

1 **Official**
2
3 **MINUTES**
4 **HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**
5 **HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**
6 **35 Main Street**
7 **Monday, April 1, 2024**
8 **6:00 PM**

9
10 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:03 PM**

11
12 **PROOF OF POSTING**

13
14 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

15
16 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

17
18 **PRESENT:** Chris Stelmach (Chairman), Mike Somers (Vice-Chairman), Robert Duhaime,
19 Sheena Gilbert, David Russel, and James Sullivan (Town Council Representative)

20
21 **ALTERNATES:** Denise Pichette Volk

22
23 **EXCUSED:** Paul Scarpetti

24
25 **NOT PRESENT:**

26
27 **STAFF:** Elizabeth Robidoux (Town Planner) and Andre Garron (Town Administrator)
28 (arrived at 7:10 pm)

29
30 **D. Pichette Volk with be a voting member.**

31
32 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES 03/18/24**

33
34 *M. Somers motioned to approve the minutes of the March 18, 2024 Planning Board meeting.*
35 *Seconded by S. Gilbert. Motion carried with a vote of 7-0.*

36
37 **APPOINTMENTS**

- 38 **1. Richard Fitz – represented by Joseph**
39 **Wichert Map 15, Lot 61, 347 Whitehall Road**
40 **Concept discussion – potential 4 lot subdivision**

41
42 J. Wichert: We were here previously to conceptually talk about this and have made progress. We
43 finalized the boundary survey, had the wetlands delineated, did some test pits, and updated the
44 plan. The next stage would be design work such as wetlands permitting and the design of the
45 common driveway. Those things are subjective to if the Board will look favorably on the appli-
46 cation. Currently there are two lots (Lots 61 and 62 on Tax Map 15). They have almost 30 acres

47 of land with frontage on Whitehall Road and Chester Turnpike. We are looking for a yield of
48 four building lots. This is in LDR with 2 acres and 200' of frontage. I theory that is good density,
49 however, this parcel has challenges. The wetlands are shown. There is a powerline that runs
50 along the northerly lot line adjacent to Whitehall Road. When Mr. Fitz's father bought Lot 62
51 that had a town dump on it. That encompasses the majority of the frontage off of Chester Turn-
52 pike. We are trying to make this work to get the yield of the four lots Mr. Fitz is hoping to get.
53 We have four lots, so even though this is a road front sub-division, it will be considered a major
54 sub-division. We are proposing a three lot shared driveway coming off of Whitehall Road. We
55 are proposing this for two reasons: 1) Whitehall Road is a DOT jurisdiction so they can limit the
56 number of curb cuts and 2) In order to get under the power line, we have to work with Ever-
57 source for a conditional use agreement which they reserve approval until they have the design.
58 The regulations stated that with three lots we would need a waiver from the Planning Board.
59 When we started this one of the concerns was having on site well and septic with the dump. Mr.
60 Fitz has spoken to abutters on the opposite side of Chester Turnpike. They had a water sample
61 from their well that were satisfactory and we have submitted that to the Town Planner. With this
62 layout, with the new wetlands, what we are showing on new Lot 4 the wetlands run along the toe
63 of the slope of the old landfill and goes into the waterworks land. In 2013 we had the wetlands
64 delineated. At that time that area wasn't wetlands and now it is. We would have to go to DES
65 and get a dredge and fill permit to cross the wetlands for the driveway. Your ordinance requires
66 the lot lines be perpendicular for the first 100'. We will struggle to make that so we would need
67 one if not two waivers for the lot configuration. We are hoping to hear if the Board thinks this is
68 viable or if you have concerns and we could look at options.

69
70 J. Sullivan: How would we be able to develop this over a former dump? What is the water qual-
71 ity across the road from Whitehall? Would that require another well testing. I am concerned
72 about the environmental issue.

73
74 J. Wichert showed the area of the old landfill.

75
76 J. Wichert: We are not proposing anything on that. The driveway would be south of there. The
77 intent is to not disturb that. Regarding the water quality and testing, the options are to drill moni-
78 toring wells and have tests done. Lot 4 will have a deed restriction that says it has an old landfill
79 on it. What you want for water is up to you.

80
81 J. Sullivan: On the water quality issue would there be anything the Planning Board would be
82 looking for.

83
84 E. Robidoux: We do not have anything in our regulations. They are trying to keep the building
85 area outside of the former landfill. My concern is the ash. We can look at Brownfields again. My
86 concern would be if they did the drilled well. It is not in our regulations where we require a cer-
87 tain level of water quality, however, in a situation like this it may not be unusual for the Board to
88 ask for the water testing. In other communities where there was even a question about being able
89 to get water the Planning Board was able to put a condition of approval on the plan that said the
90 applicant had to prove that they could get water before they would sign the plan.

91
92 D. Russell: They require a certain amount of gallons per minute to be considered viable.

93

94 R. Duhaime: Lot 4 looks like it is going into the slope of the landfill. I would want that tested.

95

96 J. Wichert showed the location of the proposed houses, wells, and septic systems.

97

98 R. Duhaime: Is there one or two wetland crossings?

99

100 J. Wichert: Where the two culverts are, over the years those pipes have been replaced. DES will
101 ask for proof if they were installed prior to 1967 and we would struggle to do that. If we get this
102 configuration to work we would have to replace that culvert to meet your current requirements.

103

104 R. Duhaime: I like the idea of a separate Lot 4 access in order for those two lots to enter from
105 Chester turnpike and have the other two enter from Whitehall Road.

106

107 J. Wichert: We would look at that.

108

109 R. Duhaime: Could you please show the power line?

110

111 J. Wichert showed the power lines.

112

113 R. Duhaime: What would you think about doing one well for all four houses put as far as possi-
114 ble away from the landfill?

115

116 J. Wichert: We could figure that out. The well radius would go up. A lot of it would go over the
117 wetlands so it would not hurt anything.

118

119 D. Pichette Volk: What would the waivers be when going with the plan as you are describing?

120

121 J. Wichert discussed the possible waivers that would be requested.

122

123 D. Pichette Volk: If the plan stays the way it is, is the nature of those waivers out of line or rou-
124 tine?

125

126 E. Robidoux: In order to grant the waiver for the lot configuration, it has to meet criteria similar
127 to the hardship criteria. If they present a good enough case for that and you agree you could grant
128 it. I have my own reservations about the lot configurations. How large is building envelope for
129 Lot 4?

130

131 J. Wichert: There is the rectangle and the 20,000 sq. ft.

132

133 E. Robidoux: This looks good on paper but we have to look to the future. If these lots are ap-
134 proved and homes are built, how much of a constraint are we placing on the people living there?
135 What if they want a shed and there is no buildable area? There would be no room for someone to
136 live on the lot. I don't think it is undevelopable, I am just not sure about this configuration and
137 number of lots. However, if he does meet the regulations and can sub-divide, he should be able
138 to sub-divide and reap the benefits of that. This is a challenging lot. I would make this meets eve-
139 rything if you grant a waiver.

140

141 M. Somers: Is the spur that comes down off the left side wetlands? Is it undevelopable?

142

143 J. Wichert: It is a standing water swamp.

144

145 C. Stelmach: Would the driveway that goes in through Lot 2 be kept the same as it is on paper
146 now as one loop? I am concerned about emergency vehicles.

147

148 J. Wichert: We may have to work with the fire department to do a turnaround.

149

150 J. Wichert spoke about lot configurations, size, and what could be put on the lots.

151

152 C. Stelmach: What are the requirements for a cistern?

153

154 E. Robidoux: That falls under the purview of the fire department.

155

156 J. Sullivan: I like the idea of a shared well. I think we need clarification on shared wells and the
157 access.

158

159 C. Stelmach: Would there be less constraint if you took out one lot?

160

161 J. Wichert: The configuration would be cleaner. That would drop this to a minor subdivision.

162

163 M. Somers: Is there any ability to move the lot line between two and three?

164

165 J. Wichert: We can look at that.

166

167 R. Duhaime: Could you limit to a two bedroom house or go to a three lot sub-division?

168

169 C. Stelmach: Would there have to be a plan on who would do the snow plowing?

170

171 E. Robidoux: Driveway access and maintenance agreements would have to be attached to the plans
172 and part of the deeds.

173

174 S. Gilbert: I am leaning towards three lots.

175

176 M. Somers: I like idea of a shared well. The proximity of the wells to the landfill is concerning.
177 Maybe Lot 1 could have its own well and the other two could share.

178 **2. United Properties – represented by Cynthia Theri-**

179 **ault Map 25, Lot 70, 1292 Hooksett Road**

180 **Concept discussion – restaurant pad site with drive-through**

181

182 C. Theriault (Wilcox & Barton, Inc.): This is for a proposed standalone Panera Bread at the
183 Shoppes at Hooksett Landing. This proposal would keep the existing access.

184

185 C. Theriault showed an aerial map, development plan, and site plan which includes a drive thru,
186 signage, elevations, floor plan, and parking.

187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222

223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232

J. Sullivan: The key concern would be parking.

D. Russel: Are there any studies for a Panera traffic flow and customers?

S. Gilbert: When it is winter and there is snow all of the spaces next to Walgreens are taken up.

M. Somers: There are times when there is almost no parking now.

S. Gilbert: From a parking perspective I am not sure this is the right location.

R. Duhaime: A lot of spaces are taken up with the drive thru. Is that negotiable?

C. Theriault: I can ask. It takes up about 30 spaces.

E. Robidoux: Panera has as many people using the drive thru as they have going in.

S. Gilbert: I am thinking about people going to the lakes in summer. The line through the drive thru would be very long.

Discussion ensued regarding other pad sites in town. E. Robidoux will provide suggestions of other pad sites to C. Theriault.

Suggestions to reconfigure were given in order to add more parking spaces.

WORKSHOP TO FINALIZE DRAFT MASTER PLAN (continued from March 26, 2024)

The board discussed the verbiage of the master plan chapter by chapter and made updates and modifications to the content and wording.

J. Sullivan motioned to recommend the verbiage of the Master Plan, Chapters 1-10, be moved to a public hearing at the April 15, 2024 Planning Board meeting. Seconded by M. Somers. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

3. TOWN PLANNER UPDATES

Town Owned Property

Discussion ensued on town parcels.

A. Garron: We want to make sure the boards have an opportunity to keep the public property if they find a need. If there is no public need to hold on to a parcel it could be sold.

J. Sullivan motioned to recommend to the Town Council that the Town of Hooksett keep 21 Merrimack Street (Map 9, Lot 45) for river appeal. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

233
234 The Planning Board is providing no comment on 60 Chester Turnpike (Map 15, Lot 57).
235
236 The Planning Board is providing no comment to Chester Turnpike (Map 15, Lots 92 and 96).
237
238 The Planning Board is providing no comment to (Off) Depot Road (Map 29, Lot 32).
239
240 The Planning Board is providing no comment on Bicentennial Drive (Lot 38, Map 33).
241
242 The Planning Board is providing no comment on 7 and 12 Beechwood Avenue (Map 41, Lots 40
243 and 42).
244
245 The Planning Board is providing no comment on Mammoth Road (Map 42, Lots 20 and 23).

246
247 Updates

248
249 E. Robidoux: On April 15, 2024 Hip Peas Farm will be presenting their updated Master Plan.
250 You also will be seeing a plan for 16 fair market rate apartments on the former proposed lot of
251 the bus depot.

252
253 Alternates for the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission and EDAC was discussed.

254
255 **ADJOURNMENT**

256
257 ***S. Gilbert motioned to adjourn at 8:48 pm. Seconded by M. Somers. Motion carried***
258 **unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

259
260 **Respectfully submitted by,**

261
262 **/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

263
264 **AnnMarie Scott**
265 **Recording Clerk**