

**Official**

**HOOKSETT ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
MINUTES  
Tuesday, June 14, 2011  
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
35 Main Street**

**CALL TO ORDER**

R. Duhaime called the meeting to order at 7:07pm.

**ATTENDANCE**

R. Bairam, R. Duhaime, G. Hyde, D. Pare, P. Denbow, and M. Simoneau  
J. Levesque, Council Rep.  
Excused: Chris Pearson

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**May 12, 2011**

*R. Bairam motioned to accept the minutes of May 10, 2011. Seconded by P. Denbow.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**36 ZAPORA DRIVE**

**Map 34, Lot 40-64**

A Variance from Article 5 Section E.4 to allow the construction of a 3 season porch which is 19 feet from the rear boundary where a 25 foot rear setback is required.

R. Mahair: We are looking for a 3 season porch which will actually be more of a buffer from the neighbor. Currently our deck looks directly into the neighbor's yard.

R. Mahair read from the application (see file)

R. Mahair: This will be a 12' x 14' porch which will be where the existing deck is currently. The existing deck is 4' x 8'.

P. Rowell: If this variance is granted, we will require a certified plot plan showing the actual setbacks.

R. Mahair stated there is an existing 6 foot stockade fence.

D. Pare: What is behind the house?

R. Mahair: There is another house behind mine which is sideways.

Open Public:  
N/A

Close Public

The Board had an issue with the fact that the plot plan does to have a surveyor's stamp. It appears that the plot plan is not an accurate as built of the exiting house.

The applicant requested a continuance in order to obtain a certified plan.

***R. Bairam motioned to continue to July with the condition that a certified plot plan be provided. Seconded by J. Hyde  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

## **12 MONROE DRIVE**

### **Map 31, Lot 63**

A variance from Article 5 Section E2. and Section E3 to construct a garage which is 10 feet from the side boundary where a 15 foot side setback is required and 31.4 feet from the front where a 35 foot front setback is required.

Leah Chandler: I currently have a carport which has a variance on record. We are now in a home with the upstairs unfinished. I would like to put a garage on the opposite side of the house. The house currently has 2 bedrooms and will have 4 bedrooms. The variance is 10 feet at the greatest point and tapers to 13 feet toward the rear of the garage. With the new garage, I would like a new driveway and discontinue the existing driveway.

P. Denbow: Will the carport be removed?

L. Chandler: I don't know. I may consider reducing the size of the carport so that is flush with the house. It currently juts out beyond the front of the house.

Open Public  
N/A  
Close Public

L. Chandler: We will dormer the back of the cape and add 2 bedrooms.

L. Chandler read from the application (see file)

L. Chandler: Behind the carport is a dining room which was converted from the screen room.

P. Rowell: The Plot Plan is not accurate as it now exists.

P. Denbow: The pictures show two (2) sheds but only one appears on the plot plan.

P. Rowell: If the neighbor requests a reduction down to 10 feet and you grant this you will they have buildings 20 feet apart. The fire department likes to see 30 feet of separation.

R. Duhaime: Does the neighbor have a garage?

L. Chandler: Yes, on the opposite side of the house. It is a two car garage.

***G. Hyde motioned to grant the variance from Article 5 Section E2. and Section E3 to construct a garage which is 10 feet from the side boundary where a 15 foot side setback is required and 31.4 feet from the front where a 35 foot front setback is required. A certified as-built must be submitted upon completion.***

***Seconded by R. Bairam.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Planning Board Joint Meeting Requests**

#### **June 20, 2011 – Heffron Asphalt Corp – Excavation**

P. Rowell: There is a request for a lot line adjustment at the Heffron Gravel Pit which is currently before the Planning Board. I provided an aerial photo which shows the portion they would like to use. The Planning Board wants to know if that portion has been adequately reclaimed. I walked the site and I feel the ZBA should do a site walk as well and review the site. It appears the pit was permitted in 1998/99 and some material was removed. There was a bond that expired in 2002. The pit was never secured and it sees a lot of ATV traffic. We need to figure out whether the piece that they want the lot line adjustment has been reclaimed. The back area has not been reclaimed. The PB is looking for that recommendation from the ZBA. I would like to see it better than it exists.

J. Levesque: This slipped through the cracks and was never reclaimed.

P. Rowell: If you feel it hasn't been reclaimed the Planning Board may either require it with conditions or hold the application up.

P. Rowell showed the proposed lot line adjustment which was submitted to the Planning Board.

P. Rowell: There was a bond until 2002. There was a request to extend the bond in the record. There is no record of that happening. I recommend that the members of the ZBA do a site walk in order to understand the property and review the ordinance and the State RSA with regard to reclamation.

Site walk at the site at 5:15 pm on Monday June 20<sup>th</sup>.

P. Rowell: In reading the Gravel Ordinance, there is a requirement that each excavator submits a plan for review and pays an annual renewal fee. Letters could be sent to the owners to have an annual review.

R. Bairam: I think we should do this so that these situations wouldn't slip through.

The Planning Board requested a joint meeting with the Zoning Board to discuss the survey from MRI. The Board agreed to the June 27<sup>th</sup> meeting date.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan