

**HOOKSETT  
PLANNING BOARD  
Workshop Meeting  
Minutes  
Monday, February 11, 2008  
(Rescheduled from Jan. 14, 2008)  
Hooksett Town Hall**

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Chairman D. Marshall called the meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM

**ATTENDANCE**

Chairman D. Marshall, D. Dreffs, Y. Nahikian, J. McHugh, D. Jodoin, and R. Duhaime  
Excused: J. Gryval, B. Ehlers, and P. Rueppel

**JACK MUNN, SNHPC –PRESENTATION OF GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE  
AND  
CLUSTER ORDINANCE**

Linda Ajello, SNHPC: Several weeks back, we sent copies of the proposed revisions to your Cluster Housing Ordinance. J. Duffy sent comments from the Conservation Commission and the Council. The Conservation Commission's comments were excerpts from other plans that S. Couture thought were interesting concepts. I took the existing ordinance and addressed the areas where in November, the Planning Board identified at a previous workshop as problems. We tried to address all the areas as best we could. As far as the Town Council comments, there was only one item, and that was the elimination of one line, and shall be based on substantial evidence. (Pg J3). I added, to advance the goals stated in the Master Plan an innovated Land Use Map per RSA 674:21.

The Town Council had a comment on section J3, recommending removal of the last sentence "and shall be based on substantial change....."

Also we were provided with comments from an audit by Jeff Taylor. They mentioned whether or not they recommend provisions for affordable housing. I wasn't sure if that was something the Planning Board was interested in doing.

Would you like to include a provision for affordable housing in the Cluster Ordinance?

D. Marshall: How do we assist in getting affordable housing when no one is building affordable housing in this Town. We've gone through this with the income level in this town.

J. Munn: A subcommittee was formed for affordable housing, with Robert Tourney, from Neighborworks.

D. Marshall: Then we are premature in doing it here. If a solid recommendation comes back from that subcommittee, we can amend this later.

J. Munn: Phil Herr's phasing recommendation talks about affordable housing and how not to include it in phasing.

D. Marshall: We should not insert that at this time, but keep in mind, we should do that when we get solid recommendations.

L. Ajello: I added the RSA quote to the first revision and the objectives were expanded to make it clearer.

To preserve the areas of the site with the highest eco value, the buildings should be located on the site where they are most appropriate. You need to preserve historical and archaeological areas, reducing any impact on water resources and the creation of impervious surfaces. It should minimize the impact on municipality, environment and neighbors.

There weren't any definition for passive and active recreation. These need to be defined. The definition for open space: land related to a conservation subdivision for the enjoyment, which may or may not include accessory structures (storage or purely landscaped)

D. Marshall: If it is to be for recreation, it must be allowed.

D. Tatem: I have seen where "the open space is the open space". It could be forest. You can't put structures on it. There would be a recreation lot, which would be separate and allow structures. That way, the Board can restrict the land. If the homeowners' association takes over that land, what is to restrict the placing of sheds within that buffer?

D. Marshall: If that is the case, it should say, may not contain accessory structures.

D. Tatem: It could say may not contain any structures.

D. Marshall: Which may not contain any structure or improvements for recreational purposes.

L. Ajello: Open space may not be further subdivided. A minimum of 50% shall be contiguous within the development.

D. Tatem: It says 50% of the land must be uplands. You could define it by saying the open space cannot contain steep slopes, wetlands, and exterior property line buffers.

All the revisions will be made by L. Ajello and forwarded to Planning

L. Ajello: Recreation: definitions of passive and active recreation were added. Are there any additional definitions that should be included?

D. Tatem: Who holds the restrictive easement? Certain towns pick organizations to hold the easements. It should be held by someone, even if the homeowner's association owns it, the Conservation or Audubon should hold the deed.

J. Duffy: Sometimes it's Conservation and sometimes it is the Land Trust. That is why Conservation wants a stewardship fund?

D. Tatem: Should the ordinance reference that the open space be accompanied by the appropriate stewardship fund.

J. Munn: It is spelled out in section H. It talks about restrictive covenants.

J. Duffy: The money will come from the developer at time of transference of the deed.

D. Tatem: The Town needs to look over those covenants.

J. Duffy: For example, Durham has drafted a covenant. That is why the Conservation Commission has asked for similar language in this ordinance.

L. Ajello: It said it wasn't an official recommendation, just a comment of Steve Couture.

J. Munn: How much of this land ends up to be ownership of the Town vs. some other land trust or homeowner's association? How much land ends up in the Town control?

D. Tatem: We should talk to the Conservation Commission. In Nottingham, the deeds went to RRCD. All the deeds were the same, because every time a piece of open space came in, they went to that.

J. McHugh: Is that a grant?

D. Tatem: We take a lump sum payment up front. They know what it takes to manage a piece, so the Town can put a lot more trust in them and it is better for the Town. Similar to the Audubon taking the Great Marsh. They know how to take care of that.

J. Duffy: It depends on the size of the acreage.

D. Marshall: Does county conservation do this as well?

J. Duffy: Can the stewardship be stated generically, as long as money is put aside for the fund?

D. Tatem: As long as the Planning Board approves the fee and the company. I don't think we can state a dollar amount per acre. I like making it a Board approval.

J. Munn: The Town of Chester has a very active Conservation Commission. They have spent many bond referendums on open space and had to create stewardship funds. How much will Hooksett get involved in creating open space funds?

D. Marshall: It should be outside organizations.

D. Marshall: The rewrites must be done quickly so it can be posted for the hearing.

J. Duffy: S. Couture wanted a clause for payment in lieu of land. If the land offered by the developer is not desirable, we will take payment that can be used to purchase better land.

D. Tatem: Why not make the developer give better land.

J. Munn: When you collect those funds, how will they be used and who make the decision?

J. Duffy: In the case of Wal-Mart, they took the money for wetlands and used that money for the Clay Pond acquisition.

J. Munn: Be cautious, these are open space subdivisions and if it goes somewhere else, it is not a conservation subdivision.

D. Jodoin: And what is fair market value?

D. Tatem: It has to be developable and reasonable land, and if you find that criteria, you will find an organization to take it.

J. Munn: I suggest you talk with the Conservation Commission and take another look at this next year after this ordinance is strengthened. Get your open space land in that development where it is needed, and if it is not desirable, force the developer to do redesign it.

J. Munn: It is a great concept but hard to implement.  
General requirements Page 2.

1. In the minutes from the November workshop, there was a comment that the Planning Board wanted more flexibility.
2. Conservation subdivisions change in the underlying zone
3. Stayed the same, took out clustering
4. Water and sewer disposal: revised the last sentence

R. Duhaime: Should we include the wording that the septic designs be shown on the lots for Cluster Housing?

D. Tatem: That is in the Development Regulations.

5. There was one question regarding the reduction of the track area to 15% as too low?

D. Tatem: That is good.

J. Duffy: My question was on # 2. Did you want to subtract wetlands and wetland buffers?

D. Tatem: When deciding open space, you take out the undevelopable land. I haven't seen an ordinance that also calls out the buffers.

J. Munn: I haven't seen that. That is something a developer must meet, so why would a developer be penalized twice?

D. Marshall: Leave it.

8. The bedroom limitation: It was also a comment by J. Taylor. Why is the bedroom limitation needed? Why not put a restriction on the FAR if concerned about size?

J. Munn: This was originally here to restrict size.

J. McHugh: I'm not happy with getting rid of the three bedrooms.

D. Tatem: The State requirement is that it meets a four-bedroom minimum. They will look at all lots and make sure they can carry four (4) bedrooms. If you go less than that, you will find more unfinished second floors, which will later get finished without permits. I suggest removing #8 totally, because the State has jurisdiction over that.

9. Home business: I received a comment from [J. Duffy](#) ~~the Conservation Commission~~ regarding the use for day care facilities. The comment is that it would be difficult to enforce. Now, there are no home occupations allowed under clusters, so I think you want it to remain.

J. Duffy: More and more people are working out their homes now. Why would you want to restrict [home occupations](#)?

D. Tatem: There is a difference between working at home and running a business like a salon, etc.

D. Marshall: We have defined home occupations in other zones with employees. You should either allow or not. We shouldn't confuse telecommuting with home occupations.

10. We only changed the name of the ordinance.

11. The minimum lot area is 12000 sf. We had put down the minimum, not less than half of an acre.

D. Tatem: With the perfect soils, the minimum lot size is 13,000 SF per the State. These aren't downtown lots. You have to go less than two (2) acres so you have open space. Ravenwood got a letter from the State because the lots were too big. This is supposed to be a conservation easement; they want to see the most land protected. I would go with a half-acre minimum.

General Design requirement

3. Large change: A min. of 50% (changed from 25%) of the tract area shall be set aside as common land covenanted to be maintained as permanent open space in private, cooperative or public.....

D. Tatem: Do you want to designate a recreation lot. If you have a recreational lot, every lot owns a piece of it. The contractor would have to grade it. The open space has the passive and not the active recreation. This would be a separate lot with it's own deed and address with no conservation restriction.

You would have to take out active recreation and create a separate lot.

Parking areas: That did not change.

#5. Natural features: read into the minutes

F. External and Internal Design Standards  
No changes

G. Requirements Applicable to Internal Design Features in the Case of Free Standing Lots

1. The Minimum lot area was changed to ½ acre minimum.

D. Tatem: The attraction is half-acre lots vs. 2-acre lots in LDR. Many towns require a calculation that you will subtract the 15% and multiply it out by the number of lots, and if you do 1,2, and 3, you can get a bonus.

J. Munn: The Planning Board would need to evaluate whether, in actuality, if adopted, it is used or if we need to add those incentives.

## **Article 19**

### **Groundwater Resource Conservation District**

J. Munn: We tried to make this in par with the State's provisions and include the recently adopted Well Head Protection program to include the Wellhead Protection areas around the Pinnacle Pond. The Town doesn't have a good map of the Groundwater Protection District, so we created one with parcels. It shows if you own a parcel, whether you have part of the aquifer.

The Pinnacle Pond Protection area pointed out on the map, which was developed, which area is the Village Water supply area. The Town's counsel made a comment that at the end of C. it should read, "the Planning Board shall".

## **REVIEW OF PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENT CHANGES**

### **AMENDMENT #1**

Read by D. Marshall: **Are you in favor of Amendment No. 1**, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, by inserting a new Section 6 into Article 10-A I., Performance Zone: 6) Directional signs which do not exceed four square feet (4 s.f.) and bear no advertising or site identifying information are subject to approval of the Planning Board.

*The purpose of this amendment is to allow directional signs in the Performance Zone when shown on a site plan.*

No comment

### **AMENDMENT #2**

Read by D. Marshall: **Are you in favor of Amendment No. 2**, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, Article 7, Section B.3. Density Limitations a), Elderly, Older Person and Handicapped Housing:

The Zoning Board of Adjustment may allow a density of ten (10) dwelling units per acre overall for a single development. Soil conditions, slope, the suitability of the land for such construction, or its location may dictate less than the maximum density; and Article 22, Definitions, Dwelling, Multi-Family by changing the definition to read: An apartment house, condominium, or building containing three or more dwelling units, but in no event more than forty (40). The criteria governing three (3) or more units can be found in the Development Regulations.

*The purpose of this amendment is to reduce the density of Elderly, Older Person and Handicapped Housing from 15 units per acre to 10?? units per acre for a single development, and to restrict any one building to a maximum of 40 units.*

J. Duffy: This just pertains to elderly and handicap housing.

The Board agreed to change the number of units from ten (10) to six (6) and to add a definition to Article 22, restricting the size of all multi-family buildings to a maximum of 24 units.  
~~No comment~~

### **AMENDMENT #3**

Read by D. Marshall: **Are you in favor of Amendment No. 3**, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, Article 7, Section B.4. Parking b), Elderly, Older Person and Handicapped Housing: In addition to these off-street parking requirements, other appropriate provisions of ~~Article 17 of this Ordinance, and others as may be required as a result of the~~ Site Plan Review process shall apply.

*The purpose of this amendment is to remove any reference to Article 17, Parking Requirements, which is no longer included in the Zoning Ordinance, but can be found in the Development Regulations.*

No comment

#### **AMENDMENT #4**

Read by D. Marshall: Are you in favor of Amendment No. 4, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, Article 26, Non-Conforming Uses and Buildings by adding a new Section D. (and renumber remainder sequentially) Non-Conforming Uses and Buildings: A nonconforming building or structure which is destroyed by fire or other hazard may be restored to its former dimensions, provided that it was not destroyed voluntarily and restoration is begun within twelve (12) months after the act of destruction; and by amending, Article 26, by adding Section C. 3. Non-Conforming Uses and Buildings: Any legally non-conforming use or structure may not be extended or enlarged by more than fifty (50) percent of the original gross floor area; and by amending, Article 26, by adding a new Section C.6., Non-Conforming Uses and Buildings,

**6.) All single family lots which conformed to the Zoning Ordinance at the time they were created and approved by the Planning Board, may expand the single family residence, as long as the expansion of the single family residence will conform to all setback requirements, and overlay district requirements, and single family residences are currently permitted in that district. A special exception will not be required. On all other lots, any extension or enlargement ~~of less than fifty (50) percent~~ of the gross floor area of a legally non-conforming use structure shall not occur without the granting of a Special Exception by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.**

*The purpose of this amendment is to further clarify allowable expansions and reconstruction of structures on pre-existing non-conforming lots.*

Bart Mayer ~~provided~~made these changes.

J. Duffy to provide the explanation.

J. Levesque: This is allowing a person to get a permit without going to the zoning board. Because homes don't conform for front setbacks, they need an exception. 20 years ago, a house conformed, now the zoning changed making them not conforming. This means they can put a deck as long as they meet the setback of the side yard.

#### **AMENDMENT #5**

Read by D. Marshall: Are you in favor of Amendment #5, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, Article 22, Definitions, Junk: Means any old metals, old bottles, cotton, woolen or other mill waste, unfinished mill yarns, old paper or rubber products, discarded lumber, more than one (1) ~~or more~~ unregistered/ uninspected vehicles, old iron metal, glass, paper, cordage, or other waste or discarded or secondhand materials, or parts which have been a part, or intended to be a part, of any motor vehicles, discarded machinery, or scrap metal, and any second hand articles the accumulation of which is detrimental or injurious to the neighborhood.

~~Junk shall not include unregistered/uninspected motor vehicles and the parts thereof which are in the process of being restored, or are being used in a restoration project, provided that such vehicles, parts and restoration activities are confined within a fully~~



~~enclosed structure, and provided further, that the vehicles and parts are owned by the resident of the property on which they are legally maintained.~~

*The purpose of this amendment is to restrict more than one (1) unregistered/uninspected vehicles on parcels of land.*

J. Duffy: We had added what is now removed per Bart Mayer's recommendation. See letter provided.

There was discussed whether to include all recreational vehicles in the ordinance. Vehicles are defined as: Anything that requires a registration and inspection.

D. Marshall recommended taking this step first before we expand to boats and recreational vehicles.

#### **AMENDMENT #6**

Read by D. Marshall: **Are you in favor of Amendment #6**, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Change the Zoning of Map 1, lots 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and Map 5, lots 7, 9, 53 and 54 from Industrial to Medium Density Residential.

*These parcels are located on Edgewater Drive.*

No comments

#### **AMENDMENT #7**

Read by D. Marshall: **AMENDMENT #7. Are you in favor of Amendment #7**, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance by inserting the provisions of Article 3, General Provisions, (which is an existing Article), shall apply, when applicable, to the following Districts: Articles listed below.

~~Article 4~~, Low Density Residential; ~~Article 5~~, Medium Density Residential; ~~Article 5A~~, Urban District Residential; ~~Article 6~~, High Density Residential; ~~Article 10~~, Commercial; ~~Article 10-A~~, Performance Zone; ~~Article 11~~, Industrial; ~~Article 12~~, Mixed UD1; ~~Article 13~~, MUD2; ~~Article 14~~, MUD3; ~~Article 15~~, MUD4; ~~Article 16~~, MUD5; Article 18, Wetlands; ~~Article 18-A~~, Prime Wetlands; ~~Article 19~~, Groundwater Conservation District

*The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that all provisions of existing Article 3 of the Zoning Ordinance apply to all zoning districts, when applicable.*

No comment

#### **AMENDMENT #8**

Read by D. Marshall: **Are you in favor of Amendment #8**, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, Article 3, General Provisions, by inserting the following:

I.3. The parking of one (1) travel trailer or manufactured home on a property, wherein the existing single family or two family residence has been damaged by fire or other catastrophic event, may be maintained for a period of six (6) months during the repair of the residence. Said temporary housing shall be secured to the ground by means of hurricane tie-downs, or equal, and must be set on the property in accordance with the

minimum yard setbacks for the zone. A maximum of one (1) extension to the time limit, requested in writing, may be granted by the Code Enforcement Official not to exceed six (6) months. This provision shall not apply to any multi-family or commercial structure. *The purpose of this amendment is to allow a temporary trailer or manufactured home in the residential districts on a temporary nature in the case of fire or a catastrophic event.*

D. Jodoin: Should this be required to conform to all building codes for electrical and sewer?

D. Tatem: This must go through the Building Department and she will do the inspection. This is just allowing it. It is still under the jurisdiction of the building.

All necessary and applicable permits must be issued to conform to Town requirements.

### **AMENDMENT #9**

Read by D. Marshall: **Are you in favor of Amendment #9**, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, regarding percentage of lot coverage by removing this reference from the following districts of the Zoning Ordinance and inserting similar language into the Development Regulations:

Article 4, Low Density Residential; Article 5, Medium Density Residential;

Article 5, Urban Residential District:

D.1. All buildings, and impervious surface, including accessory buildings shall not in the aggregate cover more than thirty (30) percent of the area of the lot.

Article 7, Elderly, Older Person and Handicapped Housing:

*2.(2) (d) Lot coverage – Total building coverage shall not exceed fifty (50) percent of the total lot area.*

D. Tatem: Most of the commercial and industrial says you can pave 90% of your lot. If you're in a particular zone, you're allowed 30%.

See handout:

I took a 40 x 70 house, which is huge, and 100 x 12 foot paved driveway and that fits under all these percentages. I used math behind these percentages.

You would put this restriction into the MUD district and it would be applicable to all zones.

D. Marshall: How do you insert this Article by Article. You will need to insert it.

J. Duffy: You might want to say, in the residential district, any reference to building coverage, impervious surface will be...

D. Tatem: These should be put in separately. One should add the residential. For the Commercial, I went through Auburn, Londonderry and Candia, and now the PZ allows 30%. I looked at towns that allowed 40 or 50%. If you opt to use a joint entrance and not use a curb cut, we give you an additional 10% of pavement.

J. Duffy: If you get into negotiation alternatives for industrial and commercial design incentives, you may want to put it in the Development Regulations. You can't put negotiations in the Zoning Ordinance.

The way it is now, for instance, you can't have more than 30% and industrial not more than 75%. If you don't meet that, you can get a variance. With this, it is more, if you have frontage, and only want one curb cut it is 60%. That comes into play as you go through the site plan process, so I think this should be in the Development Regulations. Dan Tatem came up with this today, but I don't think it will work.

D. Tatem: If you use porous pavement, you have options in the review design.  
After further discussion, it was decided that the restrictions to impervious surfaces will be removed from the Zoning Ordinance and inserted into the Development Regulations.

**AMENDMENT #10**

**Commercial District:**

D. Not more than seventy-five (75) percent of the area of any lot shall be occupied by buildings and impervious surface.

Discussed earlier in the meeting.

**AMENDMENT #11**

**Industrial District:**

5. No more than seventy-five (75) percent of the area of any lot shall be occupied by buildings, except when authorized as a Special Exception by the Board of Adjustment.

Discussed earlier in the meeting.

**AMENDMENT #12**

**Read by D. Marshall: Mixed Use District 1:**

E. Not more than 75 percent of the area of any lot shall be occupied by buildings, except when authorized as a Special Exception by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

No comments

The articles dealing with impervious coverage will be combined into one amendment

**AMENDMENT #13**

Read by D. Marshall: Amendment #13. Are you in favor of Amendment No. 14, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, to amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, by inserting Article 31, Phasing Requirement, (will have language by Monday)

Phasing ordinance

D. Marshall: This is an alternate to a Growth Management Ordinance.

J. Duffy: Elderly is exempt from this.

M. Sorel: Affordable housing is multi-family, particularly what is being proposed by the Economic Development Committee (EDC). My knowledge is from my son, who works for one of the largest lenders of multi-family units in the United States.

When you have affordable housing and control the assessed structure, you will not get the tax to support the structure.

Y. Nahikian: I think, in my opinion, restricting the CO shouldn't be the solution. You should restrict the building of the structure. They should have to wait to accumulate the number of units; otherwise everyone will build a shell and complete one floor at a time.

M. Sorel: Londonderry's GMO, first part is a phasing ordinance.

D. Jodoin: This is a lot for people to handle.

D. Marshall: This will not be ready either. You need to go back and talk with P. Herr.

J. McHugh: Do you have to wait until the second year for more than 24 units?

J. Duffy: The 40 unit maximum is for elderly and this doesn't apply to elderly. If you build elderly, you don't come under this phasing plan.

J. McHugh: Why is it for elderly?

J. Duffy: Originally, I came to you with two difference scenarios. One was high density, which allows 12 units per acre, and elderly allows 15 per acre. I had said choose between 6 per acre, which gives you a unit of 24 or 10 units, which would give you 40. We can change to 6, which gives you 24 units. I think the 15 units was put in to give an incentive to build the elderly, which at the time was 62 and over. Now it has gone the other way. If you do 6 units per acre, you'd reduce the size of the building.

D. Tatem: The smaller the building, the less likely developers will do elderly, which has less of an impact.

J. McHugh: I agree, but at some point there will not be a budget that will pass this town if we are all elderly.

D. Jodoin: There are also services associated with elderly that you don't see, particularly fire.

M. Sorel: Article 7 is specific to elderly and handicap and [Article 22](#) is specific to designing a multi family housing under definitions.

J. Duffy: Now, we have no restriction on the size of any multi family. That would restrict to 40 units. The phasing doesn't include elderly.

Article #2.

J. Duffy: Changing Article 22 to 24 [units](#) and elderly will be 24 [units](#).

D. Marshall: This is what we believe is livable within the community. We don't have control over the ZBA.

D. Marshall: A non-elderly multi family building can have 40 units if this passes but you can only get 24 permits. How do we get out of that hole? Do we say you can only have no more than 24, which is 6 units per acre? Do you want to restrict elderly to the 24 units as well?

Change article #2 so that it is consistent. Brookview came and got a variance for 60 units.

M. Sorel: Brookview proved their variance and the Code Enforcement agreed. There is now no limit.

D. Marshall: We are proposing this as a Zoning Ordinance; the alternative is to put it in the Development Regulations.

M. Sorel: It is inclusive of Article 22. That is what was passed last May.

D. Tatem: If they come in with a 30 unit building, with a variance, the Development Regulations restrict the design.

M. Sorel: The Budget Committee has been told that the Sewer is going forward with their expansion, and we don't have an ordinance in place to protect the Town. You will see apartment buildings going up. This is what happened to Milford.

J. Levesque: Why don't we put the 12-unit limit back?

M. Sorel: Or at least 24 unit.

D. Marshall: Those design criteria must be modified.

J. Duffy: We will work on the Development Regulations after we complete this.

D. Tatem: The table still stands, and you still have two good columns.

D. Marshall: We need to change amendment #2 and does that make the development phasing good, and the elderly housing is exempt.

M. Sorel: If affordable housing will be done, it will be done under NH Housing Authority and they have a formula that is different, which I believe is 60%.

[New amendments for signs](#)

**AMENDMENT #14.**

[Read by D. Marshall:](#) Are you in favor of Amendment #14, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board? This would amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance by amending Article

20, Signs, to include design requirements for permanent signs and add signage definitions.

*The purpose of this amendment is to include design requirements for permanent signs and add signage definitions.*

**AMENDMENT #15.**

Read by D. Marshall: Are you in favor of Amendment #15, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board? This would amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, by inserting a new Article 20-A, Route 3A Sign Ordinance.

*The purpose of this amendment is to provide separate sign regulations along the Route 3A Corridor from the Manchester City line to the Bow Town line, and from the intersection of Route 3A and Hackett Hill Road up to and including Map 13, lots 62 and 58 along Hackett Hill Road, and from the intersection of Route 3A and Cross Road up to and including Map 17, lots 34 and 37, which are comparable to the US Route 3 Corridor Performance Zone, adopted in May 2007, resulting in less intense signage*

Put all the design criteria for 10A in Article 20. Article 20 has all the design criteria for the performance zone, but do you want us to review the entire article for discrepancies?

The design criteria for PZ will then be in the entire town.

**AMENDMENT #16.**

D. Marshall: Are you in favor of Amendment #16, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board? This would amend the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance, by amending Article 10-A, US Route 3 Corridor Performance Zone, by amending Table of Performance Zone Sign Standards, by inserting, "Identification Sign, Building, "In a building with more than two (2) tenants, with multiple floors, each tenant with a separate public entrance shall be permitted to have one (1) building sign, not to exceed sixteen (16) square feet and each second floor tenant with common access shall be permitted to have one (1) building sign, not to exceed twelve (12) square feet. And by inserting, "Center Identification Sign, Freestanding, "Maximum sign area for four (4) or more tenants one-hundred (100) square feet per sign face, maximum sign height, fifteen (15) feet above grade." And by inserting note #2, "All building mounted sign areas shall be determined by the square footage of the letters and symbols if they are directly mounted to the building. If there is a distinctive border around the sign's lettering and symbols, that border will be restricted to the allowable square footage." And by inserting note #3, "All free-standing sign areas shall be determined by the face of the sign and will not include the base or the side posts supporting the sign face." And by inserting Section 6 into Article 10-A I., Performance Zone: 6) Directional signs which do not exceed four square feet (4 s.f.) and bear no advertising or site identifying information are subject to approval of the Planning Board. And by adding definitions for: Indirect Lighting, Direct Lighting, Internally Lit and Directory Sign.

*The purpose of this amendment is to allow buildings with multiple tenants on multiple floors to have signs, and to allow buildings with four or more tenants to have signs that do not exceed 100 square feet/15 feet high, and allow directional signs in the Performance Zone when shown on a site plan, and add signage definitions*

D. Tatem: This is related to the Sign Standards for multiple floors (see attached sheet). If a floor has it's own access, they can get a sign. Also, if you are on Rte 3, and you have a large shopping mall, you have a maximum for four (4) or more tenants of 100 SF per sign face. Maybe 50 feet isn't quit big enough. You don't need to spell everything out, because you have the ability to waiver.

Notes 2 and 3 were added to know how to measure signs without distinct boarders. That wasn't defined anywhere and now it is.

Public Hearing will begin on March 3 at 6:00 pm followed by the regular business meeting.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

J. Duffy: The printer is redoing The Build Out Study. There was an error made when printing the maps.

### **Edgewater Drive:**

The trees, with regard to the eagles: Fish and Game is supposed to be emailing something and it is being blocked. There is a Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act that says you can't disturb, agitate, bother....a decrease in it's productivity by interfering with breeding, feeding, or living.

D. Marshall: If someone can show evidence of a nest, then I won't vote to cut down the trees.

J. Duffy: We didn't see Eagles when Dan and I went down there, but there is a project in Manchester with the pedestrian bridge where they stopped the project because of the winter migration. They may not be nesting in those trees, but it may be in nearby trees. They could be using those trees to perch on. There needs to be more interaction with Fish and Game.

### **Heads Pond:**

There are concerns with the Heads Pond project. We had a meeting with MS&G last week, and there was a statement made. I asked David Campbell when he was going to get together with the School for the proposed school site. It said, in the agreement, when ~~they~~ you took the wetlands out of prime designation MUD, that at some point there would be a mutually agreeable site for a school. His response was that agreement, is in his view, no longer on the table because the golf course is no longer part of the agreement and he feels this doesn't apply. I disagreed and wanted a legal opinion. He said it was up to the Planning Board. It says, in the MUD district, (read from..for the purpose of this paragraph only the designated use was recreation or schools). He said he was paying impact fees. I think he's saying he paid impact fees for Carriage Hill, Brookridge, and Carriage Manor and because he has paid impact fees, he has done his part; ~~although, he didn't come out and say that~~. If you look at his Master Plan, all he has done is residential. Everything built has had an impact on the schools, and if he hasn't given anything up to this point, all he has left is commercial. I think we need to have a dialogue on this.-and

~~get an opinion from our attorney and can he just pay the impact fees or can he be held to a higher standard.~~

There also needs to be dialogue for the donation of the town common. That was also in the agreement and maybe he will be looking to waive the recreational impact fees.

~~He didn't say this, however, he did say, "read that section of the ordinance and it says I don't have to do anything because I'm paying impact fees". I got the impression he wasn't planning on giving land.~~

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 PM by the Chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan



