



**Meeting Minutes**  
**North Hampton Planning Board**  
**Tuesday, June 7, 2016 at 6:30pm**  
**Town Hall, 231 Atlantic Avenue**

---

7  
8  
9 These minutes were prepared as a reasonable summary of the essential content of this meeting, not as a  
10 transcription.  
11

12 **In attendance:** Nancy Monaghan, Vice Chair; Members Dan Derby, Phil Wilson, Josh Jeffrey, Terrence  
13 Belluche, and Jim Maggiore, Select Board Representative; Jennifer Rowden, RPC Circuit Rider; and Rick  
14 Milner, Recording Secretary.  
15

16 Vice Chair Monaghan called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm.  
17

18 **I. New Business**

19 **1. Case #16:05 – Applicant, Tom Bear, 9A Lafayette Road, Hangar # 11, North Hampton, NH**  
20 **03862.** The Applicant requests a change of use from the previous airplane hangar use to a  
21 proposed office and airplane hangar use. Property Owner: Hampton TCB, LLC; Property  
22 Location: Hampton Airfield, Cedar Road and Lafayette Road, North Hampton, NH; M/L 003-061-  
23 000; Zoning District: I-B/R, Industrial - Business /Residential District.  
24

25 In attendance for this application:

26 Robert Casassa and Craig Hawley. Mr. Casassa presented a letter signed by Tom Bear authorizing Mr.  
27 Casassa and Mr. Hawley to appear before the Planning Board on his behalf.  
28

29 Mr. Casassa addressed the Board. Mr. Casassa stated that the applicant's intention is to convert space  
30 within the airplane hangar for an office use which is complimentary to the airplane hangar use and  
31 permitted by the zoning ordinance. The applicant does not intend any residential use of the space. Mr.  
32 Casassa stated that:

- 33 a. There is a shower within the hangar intended to allow mechanics to clean up after working on  
34 airplanes.  
35 b. There is a microwave and sink in a kitchenette area to prepare a snack or beverage designed to  
36 supplement and support the office use.  
37

38 Mr. Hawley addressed the Board. Mr. Hawley explained that Air Bear Aviation is an aviation  
39 maintenance company which repairs and maintains aircraft on a daily basis. The company currently  
40 operates in Lawrence, MA. Operations in Lawrence have become very busy. The location at the  
41 Hampton Airfield within a 60 ft by 60 ft hangar was needed to perform some work more efficiently away  
42 from the busy Lawrence location. The Hampton Airfield location would also be used to meet with clients  
43 in a more social environment than provided by the Lawrence location. Mr. Hawley stated that the  
44 proposed office space would include:

- 45 a. office space for the business  
46 b. a lounge area for pilots to rest  
47 c. a shower area for the pilots and mechanics to clean up

- 48 d. a small kitchen and dining area
- 49 e. space to store two aircraft

50 The applicant's only intention is to create a unique office space.

51

52 Ms. Rowden asked for clarification of the applicant's previous statements regarding the applicant's  
53 intention to hold events.

54

55 Mr. Hawley stated that the applicant intends to hold small functions that he would classify as corporate  
56 run social gatherings of no more than 30 people.

57

58 Mr. Maggiore asked what type of aircraft would utilize the Hampton Airfield hangar.

59

60 Mr. Hawley stated that only small planes such as Piper Cub or Cessna class planes would use the hangar.

61

62 Mr. Wilson stated that he believes discussions during the approval process for the original approved site  
63 plan only allowed for the use of storing aircraft in the hangars, not using the hangars for business  
64 operations. The office and business use proposed by the applicant is more profound than the applicant's  
65 stated simple change of interior design and use request. The proposed business operations use is not  
66 consistent with the original approved site plan and presents larger implications and more complex issues  
67 that may only be adequately reviewed through the site plan review process, not a change of use  
68 application.

69

70 Ms. Rowden stated that there are some issues, one of which is parking requirements, which may require  
71 the applicant to submit a site plan review application. While the proposed office use is allowed and the  
72 current parking is sufficient for an office use, the events proposed by the applicant may require a more  
73 involved site plan review to satisfy parking and other regulation requirements.

74

75 Mr. Jeffrey stated that he believed the intended use for the access road to the hangars, as described  
76 during the site plan review for the airfield paving project, was for fueling and other part-time activities  
77 associated with storage of aircraft in the hangars. The access road was not intended for full-time use as  
78 described by the applicant's proposed business activities. A more involved review of how the airfield site  
79 may be impacted by the proposed business activities within the applicant's hangar may be necessary  
80 through the site plan review process.

81

82 Mr. Wilson stated that a site plan indicating the intention to include office space and business  
83 operations within the hangars at the Hampton Airfield should be presented by the property owner. In  
84 order to protect the public's health and safety interests, the Planning Board must evaluate the potential  
85 impact of the proposed uses, especially if business operations are run within several or all hangars.  
86 There are multiple public safety, water supply, and Aquifer Protection District issues that can only be  
87 adequately addressed by means of a full site plan review.

88

89 The Board came to a unanimous consensus without objection to take a brief recess to pull the Hampton  
90 Airfield files to see if any notations regarding the approved use for the hangars were indicated on the  
91 approved site plans. Ms. Monaghan recessed the meeting at 7:00 pm. Ms. Monaghan called the meeting  
92 to order at 7:08 pm.

93

94 Ms. Monaghan asked the Planning Administrator if he found any notations regarding the approved use  
95 in the Hampton Airfield files.

96  
97 Mr. Milner stated that he could not find any notes indicating approved uses for the hangars at the  
98 Hampton Airfield in the time allowed. He stated that more time was needed to complete an adequate  
99 review of relevant minutes, plans, and other documents to determine if any specific uses were noted or  
100 discussed in the past.

101  
102 Ms. Monaghan asked the Board if there was enough information submitted for the Board to take  
103 jurisdiction of the application.

104  
105 Ms. Rowden stated that she believed the information submitted is sufficient for the Board to take  
106 jurisdiction of a change of use application.

107  
108 Mr. Wilson stated that he does not believe that enough information has been presented to the Board to  
109 determine whether a change of use application is sufficient for the proposed use or if a site plan review  
110 application is necessary.

111  
112 **Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board finds that not enough information has been presented for**  
113 **the Planning Board to take jurisdiction of the change of use application submitted by Tom Bear for a**  
114 **change of use from the previous airplane hangar use to a proposed office and airplane hangar use.**  
115 **Second by Mr. Maggiore.**

116 Discussion of the motion –

117 Mr. Casassa stated the applicant's preference that the Board takes jurisdiction of the application. The 65  
118 days allowed by the statutes for the Board to decide a case after taking jurisdiction is more than  
119 adequate time for the Board to examine the Hampton Airfield records and obtain information. In  
120 addition, the applicant is aware that other businesses currently operate in other hangars at the airfield  
121 and the zoning ordinance allows for the business use.

122  
123 Mr. Jeffrey stated that, even though the proposed use may be an allowed use by the zoning ordinance,  
124 public safety issues (such as the increased public use of the access road to the hangars) may require a  
125 more substantial review of the site that can only be adequately accomplished through a site plan review  
126 process, not a change of use application.

127  
128 Mr. Wilson stated that business operations in other hangars have not been approved by the Planning  
129 Board. The fact that other businesses currently operate within other hangars without proper approvals  
130 is not a valid argument for approving the applicant's change of use request. Whether the use is  
131 permitted or not by the zoning ordinance, a site plan review may still be necessary. It is within the  
132 Board's discretion to determine whether a change of use or site plan review application is appropriate  
133 to make an informed decision.

134  
135 Ms. Monaghan stated the following circumstances that led to the change of use application being  
136 submitted to the Board:

- 137 a. The applicant filed a building permit application which stated a mezzanine office and storage  
138 area use.  
139 b. The Building Inspector found construction not consistent with the approved building permit.

- 140 c. The individuals performing the work indicated that bedrooms and bathrooms were being  
141 constructed.  
142 d. The Building Inspector stopped work on the project.  
143 e. Documents prepared by a fire engineer for the applicant stated a residential use for the hangar.  
144

145 Mr. Casassa stated that the representations of a residential use by other parties are not correct. He and  
146 Mr. Hawley have clearly stated that there will be no residential use within the hangar space.  
147

148 Ms. Monaghan asked Mr. Hawley to confirm that a previous event held by his company involved live  
149 band music, meals, and an overnight sleep-over.  
150

151 Mr. Hawley confirmed the event occurred as described by Ms. Monaghan.  
152

153 Ms. Monaghan asked if pilots would be sleeping at the hangar.  
154

155 Mr. Hawley stated that pilots would not be sleeping overnight at the hangar. Pilots would only be resting  
156 for a short period.  
157

158 The Board engaged in a discussion of parking requirements for various types of uses that may occur on  
159 the site.  
160

161 Mr. Derby stated that the Board cannot take jurisdiction of the application without knowing more  
162 information regarding approved uses for the airfield.  
163

164 **The vote was 5-1 in favor of the motion with Mr. Belluche opposed.**  
165

166 Mr. Casassa requested to continue the discussion of the change of use application to the July 5, 2016  
167 Planning Board meeting.  
168

169 **Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board grant the applicant's request to continue the discussion of**  
170 **the change of use application to the July 5, 2016 Planning Board meeting conditional upon receipt of**  
171 **the applicant's request in writing. Second by Mr. Derby. The vote was unanimous in favor of the**  
172 **motion**  
173 **(6-0).**  
174

175 **2. Case #16:06 – Applicant, Robert Cross, P.O. Box 700, North Hampton, NH 03862.** The Applicant  
176 requests a preliminary consultation to discuss potential waiver requests to the requirements of  
177 the Town of North Hampton Subdivision Regulations Section XII – Manufactured Home Parks for  
178 Shel-Al Estates mobile home community located at 115 Lafayette Road. Property Owner: Luck  
179 Enterprises, Inc., P.O. Box 700, North Hampton, NH 03862; Property Location: 115 Lafayette  
180 Road, North Hampton, NH 03862; M/L 013-071-000; Zoning District: I-B/R, Industrial - Business  
181 /Residential District.

182 Ms. Monaghan stated that the Board would be taking no action at this time regarding the potential  
183 waiver requests. The current discussion was non-binding.  
184

185 Mr. Cross addressed the Board. Mr. Cross stated that the Shel-Al Estates mobile home park located at  
186 115 Lafayette Road was created in the 1950's and expanded prior to current regulation requirements.  
187 Several older manufactured homes need to be replaced. The construction of the replacement homes  
188 may not meet current standards for frontage along the roadway, front setbacks, and sideline setbacks.  
189 He is seeking waivers from the current subdivision regulations to allow replacement of an older home as  
190 long as the placement of the newly constructed home is not more non-conforming than the location of  
191 the existing older home. Mr. Cross further stated that, since no actual lot line exists between the lands  
192 associated with each home, he would consider the distance between the nearest points of neighboring  
193 homes to be the sideline setback.

194  
195 Ms. Rowden noted that the Board could consider whether to grant waivers for individual units or grant a  
196 blanket waiver for multiple homes within a section of the mobile home park.

197  
198 Mr. Cross stated that he sees only one circumstance on the entire property where a replacement home  
199 location may be more non-conforming than the existing home location. Many of the replacement home  
200 locations would actually be less non-conforming than the existing home locations.

201  
202 Mr. Belluche stated that he believed a blanket waiver request for the entire property was reasonable.

203  
204 Mr. Maggiore stated that a blanket waiver request is more reasonable and efficient as long as the waiver  
205 language is clear.

206  
207 Mr. Jeffrey suggested that information regarding all possible placement and setback scenarios be  
208 submitted to the Board to ensure that there are no unique cases that may present a problem for a  
209 blanket waiver approval. He suggested that the applicant present a plan showing the existing home  
210 locations and the building envelope for all replacement homes associated with the proposed waiver  
211 request.

212  
213 **II. Other Business**

214 **1. Town of North Hampton, NH** review of 2017 zoning ordinance amendment proposals.

215 Ms. Monaghan stated that discussion of the elderly facilities ordinance will be moved to the June 21  
216 Planning Board work session meeting to give members more time to review the information.

217  
218 **2. Minutes.**

219 Ms. Monaghan presented the minutes of the May 17, 2016 Planning Board meeting.

220 **Mr. Belluche moved that the Planning Board accept the minutes of the May 17, 2016 Planning Board**  
221 **meeting as written. Second by Mr. Derby. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

222  
223 The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm without objection.

224  
225 Respectfully submitted,

226  
227  
228  
229 Rick Milner

230 Recording Secretary