

**Official**  
**As of 10/05/09**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD  
WORKSHOP MINUTES  
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
Monday, September 28, 2009**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 7:00pm

**Planning Board**

Chairman J. Gryval, Vice-Chair D. Marshall, Town Administrator, C. Granfield, M. Cannata, D. Hemeon, F. Kotowski, B. Sullivan, J. Mudge, R. Duhaime, and B. Sullivan (arrived 7:10pm).

Absent: Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy, Y. Nahikian, and R. Guay.

**REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT**

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy, Stantec Engineer, and Dan Tatem.

<p><b>WATER PRECINCT PROCESS WITH APPLICANTS AND DEVELOPERS TO OBTAIN WATER APPROVAL</b></p>
--

**Water Precinct Attendance:**

**Central Hooksett Water Precinct (CHWP)**

Greg Weir, Superintendent, Janet Levy, Engineer, and Jay Smith.

**Manchester Water Works (MWW)**

Guy Chabot, Water Distribution Administrator

**Hooksett Village Water Precinct (HVWP)**

Joe Hebert, Superintendent

J. Duffy: We want to have open communication with the water precincts. We are working on updating our Development Regulations. What we are asking for from applicants/ developers may not fit how water does things. We want to work as a team. Manchester Water Works provides a capacity letter, however they have to have engineered plans to look at or no capacity letter. I believe that is how CHWP is going now.

G. Weir: We have no new procedure. We issue a pre-construction letter with our by-laws and handbook to every developer. However, the developer doesn't bother to read it. I don't understand this meeting tonight. You won't change the developer.

D. Marshall: The problem we have is the developer's plan to the Planning Board (commercial, industrial, etc.) shows a municipal water line. We don't know that there in fact is a water line and need note on plan from CHWP, or other precinct, to verify this up front before the applicant can continue the planning process. We also need something from CHWP before we can approve the plan.

G. Weir: We receive the escrow deposit, plans go to Janet and she either Oks for request updates before she can approve. A capacity letter legally would bind us, so we don't issue them. I need to know what the Fire Dept. requires, before I can say OK with pipe and water.

D. Marshall: At the early stage we need to know there is a water line there. The developer needs to tell us on the plan that CHWP says there is a water line.

J. Levy: The developer submits the plan early on, and we see if the water line is correct and in our precinct. It is logged in. We have a letter for existing water line, and fire flow & domestic usage.

D. Marshall: The Planning Board needs to be notified.

J. Levy: CHWP letter has conditions.

D. Marshall: Could we get copied on that letter, so we can proceed with the approval of the plan?

J. Levy: We confirm 20 psi for fire, 35 psi for domestic, then we issue a letter the water is available.

D. Tatem: If a developer does not have pressure, they can put a pump station on their property.

J. Levy: No pump within their building per State law. Also, CHWP, per the new State law, would determine if we would allow a developer to build a pump station. It also has to go through DES.

D. Tatem: A developer could make it work if it is a pressure issue only?

J. Levy: They would need 35 psi with a pump on their own property.

D. Tatem: It is possible the developer won't be able to get pressure, if an abutter won't allow the pump house on another property. HVWP is limited on water.

J. Levy: Granite Hill's 10 yr plan is for 800 units, then stop and replace water lines and tanks. The Planning Board approved them for 1,200 units.

D. Tatem: The Board approved them, before the steps we take now to assure capacity and pressure are there before they (developers) continue to the Planning Board.

B. Sullivan: The problem is approving something, then down road there is a problem with water.

J. Levy: That is why you are not getting letters from us.

J. Duffy: Now we are not signing and recording the plan, until we have a letter from the water precinct.

D. Marshall: It is simple. We are not approving plans until water does.

D. Tatem: Can a project be found complete? We need water and sewer letters. The developer needs to make sure it is a viable project. Don't waive the letter requirement in the checklist, but reword it for prior to the completeness motion. The conceptual set of plans is to establish availability of water and pressure.

J. Levy: 1) Granite Hill, and 2) U-Haul sites had no connect letter.

J. Gryval: We need a letter of pressure and capacity from the precincts, before the plan is found complete.

D. Tatem: Can we get an example letter from each precinct; format letter?

J. Gryval: The RSA states completeness is when the Board has enough information to proceed. We need water pressure and capacity.

D. Marshall: Rewrite our Development Regulations with what we discussed tonight, and give to the precincts to get their OK.

J. Levy: At the same time the developer submits to the Planning Board, they should submit to the water precinct.

D. Tatem: You need the plans before the Board to check for accuracy of the water lines.

G. Chabot: We get plans from Donna prior to the Planning Board Meeting and I send an e-mail to her with my comments. Hooksett is better than most with this process. With other towns, if I send them that there is water available, they think that is the final water OK. Hooksett looks at more detail. Engineers and Civil don't know Fire requirements. It is easier for Manchester vs. your local water precincts, because we have bigger projects.

J. Gryval: Water should review sooner, before it gets to the Board.

G. Chabot: 99% of time the process is easy for us, but not necessarily easy for CHWP and HVWP.

D. Tatem: We get last minute plans two weeks prior to the Board. The developers should go to the water precincts first.

D. Marshall: Our Development Regulations have to reflect that. For developers and engineers, 90% of their plans just cover the checklist.

C. Granfield: The checklist isn't detailed enough. We (Board) shouldn't get the plan until it is all set.

B. Sullivan: The checklist is based on the State's guidelines. Are we saying we are making a radical shift for water and sewer to be engineered out?

J. Gryval: I was the Chair on this Board years ago when completeness was started. Not only should we have water and sewer, but also we should have State permits.

D. Hemeon: The plan should not be found complete without water and sewer.

B. Sullivan: The developer says there is no flexibility. We should instruct our Planner and Engineer for more completeness criteria.

R. Duhaime: Should we also require water and sewer easement letters, if applicable?

D. Hemeon: 3A had to cross MSG's property to get water.

B. Sullivan: There was a ZBA property that had no pressure past the foundation, but they would give the variance.

J. Hebert: Harmony Place, the water line goes up somebody's property.

J. Duffy: Greg, can we get your procedure manual "by laws"/steps for the developers?

D. Marshall: What do you give the developer when they come in?

G. Weir: What and how much to get to Janet.

D. Marshall: Can we get a copy of that document?

J. Duffy: Your listing of procedures, we can include that in our "Developer Information" booklet.

D. Hemeon: Our Blue Book has water and sewer.

J. Levy: We send design standards.

C. Granfield: At the TRC meetings is where all this should happen.

D. Tatem: They are not listening to what is required.

J. Gryval: We need a full compliment of our TRC members. Example was the Fire Dept. was not there to answer a sprinkler question.

C. Granfield: If a department can't make it, they should have someone else show up.

F. Kotowski: CHWP, HVWP, and MWW, for contractors they should get the same treatment from any one of you as far as sets of procedures/instructions. Are you consistent?

G. Weir: Yes, I would say so.

G. Chabot: MWW has 100 employees.

G. Weir: We hand them the instructions; they don't read it.

G. Chabot: If they hire an engineer, it's the engineer's job to comply.

J. Gryval: Staff, get copies of precinct packets and copy the Board.

B. Sullivan: We are deviating from our completeness to force developers to go in front of water precincts for capacity, pressure and connection.

J. Gryval: I would say yes. The more done for completeness, the less the Board has to do for the process.

G. Weir: Have them submit their plans to water first.

D. Marshall: Speaking as a developer, I spend \$1,000 to design water, pump, etc., only to have the Planning Board say you can't do that project?

D. Tatem: If they completed a full design with State permits, then I would agree with Dick's statement. However to get a water design to the size of the pipe and elevation to put in a model program with general fire flow #s, "x" heads, and pressure, is there much more than that you need? You don't want a "full" design plan before the Board sees the plan.

J. Levy: Sewer requires a DES permit. Do you need the permit first?

D. Tatem: Sewer is not an issue, just capacity.

J. Levy: Do you need the DES permit when approved?

D. Tatem: Before the plans are signed and recorded, Bruce says pay for capacity and we get a letter from him.

J. Gryval: Let us know capacity and pressure is available, and then the Board can move along from there.

R. Duhaime: Recently an applicant withdrew. He said water changed his mind due to the costs needed up front vs. what he had spent to design his building. When you first talk to an applicant, do you discuss if the building is sprinklered?

G. Chabot: The Fire dept. decides.

J. Hebert: You are talking about Green Mtn. He met with me 3x. He knew up front the costs & process, and he never got back to us.

J. Gryval: What do you need?

G. Chabot: Sprinkler and fire flow.

D. Hemeon: What is the distance of the hydrants?

G. Weir: 300-500 ft, it depends.

G. Chabot: We go as far as 1,000 ft.

J. Levy: 660-1,000 ft = 300 gallons per minute. Hooksett's requirement is 500 for a single-family house set back 60-70 ft between houses. Spacing depends on density of housing.

D. Tatem: Costs?

G. Chabot: MWW charges a quarterly fee of \$300; \$1,200 per year. A 10,000 sq ft building in Manchester requires sprinklers.

M. Cannata: For the conceptual plan, how detailed does it have to be for the developer to move forward with the water precincts, so the Planning Board can look at it and move forward?

J. Levy: Example Cinemagic, they had no water pipe on Rte 3, so we connected them from the back of their property. We question how long the water line is to see if it is enough to put in our computer and meet Hooksett's ordinance.

D. Tatem: At the TRC, water comes to this meeting and there is a discussion on the conceptual. Before the developer meets with the Planning Board, they should meet with the water precinct. The Planning Board should wait for the water availability letter, before going forward with the project.

R. Duhaime: This Board spends hours sitting here going over water issues. I appreciate you coming tonight.

G. Weir: Developers coming to us first will save a lot of time.

J. Gryval: The developer must go to the TRC with a conceptual plan, before the Planning Board sees it.

C. Granfield: At the TRC, Jo Ann and Dan can let the developer know what is needed prior to applying to the Planning Board.

D. Tatem: We need two letters from the water precincts: 1) for completeness – an availability of water letter, and 2) prior to signing and recording the final plan set – an approval letter.

List of items water precincts need from developers:

- concept plan
- sprinkler flow
- fire flow
- elevations
- ISO (2,500 gallons per minute)

### **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT REGULATION UPDATES**

J. Duffy: We thought we would go page-by-page, and stop at the pages that were highlighted (red by Stantec).

D. Tatem: The last time we met, we only got through 24 pages in 3 ½ hrs. I suggest forming a sub-committee.

J. Gryval: The 24 pages we already went through, no need to go through again.

B. Sullivan: A subcommittee will work really well.

D. Marshall: How about afternoons from 2-4pm for 4-5 sessions?

D. Tatem: Rob and Yervant have particular things, and would only be needed for aesthetics building and landscaping designs. Aesthetics criteria is in the regulations, however it is just not detailed.

J. Duffy: I will coordinate a sub-committee to review the updates of the Development Regulations.

<b>CAROL GRANFIELD, TOWN ADMINISTRATOR, UPDATE OF DRAFT 10-YEAR PLAN</b>
--

C. Granfield: On the 10 yr plan, there are a couple of Hooksett projects. We were contacted from Manchester with concern for exit 7. Several years ago exits 6 & 7 were on the plan. Manchester wanted to change the intersection. I attended a meeting with the DOT commissioner on what direction we are headed. CLD worked on plans way back when. Now there is a new plan from CLD to relocate exit 7 (Front St). The Council, along with other communities, sent a letter to add exit 6 back on the 10 yr plan. Exits 6 & 7 will help with Exit 10 traffic.

D. Marshall: Wasn't the first project on the list part of the Cabela's project?

J. Duffy: 2 yrs ago exit 6 was on the 10 yr plan; now it has disappeared.

D. Marshall: The State initiated the project connected to Cabelas project. Now without Cabelas, we would put up 1/3 of the cost.

J. Duffy: If you take off the Cabelas item, it is hard to get it back on the 10 yr plan.

D. Marshall: The Town's share would be \$633,000.

J. Duffy: Can you put it out a few years?

D. Hemeon: Don't take it off; too hard to get back on.

D. Tatem: Rene worked on the hour glass issue at Goonan Rd and the 10 yr plan for impact fees. Recently, someone asked Rich Radwanski at DOT District 5 about the 10 yr plan, and he said it was not in the DOT plan. The cost is \$1.6 million.

D. Marshall: \$200,000+ to DOT, another \$600,000 from Lowes and Walmart, and Market Basket at \$200,000. \$1.2-\$1.6 million is to include the realignment of Goonan Rd. and Central Park Dr. Use that money to benefit all.

J. Duffy: \$120,000 is what the State is looking for Market Basket to pay for that project. We are also asking the developer for the Town to hold the impact fee for 10 yrs vs. 6 yrs. We could use the Market Basket share for Town improvements. Lowes and Walmart paid "shared" impact fees, and before building, allowed the Town to hold these fees for 10 yrs.

R. Duhaime: We need to get on the DOT 10 yr plan.

***D. Hemeon motioned to adjourn at 8:35pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***



**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 8:35pm. The next Planning Board Meetings in October are at the Hooksett Town Hall Chambers @ 7:00pm:

- October 5th – regularly scheduled meeting
- October 19th – regularly scheduled meeting

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick  
Planning Coordinator