

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, April 20, 2015**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:05 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Marshall (Chairman), T. Walsh (Vice Chairman), P. Scarpetti, T. Prasol, F. Kotowski, Muamer Durakovic, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Michael DiBitetto

EXCUSED: None

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner) and Carolyn Cronin (Assistant Town Planner).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 4/6/15

April 6, 2015 Regular Meeting – *T. Walsh motioned to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2015 meeting. Seconded by M. Durakovic. F. Kotowski and D. Winterton abstained due to not being in attendance. Motion carried unanimously.*

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

HIDDEN OAK WAY (plan #15-02)

Hackett Hill Rd. & Countryside Blvd, Map 37 (Hooksett) & Map 766, Lots 15J & 15L (Manchester)

152-unit townhouse development and site improvements in Manchester with a proposed driveway on Hackett Hill Rd., Hooksett.

J. Duffy: The applicant asked for a continuance until the next meeting which is May 4, 2015.

F. Kotowski motioned for a continuance until May 4, 2015 for Hidden Oak Way (plan #15-02), Hackett Hill Rd. & Countryside Blvd, Map 37 (Hooksett) & Map 766, Lots 15J & 15L (Manchester). Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING

HOOKSETT SCHOOL DISTRICT & TOWN OF HOOKSETT (plan #15-05)

5 Memorial Dr. & Egawes Dr., Map 18, Lots 3 & 3-2

Lot line adjustment plan to consolidate 6.41 acres of Lot 3 into Lot 3-2.

F. Kotowski stepped down.

Bruce Kudrick (Superintendent of the Town of Hooksett Waste Water Commission): This year at the school warrant we put a warrant article in to get six acres of land next to the treatment plant. The sewer commissioners are looking, down the road, for expansion of the waste water facility. The site we are currently located on is maxed out. When the town grows they are looking to have the land available to expand the waste water plant. It was voted on by the legislative body by a vote of 1,049 for and 419 against.

Marcel Croteau (19 Springer Road): Who owned the six acres?

B. Kudrick: That belonged to the Hooksett school district.

M. Croteau: How long ago?

B. Kudrick: Since they built the school in the 1960's.

M. Croteau: What is the expansion for?

B. Kudrick: For whatever is needed in the future for the town. Right now we have a permit for 2.2 billion gallons at our current location. As the town grows, we need the capacity for future expansion.

M. Croteau: A few years ago it was dumping in our river.

B. Kudrick: On the drawing you can see the sewer system. At the bottom is a small square which is the waste water plant. Most waste water plants are built at the south end of towns. This plant was put in the center of town. They bought the land in 1965. It allows for the split of the town. You can take the flow from the both ends of town to go to different treatment plants if they wanted to. What you are referring to, that went down the river, was a new product that was being used that had disks. There was an engineering and factory defect and they went down the river. That won't happen again.

M. Croteau: What about the flow in the river?

B. Kudrick: We have a master plan that we have to do every 20 years. We are due for another master plan in approximately five years. We are designed to take everything on the west side. We have areas where we have to pump it under the river, but we can get it to the treatment area.

M. Croteau: Who owns the railroad?

B. Kudrick: Pan Am.

Close public hearing.

P. Scarpetti motioned to approve Hooksett School District & Town of Hooksett (plan #15-05), 5 Memorial Dr. & Egawes Dr., Map 18, Lots 3 & 3-2, lot line adjustment plan to consolidate 6.41 acres of Lot 3 into Lot 3-2. Seconded by T. Prasol.

T. Walsh: Was there a discussion at the school board level? I am not opposed to this and think planning for expansion makes sense. I am just concerned about future growth for Hooksett Memorial School.

B. Kudrick: They can only expand the school so far and they have the proper acreage. The land goes downhill so it would be unbuildable for the school. If they go up to 600 students they still have enough land.

Motion carried unanimously.

F. Kotowski returned.

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: SNHU students put together a proposal to have a food truck on site in the parking lot. It will be open from 10 pm to 2 am. It is a bright blue colored truck with designs all over it.

D. Marshall: It is owned by the college?

J. Duffy: I believe the college owns it, but the students are running the program as part of the business program. One of the professors started it.

D. Marshall: What parking lot?

J. Duffy: The one in the front. Once that goes away they are making provisions for them to have a space.

F. Kotowski: Is it open to the public?

J. Duffy: Yes.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ Approval of Stantec Invoices

D. Winterton made a motion to approve the Stantec invoices. Seconded by F. Kotowski.

D. Winterton: Is it a coincidence that these invoices are exactly the same amount?

J. Duffy: They are lot-line adjustments and fairly simple plans.

F. Kotowski: I think it is a fair trade item.

Motion carried unanimously.

➤ **Engineering**

D. Marshall: Within our development regulations there is a statement that says the Planning Board is responsible for the administration of the Development Regulations. Anything dealing with approvals, and so on, need to be handled by the Planning Board. In state law, it says each local land use Board may appoint such employees as it deems necessary for it's work. We shall be subject to the same employment rules as other corresponding civil employees of the municipality. Each Board may also contract with Planners, Engineers, Architects, and other consultants for such services as it may require. Nowhere does it mention that anybody else has the authority to take over that role. That leaves us in a situation where we have two areas that need engineering. One is the engineering review of the plans. That belongs with this Board and this Board needs to decide who is going to do those reviews. The second area is construction monitoring. That is where the line gets fuzzy. Once plans are approved and they leave this jurisdiction, someone else takes over to ensure they are being done right. The only thing the town has to keep in mind is the person who is doing construction monitoring has to know what they are doing. In the case of our regulations, it requires that whenever you are laying drainage we must have a person on site all the time. These issues need to be resolved and it needs to be determined who is going to do this. The Board needs to take a stand and pick someone.

F. Kotowski: I cannot tell you the name of the person who is doing the oversight or construction monitoring for the Sewer Commission, but he does a great job. They pay him by the hour. He is prompt and there when you need him. He is a sub-contractor. I can find out his name.

D. Winterton: Frank, are those fees then paid by the applicant?

F. Kotowski: Yes. For example, when Stantec was at Webster Woods, if they were running a sewer line this person would be there every minute of every day that trench was open to make sure everything was done right.

P. Scarpetti: Does he just specialize in sewer or road construction also?

F. Kotowski: I don't know. Bruce Kudrick would know that. We look at invoices and performance reports and are very satisfied.

J. Duffy: You need to have more than one person, because there are a lot of projects going on at one time. One person would not meet the needs.

T. Walsh: We still have no engineers lined up or interested?

J. Duffy: The DPW Director is gone and Diane is the acting Director. There is a proposal before the Town Council to make her the Director, take another position as Deputy Director, and also have that person be the engineer. That still needs approval by the Town Council, they still have to advertise the position, and hire. It will take a while. In the meantime, Stantec is still doing the plan review and

Keach-Nordstrom is doing the construction review. However, he made an agreement with Leo to do it at a lesser amount because he was helping him out for a short time period. I do not know how long he can go at that price. He had contracted with an individual and I am not sure that individual is still available.

D. Marshall: He was a former Deerfield road agent. Steve Keach has indicated he will continue to do the monitoring on those projects that he was working on, but did not want any new ones, at that rate anyway.

J. Duffy: I think if the rate went up, then he could use his regular people.

D. Marshall: He cannot use his people at that rate.

T. Walsh: What is the rate from the past and what Keach-Nordstrom needs now?

J. Duffy: The rate was approximately \$85 per hour and right now they are paying \$65 per hour. I believe Stantec's rate was around \$90 per hour. This other person happens to be out of work so he is able to do it through Keach and then Keach covers him for the insurance.

F. Kotowski: If it is sub-contacted and we bill the developer for that service, does it matter what we pay? I can see where you do not want to rip off folks, but I can also see the need to make sure someone is available to do that work when the developer is ready to move forward with their projects.

J. Duffy: The reason they chose the \$65 per hour is because when Leo first started it that is what he was charging, but then he lost a lot of people and wasn't able to do it any longer.

D. Winterton: From the Town Council's point of view, we are in an interim period. Is it possible that developers could come with a suggestion of one or two engineering firms, or is it possible for us to develop a list of more than one?

J. Duffy: We used to do that, and one person charged less than the other, so everyone chose the one that charged less. If that was to be done, I would recommend the rate be the same to make it fair.

D. Marshall: Historically, the firm that we have used also agrees they will do no other work in town, because then no one can claim that one developer or construction firm is favored over another. That could drop a lot of companies. Stantec agreed to it. Steve Keach might.

J. Duffy: He told me he would if he was the sole engineer.

D. Marshall: You can't have three firms that agree to never do any other work in Hooksett. It doesn't work. If you decided to do that, you have to see who they worked for in the past and make sure they are not assigned to a client they had before. It doesn't look right due to conflict of interest.

T. Walsh: I know we pass these costs on to the developers. It was the price that Stantec was charging these developers that started this desire to change. I think to let them charge what they want goes

against the reason we went down this road in the first place.

D. Marshall: When a decision is made, they have to submit a rate schedule, and it can be within a certain amount of time. They have to agree to freeze those expenses. I don't know how to go about this anymore, because what you are offering a registered professional engineer, you will have a hard time finding one.

D. Winterton: The plan that is going to be presented to the Town Council on Wednesday will address that.

D. Marshall: It has to be a registered, professional engineer or he cannot practice engineering.

P. Scarpetti: We can check the rate, but it is busy work. You can get billed 100 hours for something you thought would take 50 hours. We can look at a Stantec bill and say it is approved, but we have no idea how much time the people thought it would take or what the scope of the work was. We have to put our faith behind whoever we pick. This is an interim problem that I hope will be corrected, and I hope they adjust the rate scale and try to consolidate two jobs into one so we can get someone.

➤ **Recommendation for appointment to SNHPC**

D. Marshall: Have we had any recommendations for appointments to the SNHPC?

J. Duffy: No.

➤ **Recommendation for Conservation Commission Representative**

D. Marshall: Have we had any recommendations for Conservation Commission?

J. Duffy: Frank had been volunteering, but is no longer able, so we need someone else. They meet the second Monday of the month at 4:00pm.

OTHER BUSINESS (cont.)

J. Duffy: General Electric is having their groundbreaking ceremony on May 7, 2015 at 11:00 am. This is a ceremonial groundbreaking. They are not at the point of starting construction yet.

D. Marshall: When is the state-wide planning session?

J. Duffy: I believe it is either the first or second Saturday of May.

T. Walsh: For the on-site surety bond, Leo was establishing that based on his opinion. Are we going to be going back to our original formula on that?

J. Duffy: No. I had one come in from Scott Bussier. The numbers were from 2006 and he tried to pass it as if it was current, but I sent it to Keach and asked him to look at it and determine what the numbers

should be.

T. Walsh: I was in agreement with that. It was making a difference and getting out in the engineering world that it is easier to do business in Hooksett than it used to be. I hope the changes that were made can continue.

J. Duffy: I have had many phone calls about Leo's departure because of that.

F. Kotowski: This Saturday Comcast is coming in with 45 people to help clean up the riverfront. Carolyn saw to it that Conservation Commission has work for them to do. If you see a Comcast person in town please thank them. Comcast, nationally, has about 90,000 employees and they break off one day a year and pay their employees to go out and do this type of work. Hooksett will benefit from a lot of work for free. Carolyn what time will they be here?

C. Cronin: They are starting Saturday morning at 8:00am. We are meeting at Lambert Park. We will be picking up trash and brush, doing some invasive species removal, and some planting and mulching. They are not only providing volunteers, but also funding a lot of the supplies.

D. Marshall read a thank you note from David Rogers.

ADJOURNMENT

*T. Prasol motioned to adjourn. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 6:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**