

Official
As of 02/12/13

HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, January 7, 2013

CALLED TO ORDER

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD

Chair John Gryval, Town Administration Rep. Leo Lessard (DPW Director), Donald Winterton, Tom Walsh, Frank Kotowski, Robert Duhaime and Thomas Prasol.

Excused: Vice-Chair Dick Marshall, David Rogers, Town Council Rep. Susan Lovas Orr, and Town Administrator, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr.,

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

Jo Ann Duffy, Town Planner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 12/17/12

*D. Winterton motioned to approve the minutes of 01/07/13. Seconded by F. Kotowski..
Vote 5 in favor. R. Duhaime and T. Walsh abstain.*

J. Gryval: All 3 alternates Thomas Prasol, Donald Winterton and Robert Duhaime will be voting tonight in place of Martin Cannata (open slot), David Rogers, and Vice-Chair Dick Marshall.

COMPLETENESS WAIVER & PUBLIC HEARING

1. GREEN VIEW MANAGEMENT LLC (#12-28)

University Heights Subdivision, Map 14, Lot 1-13

Amended 2-lot subdivision (parent lot + 1 new relocation of Map 14, Lot 1-13-19) AND lot consolidation.

- **Waiver Request** – Development Regulations (06/04/12) Section Part II – Subdivision Regulations
2. Completeness Criteria – Checklist
- **Waiver Request** – Development Regulations (06/04/12) updated AOT permit

Jeff Burd, RJB Engineering: We were here last month and were granted a waiver for the length of Alumni Drive to relocate lot 1-13-19 to Alumni Drive. We have formalized a plan showing that relocation and it has been distributed to you.

J. Gryval: You met with the Conservation Commission and they are happy. Jo Ann are you all set?

J. Duffy: Yes.

J. Burd: We have two waivers.

J. Gryval: Yes one for completeness checklist.

R. Duhaime: Where is the easement going?

J. Burd: Lot 1-13 is the open space. We are adding the existing lot 1-13-19 to open space for access to the school lot.

R. Duhaime: Is the proposed lot 1-13-19 a different lot where the cul-de-sac is shorter?

J. Burd: No it is the same lot just being relocated to the cul-de-sac.

J. Gryval: It is the same number of lots with lot 1-13-19 just being relocated.

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

Waiver Request #1 – Development Regulations (06/04/12) Section Part II – Subdivision Regulations 2. Completeness Criteria – Checklist

*F. Kotowski motioned to grant waiver #1 above. Seconded by T. Walsh.
Vote 6 in favor. R. Duhaime abstains.*

Waiver Request #2 – Development Regulations (06/04/12) updated AOT permit

J. Duffy: Normally we would need a renewed AOT permit for one that expired, but in this case it wouldn't be needed until construction.

*D. Winterton motioned to grant waiver #2 above. Seconded by F. Kotowski.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Waivers above per RSA 674:36 (II) (n).

T. Walsh motioned to approve the application for Map 14 to 1) consolidate lot 1-13-19 into lot 1-13, 2) subdivide lot 1-13 for one new lot at the Alumni Drive cul-de-sac, and 3) relocate lot 1-13-19 to this new lot conditional:

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to the Community Development Dept.
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital

- All outstanding Federal, State, and local permits are obtained and submitted to the Town
- Note on plan AOT permit to be renewed at time of construction
- All waivers noted on plan cover sheet
- At the discretion of the DPW Director, the applicant agrees to attend a required pre-construction meeting after (a) all bonds are submitted and approved, (b) site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place, and the Inspection Funding Agreement is signed and submitted, and (c) the plans are signed and recorded
- At the discretion of the DPW Director, the applicant agrees to site plan compliance monitoring
- PDF version of signed plans is submitted to Town via e-mail attachment

Note: The above conditions in no way reflects all requirements to be met by the applicant per the Town of Hooksett Zoning Ordinances, Development Regulations, Minutes of Boards/Committees/Council, Stantec, and Merrimack County Registry of Deeds.

Seconded by L. Lessard.

Vote unanimously in favor.

**2. SMC MANAGEMENT CORP. (#12-29)
University Heights Apartments, Map 14, Lot 1-12**

Amended site plan to add carports for the apartment parking area

- **Waiver Request** – Development Regulations Section III Site Plan Completeness Criteria – Checklist

Jeff Burd, RJB Engineering: I am here tonight with Steve Dotolo, Project Manager, SMC Management Corp. There are five (5) buildings and we propose carports for 30 spaces. I discussed this with the Fire Dept. and they did not want the carports adjacent to the buildings for fire protection. The carports will also not interfere with snow plowing and snow storage. The Fire & Building departments are on board with the carports.

S. Dotolo: For building #50 we are unable to install the carports as they are shown on the plan now, because the utilities are going through that area. The alternate is to go through the clubhouse area. The total number of carports shouldn't change.

R. Duhaime: I am stepping down from this application as I see Artisen is associated with SMC.

T. Walsh: The proposed car ports for building #50 can't be put in, because of the utilities.

S. Dotolo: Utilities with columns is not for me. We will move the carports to the left hand side of the clubhouse area.

F. Kotowski: Where the carports are proposed, you won't remove those parking spaces?

S. Dotolo: No, we are putting the carports over the parking spaces.

J. Duffy: Also from the Fire Dept. they do not want any storage of gasoline or propane.

S. Dotolo: I met with Deputy Chief Hoisington and Matt, CEO, for their concerns in advance.

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

**Waiver Request #1 – Development Regulations Section III Site Plan Completeness
Criteria – Checklist**

*T. Walsh motioned to grant waiver #1 above. Seconded by D. Winterton.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

Waiver above per RSA 674:44 (III) (e).

D. Winterton motioned to approve the application for carports conditional:

- All review fees are paid-in-full
- LCHIP check payable to Merrimack County Registry of Deeds is submitted to the Community Development Dept.
- 2 mylars, 11 paper copies (22x34), 1 paper copy (11x17), and 1 digital
- All outstanding Federal, State, and local permits are obtained and submitted to the Town
- Recordable plan sets to show building #50 carports relocated to clubhouse area
- All waivers noted on plan cover sheet
- At the discretion of the DPW Director, the applicant agrees to attend a required pre-construction meeting after (a) all bonds are submitted and approved, (b) site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place, and the Inspection Funding Agreement is signed and submitted, and (c) the plans are signed and recorded
- At the discretion of the DPW Director, the applicant agrees to site plan compliance monitoring
- PDF version of signed plans is submitted to Town via e-mail attachment

Note: The above conditions in no way reflects all requirements to be met by the applicant per the Town of Hooksett Zoning Ordinances, Development Regulations, Minutes of Boards/Committees/Council, Stantec, and Merrimack County Registry of Deeds.

*Seconded by T. Walsh.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

WAIVER REQUEST & PUBLIC HEARING

3. **GREEN VIEW MANAGEMENT, LLC (#12-30)
University Heights, Map 14, Lot 1-16**

- **Waiver Request** – Article 30 Impact Fee Ordinance E (2) waiver to recreational impact fees for University Heights Apartments (Map 14, Lot 1-12) in lieu of improvements to public use parcel
- Applicant request for Planning Board to recommend to the Town Council that the Council accept the public use parcel

Jeff Burd: SMC Management Corp. owns the apartments (Map 14, Lot 1-12) and they are asking for a waiver of recreational impact fees and Green View Management, LLC owns the public use parcel (Map 14, Lot 1-16). The park is directly across the street from the apartments on Blackwater Road. The site was filled and leveled when Blackwater Road was built. Now it is a staging area for the apartment construction. We met with Leo and Jo Ann and came up with a plan for a public use parcel in lieu of paying recreational impact fees. The land would be conveyed to the Town for a public park. The improvements we are proposing to this parcel are noted in our application to include: two (2) tennis courts, open pet friendly lawn area, a perimeter walking trail (1/4 mile), public rest rooms, park benches, fencing, parking lot for 11 vehicles, and landscaping. There is a steep rip reap slope in back, so we want to fence there. The open lawn area is pet friendly and will have landscaping and lighting.

Steve Dotolo, Project Manager, SMC Management Corp.: We had a more elaborate plan for possibly making part of the green lawn area an ADA handicapped playground, but the cost of the project exceeds that. We weren't in a position to know what funding is available to the Town. We now propose a scaled down version. Should the Town want us to put in a playground and sprinklered park, we can have designs for that.

D. Winterton: The maintenance of that would then become the responsibility of the Town?

J. Gryval: Yes.

D. Winterton: Mr. Chair, is this something we have done in the past?

J. Duffy: This parcel is part of the University Heights' parcel and because of their zoning (MUD#2) there is a requirement that so much land is dedicated for public use. We had no solid plans back then. Impact fees we normally collect for recreation are for fields and goes into a town-wide fund and spent town-wide. This developer approached us to keep these impact fees within the University Heights' parcel, because that MUD is so large. The public use parcel would benefit the residents of the apartments, Mt. St. Mary's condos, and library visitors may even use it.

D. Winterton: Are they just asking for a waiver of recreational impact fees?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. Winterton; I was on this year's CIP Committee with Mr. Walsh and there weren't enough impact fees for the Donati Field bathrooms.

J. Duffy: We have a pool of funds. I don't know the amount now, but those funds would typically be put in that fund.

T. Walsh: The location looks like it would be mostly to the benefit of University Heights.

J. Duffy: The total cost is \$118,116 in recreational impact fees.

F. Kotowski: What is the cost to develop the park?

S. Dotolo: We are still in the estimating stage with the project. We would certainly work with the Town Council and DPW for a final proposal so that \$118,000 will be spent on this project.

F. Kotowski: Is \$118,000 sufficient?

J. Burd: \$130,000 is my estimate, and I am hoping mine is high. We do have other single-family homes at University Heights that are paying impact fees. It is just the apartments we are asking a waiver for recreational impact fees.

F. Kotowski: I would like to hear from Leo, DPW Director. Also, have you talked to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board directly?

L. Lessard: I am in favor of this. It will probably bend to the apartment people, but it will still be a nice park for University Heights as a whole development.

F. Kotowski: I live in that area of Town and I know there is nothing there for parks. I want to make sure we are not circumventing the vision of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.

J. Gryval: How is the general public going to know the park is available to them?

S. Dotolo: University Heights apartments have their own separate playground to include a separate gazebo and separate BQ area. Will University Heights use the park? Sure. Will the Town residents benefit with having the park? Sure.

T. Walsh: Leo, are the estimates for the park improvements close?

L. Lessard: Yes, pretty close.

T. Walsh: What is the difference of fees to create the park and impact fees?

S. Dotolo: We wouldn't go over the \$118,116. Originally we had an ADA handicapped playground design. It would have been the first in Town. At Village Water Joe Hebert has a handicapped family member and he wanted to know how the water precinct could contribute to an ADA handicapped playground design.

T. Walsh: Should we bring this to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board?

L. Lessard: Yes. They are coming here first, then to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board and then to the Town Council.

J. Gryval: This proposed park area is so far off the beat and path that I am not sure the public would use it.

J. Duffy: You can see the park area from the main roadway. The streets in this development are public not private.

J. Gryval: I would rather hear from the athletic association before we recommend waiving the impact fee.

S. Dotolo: We wanted to assure this impact fee was used for this project.

T. Walsh: I would like to table this item until after we hear from the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.

S. Dotolo: How would you like University Heights Limited Partnership to handle impact fees so that should this park project get approved, we don't lose that money? It is because it (park) helps the Town is what I am getting at.

J. Gryval: We can recommend or not recommend, but I and other members feel there is not enough information to make a recommendation.

J. Burd: The Town Council makes the decision and we are looking only for your recommendation.

F. Kotowski: If you had already been to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board and they said "we reviewed the park project and we think it is a good thing", then I would be able to make a recommendation.

J. Duffy: Read Article 30 Impact Fee Ordinance E.2. *"The Planning Board may agree to waive all or part of an impact fee assessment and accept in lieu of cash payment, a proposed contribution of real property or facility improvements of equivalent value and utility to the public. Prior to acting on a request for a waiver of impact fees under this provision that would involve a contribution of real property or the construction of capital facilities, the Planning Board shall submit a copy of the waiver request to the Town Council for its review and consent prior to its acceptance of the proposed contribution. The value of contributions or improvements shall be credited only toward facilities of like kind, and may not be credited to other categories of impact fee assessment. All costs incurred by the Town for the review of such proposal, including consultant and counsel fees, shall be paid by the fee payer."* Leo's department is in charge of impact fees and how they are spent.

J. Gryval: I understand and that is why we have a Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.

F. Kotowski: We are short of hearing from those who make the input we need.

J. Duffy: 10 days prior to the CO is when the impact fees are due. Maybe we could send a recommendation to the Town Administrator that the impact fee funds be held in a separate escrow account until a decision made about the park parcel and what to do with those funds.

J. Gryval: I personally would want more information before I make a recommendation to the Town Council. If the whole Town can benefit from the park area and they know they can use it and that is clear to me, then I can make a recommendation.

D. Winterton: Will this set you back in terms of getting your CO?

S. Dotolo: I am responsible to pay my impact fees. We would like to see some improvements not only locally but town-wide. That is why we looked at an ADA handicapped park. We looked at the area and asked ourselves what would the park name be? We started talking about having a name for a "community park."

D. Winterton: If you were forced to pay impact fees in cash, does this make this project go away?

S. Dotolo: We are not saying we are holding back impact fee payment, however if the Town doesn't use it in so many years it goes back to the developer. If the Town benefits and we benefit then everybody benefits.

T. Prasol: How many total University Heights homes in the area?

S. Dotolo: We have 9 buildings and a clubhouse for a total of 204 apartments.

J. Burd: There are also 150 single-family homes and another 50 townhouses.

S. Dotolo: You will be getting future impact fees from the future single-family homes. I would like to see the park built this summer so residents can use it immediately.

Open public hearing

Robert Duhaime, 1779 Hooksett Rd.: The University Heights were originally to be 2-bedroom units. Now the units are downsized to one bedrooms. 100 more units, more than half, are one bedroom. Elevation wise the site is visible from DW Highway. There will be screen for the apartment building across the street. Eventually there will be access to Avon Road to the Granite Heights development with another 100+ units for their easy access to this playground. The site elevation is my concern.

T. Walsh motioned to table this application to the Planning Board meeting of February

***11, 2013 conditional that the applicant meet with the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board before this date. Seconded by T. Prasol.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

TABLED TO FEBRUARY 11, 2013 PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

***PUBLIC HEARINGS – EXTENSION REQUEST – ACTIVE & SUBSTANTIAL PERIOD PER RSA 674:39 EFFECTIVE 06/27/11**

- **Extension Request** - Development Regulations (06/04/12) Section 22. Legal Provisions 22.02 Five-Year Vesting Period “The Board may grant extensions, upon written request (waiver for the 30 days), stating the requested length of extension and the extenuating circumstances justifying an extension.

**4. *WALMART (wastewater treatment plant) (#08-37)
3 Commerce Drive, Map 37, Lot 43**

Site plan for the proposed addition of a 249 sq. ft. wastewater treatment plant. Active & Substantial period expired on 02/03/12. On 08/06/12 the Planning Board granted a 1 yr. extension to 02/03/13. The applicant is seeking a 2nd 1 yr. extension to **02/03/14**.

Peter Imse, Sulloway & Hollis: I represent Walmart in connection with this application. Some of you were on the Board 8/6/12 when we came for our 1st extension. This is our 2nd extension request. On 11/17/08, Walmart received an amended site plan for a wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) to replace their subsurface septic system. Before the WWTF was constructed they were approached by the Town to expand the municipal sewer lines to serve their store and other stores on that side of the Town. If that happens, they will not proceed with the WWTF. Things go slower than you expect, but we have had good conversations and a short list proposed agreement. Walmart would build the sewer extension to the Martin’s Ferry pump station. If all goes as planned, they would aggressively start permitting this year with construction this or next year. In the meantime, approval for WWTF expired 2/3/12 and we received our 1st extension to 2/3/13. This is our 2nd extension request to 2/3/14.

F. Kotowski: Atty. Imse, the Sewer Commission, Town Administrator, and Town Planner have good open meetings to bring the sewer extension to fruition.

Open public hearing

No comments.

Close public hearing

***F. Kotowski motioned to grant an extension to February 3, 2014 for the Active & Substantial period. Seconded by T. Walsh.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

**5. *GRANITE PLAZA , LLC/GEORGE LAWRENCE (#08-32)
1778 Hooksett Road, Map 6, Lot 23**

Site Plan for building addition, parking lot, and related improvements to support a 60-Seat Restaurant. The Active & Substantial period expired on 01/26/12. On 07/09/12 the Planning Board

granted a 1 yr. extension to 01/26/13. The applicant is seeking a 2nd 1 yr. extension to 01/26/14.

Paul Mansback: I work with George Lawrence who is in the audience tonight. Several years ago this Board was gracious to grant us a variance for a 60-seat restaurant (or service facility) with a parking lot. We were gung ho about it, then right after approval the economy took a tail spin. We have since asked for extensions. We are asking for a re-upping of the approval, so that we may have another year of sales to make the property what we originally envisioned.

Open public hearing

Pauline Pellerin, 96 Granite Street: We were told if they came again for another extension that it would be harder for them. What good is it if we give them an extension every time it expires?

J. Gryval: It depends on the circumstances. I don't know how long they will go for extensions. If the Board feels they want to vote to grant an extension, they have the right to do that.

Donald Carrier, 95 Granite Street: Here we are again another year later. People of the Town voted to have a significant buffer between residential and commercial use. I believe it is the Board's responsibility to enforce that. I shouldn't have to come here every year to approve or disapprove this project. I am 53 years old and have lived there all my life. The front of the building faced Rte. 3. Yes there is a proposed 8 ft. fence, but the site is higher so they will look right into my windows. A buffer would be wonderful vs. an 8 ft. fence.

J. Gryval: The buffer is 25 ft.

D. Carrier: 95 and 96 Granite Street are affected as well. I live where the fence is supposed to be. A buffer would have a very big impact to approve this property.

R. Duhaime: I was hoping by now Mr. Lawrence would develop this property. We are supposed to represent the citizens of Hooksett. A year ago we had this same conversation. His neighbor's home is for sale. I know the applicant has issues. The lot has been like this for a few years. A lot of applicants we are extending, we need to put some conditions on. I think he should put some type of screen.

J. Gryval: I never thought they could get a 60-seat restaurant in there. I don't remember exactly how it was approved, but they are here for another extension.

R. Duhaime: It is a 15 ft. buffer.

T. Walsh: It was approved with the buffer requirement at the time.

J. Gryval: Many times I questioned these extensions.

J. Duffy: At the time it was a 25 ft. buffer and now it is a 50 ft. buffer.

P. Mansback: I believe there was a limit to how many times to request an extension.

J. Duffy: There is no limit on the number of times to request an extension. The State changed expirations from 3 to 4 to 5 years. We are following the State requirement. It was a 25 ft. buffer, but the Board agreed to a 15 ft. buffer with a fence.

F. Kotowski: Have there been zoning changes, since this was originally approved?

J. Duffy: Just the buffer.

F. Kotowski: We should treat this developer as any other. It is because of the economy they are asking for extensions. I don't think it would be fair to tell you to start over.

J. Gryval: We are not making any changes. At the time they were approved it was a 15 ft. buffer.

J. Duffy: It was a 25 ft. buffer, but the Board allowed a 15 ft. buffer with a fence and plantings. Nothing changes from the original approval. The only thing they are asking for is an extension for their active & substantial period. If they are not granted an extension, they would have to start all over again and get a waiver for the buffer.

T. Walsh: Even if we went with the 50 ft. buffer change, it still allows this Board to require less with fencing and plantings.

Close public hearing

***R. Duhaine motioned to grant an extension to January 26, 2014 for the Active & Substantial period. Seconded by D. Winterton.
Vote 6 in favor. J. Gryval opposed. MOTION CARRIED.***

OTHER BUSINESS

CHARTER AMENDMENTS

Amendment Relative to Membership on the Planning Board

J. Gryval: Amend Article 11.1.A, to read as follows (new text in *italics*, text being deleted in strikethrough type): A. Planning Board. There shall be a Planning Board consisting of *seven* ~~nine (7 9)~~ members and three (3) alternates as provided by state statute. Six (6) of these members shall be appointed by the Council for terms of three (3) years, such terms to be staggered. The Town Administrator and one other member of the Town administration appointed by the Town Administrator shall serve as ex-officio members and one representative from the Town Council shall be appointed annually at the Council's first meeting. *A member of the Town Council appointed annually by the Town Council at their first meeting shall be an ex officio member.* This representative shall have all the rights of membership except the right to hold office of the Planning Board and shall be appointed on

an annual basis. The Council shall fill any vacancy for the period of the unexpired term. The Planning Board shall have all the powers granted to planning boards by state law.

Explanation: The purpose of this amendment is to eliminate the Town Administrator and one other member of the Town Administration as members of the Planning Board.

J. Duffy: The amendment would be eliminating two positions from the 12 member Board (9 full-members + 3 alternates) to a 10 member Board (7 full-members + 3 alternates).

T. Walsh: I want to applaud Dr. Shankle on this amendment. There needs to be a go to person for residential or non-residential sites. Once they applied to the Planning Board, there could have been a conflict of interest as a voting member (Town Administrator & DPW Director). I see his angle here.

F. Kotowski: I would support it also. We have our Town Planner here who doesn't vote as member of the Board. Members of this Board are residents of the community. I believe we do need the DPW Director at the meetings, because he is an invaluable asset to this Board. I don't think that when an issue comes up that really affects Town's people, members on the Board particularly, can cast a deciding vote. I support this and it is a great thing.

J. Gryval: The DPW Director should be on the Planning Board whether he votes or not.

L. Lessard: I agree with you 100%. I don't think I should be voting. I don't live in this Town. I would like to put my input in just the same.

D. Winterton: My concern is it would be hard to mandate attendance at every meeting. The job description for Town Administrator & DPW Director, if they can't attend the Board meeting, they could make comments to the Town Planner. That is why they have a job. I am in agreement for these two non-voting members.

R. Duhaime: Not having public works represented here would be a big mistake.

T. Walsh: We still have our Town Engineer also. I just don't want to miss your (DPW Director) information.

L. Lessard: I would still come to the Board meetings as a non-voting member.

J. Gryval: Does the Board think it is important for the Town Administrator to be here?

F. Kotowski: No.

J. Gryval: OK, I will inform the Town Council at their meeting of 1/9/13 of our discussion tonight.

Amendment Relative to the Number of Signatures Required for Zoning and Building Code Amendments by Petition

J. Duffy: Amend Article 3.6.F to read as follows (new text in *italics*, text being deleted in strikethrough type): F. Creation of, or amendments to, Zoning ordinances, historic district ordinances or building codes may be petitioned for by no less than *twenty-five two percent (2%) of the* voters of the town and shall be established or amended in accordance with the procedures outlined under RSA 675:4. Any Zoning Ordinance, Historic District Ordinance or Building Code or amendment to an existing Zoning Ordinance or Building Code proposed by the Council or the Planning Board shall be submitted to the voters of the Town in accordance with the provisions of RSA 675:3.

J. Duffy: The Town Charter since the beginning required 2% of registered voters for a petitioned zoning article. The RSA says only 25 registered voters are required. In 1989 when the charter was adopted the Town did 25 voters. It wasn't until 6-7 years ago that our attorney said 2%. It seems excessive. Every year we never know what the actual number of signatures is to require, because it is based on the number of registered voters and is a moving number. A petitioned article would still come to the Planning Board to recommend or not recommend to go forward to the voters.

Board consensus: OK with the 25 registered voters.

J. Gryval: OK, I will inform the Town Council at their meeting of 1/9/13 of our discussion tonight.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CHAPTER INTO THE MASTER PLAN

J. Duffy: Jack Munn at SNHPC will attend an upcoming Planning Board meeting (either February 11th or March 4th) for the public hearing for the Board to adopt the Economic Development Chapter into the Master Plan.

TOWN ENGINEER FOR PLAN REVIEWS VS. STANTEC

L. Lessard: I would like to hire an engineer for all plan reviews and sewer reviews. \$200,000 a year collected for Stantec could come to the Town. He/she doesn't have to be a PE, but can be licensed. The person will work alongside Jo Ann, myself, and Matt Labonte and on projects like CMAQ. We still may need an outside source for specialty items. Things would go a lot faster and smoother and there would be better customer relations with an in-house engineer. I would miss too much if I did it all myself. I talked with the Sewer Commission, and they are going to think about it. So far they think it is a good idea. It is a plus all the way around. I didn't want to bring it up to the Town Council this past Saturday, because I wanted to discuss this with you (Planning Board) first.

F. Kotowski: Leo in Hudson what did you do?

L. Lessard: We had our own engineer and hired out for specialty items.

F. Kotowski: It will be a savings in dollars for the Town.

L. Lessard: In 2007-2008 there was \$600,000 collected for Stantec. We can hire someone for a lot less per year.

T. Walsh: Estimate by percentage, how much will it save us?

L. Lessard: We (Town itself) spent \$30,000 last year on Stantec. The previous year it was \$150,000-\$200,000. Developers last year spent \$175,000 to Stantec.

R. Duhaime: A previous Public Works Director was an engineer.

L. Lessard: Our CEO is a licensed architectural engineer.

J. Gryval: You will need to be careful on how you present it (in-house engineer). Now developers pay Stantec. Having an engineer on staff, would the taxpayers pay?

L. Lessard: The position should be self-funding, because funds are coming from developers to pay for it. It should be a special revenue fund.

J. Duffy: When Jim Graham was here he went to the Town Council with the same proposal and got shot down.

R. Duhaime: Applicants said Dan (Stantec) wasn't a PE, and now they can say the Town engineer is not a PE.

D. Winterton: How would the rate/fee be set?

L. Lessard: I would call other towns and get their prices. It would be "x" amount for a quick plan review, and then a rate by the hour after that. The applicant is still charged, but the money would go to the Town vs. Stantec.

D. Winterton: It is not the same as outsourcing.

L. Lessard: Now I do site plan compliance monitoring at \$65.00 per hour in-house vs. Stantec's \$113.00 per hour.

Board consensus: Pursue in-house engineer vs. Stantec.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Matt Mercier: As of September I am the Chair of the Economic Development Committee (EDC). We have three focuses: 1) recruit new business to Town, 2) keep business already in Town, and 3) promote unified boards/committees (i.e. Town Council and EDC). Mike Bergeron, DRED, stated that businesses who want to come into the State of NH call DRED. We need a more unified vision to recruit businesses to Town. What I am proposing is in February to have boards/committees come together to discuss a unified vision of what business friendly really means while working with the State. This gathering could take place in Town Hall chambers or at one of the schools. Mike at DRED can come to speak with us. He spoke highly of Bow.

J. Gryval: Why do you think it is difficult to get members to attend the EDC?

R. Duhaime: At a SNHPC meeting they talked about “civic activity”.

J. Duffy: When EDC changed their meeting from noon to 4:00pm the attendance dropped. Also when it was at noon the attendees were served lunch.

M. Mercier: Now we have a simpler vision and the support of DRED.

J. Gryval: Now that we have someone committed to be Chair of the EDC, we now have to find a way for better membership participation.

J. Duffy: Bill Sirak got all the department heads together to provide an update to them on how important economic development is.

M. Mercier: We are going to continue the Ambassador Program and focus groups. We are working to build a stronger relationship with Hooksett’s Chamber of Commerce.

F. Kotowski: 25% of the Town is undeveloped. When the economy turns, we are in a good position. Look at the development at Exit 10. We have to look at our Master Plan for our vision.

M. Mercier: The vision for the Town is a galaxy quest goal. We need to all pull the rope in the same direction for momentum.

**PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP – PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS
2013**

J. Duffy: Just a reminder we have a workshop with the ZBA and Conservation Commission to discuss the proposed zoning amendments for 2013.

***F. Kotowski motioned to adjourn at 7:45pm. Seconded by T. Walsh.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

ADJOURNMENT

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 7:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,
Planning Coordinator