

**Official  
As of 3/03/08**

**HOOKSETT  
PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING  
Monday, January 28, 2008**

**Hooksett Public Library**

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

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

**ATTENDANCE**

Chairman D. Marshall, Y. Nahikian, R. Duhaime, J. McHugh, B. Ehlers, B. Sullivan, D. Jodoin, D. Hemeon, P. Rueppel and D. Dreffs

Excused: J. Gryval & J. McHugh

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

**MANCHESTER SAND & GRAVEL – HEADS POND**

Hooksett Road

Map 3, Lot 1, 5, & 19

Major Subdivision/Site Plan for 430 residential units

D. Campbell: The Heads Pond parcel is 1300 acres. This was once part of Chester and Rockingham County. In the old colonial deeds, every tree over 24' in diameter or more was reserved for the King. In the early 1800, Lakins built a sawmill on this property. The home is still in the historical sites. In the old maps, this was called Lakins until the Head family took it over. Head was a governor during the Civil War and the name was changed to Heads Pond. We are sensitive to the history of the property and one road is called Lakins Landing. The Heads had it till late 1900's. In 1977 MS&G bought the lower half of this property and the Liberty street track and Heads Pond. That is how we got the 3800-acre parcel. In 1990, a group of people on the Planning Board and the Master Plan committee came up with the MUD5 in order to find a way to develop this property in a rational way without turning this town upside down. The MUD zone requires a master plan. There has always been a requirement for a proposed parkway.

In 1993, a number of water bodies were designated as prime. The State made that a prohibition of any development. When we came back for a golf course, we had to address those designations. We negotiated with the Planning Board, the Conservation Commission and the Town Council and talked about the parkway and the golf course. We amended the MUD5 to have those wetlands redesignated from prime to wetland of special concern, which allowed for a golf course near by and a limit of 650 homes in the area. That was by the town with 58% of the vote. A protest petition was filed and found invalid and 2 ½ years later the Supreme Court found it invalid. In 2006 we did the hard

engineering at significant cost. In 2007, the Planning Board ruled that based on the cul-de-sac rule, they needed to reconsider the plans and have an additional access. That redesign is what we are presenting; 120 units on Carriage Hill, with 428 proposed now. We will not exceed that number and we may lose some 5-6 units due to drainage. Because there is no golf course, we will increase the open space. The total developed area is 280 acres. The town zoning allows 70% developed; we have developed only 27%. The Common is surrounded by condos as well as ¼ acre lots. The Park will be 200 acres including the Town Pond. These are man made lakes as a result of dredging by MS&G, which are spring fed. We are giving all this land to the town in addition to the RR bed and parking. The haul road is a seasonal road and is in good shape. There have been negotiations with DES and Conservation.

Beyond the land going to the town, we are negotiating with Audubon giving the Great Marsh to Audubon and the purple area as conservation land for wildlife conservation. The large green piece will remain undeveloped.

The green slashed area on the map is open space. The trail is 7000 feet and will tie into the sidewalks and parking area in the common and areas called out in the conservation easement and boat landing on Heads Pond.

Phasing Plan – Phase I

Route 3 will still be 2 lanes coming in with 35 single family and 45 townhouse units. Phase II is the utilities and roadways beyond the cul-de-sac and a second egress. We will put in Broad Arrow Drive for the second access and will open up other lots.

It will have sub phases but we have not determined what they are.

Unit Mix and proposed cost of homes. (See file)

Condos on Carriage Hill are going for \$295,000. Cost of these future homes will be predicated on the market.

The phasing plan III – is 9 lots with a cul-de-sac.

IV and V are as the economy allows. This will be something that will happen over a long period of time with balanced growth. Some later phases are the condominiums.

Russ Thibeault, Applied Economic Development- Community Impact Analysis (Power point presentation)(see file)

This is not an exact science. I have used this model in several communities.

Does it impose a large burden?

Does it break even?

Does it result in a surplus?

(See file)

This is a growing community. The population has doubled since 1960 and this project fits into the model of the community. Construction is primarily single family however some diversity. Housing continues to be the trend.

Employment - the total jobs vs. the housing units. Since 2001, when retail came, we have been offering more jobs than houses, which says the community is becoming more diversified. Home prices have doubled since 1997. Home prices are strong today.

Municipal property tax appropriation – we have built a new school and expanded an existing school. You have been investing in schools and investing in your town and this will result in increased home values.

Tax rate stayed in a narrow range.

In 2003, there was a revaluation, which caused the numbers in Valuation to jump. Hooksett's tax rate, compared to other communities, is in the high range but not the highest. The key variable in doing an impact study is how many kids will this generate. The perception is every house has two (2) kids. That is a myth. Generally speaking, demographics are deceiving. Bruce Mayberry's report, released recently gave a great deal of data. The number of housing units has increased faster than the number of kids enrolled. There is a mixed of housing units. With this data, the number of kids per household is declining. In 1970, there was .83 kids per house and now there is .45 per household. This is the result of Bruce's Mayberry's study where in Hooksett; the actual data shows .415 per household.

Hooksett MUD 5 enrollment is .47 students per unit.

Using those multipliers, 210 students coming out of this project.

Overall, the capacity, if enrollment stayed the same, you'd have enough capacity for these students. Understanding that there will likely be additional developments, you will probably need to build a new elementary school, at some point, and that is why you collect impact fees.

The bottom line – Using the lower end of the range, the 428 units and 369,000 per unit is the basis of the analysis. I allocated, \$3.2 million in property tax revenue, the school expensed and municipal expense for a total of \$694,000 with more revenue than expenses if we get the sale price presented. Impact fees total \$2,502,083 dollars.

There are also connection fees for sewer and water and the developer is donating open space land.

The bottom line is this is at least a break even for the Town and will probably bring more revenue.

#### Actual MUD5 impact

We added all the assessed value in the MUD and factored the tax rate and you get an increase of a little over one million in residential and ½ million in commercial with a net surplus of ½ million dollars. We are missing what it cost to service the non-residential district.

D. Campbell: We will provide 153 public parking spaces and a bandstand. This will give the area a flavor that is different from any area around.

There are 58 townhouse units around the Common with a bandstand at the south end and we planned to have bollard lighting in the inside of the common and trees along the path. Because of the trees, we thought we'd put beacon lantern lights.

With regard to regional planning comments, most are with traffic, and the rest will be addressed with Stantec and the Planning Board.

#### Steven Pernaw: Traffic Impact study

The traffic counter was installed. It was pretty consistent during the day. As traffic engineers, what's important is the hourly variation. There is a morning and evening peak. In the original study, we saw morning and evening peak as well. South bound is the primary destination in the morning and north in the evening.

Addendum #1 2009 and 2019 – the future projections are based on a regional growth rate. Other developments have been computed into our calculations.

With the addendum, the number of units dropped to 430 units, in terms of peak hour, we originally had 503 and now 383 trips.

In the original study, there was one access, now with three (3) points of access, the traffic is not only less but distributed over three access points.

When you look at a projection to 2019 and 430 units, you will see long delays at a stop. A signal is required based on the study. That minimum threshold at 300 units. We recommended that at the end of phase IV we would do actual counts at the end of each access. That will allow us to assess the need for a traffic signal.

Long-range analysis tells us if you do put it in, you will need two (2) through lanes north and south bound. When we do hard data count in Phase IV, we will update that for the town. The initial plan for the mitigation is being reviewed. Stantec has asked for alternatives. They have asked for two approach lanes and upgrading the mitigation for the southbound turn lane. That will be done at the initial phasing. We may provide turn lanes at the other two access points. The greatest impact will be south of the site. We are dealing with mitigation initially and the other two points can operate with a Stop control. We will continue to work with Stantec.

D. Campbell: To summarize, when we need to signalize, we will build it. We are willing to do traffic update before each phase. When it triggers, we will build that intersection. We are open to all turn lanes.

Permits: We have, under the old plan, the wetland and site specific permits. The wetland was amended. The site specific took longer.

Public use benefits-

We have public use requirements for MUD5.

The public use is 213.2 acres where 6.42 acres is required.

The pond is 24 acres and the small pond is 6 acres. The frontage on Heads Pond is almost a mile, about 2700 on the Great Marsha and 1 ¼ mile on the gravel road.

Tom Sokoloski, Schauer Environmental

Wetland permit application – originally this had the golf course. The redesign with eliminating the golf course and the second access, and reducing the residential lots, pulled away from the Great Marsh. Originally we had over 8 acres of wetland impact. They wanted a way to preserve the wildlife. In revising the plan, we opened up a block of land that is largely undisturbed and maintaining a large habitat conductivity to Bear Brook. Our redesign has only 1800 sf of wetland impact now. We do need to mitigate for that. We need to preserve 10 acres for every one (1) acre of impact. We only need four (4) acres of mitigation. Our town park gives us 50:1 mitigation ratio. With 90 acres of Great Marsh and the additional purple area of 279 acres to Conservation for turtle species we have 150 times our mitigation. We haven't had any mitigation package that offered a ratio or quality of land that we are providing here. We will also have a mile of recreational shoreline with the gravel road that will provide access to an active recreational area. Perhaps a year round access as we can negotiate with DES for this conservation parcel. As the revised plan was developed, I met with DES and showed them our conceptual design and saw a favorable reception, particularly with the decrease in wetland impact.

The State Wetland review process should be complete by the end of February; 30 days following, we should have a permit in hand.

**Public Comments:**

Questions:

J. McHugh: In speaking of diversified jobs, retail, I didn't understand.

R. Thibeault: That chart showed growth in jobs and growth in housing. When retail came to Exit 10, you had more jobs and that reflects a change and movement away from a bedroom community.

J. McHugh: Those jobs don't reflect an ability to buy those homes.

R. Thibeault: That was based on a diversified tax base and not from an affordability point.

J. McHugh: With regard to the capacity of the schools; I think those numbers are not accurate.

R. Thibeault: They are from Bruce Mayberry's report and they reflect the State standards.

J. McHugh: If you have a cost per student vs. the taxes generated, it is not a win, win.

B. Sullivan: We are investing in our Town; you are competing with other towns like Bedford. How is this balanced, if I have my choice, Hooksett has some of the worst access. If we add on more communities, I don't grasp why, as a competition phase, this is a good deal.

There are negatives being so far from the highway.

P. Rueppel: Are we getting a more senior population in NH?

R. Thibeault: More retirees are staying. NH is going to add 145,000 total population growth and that is all 55 and over. This is attributed to the aging of the baby boomers.

Public: Have you considered Chester Turnpike as an access through to Allenstown?

R. Corriveau: Chester Turnpike often floods out. We were encouraged to stay away from the wetlands along the Chester Turnpike. As a developer, we are discouraged from working on the Chester Turnpike.

There are substantial natural wetlands from Allenstown to Chester Turnpike.

D. Marshall: There are several towns in the State that want Chester Turnpike protected.

Public: Is there a correlation between children and income level?

R. Thibeault: The primary factors are age of the head of household and number of bedrooms, not income. I haven't seen anyone study it by income. I recently did a subsidized rental property and the child ratio was higher.

D. Campbell: Per the Master Plan for MUD5; there will be no more residential allowed without coming back. Over the next 10-13 years, the commercial will happen as well.

D. Tatem: For the last 8 months, you have shown a possible school site, that is now gone?

D. Campbell: There is still a dash line, but when we talked to DES, they wanted to keep that for any use, because the school doesn't want it. It is about 30 acres.

B. Sullivan: The architecture shown in the common and the gazebo are very nice.

D. Campbell: We want to keep to a Victorian look.

B. Sullivan: Where is the parking located?

D. Campbell: The parking is planned behind the units. There are 58 townhouse and 15-multi families

J. Duffy: What is the smallest lot size?

D. Campbell: 8500 sf and Heads Point is 18000 sf. with most being about 12000 sf.

J. Duffy: Would you consider benches in the common?

D. Campbell: Yes, but you might want to allow people the opportunity to put some in someone's name.

J. Duffy: I think there needs to be more discussion on the timing of the installation of the traffic light.

D. Marshall: Steve has quoted the warrants based on the major and minor streets. But they forget the warrant based on the number of accidents.

D. Campbell: We will put in the signal when it is warranted.

R. Duhaime: Will the townhouses have outside parking?

D. Campbell: The townhouses will have outside parking and some will have attached garages.

R. Corriveau: There is a requirement for off street parking and they will not be competing for the same space.

R. Duhaime: Are the roads private or public?

D. Campbell: They are all public. Private parking will be maintained by the association and public by the town.

R. Duhaime: Across the road, is that MUD5 and will that be developed?

D. Campbell: It is MUD 5 and it will not be developed. It is mostly wetland and there is talk with Kiwanis about extending the railroad bed.

D. Tatem: The purple land, when that was discussed, did you discuss ownership of deed restriction?

D. Campbell: We are discussing with trust for public land.

D. Tatem: With Route 3 and discussions with Bob, when the study comes out, if the turning lane is required or not, we will need to discuss it.

D. Campbell: We took the trees out of the right of way and put them in the lots because you didn't want to maintain them. There are six types of trees staggered over the land.

Greg Wilson: On the north side, there doesn't show any development. Will there be shops?

D. Campbell: That is open space.

M. Sorel: In the past presentation, there was a stipulation that a development plan between the Town and MS&G would exempt this from any zoning or GMO. Is that still on the table?

D. Campbell: Since we have a completed application, we are exempt from any zoning changes and once approved, we will be exempt from future changes.

M. Sorel: Why, in the previous presentations was that condition being required by MS&G.

D. Marshall: At that time, they hadn't come with a completed plan and they were concerned of changes. Now that the plan is complete, it is mute.

M. Sorel; I don't see any commercial development in this plan.

D. Campbell: There is none and in discussions with retailers, there isn't enough to bring in some. It lends itself to vending but not to retail.

M. Sorel: What is the board's feeling about a convenient store located near a project of this size?

D. Marshall: There was a store at Granite Hill and that failed.

M. Sorel: They built a wall to keep people out. It was poorly done. That is not a good comparison.

**Public Hearing closed.**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

J. Duffy: Asian Breeze, a new restaurant at the Wal-Mart Plaza, would like to put a sign in between the existing panels of Shaws and Wal-Mart's sign.

The consensus of the Board was to allow this sign, but they must conform to the requirements of the Performance Zone.

J. Duffy: Last year, we changed some of the lots from MDR to URD and in doing so, took away the ability to do multi family and accessory apartments in this district. We would like to amend that zoning to allow this. The purpose of the URD was to help those homes with regard to lot size and make them conforming, but you also took away a use that was allowed.

D. Tatem: We are not talking about building new houses; this is taking an existing home and splitting it into two families.

D. Marshall: Will you have sufficient time to prepare the amendment and have it review by counsel?

J. Duffy: Yes

The consensus of the board was to proceed with this amendment.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan