

Unofficial

**HOOKSETT ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Tuesday, March 1, 2011
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
35 Main Street**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Pearson called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Chairman C. Pearson, D. Pare, R. Bairam, G. Hyde, Alternate P. Denbow, Alternate T. Lanphear, Alternate M. Simoneau
R. Duhaime – excused

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 11, 2011

R. Bairam motioned to approve the minutes of January 11, 2011. Seconded by T. Lanphear.

Vote unanimously in favor

CONSIDERATION OF APPEAL

BURL LAND CLEARING

150 Londonderry Turnpike
Map 43, Lot 49

An Appeal of Zoning Board of Adjustment Decision which denied the Appeal of Administrative Decision by Peter Rowell, Code Enforcement Officer which states, *industrial operation is not allowed on this site.*

Members to vote on reconsideration:

C. Pearson, R. Bairam, T. Lanphear, P. Denbow, and D. Pare.

R. Bairam motioned to deny the appeal based on no new evidence. Seconded by T. Lanphear

C. Pearson stated that there was no new evidence presented in the request for a rehearing and further that the decision by the Board addressed the Industrial Use in a Commercial Zone.

Vote unanimously in favor

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

MARKET BASKET

30 Market Drive

Map 37 Lot 5 MUD 3 (Route 3A Corridor)

A Variance from Article 20A for Center Identification Sign (freestanding) size, design and location and Article 20A for Building Identification Sign (Wall) Size and height.

Tim Sullivan, Barlo Signs of Hudson NH representing DeMoulas Super Market at 30 Market Drive.

We are seeking relief for the freestanding sign and the wall on two (2) sides of the building.

Monument Sign

The entrance to Market Basket is accessed from three (3) directions. N. Rte. 3A and the Exit ramp to the highway. We are looking to identify the entrance from three (3) directions. The ordinance allows two (2) single face signs, perpendicular to the road. We would like a V shape which is visible from all directions. It is visible from the South and the North as well as the off the ramp. The sign is set back to help with the visibility. The size is keeping with other signs on that part of the road. Unlike other signs on that road, it will be built with an opaque background. The copy only will light. At night, you will only see the letters with red. They will incorporate a soft glow on the letters to see the monument sign. The size proposed is 155 sq. ft. where 32 sq. ft. is allowed. For the size of the property and keeping with others on that road, it fits and is also set back and needed to identify that entrance particularly coming off that exit ramp.

Wall Sign – Front

Photos of another Market Basket signage in Salem were distributed to the board.

The setback from Route 3A is 650 ft. which allows 159.9 sq. ft. and we are proposing 354 sq. ft.

The size of what is allowed and what we are proposing is showed on the full mass of the building and fits the building. The reality is Market Basket has more letters than Lowes, Walmart and Target. We need relief for the 12 foot height limitation on the fascia-band which is needed to get above the glass.

Wall Sign – Side

This is the same type which proposes 246 sq. ft. where 152 sq. ft. is allowed. The intention is to have visibility from the highway. We also need the 12 foot height relief. The distance from the side of the building to the highway is 150 feet.

The applicant read the application into the record.

Open Public at 7:28 pm

Close Public at 7:29 pm

Tim Lanphear, alternate will vote on this application

C. Pearson stated that he believes that there is not a need for larger signs given that the building will be obvious.

The monument sign is 30-50 feet from the paved surface.

V – Shape:

The consensus of the board was not in favor of the V shaped sign and traditional location perpendicular to the road.

R. Bairam stated that this was a unique location and therefore should be allowed to have a larger sign.

D. Pare stated that the building will be clearly visible.

The consensus of the board is 3:2 to deny the size.

The board discussed allowing the V-shape option with 32 sq.ft.

Wall Sign

The applicant stated the size was based on what works with the size of the building. With the logo having a large M and B, it is difficult to make it smaller and look aesthetically correct. A smaller letter set will look lost on the build.

The Board consensus is 3:2 in favor of allowing the larger sign.

Side Elevation Sign

The Board consensus is to adhere to the regulations in this location.

The applicant requested the Board continue the hearing so that they could look at other options.

G. Hyde motioned to continue the public hearing to April 12. Seconded by R. Bairam. Vote 4:1 motion carries

FALCON BROOK

49 Mammoth Road

Map 45 Lot 33-2 MDR

A Variance from Article 5, Section C.3.B Multi-Family Dwellings to allow 20 multi-family units on 14.25 acres where 14 units are allowed.

P. Denbow will rule on this application

John Cronin, Attorney representing the applicant

Douglas MacGuire, Engineer and Bill Maurais

Variance from Article 5, Section C.3.B for density.

Background: This was approved in 1998 for a 22 lot subdivision. Despite paying taxes, this was never built and the project lapsed. The Engineer and the owner looked at Workforce Housing options and spoke with the Planning Board staff and it was not

viewed favorably due to the town having its' fair share of Workforce Housing. They then scaled down the project and the result is 20 standard units.

D. MacGuire, Engineer with Woodland Design: There is a significant reduction in the impervious area and an increase in green space. The original proposed road length was 1700 linear feet and now it is 750 linear feet. The disturbed area was reduced from 200,000 sq. ft. to 82,500 sq. ft. or 60%. We feel the new layout fits well within the parcel. We feel the added green space is a benefit.

R. Bairam: Who will build the walking trail that is shown on the plan?

D. MacGuire: That was brought up by the Planning Staff. It would be a small machine cut trail.

C. Pearson: Has the impact on surrounding residential property been examined?

J. Cronin: A licensed appraiser looked at the impact and reported state it will not impact surrounding property. Stonegate is a multi-family development on Mammoth Road and they have not diminished the surrounding values.

P. Denbow: What is the square footage of these units?

Cronin: The square footage is 1200 to 1400.

P. Denbow: The square footage of the units at Stonegate are 2000 sf. and it is a +55 community.

D. MacGuire: They are proposed to be 2 bedrooms, 1.5 bath price range.

The applicant read the criteria into the record

The applicant read two (2) abutters letters supporting the project from Julie Pascol and Paul Maurais

Open Public Hearing

Peter Marx: 18 Fieldstone: As an abutter, I am against expanding the size. If you walk that property, there is a lot of wetland. As you start digging, you could potentially cause a lot of problems with run off. We have had a lot of areas affected by residents filling in wetlands. I ask that you keep within the limitations of the ordinance.

George Porter, 40 Castle Drive: I am new to Hooksett, and I understand the walk through was in July and they said 300 sq. ft. of buildable property. They want 20 units and are allowed 14. If they want single family, I have no problem.

Leslie Leahy, 14 Fieldstone: We prefer single family and this is one step. There are a lot of wetlands and we are concerned with the drainage.

Close Public

C. Pearson: Are the wetland crossings the same as in the previous plan that was approved for a special exception?

D. MacGuire: This is not the same location but the impact is the same. I can see if we can stay in the limits of the original approved crossing.

I am well aware of the drainage concerns. I took drainage into consideration when I did the initial 28 unit design and reduced the drainage flow in the 25/50/100 storm. I certainly recognize the abutters concern with drainage and work to minimize that in the same manner with the 20 unit design. This is a conceptual plan, so I don't have the exact locations for drainage ponds but the plan is for it to be in the front of the four-plex and depending on the results of the additional flow, a shallow pond at the top of the hill or a smaller pond in another area of the property but I won't know this until we complete the plan.

C. Pearson:

- We need more detail plans to see where the detention ponds will be to understand the impact on abutters.
- We would like to see the buildings drawn on the plan as well.
- An appraisal study is required by an independent appraiser at the cost of the applicant.
- If this is not the same crossing, you will need a Special Exception.

***R. Bairam motioned to continue the public hearing to April 12. Seconded by D. Pare.
Vote unanimously in favor***

ADJOURNMENT

***R. Bairam motioned to adjourn at 8:30 pm. Seconded by D. Pare.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan