

## **Official**

### HOOKSETT ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Chris Pearson called the regular meeting to order at 6:33 pm.

#### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ATTENDANCE:** Chris Pearson (Chairman), Roger Duhaime (Vice-Chairman), Michael Simoneau, Phil Denbow, Richard Bairam, Gerald Hyde, and Jackie Roy

**STAFF:** Matt Lavoie, Code Enforcement Officer

**EXCUSED:** Don Pare, and Jim Levesque, Council Rep.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**December 9, 2014** – *R. Bairam motioned to approve the December 9, 2014 regular meeting minutes. Seconded by G. Hyde. Motion carried unanimously.*

#### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**GENERAL ELECTRIC AVIATION**      **Case #14-15**  
30 Industrial Park Drive      Map 18, Lot 43  
IND

A Special Exception is requested from Article 18, Section E.1.(a) and G.2.(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to fill approximately 2,453 SF of wetlands and impact 17,385 SF of its associated buffer relative to their proposal to discontinue a portion of Industrial Park Drive and expand GE Aviation Building Two.

Dave Colburn: (Employee of General Electric): We were here in December. There was a site walk to look at the grounds around where the proposed facility is. This is something to help us maintain the job levels we currently employ in the town of Hooksett and it would maintain the longevity of the manufacturing here in New Hampshire for advanced aviation. With me is Nick Golon from TF Moran, and Ron Breton from GZA GeoEnvironmental who are partnering with me on this project.

Nick Golon (TF Moran): We were here in December and had the opportunity to read the

application into the record, and we had some discussion as to the impacts. I handed out the same graphic as last time as a point of reference. We had the opportunity to go through each one of the areas relative to what the impact was. We looked at the photos. The Conservation Commission was able to provide a recommendation that was read into the record. As part of that meeting we said that we needed to do some clarification on our applications, which has since happened. There has been a memo provided to that effect, as well as a signed application. We had the site walk to look at these areas and verify that the photos were accurate. The project team has since met with the Planning Board to garner a recommendation from those people as well, and you should have that. At this point we are back for clarifications, questions, or otherwise. The project team is happy to answer anything we can assist with.

D. Rogers: Are there any further questions?

R. Duhaime: Do you have any information on the landscaping?

N. Golon: A landscape plan has been prepared, associated with the site plan. We submitted a landscape plan that is in accordance with the regulations. It ties in nicely with the adjacent lots. Our landscape architect did a nice job tying it all in together.

R. Duhaime: Who did it?

N. Golon: Michael Krzeminski. I think you will be happy with it. It ties in nicely with the surroundings, but at the same time provides some appropriate natural buffers to the parking lot and building.

M. Simoneau: There are no changes?

N. Golon: No.

C. Pearson: You had mentioned that you do things with students and youth with regard to fishing and other things in the stream. Does that change the access to doing things with them?

D. Colburn: No. On the north end is where the employees and students go down. We are planning to keep all of that grading and the bank of the wetlands where the channel opens up so there is still access to get down there with the students.

G. Hyde: We had talked about the new security gate and some of the landscaping being left open for security concerns so they could have view from the gate. On the backside, where the other road comes in, what will that entrance look like? Will that be a security gate as well, or will it be locked and have everything come through the one big gate?

N. Golon: The conversation you are referencing was regarding the guard house or welcome

center. Relative to the site plan that has been prepared, we have been careful with line-of-sight. One of the things that is different about this is there is no formal guard house being proposed. These gates that are going to be used for the primary entrance are mechanized gates with card readers. The need to have as clear a line-of-sight for the guard attendant does not exist. Due to the fact that it is a regulated facility, they still need to be able to see what is going on in front of the building, and we have been able to provide more of an entrance experience as far as landscaping. In this case, being that we have the area along the frontage with the relocation of the right-of-way, and there not being a guard house, there isn't a need to worry about the line-of-site of that guard as you are making sure that it is open enough that the casual observer could notice anything of concern.

**Open to abutters and public.**

No abutter or public comments.

**Close to abutters and public.**

R. Duhaime: I think this is great for the town of Hooksett. I am glad to see you are expanding and staying in town.

D. Colburn: I don't walk through the floor one day without someone saying how great this is for our future, for what we do here in Hooksett, and for bringing advanced manufacturing jobs to the town.

M. Simoneau: I think a lot of our questions were addressed at the meeting on December 9, and the follow-up site walk addressed a lot of the visual issues.

P. Denbow: After the site walk a lot of this makes sense, and they are disturbing as little wetland areas as possible.

C. Pearson: The only advice or recommendation I would make is in terms of landscaping in the area of Petersbrook, where the fields are. You have done a great job, but the more you enhance that and the better you make it, the better for GE and the town because a lot of people go down there.

P. Denbow: That is all I can think of.

C. Pearson: As you go through Planning, the prettier you can make that the better the town will be.

***G. Hyde motioned to grant the special exception from Article 18, Section E.1.(a) and G.2.(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to fill approximately 2,453 SF of wetlands and impact 17,385 SF of its associated buffer relative to their proposal to discontinue a portion of Industrial Park Drive and expand GE Aviation Building Two, for General Electric Aviation, Case #14-15, 30 Industrial***

***Park Drive, Map 18, Lot 43 IND. Seconded by R. Bairam. Motion carried unanimously.***

**NH BUSINESS FINANCE AUTHORITY**

**Case #14-16**

21 Industrial Park Drive

Map 24, Lot 34

IND

A Special Exception is requested from Article 18, Section E.1.(a) and G.2.(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to fill approximately 2,453 SF of wetlands and impact 17,385 SF of its associated buffer relative to General Electric Company's proposal to discontinue a portion of Industrial Park Drive and expand GE Aviation Building Two.

***P. Denbow motioned to grant a special exception from Article 18, Section E.1.(a) and G.2.(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to fill approximately 2,453 SF of wetlands and impact 17,385 SF of its associated buffer relative to General Electric Company's proposal to discontinue a portion of Industrial Park Drive and expand GE Aviation Building Two, for NH Business Finance Authority, Case #14-16, 21 Industrial Park Drive, Map 24, Lot 34, IND. Seconded by G. Hyde. Motion carried unanimously.***

C. Pearson: The zoning workshop will be held on January 26. I have a prior commitment and will not be able to attend. I am hoping someone else will be able to attend.

J. Roy: What time does it start?

C. Pearson: 6:00 pm.

J. Roy: Does anyone know how long it is expected to last?

M. Lavoie: There will be discussion about the proposed zoning changes. They are minimal. It shouldn't be too long.

R. Duhaime: There could be some debate on the commercial vehicle issue.

M. Lavoie: There might be and adding contractors to home businesses.

C. Pearson: Correct and I also read something about signage. Are you allowing signage for home businesses?

M. Lavoie: There are residential signs allowed as long as they are tied to the home business, but it doesn't say they cannot be back lit. We are putting that in there.

C. Pearson: I cannot attend, so I wanted to make sure someone else will be here.

R. Duhaime: I will be there, weather permitting.

R. Bairam: I am going to try to make it.

J. Roy: If someone cannot attend, we could write comments and send them to Matt.

***R. Bairam motioned to adjourn. Seconded by G. Hyde. Motion carried unanimously.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

AnnMarie White

Recording Clerk