

**Unofficial as of
04/12/06**

**HOOKSETT
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
APRIL 11, 2006**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson, Tracy Murphy Roche, called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm

ATTENDANCE

Chairperson, Tracy Murphy Roche, Alan Rozwadowski, Chris Pearson, Dan Belanger, and David Boutin

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

DTR HOOKSETT PROPERTIES

1631 Hooksett Road, Map 14, Lot 32

Variance from Article 22 to permit a 60 dwelling unit where 12 is permitted.

Request for appeal of administrative decision on 2/14/06

Tracy Murphy Roche recused herself.

Alexander Buchannan requested a continuance to May 9th on behalf of the applicant.

D. Boutin motioned that DTR be continued to May 9,2006. Seconded by D. Belanger.

Voted unanimously in the affirmative.

MIACOMET DEVELOPMENT

1794 Hooksett Rd, Map 6, Lot 114

Variance from Article 10, Section A to allow for a 62 and older occupancy restriction to be reduced to 55 and older.

Variance from Article 10, Section A, to permit a housing development for 55 and older in the commercial zone on the back portion of lot 114 where 62 and older has already been permitted on the front portion of the lot.

John Ratigan representing Miacomet requested a continued to next month.

Information was recently submitted and this will give the board the opportunity to review it.

C. Pearson motioned to continue per the applicant's request to May 9th, 2006. Seconded by David Boutin Unanimously in favor

Jackie Noel: Questioned why she wasn't notified and is an abutter.

John Ratigan to review and correct abutters list submitted.

3A DEVELOPMENT

Hooksett Road Map 14, Lot 1-2

Special Exception from Article 18, Section E to allow filling in wetlands for the development of a residential development on lot 1-12 of University Heights.

Karen O'Rourke, Brown Engineering

Representing 3A development as part of University Heights. This lays the groundwork for 204 units. Based on what's been done for sight layout, we ended up with needing to fill some isolated wetlands and a larger wetland. We got the Planning Board's approval and should have a letter. A favorable letter was also submitted from the Conservation Commission. The site walk was completed tonight. We are asking for special exception to fill the wetlands. 3835 feet is the total impact on the wetlands.

T. Murphy-Roche stated that the Planning Board's letter does not say they responded favorably to all aspects of this request.

D. Boutin: What is denoted on the west side of university circle.

K. O'Rourke: That is a private road that will be built.

D. Boutin:

On the site walk, if you look on the west side of university circle, you will see a solid line that represents a conservation easement that is tagged on the property. If you have a conservation easement is there a separate easement already prepared to have a road.

K. O'Rourke: Yes, they will be separate.

D. Boutin:

If I were to vote favorably on this plan, I would state that the easement would have to be highlighted on the plan. If there is any change on that easement, that would effect this approval

K. O'Rourke: There is an easement plan and it was approved in the past few months.

D. Boutin: Why do you show us an incomplete plan. Why doesn't this plan show that easement plan?

K. O'Rourke: This plan is for a specific purpose for wetland approvals and I didn't see it as necessary.

D. Boutin: You use the term conservation easement and then used the term buffer. Which one is it?

K. O'Rourke: It started as a buffer and now is a conservation easement.

T. Murphy-Roche: What is the purpose of the conservation easement?

K. O'Rourke: I think it is due to the filling of wetlands on other sites. We were required to give a buffer in some areas and we gave more. Some commercial sites needed mitigation and therefore the conservation easement was given.

D. Boutin: We're seeing this now at Webster Square.

Projects go down the road and then an abutter shows up and says they promised this or that and then look at the record and not one of the items is in there. How do we defend the abutter's position?

With a project like this, and no record of it, and it goes to court and the plans don't indicate these items. I am uncomfortable voting on a plan that is incomplete.

T. Murphy-Roche: We need to see complete plans.

K. O'Rourke: filling this wetland has nothing to do with this conservation easement or these buffers.

T. Murphy-Roche: These easements were given for a reason and they all play in to the complete plan. I agree with Dave Boutin.

D. Belanger motioned to continue until detail plans are submitted indicating the buffers and easements. Seconded by C. Pearson. Voted unanimously in the affirmative.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING

3A DEVELOPMENT

Hooksett Road Map 14, Lot 1-12

Variance from Article 22 to allow 24-unit apartment buildings to be constructed within the residential development.

K. O'Rourke, Brown Engineering

Representing 3A Development

As a result of recommendations made by the beautification and aesthetics committee adjustments were made to the original plan to increase the green space and reduce the congestion. They were happy with the new plan and the Master Plan allowed the 204 units. We continued in that direction, but the client decided it was worth trying to redesign and use fewer buildings with more unites. This plan is for 3 story buildings that have 30% less impervious area and significantly more green space and fewer walls than the original site plan. This is in the conceptual stage. We

are here tonight to ask for a variance to a multi-unit dwelling.

T. Murphy-Roche: I am going to recuse myself because our Planning Board was not in favor of the prior plan but is in favor of this plan.

D. Belanger asked if the applicant would like to continue with a 4-member board

C. Pearson: Do you have the original plan?

K. O'Rourke: That's the one you were looking at earlier with 17 buildings. I don't know what this new plan changes for wetland impacts.

D. Belanger: We would like to see a complete plan for once.

D. Belanger motioned to continue on request for the wetland easement as well as this variance request to May 9th. Seconded by C. Pearson.

D. Boutin:

I think it would be helpful if you would delineate the wetland that are impacted on the original plan on the new conceptual plan so the board can see the difference in the wetland impact on the two plans.

K. O'Rourke: Are you looking for square footage as well. The original plan is very specific. This is conceptual. I can't see until it is developed.

D. Boutin: You are asking this board to go down two tracks.

The first one has 17 buildings with wetland impacts and then change gears and look at a second plan with 12 buildings and we don't know the difference in the wetland impact.

A. Rozwadowski: If this plan gets approved, they will have to come back for a new wetland impacts.

D. Boutin: We would then have to do another site walk. You need to pick a plan and go with it.

Voted unanimously in the affirmative.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 14, 2006

D. Belanger motioned to approve the minutes of February 14th, 2006 as presented.

Seconded by C. Pearson

Voted unanimously in the affirmative.

March 14, 2006

D. Belanger motioned to approve the minutes of March 14th, 2006 as presented.

Seconded by C. Pearson

Voted unanimously in the affirmative.

ADJOURN

The chairperson declared the meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan