as you go back the flexibility is given to the  
394 town to be consistent with the area. There is a kennel to the front and to the rear is residential. Is it un-  
395 characteristic to allow another residential zone and a lot to be created? In this case you could argue no.  
396 Whoever buys that property will know there is a dog kennel. It does not prevent anybody from calling  
397 but our response has to be it was a pre-existing use and therefore they are allowed to be there. There is  
398 nothing we can do to change that. This is an allowable use if you grant the waiver and it is an allowable  
399 use by ordinance. This is not a ZBA issue. It is a Planning Board issue within the zone.

400

401 J. Flaherty: It hasn't been approved yet so it does not meet the zone requirement. If you want to go  
402 with the two weeks we can go back with a good faith estimate outside of the board's purview and come  
403 back with something agreeable otherwise you are pitting us against one another which we do not want  
404 to do.

405

406 C. Stelmach: Do you feel the property line is where it is. Would you like to get a surveyor for your-  
407 self?

408

409 J. Flaherty: We have been looking into getting one, but the problem is the time. The next booking is  
410 three months out and I don't want to hold them up for three months. We just want to set ourselves up  
411 for success in the future.

412

413 ***J. Sullivan motioned to continue the minor subdivision & performance zone waiver for the Estate of***  
414 ***Patricia A. Martineau, represented by T.F. Bernier, 18 Hunt Street, Tax Map 18 Lot 26 to the Au-***  
415 ***gust 7, 2023 meeting with the hope that a motion will be made for final resolution.***

416

417 R. Duhaime: He is a licensed civil engineer for the State of NH. If he provides false lines he can lose  
418 his license. This board could revoke him and not allow him to do work in this town again. He wants to  
419 keep his license.

420  
421 S. Piche: We have done our research. We would like you to allow us to do our due diligence ourselves.  
422

423 P. Scarpetti: My opinion is to put your efforts toward the lot-line adjustment.  
424

425 J. Flaherty: We are looking for a good faith negotiation that does not involve hardship on either party.  
426

427 Close public hearing.  
428

429 *J. Sullivan motioned to grant a minor subdivision and performance zone waiver for a residential lot*  
430 *within the current PZ with the conditions that a 25' side yard building set-back with a 20' no cut*  
431 *buffer within the setback line is maintained, and a 6' stockade fence is installed from the area of en-*  
432 *croachment to the southern boundary line as indicated in Map 18, Lot 26 for the for the Estate of*  
433 *Patricia A. Martineau, represented by T.F. Bernier, 18 Hunt Street, Tax Map 18 Lot 26. Seconded*  
434 *by D. Pichette Volk. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*  
435

436 *M. Somers found the plan compete for the minor subdivision and performance zone waiver for the*  
437 *Estate of Patricia A. Martineau, represented by T.F. Bernier, 18 Hunt Street, Tax Map 18 Lot 26.*  
438 *Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*  
439

440 **2. RIDGEBACK SELF STORAGE, LLC represented by THE DUBAY GROUP**  
441 **1461 Hooksett Road**  
442 **Tax Map 18 Lot 49-D**  
443 **Amended Commercial Site Plan**  
444

445 J. Sullivan abstained as he is an abutter. R. Duhaime will be abstaining due to any work affiliation.  
446

447 C. Stelmach: The public hearing has been closed. We will open this up for board discussion.  
448

449 M. Somers: I have some concerns about this application. I think there is information that we are lack-  
450 ing.  
451

452 *M. Somers motioned that under PZ regulations 10(a)(i) Sections 2 and 5 regarding the noise and*  
453 *odor (nuisance ordinances) we require an independent study of those two issues as we do not have*  
454 *enough information to make an accurate determination. Seconded by D. Winterton with the request*  
455 *to add having the independent investigation be chosen by the Town Administrator with no more than*  
456 *three names of which will be brought to the table by the applicant. Addition accepted by M. Somers.*  
457 *Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.*  
458

459 A. Garron: The independent reviews will study the effects of the noise generated by the site and the  
460 emissions from the site.  
461

462 P. Scarpetti: I would like to have an independent study done to evaluate the values to the abutting  
463 properties.

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  
508  
509  
510

M. Somers: There is an ordinance regarding the odor and fumes. We need that information before we can move forward. We can request a real estate assessment but that can get subjective.

***P. Scarpetti motioned to have an independent study of what the valuation of abutting real estate might become with the proposed use. Seconded by D. Winterton.***

D. Pichette Volk: I will not support that due it being subjective.

**Roll Call**

***D. Winterton - Yes***

***P. Scarpetti - Yes***

***M. Somers - No***

***S. Gilbert - No***

***D. Pichette Volk - No***

***C. Stelmach - No***

**Motion fails with a vote of 4-2.**

Discussion ensued regarding the time of the application being received.

***M. Somers motioned to continue the amended commercial site plan for Ridgeback Self Storage, LLC represented by The Dubai Group, 1461 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 18 Lot 49-D until the August 7, 2023 Planning Board meeting and have the town attorney consulted about what the proper procedure should be. Seconded by D. Pichette Volk. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

- 3. PRAMUHK REALTY, LLC represented by GREENMAN-PEDERSEN, INC. (GPI)  
1663 Hooksett Road  
Map 14 Lot 1-9  
Commercial Site Plan**

***P. Scarpetti motioned to reopen the public hearing for the commercial site plan for Pramuhk Realty, LLC represented by Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. (GPI), 1663 Hooksett Road, Map 14 Lot 1-9. Seconded by M. Somers. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

Discussion ensued regarding the process for water and sewer approvals.

The public hearing was reopened for the purpose of a traffic study and new information being added.

David Jordan (Greenman-Pedersen Inc.) handed out recently updated plans and a response letter.

D. Jordan: Hooksett Village Water Precinct has reviewed the plan. Conceptually they have agreed to how we are connected to the water supply. We are on the Sewer Commission's agenda for tomorrow. After that we can get the DES permit signed and submitted to the state. We did a traffic study that was submitted to DOT. We do not have any concerns in the Rt. 3 right-of-way. The concern is on Campus Drive. We have frontage on Hooksett Road so DOT wants to review the site plan to determine if there

511 is any impact to their operations within Rt. 3. The DOT process is long and slow. The application with  
512 the report was submitted at the beginning of June. It could be one or two months before they perform  
513 an initial review. We have provided updated plans showing snow storage areas, two EV charging sta-  
514 tions, and revisions that have come out of our discussions with wastewater and the Hooksett Village  
515 Water Precinct. Regarding building design and discussion of historical or brick facade, the owner and  
516 project architect would like to proceed with the plan as submitted and has provided a written response  
517 to the architectural design. We have complied with the spirit and design of commercial requirement. A  
518 free standing sign has been added to the plan set. See letter to Dana Pendergast, Code Enforcement Of-  
519 ficer, dated July 11, 2023 regarding compliance with Hooksett Commercial Design Standards from  
520 James Owens AIA, NCARB HFA-AE, Ltd.

521  
522 R. Duhaime: We want to break up this site. You have the canopy in front with lighting. If you put the  
523 pumps to the side and rear we might enjoy it more. The plans are not showing a site line elevation for  
524 the height of the building or the height of the canopy. Is there lighting and signage on the canopy?  
525

526 D. Jordan: Yes.

527  
528 R. Duhaime: I would love to enjoy this building but not with the canopy in the front of the building. If  
529 you are going to keep it this way I would like to see more trees to break this up. It is a great building  
530 but I would like to see large improvement to the landscape plan. Is there erosion stone?  
531

532 D. Jordan: There is some there already. We are just extending it a bit farther up the hill.

533  
534 R. Duhaime: Adding rock walls and farm trees would look nice.

535  
536 D. Pichette Volk: If this is not corporate what is it?

537  
538 D. Jordan: It is more of a regional New England brand.

539  
540 D. Pichette Volk: The bottom of the sign says new tenant. What does that mean?

