

**Official
As of 02/14/11**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP MEETING
MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING - CHAMBERS
Monday, January 24, 2011**

CALLED TO ORDER

D. Marshall called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

ATTENDANCE

Planning Board:

Town Administrator, Carol Granfield, Martin Cannata, Dick Marshall, Dale Hemeon, Jack Mudge, Tom Walsh, Frank Kotowski. Town Council Rep. Nancy VanScoy (arrived 6:05pm), and Vice-Chair Robert Duhaime (arrived 6:08pm).

Excused: Chair John Gryval.

Absent: Brendan Perry & Yervant Nahikian.

Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA)

Chair C. Pearson, Michael Simoneau, Don Pare, and Tim Lanphear.

Conservation Commission

No attendees.

Representing the Town of Hooksett

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy, and Code Enforcement Officer, Peter Rowell.

2011 ZONING ARTICLES

1. David Scarpetti, landowner & Jennifer McCourt, McCourt Engineering for property on by-pass 28, Map 35, Lot 7.

J. McCourt: Propose a rezone of back parcel (higher elevation) abutting Autumn Run to MDR. Now the lot has a 25 ft buffer and zoned commercial. We would move the lot line and use the wetland for a buffer (100-200 ft). The MDR is proposed for a future subdivision with one access from Summerfare and the rest will remain commercial. We would have a non-disturbance easement for development of the remaining commercial to maintain this larger buffer. In 2002 we were granted a special exception for the wetland crossings on the commercial site.

D. Scarpetti: Proposed subdivision would be 20 lots (single-family homes - smaller, traditional not as large as Autumn Run) with sewer, natural gas, and prior approval from

Manchester water. The new lots created would have a description in their deed that they are aware the abutting lot is commercial land.

Ivan Doroteev (abutter): 10 yrs ago when I bought my house we were all told this property (map 35, lot 7) was conservation land, but it is commercial.

M. Cannata: What is your (Ivan) feeling about a residential development being proposed instead of commercial abutting you?

Ivan Doroteev: I am happy.

Robert Duhaime: What is the benefit to the Town to have a subdivision (residential) vs. commercial?

J. McCourt: There would be impact fees, property taxes, and the larger buffer adds tranquility and a better transition between zones. Hooksett zoning is by property lines. In talking with abutters, a rezone was a close vote when previously petitioned.

D. Marshall: Zoning change can either be Planning Board recommended OR landowner completes a petition.

M. Cannata: If you do move the line, how do you benefit yourself?

D. Scarpetti: Sell some houses and the land is more taxable.

J. Duffy: This land was before the Planning Board several years ago for a rezone with a similar layout. The Board at that time did not want to go along. It was petitioned and failed on the ballot by 100 votes. At the hearing the room was packed with abutters of Autumn Run and they supported the residential rezone. I have worked with Dave many times to conceptually review this site. I think this is the best use of this land (residential upper and commercial lower).

D. Hemeon: The Board back then was not against the rezone concept; it was a growth ordinance issue.

F. Kotowski: Win-win – Town (lot not just sitting there), Autumn Run (residential abutters), and for landowner to develop his land. I would like to see this Board recommend the zoning change. We should hear from more of the abutters.

Straw poll by Planning Board to recommend rezone of Map 34, Lot 7 (upper MDR and lower Commercial) vs. landowner petition (7:0 in favor):

N. VanScoy – yes

J. Mudge – yes

D. Marshall – abstain

F. Kotowski – yes

Robert Duhaime - yes

M. Cannata – yes

C. Granfield – yes

D. Hemeon – yes

T. Walsh – yes

2. Proposed Zoning Amendments – signage Articles 10-A (Rte 3 PZ corridor – Planning Board administered), 20 (whole town), & 20-A (Rte 3A corridor)

Jo Ann Duffy, Town Planner: Signage comments:

- streamline all 3 articles for similar language and timeframes
- added definition for banners (not allowed but people using them) and political signs to 10-A
- now monitored based on complaints (too many signs and not enough staff)
- portable are up longer than temporary

Peter Rowell, CEO: Signage comments:

- need clear definitions and timeframes (streamers and banners defined portable?)
- if no permit required, then we have no control
- cumbersome to enforce and we don't have staff for this
- special events for temporary, portable, streamers, flags, and banners (30 days at a time, no more than 90 days in a year) – primarily car dealers
- political signs Ok since they fall under State statute

Lee Ann Moynihan, Building Dept. Admin. Asst.: Signage comments:

- permanent signs are OK
- difficult to track temporary, portable, banners, flags, balloons, sandwich boards
- definitions confusing for temporary and portable
- missing section under sections “portable” and “sale and lease of property”
- portable signs – as written it is one for entire plaza, should be more

Robert Duhaime: I think any sign ordinance is difficult to enforce.

C. Granfield: We need signage consistency (portable and temporary signage is the same thing). Staff could use automated post card mailings when banners/streamers expire. Staff needs direction. What does the Planning Board want to see and have the CEO enforce? If not ready with these amendments now, Peter research CEO link to see what is working in other municipalities and he and Jo Ann bring back to Board next year.

N. VanScoy: The two problems are: 1) definitions are not clear, and 2) different timeframes.

D. Marshall: Permanent signage is not a problem. Proposed amendments pgs 133-137 should apply to all three signage articles 10-A, 20, & 20-A? If Building staff is aware of the issues, why haven't they rewritten the proposed signage amendments and brought them to the Board?

Straw poll by Planning Board to have banners, streamers, and flags in articles 10-A, 20, & 20-A (7:2 in favor):

N. VanScoy – yes	M. Cannata – no (irritant to CEO)
J. Mudge – yes	C. Granfield – yes (with restrictions)
D. Marshall – yes	D. Hemeon – yes
T. Walsh – yes	F. Kotowski – yes (timeframe?)
Robert Duhaime - no	

Chris Pearson, ZBA Chair: The more clearly defined you can make the articles, the better it is for us.

M. Cannata: Building staff, can you let us (Board) know when these signage issues occur so we can be aware of them?

Thank you to ZBA & Conservation Commission

Robert Duhaime: I would like to thank the ZBA for participating in tonight's workshop.

OTHER

Rte 3A Access Management Study

J. Duffy: Facilitated discussion on draft Rte 3A Access Management Study:

- Hackett Hill Rd & Rte 3A intersection – Manchester side proposing a truck facility. Part of this proposal is to build Manchester a fire station. Do not know if there are plans for upgrades to this intersection as result of these projects.
- Rte 3A Corridor – realignment of roadways and curb cuts will be done as parcels get developed. If the Board adopts this study, I will give it back to Jack Munn to finalize. The Town and State can have a Memorandum of Understanding that when a developer wants to apply to DOT for a project on Rte 3A, the State would take into consideration the MOU in the permitting.

N. VanScoy: The first time we went through this, the Board had a lot of concern of a traffic circle at Main Street and Rte 3A. I don't think there was anything else they felt strongly about. The long-term planning is to straighten out intersections and driveways.

C. Granfield: Has the Police Dept. looked at this study?

J. Duffy: Rte 3 A is a State road, therefore the Police Dept. doesn't usually comment. They refer me to the State for comments and accident reports.

D. Hemeon: A roundabout is a cheap version of a traffic light, but hard and expensive to maintain.

Straw poll by Planning Board for study sheet #21 for one-way north on Main Street in area of Town Hall: 4:4

Straw poll by Planning Board for study sheet #22 for roundabout at Main St. and Rte 3A in area of Town Hall: 5:3 in favor

***D. Marshall motioned to adopt the Rte 3A Access Management Study with edits from tonight's discussion. Seconded by D. Hemeon.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Charter Change

C. Granfield: The Town Council will hold a public hearing on charter amendments Wednesday, February 2nd. The Charter Committee recommends the Planning Board lose two member seats (Dale and Carol). The Council will still need to appoint a voting member or administrative rep. to the Board.

***N. VanScoy motioned to adjourn at 7:55pm. Seconded by C. Granfield.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair Robert Duhaime declared the meeting adjourned at 7:55pm

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator