

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, October 20, 2014**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:02 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Rogers (Chairman), Dick Marshall (Vice-Chairman), P. Scarpetti, T. Prasol, T. Walsh, Frank Kotowski, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES:

EXCUSED: Muamer Durakovic (Alternate), Michael DiBitetto (Alternate)

STAFF: Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Town Planner).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 10/6/14

October 6, 2014 Regular Meeting – *D. Marshall motioned to approve the October 6, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by F. Kotowski. T. Prasol abstained due to not being in attendance at the October 6, 2014 meeting. Motion carried.*

EXTENSION REQUEST

1. MAURAI'S ESTATES SUBDIVISION (Plan #12-22)

49 Mammoth Rd, Map 45, Lot 33

Amended minor 2-lot (parent lot and one new lot) residential subdivision plan, including roadway improvements and Town Right-of-Way. Conditional approval is valid through November 3, 2014. Applicant is requesting a 1 (one) year extension per the following:

- **Extension Request**—Development Regulations (06/04/2012) section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions.

D. MacGuire (The Dubay Group): I was here two weeks ago discussing this two-lot sub-division. We had this approved. It is approximately a 500' length cul-de-sac off of Mammoth Road. There is an existing single family house that was serviced by this private way. This plan set included upgraded plans to make that a town road with right-of-way to gain access to the viable upland to the rear of the property and provide legal frontage for an existing single-family home. Over the last year, Mr. Maurais has been actively marketing this piece along with the potential for development in the rear of the parcel. We have been before the Zoning Board to get some variance relief to allow for certain types of development to the rear. It has all been proposed as single-family homes. We have done some extensive

work at the Zoning Board to get to that point. One of hardships of this property is you have to construct this length of road to be able to get to the back, and there are not a lot of options for development along that because of existing homes. There have been some new developments recently in that the Maurais' were able to acquire the lot to the bottom, Mr. Frasier's old lot. That makes a significant difference to this parcel because it gives additional development opportunity to this two-lot sub-division. That allows this to be marketed in that manner and be potentially more viable to develop this portion of the property and allow them to continue on to the back. They are asking for a one-year extension. They felt the extension would allow them the opportunity to market this knowing they have the additional parcel. They want to make sure, if the Board is open to this, to maintain this conditional approval because that helps with their marketing effort to suggest that this is already approved and be able to bring them on to the next level, which is the rear of the parcel.

Open Public Input

George Porter (40 Castle Drive): When they granted the waivers it was supposed to go to the Planning Board for approval. I never got a notice that there was a Planning Board meeting for the waivers to get approved so now we are going to give them an extension on something that has never been approved?

D. Rogers: This was acted on at least a year ago.

D. MacGuire: This was originally approved in 2012. We were granted a one-year extension and we are asking for one more.

G. Porter: That is on the one house, not on the waivers that were given on the property in the rear?

D. MacGuire: Correct. We haven't gone back before the Board for anything involving the rear of the parcel. That would be a full separate plan and application.

G. Porter: Which included that lot?

D. MacGuire: Which lot are you referring to?

G. Porter: The single family lot that you are talking about now was included in the waivers that you requested a year ago.

D. MacGuire: I am not sure what you are talking about.

G. Porter: As far as I know, it was never approved on the waivers from last November. That is what I got in the letter I received.

D. Rogers: It was originally approved in 2012. There was an extension granted from 2013 until November. They are back to simply extend that one-year extension to make it into another one-year extension.

G. Porter: As long as that is noted that is fine.

D. Rogers: There are no other changes proposed at this moment, but there has been a change in circumstances to the extent they have acquired this other piece of property to the front which may require additional sub-division plans.

G. Porter: I understand that will change so they will have to change their plans.

D. Rogers: As an abutter you would receive notice of that, would be eligible to come to a meeting, and we would have a public hearing, etc.

G. Porter: I noticed there are two addresses, one for 47 and one for 49 Mammoth Road.

D. MacGuire: 49 Mammoth Road is Mr. Maurais property address. 47 has no bearing on what we are talking about tonight. We would have to come back for that.

G. Porter: There are two separate lots on 49 that went in for approval at one point.

D. MacGuire: Not that I am aware of.

B. Maurais: We are the applicant. We have been actively involved in marketing the property for the past two years. I talked with representatives from TD Bank today about financing. Keller Williams has had the MLS listing for one and a half years and we have approached others and some have approached us with developers and builders. My dad resides at 2 Maurais Street, one of the lots at the tip of the cul-de-sac, which has been existing since 1975. He also bought 49 Mammoth Road more than 9 or 10 years ago. A lot of these abutter letters go to that address because he is the property owner. 47 Mammoth Road is what we acquired this past July for the purpose of seeking development in the back portion of that lot. It gave us extra access which has been a sticking point for a lot of developers because there are a lot of up front road costs for the town road, and by securing another house lot now you have two house lots and can spread out the cost of the initial cul-de-sac.

Close public input.

F. Kotowski motioned, based on the recommendation of the Town Planner, to grant a 1 (one) year extension per Development Regulations (06/04/2012) section 10.03, 2), Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions. Seconded by D. Marshall. Motion carried unanimously.

WAIVER REQUEST

2. GARY HARGIS (Plan #14-15)

1330 Hooksett Rd, Map 25, Lot 60

- **Waiver Request** From Other Ordinances (06/12) requirement for site plan for tattoo studio. Ordinance #OO-19, Section 2-1, B.

D. Rogers: Could you please make your presentation regarding your waiver request.

Gary Hargis: I am requested a waiver for 1330 Hooksett Road.

D. Rogers: What is the nature of your request? You are not purchasing the property, correct?

G. Hargis: No I am not.

D. Rogers: You will be a tenant renting?

G. Hargis: Yes.

D. Rogers: Do you have a lease?

G. Hargis: I will.

D. Rogers: Barrett Insurance is the owner of the property?

G. Hargis: That is correct.

D. Rogers: What is the nature of business? What will you be doing, how will you be operating, your hours, etc.

G. Harges: A tattoo studio. The hours will be 3pm -7pm, Monday – Friday and most likely Saturday.

D. Rogers: What do you estimate the traffic will be and the number of clients?

G. Harges: Very minimum. It will be more of an appointment only, not a street shop. The only customers there will be the ones with an existing appointment. There might be some coming to review a portfolio but the street traffic will be minimal.

D. Rogers: Are you aware of the tattoo ordinance the town has?

G. Harges: I am.

D. Rogers: You will be in compliance with that?

G. Harges: Absolutely.

F. Kotowski: The access will be to the rear of the Barrett property with parking in the back, in the lower level?

G. Harges: That is correct.

D. Marshall motioned to grant the waiver request from other ordinances (06/12) requirement for site plan for tattoo studio, Ordinance #OO-19, Section 2-1, B, for 1330 Hooksett Rd, Map 25, Lot 60. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

CHANGE OF USE

C. Cronin: We had one change of use for a hot dog cart at 1558 Hooksett Road, which is the Great Woods Plaza. It has been approved.

BOARD DISCUSSION

F. Kotowski: At the last meeting Mr. Walsh questioned the clothing and shoe depositories. Have we gotten any information on those? Has anyone looked into that?

T. Walsh: JoAnn was going to have Matt look at that.

C. Cronin: I am not sure if he has looked at those yet.

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ Approval of Stantec Invoices

D. Marshall motioned to approve the Stantec invoices. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

➤ Letter of Support for Merrimack Riverfront Project

D. Rogers: We have a request for a letter of support for the Merrimack Riverfront Project. We have a draft letter that Carolyn put together.

C. Cronin: It is nearly identical to the last letter that you approved. It is for the same project. The Conservation Commission is applying for another grant for that same project. This one is through The Department of Revenue and Economic Development.

D. Winterton motioned for approval of submitting the letter to the New Hampshire Bureau of Trails and to have the Chairman sign the letter on behalf of the Planning Board. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

C. Cronin: For those interested in being facilitators or scribes for the Community Profile, there is a training on October 27. It will be held here at 6pm. Food will be provided. I have an update on the Conservation sub-division ordinance and how that needs some work. We are beginning that process. I met with Jack Munn, from Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission on Friday. He sent JoAnn and I some materials to look over. We will get in touch with him and come up with a scope of work for Southern New Hampshire Planning to help us out. Moving forward we will bring it to the Planning Board. I know Tom and Paul were interested in looking at that and we will be recruiting you at some point in that process. Hopefully we will be able to have a workshop with the Conservation Commission and any other Boards that are interested.

D. Rogers: That was the one that has the question on whether to go with staff or have a sub-committee and we went with the staff approach?

C. Cronin: Yes.

T. Walsh: Do you think by the next meeting?

C. Cronin: Possibly.

T. Prasol: Developers of University Heights came before this Board and then they went to the Parks and Recreation Board about turning the area across the street from the apartments into a park. They put their impact fees into a separate fund so they could do that. As the Parks and Recreation Chair, we are working on our five-year plan, and there have been some questions as to if there is a time line for that because, otherwise, we want that impact fee money back to put towards other projects. There is a lot of money on the table there, and we don't want to lose it.

C. Cronin: I can look into that.

ADJOURNMENT

*D. Marshall motioned to adjourn. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 6:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**