541  
542 D. Jordan: In a convenience store there is usually something else like a Dunkin Donuts or a coffee  
543 shop. That is to be determined.

544  
545 P. Scarpetti: I know this is a challenging site as there is a retaining wall in the back. What are they  
546 planning on using for materials on that wall?

547  
548 D. Jordan: It will be something like a redi rock.

549  
550 P. Scarpetti: Redi rock has different materials and some look better than others. I would like the model  
551 specified on the plan.

552  
553 S. Gilbert: There is significance related to the design. Mt. St. Mary's is significant as it is listed as a  
554 historic site. It is unfortunate you folks don't feel that way but we do. I agree with the plantings.

555  
556 D. Pichette Volk: In terms of a charging station there are various types.

557

558 D. Winterton: Are they going to be a super rapid one? A 240?  
559  
560 D. Jordan: That is TBD. Technology is evolving.  
561  
562 J. Sullivan: Mt. St. Mary's was built in 1906. Bluebird doesn't fit in with that. This meets that. I think  
563 a barn would seem to fit better than a brick building. You tend to see a barn by itself. I like the design. I  
564 concur with more plantings. I think the barn fits more in this area than a brick building.  
565  
566 R. Duhaime: It would be nice to do a monument and tie it in with landscaping. You have to put some  
567 evergreen and tall trees in. You are going to have to screen the charging stations. Would the board ask  
568 for the minimum amount of light in this area. With the proper amount of screening, you might mitigate  
569 the light.  
570  
571 W. Russell: I live at Mt. St. Mary's and can walk out on the roof. This is like I am at the drive in thea-  
572 ter and you are the movie. I have been looking at the Seasons gas station and that place is lit up bright.  
573 This is in my face. Will there be hours of operation?  
574  
575 D. Jordan: I will clarify that.  
576  
577 P. Scarpetti: They have to follow our lighting ordinance. If you look at the elevation changes they  
578 can't move this.  
579  
580 R. Duhaime: Could you do a line of site elevation.  
581  
582 P. Scarpetti: What is that going to help? This can be visualized.  
583  
584 R. Duhaime: I want the rest of the board to see.  
585  
586 C. Stelmach: Could you come up with a simple rendering?  
587  
588 D. Jordan: I would have to speak with the architect.  
589  
590 *J. Sullivan motioned to continue the hearing and discussion for a commercial site plan for Pramuhk*  
591 *Realty, LLC represented by Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. (GPI), 1663 Hooksett Road, Map 14 Lot 1-9 to*  
592 *the August 7, 2023 meeting with a Planning Board request for a landscape plan and clarification on*  
593 *the retaining wall. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*  
594

595 **PUBLIC HEARING**

596  
597 **4. MASTER PLAN**

598  
599 *S. Gilbert motioned to continue the master plan public hearing to the August 7, 2023 Planning*  
600 *Board meeting. Seconded by M. Somers.*  
601  
602 Discussion ensued regarding subdivision frontage and landscape plans.  
603  
604 S. Gilbert suggested have a workshop session for the master plan and withdrew her previous motion.

605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644

*S. Gilbert motioned to discuss the housing portion at the August 7, 2023 Planning Board meeting and hold the public hearing at the August 21, 2023 Planning Board meeting. Seconded by J. Sullivan.*

D. Pichette Volk requested that everyone review the housing section of the master plan and the SNHPC report.

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

**NOTICES**

**5. TOWN OF BOSCAWEN**

**Public Notice – Conditional Use Permit and Major Site Plan**

*P. Scarpetti motioned the public notice regarding a conditional use permit and major site plan from the Town of Boscawen is not relevant to the Town of Hooksett. Seconded by D. Pichette Volk. **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

**6. NHDOT – Driveway Permits**

NH DOT provided notice of driveway permits on Castle Drive and Clough Ave.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*M. Somers motioned to adjourn at 8:55 pm. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

**The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board will be held August 7, 2023 at 6:00 pm.**

**Respectfully submitted by,**

**/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

**AnnMarie Scott  
Recording Clerk**