

Official
As of 03/09/09

HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, February 23, 2009

Chairman J. Gryval: 7:00pm - we do not have a quorum at this time. The Planning Board members in attendance (Chairman J. Gryval, D. Marshall, M. Sorel, and Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy) will have a discussion only with the Harmony Place applicant on their sight distance.

DISCUSSION

Harmony Place – Sight Distance

Jenn McCourt, McCourt Engineering: Sonny is not here tonight due to a heart attack and surgery. I have been having 5-minute conversations with him as he recovers. His recovery is a slow process. During that time period, I received Dan's comments for the sight distance. We have our DOT 400 ft. requirement. The Town's requirement of 533 ft of sight distance is looking Southerly. Distributed sight line plan. The DOT is eye height, the orange is the AASHTO recommended eye height, below in green is the 2 ft. clear, and the big black line is the current grading (I say this loosely because this is before the sidewalks). I took a cross section of D.W. Highway and continued 4:1 for the ditch to make more sight distance; 3:1 slope. The high point on the road, 533ft, is just over the crest of the road. As you come up, you get better and better sight view as you come this way. Everyone keeps saying that I am redesigning D.W. Highway, but I am not.

J. Gryval: You can comply with the State's sight distance?

D. Tatem: The first DOT permit was 5 yrs ago. There are notes that Keach-Nordstrom checked it. This is the first sight plan distance, right?

J. McCourt: No, there was a sight distance done earlier.

D. Tatem: We wanted the State to be aware.

J. McCourt: Rich at the DOT has all of this information.

J. Gryval: What is the difference between the State and the Town sight distance?

J. McCourt: Town is 533 ft (14 ½ ft), and the State is 400 ft.

J. Gryval: The State regulations are 133 ft shorter than the Town's regulations.

D. Tatem: The 533 ft, can you get this distance if you grade from your site? Push back the grading for an extended 3:1.

J. McCourt: 3:1, only if the State agrees to it. I couldn't get the State to OK the clearance. The worst case is 9 inches (3 ½ ft). The State uses 3 ¾ ft.

J. Gryval: Any questions from the Board?

M. Sorel: Can the applicant comply with our Town regulations?

J. Gryval: No.

J. McCourt: I sent this information to Rich at the DOT. One suggestion from Dan is to have a pork chop shaped raised island. Rich said they would be against that, and most people will want to take left hand turns. This would cause a more dangerous situation.

D. Hemeon: I am not a fan of islands. It is a pain to plow around them.

J. Gryval: You will need all the sight distance around that curb.

J. McCourt: It is a reconstruction of Rte 3.

M. Sorel: Richard Marshall was on the Board when this was approved originally for this site (Northview condos). Was the curb cut obtained at that time? Have our regulations changed since then?

J. McCourt: We got final approvals on Northview Condos and he could have built it if financing was available.

D. Marshall: What is the traffic layout?

J. McCourt: A left and right hand turn from the site onto Rte 3, and a left hand turn pocket southbound on Rte 3 to access the site.

D. Marshall: Did you change the acceleration lane?

J. Gryval: I would like to see all the distance we can get.

D. Tatem: I recommend, if Jen can show a plan with grading, without reconstructing all of Rte 3, and then let the Board look at that plan.

J. McCourt: I would only have a 1 ft clearance, and not the required 2 ft clearance. The State may let me platform it, but I don't know.

J. Gryval: Get some definite figures where you are and then come back to present them to the Board.

J. McCourt: Distributed inside parking layout. There are 21 ft center-to-center columns. What happens when you put a 2 ft column in, right at the beginning of the space (the entrance), it narrows to 9'6" then it widens to 10'6" as you go farther back. The problem is spacing of these columns.

J. Gryval: You are one foot short. How does the Board feel about this?

J. McCourt: Actually, we are 6" short. Your requirement is 10', and at the narrowest point it is 9'6".

J. Gryval: Does anyone on the Board have a problem with that?

Board: No problems.

D. Tatem: Jen, submit a waiver for that.

CALLED TO ORDER

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 7:25pm

ATTENDANCE

Chairman J. Gryval, M. Sorel, D. Marshall, Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy, and D. Hemeon (arrived at 7:25pm).

Excused: Interim Town Administrator, C. Granfield, B. Ehlers, and D. Dreffs.

Absent: Vice-Chair J. McHugh, R. Guay, R. Duhaime, and Y. Nahikian

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy, and Stantec Engineer, Dan Tatem, representing the Town of Hooksett.

2009 PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS

ARTICLE 2

Amendment No. 1

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 1, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to renumber Articles 29-35 and add a new Article 29 as follows: To create a new Article 29 Small Wind Energy Systems? *The purpose of this amendment is to regulate small scale wind turbines as defined in a new 2008 State law by limiting the height of such systems to 120 feet, to require them to be setback from property lines and abutting structures and to meet certain noise and shadow requirements.*

The complete text of this amendment is on file for public viewing at the Town Clerk's Office and on the Town's Website.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 1 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: Last year a house bill was approved to regulate wind turbines. If we don't have something in our regulations, someone could ask for 190 ft wind turbine. This gives the height requirement of 120 ft. This allows someone to go through the Building Inspector vs. the Planning Board for a wind turbine. There is still an abutter notification requirement. This notification would be completed by the Building Department and you can provide your comments to them. This amendment will allow us to regulate wind turbines. Right now, we have no regulation.

D. Marshall: The application for wind turbine only goes to the Building Dept. vs. the Planning Board?

J. Duffy: Yes.

Open Public Hearing

Christina Persson, 32 Coaker Ave.: What is the functional difference between 190 ft vs. 120 ft?

J. Duffy: We were told the wind turbines would not work lower than 120 ft.

David Ross: What about the distance and the property line setbacks? It just says to meet what the current regulations allow in Town.

J. Duffy: For an occupied building, it is a 1.5 setback.

David Ross: I have a problem with that, because of antennas, etc.

J. Duffy: I am sorry, it the height of the building. If you have a public road it is 1.5, and private roads are 1.1

D. Tatem: It states the system height.

Close Public Hearing

*D. Marshall motioned to send Amendment No. 1 to the voters. Seconded by N. VanScoy.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Amendment No. 2

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 2, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend the entire text of Article 26, Non-Conforming Uses, Lots and Structures?

The complete text of the amendment is on file for public viewing at the Town Clerk's Office and on the Town's Website.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 2 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: There was a lot of confusion a few years ago on this, and part of the ordinance was rewritten. The ordinance should have addressed non-conforming uses, structures and lots. We had a discussion with Bart, our Town Attorney, and asked he rewrite Article 26. Now it is much clearer to break out the information.

N. VanScoy: If this amendment is unclear, the voters will vote "no".

D. Marshall: We post the full text at the voting location. This has all been done out in the open via a workshop, and a public hearing. Who is going to sit in a booth and read all this?

N. VanScoy: Maybe add another sentence or two?

D. Marshall: I am sure you can put text in, but you cannot add anything in to sway the voter. Add something worded for a purpose.

D. Hemeon: Frontage Jo Ann? Let's say someone had a lot at one time and they lost because the Town took some of their land?

J. Duffy: The frontage is not normally what is considered non-conforming. For the use of the lot of record, frontage is defined by the ordinance. Then you go to the definition section of the ordinance (refer to Article 22 Definitions – Frontage for details). It really doesn't go by the linear feet of the frontage. If a lot has 50 ft and it is supposed to have 100 ft, there is no such thing as it being non-conforming.

D. Marshall: Are you saying non-conforming is based on the area and not the frontage?

J. Duffy: Right. However, this Town has sometimes considered the frontage for non-conforming.

D. Marshall: We cannot approve a lot without appropriate frontage.

J. Duffy: You may create a lot that doesn't conform, but it is not a non-conforming lot.

M. Sorel: Referred to the full text of this amendment section B.1. It states a "Lot of Record" means a lot described by metes and bounds in a deed. Some of these properties are very old and don't have metes and bounds.

J. Duffy: This is the language we currently have, and we are not changing it.

M. Sorel: You may have a description as "the stone wall to a birch tree" as the metes and bounds survey. Does that mean lots without meets and bounds descriptions are non-conforming? Do they have to go for a variance?

J. Duffy: A lot of record is any lot recorded at the registry of deeds.

M. Sorel: Metes and bounds descriptions is not a stone wall. Do we want to continue with this or add other language?

D. Tatem: Mike, as far as metes and bounds, are you sure it is a barring?

M. Sorel: Some descriptions say "from Mr. Jones' property until it meets Mr. Smith's property". Do we have a glossary to define metes and bounds?

J. Duffy: Per Wikipedia, **Metes and bounds** is a system or method of describing land, "real" property (in contrast to personal property) . . . Typically the system uses physical features of the local geography, along with directions and distances, to define and describe the boundaries of a parcel of land. The boundaries are described in a running prose style, working around the parcel of the land in sequence, from a point of beginning, returning back to the same point. It may include references to other adjoining parcels of land (and their owners), and it, in turn, could also be referred to in later surveys . . .

J. Gryval: A lot of descriptions are a stone wall to the end. We have gone along with this in the past. Whether we have to change this, I don't know.

D. Marshall: If it is recorded, it is a "Lot of Record".

M. Sorel: We could add language.

J. Duffy: This language has been in here for years, and there have been no problems. Bart wrote this ordinance.

J. Gryval: Could we just add, "lot on record".

N. VanScoy: That is already there.

Open Public Hearing

David Ross: It seems like there is insecurity about this. Is this going to force someone to merge two lots that currently are two separate lots?

J. Gryval: We have always operated that way.

J. Duffy: A non-conforming vacant lot (Refer to Article 22 B.3 for details) language changed in 2004. Prior to 2004 it was the same requirement, just worded differently.

Close Public Hearing

D. Marshall motioned to send Amendment No. 2 to the voters. Seconded by M. Sorel. Vote unanimously in favor.

Amendment No. 3

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 3, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 10-A, US Route 3 Corridor Performance Zone by eliminating Map 41, lots 67, 68, 69, and Map 45, lots 1, 87, 88, 97, 98, 99, 100, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 142, and by adding Map 41, lots 67, 68, 69, and Map 45, lots 1, 87, 88, 97, 98, 99, 100, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 142, to Article 5-A, Urban Density Residential District?

The purpose of this amendment is to change the zoning of certain parcels located on Coaker Avenue and Francis Avenue from US Route 3 Corridor Performance Zone to Urban Density Residential District.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 3 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: Prior to 2007, the Rte. 3 corridor was zoned commercial. In 2007, now Rte. 3 is zoned as the Performance Zone (PZ). The line on the zoning map has some existing commercial, some a little bit over (2 blocks), and the remainder is in the Urban Residential District (UR). The lots in the 2 blocks are residential. This area is under a revitalization. Younger families are moving in who want to add onto their homes. Unfortunately, the PZ doesn't allow residential homes. No variances are allowed in the PZ. We thought we would move the line over 2 blocks on the zoning map to add those residential homes into the UR. Those people could then add a bedroom or other addition. They would still need to meet setbacks, and they could go to the ZBA for a variance. When the line was initially drawn, it was the thought that someone would purchase a few parcels and build a business (commercial). However, there is no access from Rte. 3 to these lots. You would have to access these lots from the neighborhood.

J. Gryval: Any questions from the Board?

M. Sorel: The 90 ft of frontage, where did this come from?

J. Duffy: We are not looking at frontage for this amendment. We are only looking at the zoning. In the 2007 UR, Charles looked at the older neighborhoods in Town to include the Beauchesne Development and several other neighborhoods in Town. Most of these

neighborhoods were built before zoning was established. Medium Density Residential (MDR) was zoned for these, however now the MDR parcel requirements have increased. Due to repetitive requests to the ZBA, he suggested these areas get zoned UDR.

J. Gryval: Most lots in these older neighborhoods are residences anyway.

Open Public Hearing

J. Gryval: There will be no motion this evening on this amendment. We may have more input from the map and lot owners who will be affected by this amendment, but could not make it to tonight's meeting. This amendment will be continued to March 9, 2009.

Eric Muehlmann, 32 Coaker Ave.: Is it possible to characterize the residents who could not be here tonight?

J. Duffy: We had some individuals stop in the office or call today on this amendment. One of their questions/concerns was the UDR section describing Home Occupation – farm products. Some thought farms would be allowed, but that is not what that means. It means if someone grown a garden and wants to sell their vegetables on their lot. Someone else questioned why do we have this amendment? The UDR zone will allow a residential homeowner to add onto their homes. In the PZ, residential are not allowed, therefore you could not have additions. Also another question was does the UDR zone affect their taxes? Taxes will not be affected; they go by the use not the zone.

James Molony, 18 Coaker Ave.: This is a good change for the neighborhood. When I moved in 5 years ago, I always thought it was strange that my section of Coaker Ave. was commercial zoned. If they flatten houses and put in a giant retaining wall for a commercial business, that did not make sense. For that section of Coaker Ave., UDR would fit better with the neighborhood. I like this change. My neighbor Dennis Griffin was confused it was going to be the opposite (now UDR changing to PZ). He is quite happy to find out it will remain residential – UDR.

Pauline Evarts, Map 45, Lot 127: I own land in this area. Does this include all the land?

J. Duffy: It affects the easterly side of Francis Ave.

Pauline Evarts: So, the westerly side will remain in the PZ.

Joe Gassek, 21 Francis Ave.: On that same question, why don't they include the yellow lots?

J. Duffy: A lot of those lots abut D.W. Highway. They are right in the PZ. I believe there are a few businesses (i.e. auto body, brace shop, Crown Trophy). The way the lots are, there are some small lots and then there are some behind them along Francis Ave. It would be tough to take two lots here and two lots there.

Joe Gassek: Lot 90, which is further down, could become a strip mall.

D. Marshall: You would have to combine a lot of lots to have a strip mall. They are currently in the PZ.

J. Duffy: There is no access to Rte. 3.

D. Marshall: The only access is by Francis Ave. No Town roads are allowed next to a ramp.

James Molony: If Francis Ave. was turned into a commercial building, it could not be a business with high traffic like a strip mall.

D. Marshall: Not unless they (developer for the strip mall) are willing to reconstruct Francis Ave. for that kind of traffic volume. They (developer) would have to take from their property. It would not be a sound investment. The lots closer to Alice would provide access vs. those far lots. Again, not likely to be a wise investment for commercial developer.

NO MOTION THIS EVENING. Continued to March 9, 2009.

Amendment No. 4

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 4, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 29, Impact Fee Ordinance, Section F.8. to change the first sentence to read: "The total impact fee, as calculated from the applicable fee schedule, is to be assessed to the applicant if a new development is created on vacant land or on land wherein there has been a structure and/or use that has been vacated for a period of one (1) year or more?"

The purpose of this amendment is to reference the applicable fee schedule, rather than the current fee schedule.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 4 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: It speaks for itself. The ordinance states the current fee schedule. If you had a plan approved during a time of the old fee schedule, then the wording should say "applicable fee schedule."

J. Gryval: Any questions from the Board?

Board: No comments.

Open Public Hearing

No comments.

Close Public Hearing

D. Marshall motioned to send Amendment No. 4 to the voters. Seconded by N. VanScoy.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Amendment No. 5

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 5, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 18, Wetland Conservation Overlay District, Section C.2.8., and Section G., which will change the prime wetland buffer from seventy-five feet (75') to one-hundred feet (100')?

The purpose of this amendment is to change the prime wetland buffer from 75' to 100' to be consistent with RSA 482-A:11.

The complete text of this amendment is on file for public viewing at the Town Clerk's Office and on the Town's Website.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 5 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: The State just changed their rules recently.

M. Sorel: Are these changes to their rules or the RSA?

J. Duffy: The RSA.

Open Public Hearing

David Ross: This is a good amendment.

D. Hemeon: Is the Conservation Commission OK with this?

David Ross: Yes.

Close Public Hearing

D. Marshall motioned to send Amendment No. 5 to the voters. Seconded by N. VanScoy.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Amendment No. 6

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 6, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 18, Wetland Conservation Overlay District, by adding Section G.5. Compensatory Mitigation Fee?

This purpose of this amendment is to require projects that have encroachment within a wetland setback or impacts to wetlands to pay a mitigation fee to the Hooksett

Conservation Commission, which would be used for the acquisition of or protection of wetlands or for other conservation purposes.

The complete text of this amendment is on file for public viewing at the Town Clerk's Office and on the Town's Website.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 6 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: Currently the State has a program that if you have an impact to a wetland, instead of paying a mitigation fee to the Town, you can pay a State fee. This ordinance is for any wetland impact greater than 10,000 sq ft. If the State is requiring this payment, then the Town would not collect. This way, we could recoup funds to create new wetlands. The mitigation fee is set-aside in a separate conservation fund.

J. Gryval: Or the money would go to the State, and we would not see any of it. Example, the Walmart fee went to the State vs. the Town.

J. Duffy: Or we may not get any funds at all. The State has a formula (per sq ft of impact). We are supposed to use the same calculator.

D. Hemeon: They have a fee in addition to the land to give to the Town?

J. Duffy: If they are up to the point they need to pay the state (10,000 sq ft), we don't get anything. If it is 1,000 – 9,999 sq ft, the fee goes to the Town.

D. Tatem: The developer can give the land OR pay the fee.

M. Sorel: I need an explanation of this amendment. The acquisition of wetlands, where do these funds go?

J. Gryval: Do the funds go to the Town?

J. Duffy: Referred to section 5.E – the fee goes into a separate conservation fund not the general fund.

D. Hemeon: Is the Conservation Commission fund capped at \$100,000?

M. Sorel: The Current Use was capped, then last year it was changed to unlimited.

Eric Muehlmann: So, does the text of the amendment say what the funds will be used for? And does it say the fund go to the Conservation Commission?

M. Sorel: Let me read, Mr. Chairman, the full text of this amendment. Read the full text of Amendment No. 6 into the record.

Eric Muehlmann: And that is within Hooksett?

David Ross: Jo Ann, do you have their (Conservation Commission) record, if this was a unanimous recommendation. We already have this language.

J. Duffy: The program you are referring to is the State program. This amendment is for wetlands impacts of 1,000 to 9,999 sq ft. None of what already exists will go away.

J. Gryval: The last time we asked the question, the money went to the State. The State money did not necessarily go to Hooksett.

Eric Muehlmann: Does that give the developer more incentive to buy an area of more wetlands to total 10,000 sq ft +?

J. Duffy: No, because they would still need to pay an entity.

M. Sorel: It keeps the Town in the mix up to 10,000 sq ft of wetland impacts.

Close Public Hearing

D. Marshall motioned to send Amendment No. 6 to the voters. Seconded by M. Sorel.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Amendment No. 7

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 7, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to add a new Article 16-A Workforce Housing, adopted as an Innovative Land Use Control under RSA 674:21? *The purpose of this amendment is intended to make the Town compliant with a new State law that requires all municipalities to provide for reasonable and realistic opportunities for the development of Workforce Housing in their zoning ordinances. Failure to adopt an amendment may allow for developers to have their projects approved through the court system anywhere in town with little or no public input and without approval of the Planning Board.*

The complete text of the amendment is on file for public viewing at the Town Clerk's Office and on the Town's Website.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 7 into the record. This is something we are going to have to live with. I don't know if this will keep changing up in Concord. It is a pretty extensive bill. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: There was a bill proposed last year, which passed, to have towns provide something in their ordinance for workforce housing effective July 1, 2009. There is another bill to extend the effective date to July 1, 2010. There is another bill to have the

effective date of January 1, 2010. I won't know until the first week in March how this is voted on. It is under the Innovative Land Use Board. Nothing has been decided for a certain size lot, frontage, etc. We decided not to get in too much detail, not knowing how it will be voted. We do need to have something in our ordinance, or a developer could challenge us. This would be a quick hearing through the Court system, if we are challenged (it would be an expedited hearing). This is all new to every town. Some towns have take the stance to sit back and wait to see what happens. A few towns have specific articles. You do have to allow it in 51% of the residential land area. For multi-family, 3 units or more, this legislation calls for multi-family to be 5 units or more. Legislation would be allowed in LDR, MDR, and HDR districts. They would not need sewer and water. If they are within 1,000 ft from utilities, then they have to hook in. The developer has to provide the Town with how they will make it affordable housing (i.e. architectural costs, construction financing, etc.), so that the Town can determine if the housing is truly affordable. There are deed restrictions so that these units will remain affordable. We have an effective date of July 1, 2009, or another date if passed by the State Legislature.

J. Gryval: So we don't have much of a choice with this legislation.

J. Duffy: Not unless you want to get sued.

D. Marshall: Every town is going to be required to do something at some point in time. We are not sure what the legislature will do, except to require workforce housing. Will the developer think this is affordable housing? Can the developers build affordable housing? I have been in planning for four decades. Sustainable housing, workforce housing, it's all the same. We skirted the issue about providing housing for those types of workers. It has been great economically to have Manchester and the cities provide the housing. The cities are now saying the other communities need to provide their full share of workforce housing. We are at least agreeable to provide a base for workforce housing. If this passes legislation, we may need to come back in a couple of years to comply.

M. Sorel: If we do not have an amendment for this legislation, we will be exposed. We are not the only state. NJ, MD, NY and other states in the Northeast region must comply. Workforce housing is here and we cannot change it. We only come around in May each year with the voters. The Board has discussed this issue.

D. Hemeon: I don't like it. There are too many holes.

J. Gryval: That is why it is still in committee.

M. Sorel: My opinion is to keep workforce housing in multi-family units.

J. Duffy: The Economic Development Committee (EDC) a few months ago, met with the president of SNHU. Most people think workforce housing is for workers in retail. The SNHU professors cannot find housing. SNHU is having difficulty finding staff. Workforce housing really affects everyone, not just those you think it would.

Open Public Hearing

David Ross: I don't see any regulation here. Maybe I am missing something. There are no restrictions. The requirements are the same for non-workforce housing. Every year, there are a lot of amendments to the zoning ordinances. Here is one that is not doing anything. Personally, I think this may be used as a tool against us. Do something more constructive and planned out. This doesn't accomplish much of anything.

J. Gryval: Complete construction to the minimum wage.

David Ross: But we don't have any say in the State decision.

M. Sorel: If the Town does not comply with the RSA, we are exposed.

D. Marshall: Referred to the most recent change distributed this evening for Amendment No. 7 full text. There are other requirements for workforce housing, that we do not require for other developers. That is our key. The developer has to show, finally, that he will produce a unit affordable to the medium income (based on a State or Federal tabulation).

David Ross: That is what I read on the website. Again, this may be used against us.

D. Marshall: Innovative Land Use Control is the much broader section under the RSA.

David Ross: The spirit of the law is that workforce housing is reasonably accessible for the builder.

D. Marshall: The purpose is so the community has affordable housing. Now we can require workforce housing.

D. Tatem: The Town must have something to address the State RSA. The RSA says we have to allow it, but with this amendment we are stating where in the Town. This gives the developer the right to do workforce housing developments in Hooksett. This amendment restricts where the developments can be completed.

M. Sorel: There needs to be a provision on how it will be maintained in perpetuity. The Legislature has done something, and we are not alone to comply with it.

Paulina Edwards: Is this also for Low Density Residential (LDR)?

Eric Muehlmann: Do you have any power or control over the aesthetics?

D. Marshall: It says in section D.2. of the full text "Architectural compatibility of all units", so yes we do have controls.

Eric Muehlmann: How do you assure they get built to blend in with the neighborhood?

J. Duffy: It is part of the Planning Board process. You can come to a public meeting.

NO MOTION THIS EVENING. Continued to March 9, 2009.

Amendment No. 8

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 8, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 25, Section G., Permit Time Limits to read: Any work, for which a permit has been issued by the Code Enforcement Officer, must be actively pursued within six (6) months and must be completed within eighteen (18) months of the issuance of the permit. At least 30 days prior to the expiration of the permit, the applicant may apply for an extension for not more than twelve (12) months. The extension may not be approved, if the exterior of the building is not fully completed or safety issues exist?

The purpose of this amendment is to include a time limitation for completion of work.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 8 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: We have a changed the wording in the amendment paragraph above from “be actively pursued” to “commence”.

Open Public Hearing

David Ross: There will be a 2nd hearing on this right?

D. Marshall: Yes. If there is a comment now, we would like to hear it?

David Ross: What is the enforceability of this? How do you force someone to do something when they can't do it?

D. Marshall: You can revoke their permit.

J. Gryval: Their permit can be revoked, until they can find a buyer.

David Ross: The purpose is to see that these things do get finished. When it comes to the exterior and how it affects the neighbors, can we enforce with a bond?

M. Sorel: Are you aware right now it is almost impossible to get a bond? Right now, Mr. Chairman, you put up your own money for your site. This was proposed by the CEO, so that the Town would benefit. There are no checks and balances in the system now. He (CEO) felt projects are ongoing for years, and there is no ability to get them done.

David Ross: This method will land us in court.

D. Hemeon: We need to get a clearer explanation from Peter what his issues are.

M. Sorel: A foundation has been poured, and it is sitting there over a year with no further construction. If you have structure, you can have a good process. Right now, we don't have structure in this area.

David Scarpetti: Can't you ask for financials from the site owner/developer, before you start something like that?

J. Gryval: Things go up every day.

David Scarpetti: They have the money.

J. Gryval: It is not in our regulations now.

D. Hemeon: What about someone who wants to build a barn?

J. Gryval: Discuss with Peter what he is thinking.

N. VanScoy: I see this as two issues, 1) giving a permit and work not getting started in a long time, and 2) issues not being completed in a timely manner. What power is he (CEO) trying to put in his hands?

J. Duffy: Do you want Peter to come to the next meeting?

J. Gryval: Yes, so he can reply to our questions.

NO MOTION THIS EVENING. Continued to March 9, 2009.

Amendment No. 9

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 9, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 22, Definitions, to add three new definitions: Accessory Use, Workforce housing/owner occupied and Workforce housing/renter occupied?

The purpose of this amendment is to add a new definition named Accessory Use to the Zoning Ordinance and replace the existing Affordable Unit with a new definition for Workforce Housing to coincide with the new Workforce Housing Ordinance definition, per State Statute.

The complete text of this amendment is on file for public viewing at the Town Clerk's Office and on the Town's Website.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 9 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: We currently do not have multiple definitions for accessory use. We only have accessory building defined. I think Peter asked for this amendment as well. We need definitions for Accessory Use, Workforce housing/owner occupied and Workforce housing/renter occupied.

J. Gryval: I think this came about, because someone asked if a wind turbine was an accessory use.

J. Duffy: Workforce housing comes from new changes. We don't have a new definition for workforce housing. Affordable unit was adopted last year as part of the Phil Hare definition. We are replacing that definition and adding these two.

J. Gryval: The Text seems pretty clear. As for the State percentages for medium income, we don't have any choice on that.

M. Sorel: This came right out of the RSA. It is defined by State law.

J. Gryval: Any questions from the Board?

Open Public Hearing

No comments.

Close Public Hearing

D. Marshall motioned to send Amendment No. 9 to the voters. Seconded by M. Sorel.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Amendment No. 10

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 10, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend all references to the Buffer Zone and require a Buffer Zone where any commercial or industrial use abuts a residential use, zone or district?

The purpose of this amendment is to consistently include a 25' vegetated buffer between any commercial and industrial use and any residential use.

The complete text of this amendment is on file for public viewing at the Town Clerk's Office and on the Town's Website.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 10 into the record. This is for one use to another vs. one zone to another. It is for the protection of the residential zone more than anything else. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

J. Duffy: You covered it.

J. Gryval: Any questions from the Board?

D. Hemeon: What happens if they cut the buffer down?

D. Tatem: Per the site plan, they do not meet their approval criteria.

D. Hemeon: Piano Arts and the car place, the guy chopped the buffer down.

M. Sorel: In other states, they require the applicant put the buffer back.

D. Tatem: An approved site plan on record is enforceable. Enforcement has to happen.

J. Duffy: This is not a change to what is required now. Instead of industrial and commercial zones, it is the "use" (i.e. residential). Residential lots are included as abutters.

D. Hemeon: What can we do about it?

J. Duffy: There is a process to follow through code enforcement.

J. Gryval: I think it is a good amendment. We do have people who do what they want to do.

Eric Muehlmann: Is this amendment retroactive?

J. Gryval: It is for future site plans.

Eric Muehlmann: If we currently have a 25 ft buffer with a business, they can do what they want? I don't know if it is classified as a buffer. What if they expand?

D. Marshall: They would have to come before this Board.

Eric Muehlmann: Is it a 25 ft buffer right now?

J. Duffy: Yes.

David Ross: Isn't there already an ordinance for abutting residential properties?

J. Gryval: We are keeping residential zone and adding "USE".

David Ross: The teeth should be in the ordinance. If they violate it, the enforcement should be in the ordinance.

J. Gryval: That would change this entire ordinance.

J. Duffy: There is a section in the ordinance for violations of all the ordinances in RSA 676:17. The CEO should follow through with a cease and desist. I believe there are fines involved as well.

J. Gryval: Coming in, he has to put in a buffer. This is already in the regulations.

David Ross: The Cinemagic project is a perfect point. The buffer there, the building is taller. This defeats the spirit of the concept. The buffer is abutting a residential neighborhood. There should be teeth spelled out in the ordinance.

J. Duffy: The RSA says “. . . any person who violates any provision, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, civil penalty, . . .” There is a process to follow.

David Ross: It doesn't restrict us to enforce that. These ordinances are cheaper to pay the fine, than to comply.

J. Gryval: Change the buffer ordinance, but just not this year.

J. Duffy: You should change the ordinance for the CEO.

J. Gryval: This amendment, we are just changing to “USE”.

N. VanScoy: Then this would be a different amendment.

David Ross: I would like to see this rewritten next year.

D. Tatem: Wouldn't you like to see this go through this year, and then you could update it again next year?

J. Gryval: There are a lot of residential lots in commercial zones.

D. Tatem: CVS, they didn't have to provide a buffer, but they did. This amendment would make them do the buffer.

D. Marshall: Suggestion, this should go to the voters. Then flag this for next year for the overall wording for buffers.

N. VanScoy: And include penalties next year.

Close Public Hearing

*D. Marshall motioned to send Amendment No. 9 to the voters. Seconded by N. VanScoy.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Amendment No. 11

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 11, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 10-A, Table of Performance Zone Sign Standards, amend the size of Identification Sign (Building) for buildings with more than two tenants with multiple floors?

The purpose of this amendment is to address the size of signs when there are multiple tenants in a building.

The complete text of this amendment is on file for public viewing at the Town Clerk's Office and on the Town's Website.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 11 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

D. Tatem: This amendment came about from concerns about signage for a local project on Rte. 3 with a multi-unit building. Signage is as narrow as 20 ft. Math from the road would calculate to have 70 ft signs. They asked us to put in additional notes, that if there is a building with more than 2 tenants, the building signage does not affect the street sign.

D. Hemeon: How big can a street sign be for this?

D. Tatem: Street sign: 2-3 tenants = 50 sq ft per sign face, and 4 tenants or more = 100 sq ft per sign face.

D. Hemeon: What about 10 tenants for the building sign?

D. Tatem: The building sign is limited to 25 sq ft per tenant.

D. Hemeon: Where did we get this information?

D. Tatem: We used an example from Bedford.

M. Sorel: The guy who wrote the Bedford ordinance is from Vermont. Mr. Chairman, my opinion on signs, I am not in favor of this ordinance in the PZ. It is my conviction and my opinion, and I will not support it.

D. Marshall: This Town suffers from sign pollution and it is about time we take control of this. Who can put up the biggest sign? We made a big attempt in the PZ to control the signage. If someone in the PZ wants to change their sign, they have to comply with the PZ ordinance for signage. Years ago (i.e. Merchants Motors signage) there were a lot of regulations against these signs, but they still put in a big sign. Now, Cinemagic, CVS, Ninety-Nine Restaurant have uniformity in their signage. They are all competing the same way.

D. Hemeon: I agree with Mr. Sorel. They spend millions and we give them a 4x6 signage. Besides Merchants, I don't see a big sign on Hooksett Road. This is Bedford's ordinance. I think we should do what is right for Hooksett.

M. Sorel: One of the concerns I have, this Board has not heard a balance of opinion. We did not seek input from the businesses or the EDC. To keep businesses and expand, we need appropriate signage. I have an issue with that. There is no balance of data.

J. Duffy: The Planning Board has granted waivers in the PZ. Most recent are the Sovereign Bank, Ninety-Nine Restaurant, and Cinemagic. When this ordinance was written, we did not see how this would impact a strip mall. We looked at two tenants on the first floor. Then we put language for more than 2 or 3 tenants. The new Hooksett Commons (Landing) building, can you imagine each unit having a 70 ft sign? That would look horrible. This has nothing to do with pole signs or monument sign. It only has to do with building signs.

J. Gryval: Go down the street (main business district) in Salem. I don't think that is what we want in Hooksett.

Open Public Hearing

David Ross: My concern is that we are stepping on toes. It is in the developers' best interest to have a good looking building. It is also their best interest to make a lot of money there. Putting a 25 sq ft sign, if you are driving on Rte. 3 you can't read that size. I think that having this 25 sq ft signage criteria is too small on even the smallest store front; way too small. You will inhibit business from wanting to be here. Signs still come before this Board in the PZ. You have that authority to say if it is a tasteful sign or not.

J. Gryval: They would have a larger sign, if they are further back off the road.

D. Tatem: With this amendment, a 16 sq ft sign would now double to 25 sq ft.

James Molony: I do like some of the most recent signs. Some of the other ones like Merchants can be distracting. I know businesses want to do something for their properties. A 16 sq ft sign, would then become 25 sq ft, then larger as the building is further back from the road. The other thing to comment for the Board is the lumen of the sign (brightness). Example the Mall of NH LED is horrifically distracting. The lighting looks like an emergency vehicle. I can understand the desires of the community to have tasteful signs, and the businesses wanting larger signage farther back. I would like to see language for lumen.

J. Gryval: The sign ordinance does state the type of lighting.

Eric Muehlmann: As a resident, I would second Mr. Molony's comments. We came to Hooksett, not because of the signage. If there is a request for hard data, CVS did move here even though they had the sign requirement. Signage is for visibility, not the size.

There needs to be some sort of size regulation. Are the businesses looking at demographics, or have they not come here because the sign requirement isn't as large as what they would want?

J. Gryval: I think if you drive through the center of Town, they are now attractive. Some older businesses, once they change their sign will look a lot nicer too.

David Ross: Signs on buildings, even CVS has signage on their building. We have heard back that there are some developers who find it hard to do business in Hooksett. A lot of businesses in the Bedford PZ have closed. Maybe it is because of Bedford's signage?

D. Hemeon: If we live in Hooksett, we know the signs are there. If you go to another town, it is not that easy to find the signs. We are satisfying our own ego that we don't want big signs. We need to work with the developers.

J. Gryval: Board, do you want more information, or do we have enough information?

N. VanScoy: The two members that are very vocal on this amendment, what would you need to be in favor of this?

M. Sorel: Signs sell products (i.e. ceramic ash trays, gray socks, etc.). Businesses get customers first by word of mouth, then signage. We have signage on Rte 3. I don't agree we have sign pollution. I don't think they are all tasteful.

J. Gryval: You can't have developers put up any type of sign they want.

M. Sorel: Example of signage: Hooksett Commons, anchors are Sovereign Bank to the north end, Good Will to the south end, a large unit in the middle, and other smaller shops in between. That shop in the middle would only be allowed a 25 sq ft sign. There is no common sense on this.

J. Duffy: That particular building is grandfathered. We have a good video on signage, if the Board would like to view it.

Christina Persson: Just the building sign. Every business can have 2 signs.

Dave Garvey: Quick suggestion, perhaps you can use as ratio or percentage of the building size.

D. Marshall: If we fail to move this forward, this affect the tenants will multi-units. We have the status quoi.

J. Duffy: 69 sq ft for each of those tenants.

James Molony: What is the USA Sub sign size?

J. Duffy: It is under 69 sq ft.

James Molony: The USA Sub sign is way too small.

M. Sorel: The existing sign ordinance allows 2 very large signs by the road. With this amendment, that would no longer be allowed. They would have a monument sign similar to CVS. The building sign would need to be larger.

Eric Muehlmann: I think you started with insufficient data. Do businesses without signage rules under perform vs. signage that has rules? You are making an arbitrary decision.

Close Public Hearing

M. Sorel motioned to send Amendment No. 11 to the voters. Seconded by D. Marshall.

Vote in favor. M. Sorel and D. Hemeon opposed.

Amendment No. 12

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 12, as proposed by the Hooksett Planning Board, for the Hooksett Zoning Ordinance to amend Article 7, Elderly, Older Person and Handicapped Housing, B.1.d) to read: With respect to these requirements, the Zoning Board of Adjustment and the Planning Board shall conduct their respective hearings jointly, in an effort to prevent the imposition of conflicting conditions. To this end, the applicant shall submit applications simultaneously to both boards?

The purpose of this amendment is to require a joint hearing with the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment for applications for Elderly, Older Person and Handicapped Housing in order to better coordinate the process.

J. Gryval: Received and read Article 2 Amendment No. 12 into the record. Jo Ann, could you further explain this amendment?

M. Sorel: That was not my understanding when we had the workshop with the ZBA. They wanted to change “encourage” to “required”. This is not what that says. This is requiring a joint hearing. I thought the ZBA wanted the applicant to come before both Boards informally, before forwarding their application.

J. Duffy: I wanted to say the ZBA is a judicial Board and cannot hold discussion type meetings. They can’t sit and chat with someone, only this Board can do that. That is why I changed to “joint hearing”.

D. Marshall: Why not change to “joint consultation meeting”?

N. VanScoy: The issue is with the wording also, “conduct their respective hearing jointly” as written, would be illegal.

J. Duffy: The statute states the ZBA and Planning Boards are allowed to have joint meetings.

D. Marshall: For joint hearings, the Planning Board has to Chair these meetings.

N. VanScoy: All hearings for elderly, older person and handicapped housing must be joint?

M. Sorel: For the applicant's conceptual, change the wording from "encourage" to "required". The developers can come and just speak with us.

D. Marshall: A developer has a proposal and comes to a joint meeting with the Planning Board and the ZBA to discuss issues. They cannot go simultaneously, because the ZBA cannot do these. Better have a third party mediator. Change the wording to "joint consultation meeting".

M. Sorel: This comes from an applicant who went to the ZBA for a special exception, and 5 days later was on the Planning Board agenda. We don't want a developer to say one thing to the ZBA, and another thing to the Planning Board.

Open Public Hearing

Jim Levesque, ZBA: The applicant came to us for a special exception. We would get information from them, then you people would get to meet with them. We could have a joint meeting. We are allowed to hear testimony jointly, but not deliberate jointly.

J. Duffy: I understand what everyone is trying to do, but by changing "informally". This is before the applicant actually submits to hold a hearing, and before they have time to accept it. The way the special exceptions work: 1st) ZBA hearing, 2nd) ZBA site walk with invites to Planning Board, 3rd) appear before the Planning Board, 4th) Planning Board submits their comments to ZBA, and 5th) ZBA makes their decision. For the Nancy Lane special exception, the applicant was told by the ZBA they needed more information. The applicant was told they didn't provide everything. They were also told to provide whether there was impact to the surrounding properties. I don't think changing the ordinance was the solution to Nancy Lane. I think communication is the solution.

D. Marshall: I agree you need joint communication or a joint session. The question is whether you call it a hearing. That is my only hang up. We are not here to hear all of their questions, and how they were responded to.

J. Duffy: The ZBA does not have the authority to have a rap session with the developer.

D. Marshall: Then the Planning Board will have to Chair it and have the ZBA attend.

M. Sorel: The language is in our ordinance right now. The only wording to change is “encourage” to “required”. Do we communicate to the CEO, or the department who accepts the application?

D. Marshall: Ordinance now say encouraged, this would say required.

M. Sorel: I thought the ZBA just wanted to change two words. I am hearing the ZBA can't have an informal discussion.

D. Marshall: No joint hearing.

J. Gryval: If it is informal, then it is not a hearing.

N. VanScoy: That is what I mean.

Jim Levesque: It needs to be communicated.

D. Marshall: Developer “X” shows what he wants to do, and we look at it. What is the ZBA going to do? They can't do informal meetings. It comes to the Planning Board, and we can comment on what is needed. The ZBA could attend the Planning Board meeting. If it is a joint hearing, all the abutters must be notified. Now you are bringing in all these people, which was not the intent.

Jim Levesque: Encourage the applicant to communicate their interests to the Planning Board and the ZBA.

J. Duffy: When an applicant submits a special exception to the ZBA, you get the application prior to the Planning Board meeting. When the information is verbally relayed to the ZBA, this information is not getting to the Planning Board.

David Scarpetti: Maybe you would want the abutters comments also.

David Ross: Amendment No. 12 is a bad amendment. You have the word “shall” twice where it couldn't be used. Shall indicates a must. It is unattainable.

***N. VanScoy motioned to extend the meeting for 15 minutes to 10:15pm. Seconded by M. Sorel.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Gryval: It should be a joint meeting.

Jim Levesque: The ZBA's point is to have the ZBA and the Planning Board work together.

David Ross: To require it is a mistake. I think the two Boards can work it out.

D. Hemeon: Can we take out the word “hearing”?

Jim Levesque: Have it as “communicate” to both Boards.

J. Duffy: It sounds really simple, but the ZBA does not have the authority to have these informal meetings with the developers. Change to “may conduct” or “will require” “joint meetings” rather than hearings. At least with the hearing, the ZBA has already received the application, and the Board gets a copy.

J. Gryval: Have a Planning Board meeting with the ZBA in attendance.

J. Duffy: Leave it up to the ZBA to decide. If they get an application for elderly, older person and handicapped housing, the ZBA can decide whether they want a joint meeting with the applicant. If the applicant wanted to give his conceptual, how does he do that with the ZBA? The Planning Board has a process for discussions, or the applicant could also appear before the Technical Review Committee (TRC) to get staff comments.

Jim Levesque: How are conceptualls done now?

D. Marshall: Let’s say there is an application for elderly, older person and handicapped housing, he knows he will need to go to the ZBA. Then, the Planning Board states to him that he will need to address “X” issues. Then he can go back to the ZBA, and they can request a joint meeting. They get a memo/letter from the Planning Board to the ZBA on the Planning Board’s comments.

J. Duffy: A ZBA hearing first, then a joint meeting.

D. Marshall: Do we have an understanding with the ZBA to have a joint meeting, or does it have to be in the ordinance?

M. Sorel: If we have good structure, then you have good process.

J. Gryval: We have been having memos going back and forth between the ZBA and Planning Board, and some get lost. Both Boards should hearing the same things.

D. Marshall: How do we get there?

M. Sorel motioned to change language to “may” and remove the last sentence. Seconded by D. Hemeon.

David Ross: You already have “may”, do you need this amendment?

M. Sorel: You need rules.

David Ross: I try to unclutter the ballot whenever I can. You can have a joint meeting whenever you want now.

Vote unanimously in favor.

NO MOTION THIS EVENING. Continued to March 9, 2009.

OTHER

Park Place – Multi-Family Mixed Use in PZ

J. Duffy: Mr. Garvey came a couple of weeks ago for the Park Place site, and said he would give you suggested language. I think he wanted to explain it to you.

Dave Garvey, potential applicant: The last time we met, there was a good reception from the Board. We looked at your zoning. What this accomplishes, is it gets us to the point of multi-family mixed used in the PZ. It would adding #19 to the existing regulations. Right now, the allowed uses goes up to #18. What you have in front of you, under F1 c) should be twenty five not “four”. This gives the ability for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Put the language in the zoning, and address in the CUP.

N. VanScoy motioned to extend meeting 5 minutes to 10:20pm. Seconded by M. Sorel. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Marshall: There is no residential allowed in the PZ. What this does is open an entire issue in the PZ. This isn't project specific, it is all of the PZ you are asking to change. We don't want to give up commercial and industrial lots in the PZ.

M. Sorel: Richard, you can add specific language for maps and lots within the PZ.

D. Marshall: Then you have spot zoning.

J. Gryval: We need the commercial and industrial lots in the PZ.

N. VanScoy: Is there residential there now? Does it fall under existing use?

Dave Garvey: It is occupied currently with 46 residents.

J. Duffy: You couldn't have one structure holding 40 units. HDR is 12 units per acre, and the elderly is 6 units per acre. This would be twice what the HDR would allow.

Dave Garvey: This will be more aesthetically pleasing. The property is not ripe. It will be a better property for the Town. Start with the multi-family for the back half of the lot. Then a buffer, commercial in the front, and residential behind (55+ Jensen's 100+ units). Half way in between will move faster than a market for commercial use. Commercial is a more distant need, multi-family is needed now.

J. Gryval: I disagree, Faulkner's Nursery & Landscaping (commercial) will be across the street.

N. VanScoy: I agree with Mr. Garvey, right now that site is an eye sore. We don't see development, and we see the area getting worse and worse over time. We are not being asked to put this for a public hearing tonight. It would be at the next public hearing as it is written.

N. VanScoy motioned to continue to the March 2, 2009 hearing, if it is legal to do so. Seconded by M. Sorel.

J. Duffy: Can you add this for the 2nd public hearing, if it is not on the 1st public hearing?

***M. Sorel motioned to extend the meeting 10 minutes to 10:30pm. Seconded by D. Marshall.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Hemeon: If we don't change the language, can it go to the 2nd hearing?

J. Gryval: If it is the way it is written?

Tom Toye, potential applicant with Mr. Garvey: The reason we are bringing this before you? Right now we have a property and we think we have a nice solution for improvements to the Town, current residents there, and the property owner. Part of the solution involves multi-family units. There is no framework to discuss this, because it is not allowed in the PZ. Is the Board willing to discuss this in another way?

D. Marshall: You can come to the Board at any time in the future with a plan that has dimensions for a discussion. This may lead to the 2010 zoning changes. We can discuss planning at any time. My suggestion is you don't spend a great deal of money until you have discussions. The next action on this would be in 2010.

***N. VanScoy and J. Gryval in favor. M. Sorel, D. Marshall, and D. Hemeon opposed.
No continuance on this item.***

ADJOURNMENT

***N. VanScoy motioned to adjourn at 10:30pm. Seconded by D. Marshall.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

ADJOURNMENT

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 10:30pm. The next Planning Board Meeting(s), Hooksett Municipal Building, 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH Town Hall Chambers (room 105):

- regular meeting, Monday, March 2, 2009
- 2nd public hearing for zoning amendments, Monday, March 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Fitzpatrick, Planning Coordinator