

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**

35 Main Street

Monday, May 23, 2016

WORKSHOP

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), T. Prasol, P. Scarpetti, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Denise Grafton and Christopher Stelmach

EXCUSED: Frank Kotowski, Muamer Durakovic and Michael DiBitetto (Alternate)

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner), Jim Donison (Town Engineer and Assistant Director of Public Works), and Dean Shankle (Town Administrator).

1. REVIEW OF MASTER PLAN

D. Shankle: Town Council has made the Master Plan part of my responsibilities. Staff has been gathering information with the intention of having the data available to pass along to you when the Planning Board called a meeting together.

D. Marshall: Does anyone have any comments on the introduction? I have one for Item 1.1. In the last sentence should read 13 communities, not 12. On page 2, Item 3, "How growth is shaping up" the figures need to be altered to be more current. In the third paragraph which was the indication of serious problems with traffic, I am not sure we have accomplished a lot of that except for the two sections on Rt. 3. When we get to the transportation we need to take a look at how we will address that within the town. On page 1.3, the figures need to be updated in the second paragraph.

J. Duffy: On page 1-1, No. 2 needs to be consolidated and joined with No. 1. That is the history of the current plan. No. 2 needs a different heading based on what has been done and the most recent community profile needs to be added. On 1-3, the second paragraph, the population of Manchester is 109,565. The last paragraph I would reword the Exit 10 information.

D. Winterton: The last line on 1-1, says the Planning Board was disappointed in the level of public involvement. I would add, "continues to be disappointed in the level of public involvement." On page 1-2, Section 3 regarding Heads Pond, North Campus, and Granite Hill, how close was that planning number to being correct?

D. Marshall: That did not happen.

T. Walsh: It is still in the plan?

D. Marshall: That needs to be reworded because we have not seen that growth.

D. Winterton: In the next paragraph down the value \$52 million needs to be updated.

D. Grafton: I think that should mention there was an economic downturn.

D. Marshall: A paragraph can be added that the anticipated growth did not happen due to the economic downturn.

T. Walsh: I originally supported doing this ourselves and thought it would be done the same way as the ordinances. Would it be easier to have a red-lined version done instead of coming to a consensus?

D. Marshall: It will get more difficult when we get into the next chapter regarding vision. You would have to take what was done in the community profile and look for the same section in this to see what, if anything, has been accomplished. There were issues in 2004. The most difficult part of doing a master plan is using vision versus dream. If you have a vision that is not realistic why do we include it? We need to look at what the taxpayers are willing to do.

T. Walsh: This is a ten year plan. For example, a town of 14,000 people is not going support public transit.

D. Shankle: I did not want to get ahead of where you are. If you like the general format we can take drafts chapter by chapter and bring it in for your comments. What process would you like to use? How would you like us to help you?

D. Marshall: I would like to have a strong relationship with Planning to get this done. I would like to see the Assistant Planner position replaced, however, that is your decision. We need time for discussion and something in writing that addresses the issues.

T. Walsh: It is recommended, not mandated, that this be done every ten years. I do not see how we can do this in any other way but to work with staff and use the data that has been compiled.

T. Prasol: I believe that if staff has the data it would be good to see that data in a chapter format.

J. Donison: If we go that direction, let's do one chapter at a time to ease the burden on our staff.

D. Marshall: Let's go back to Chapter 3.

A recess was called at 6:34 pm so that J. Donison could make copies of Chapter 3: Existing Land Use. Back in session at 6:40 pm.

J. Donison: Do you want the maps updated with the GIS mapping?

J. Duffy: On page 3-1, it says residential includes 1, 2, or 3 family units. Per zoning 3 family is multi-family. I am not sure if it needs to be as that was for assessing. That needs to be looked into. If the table is getting updated, the existing land use categories need to be updated as well.

D. Marshall: Assessing has a massive data base. Can we extract what we want out of that data base and make the tables consistent over time?

J. Donison: I can find out. Each category has a tag for it.

P. Scarpetti: The one in the existing Master Plan is too broad.

J. Donison: I also do not know why the acreage changed.

D. Winterton: I question why the current land use has increased.

P. Scarpetti: There is a large list and I think some of the items should have been in current use.

J. Donison: The new version has the numbers specified. We can go back to the old version if you would like.

D. Marshall: The newer table reflects what is actually there. I think the newer format explains things better, but there would need to be a footnote explaining why this does not correspond with the previous Master Plan.

P. Scarpetti: Some of the industrial is being used as commercial so that needs to be considered.

D. Marshall: The residential definitions need to be looked at.

J. Duffy: Are condos considered multi-family?

D. Grafton: Can we define the definitions of that in the different zones?

J. Duffy: That is discussed later. This chapter is about what things are being used as.

D. Marshall: The zoning map needs to be worked on.

J. Donison: I can use the GIS for that.

J. Duffy: There are a few parcels that have been rezoned in the past few years and they may not be on the tax maps or the GIS.

J. Donison: Whatever assessing has goes to the GIS.

J. Duffy: Assessing is incorrect. The Performance Zone will be included in the new map.

D. Grafton: Is assessment phasing done?

D. Winterton: We go to full assessment.

J. Duffy: Assessing happens when it is being built.

D. Marshall: Are we going to settle on a base of 2105 for data?

J. Donison: The data we have collected is for 2015.

D. Winterton: On page 3-5 under residential land use, paragraph A was a copy of the previous one. Is that where the concentration of residential areas are?

J. Duffy: No that needs to be changed.

P. Scarpetti: On that same paragraph, Manchester Sand and Gravel transferred a lot of land so that needs to be updated.

D. Marshall: In the last sentence on 3-6. "It is the intent of the Community Development Department, the Assessing Department, and those involved with developing computer databases and mapping for the Town to enhance our abilities to map these land uses with increasing accuracy." That was a goal in 2004 and no move has been done to do that. I would love to see that happen. That needs to be reworded.

D. Marshall: So you will take this back, rework it, and we will see the updated draft and it is up to this Board to approve it or amend it.

J. Donison: Yes.

D. Marshall: Each time we meet can we have a new chapter, see the draft of the previous chapter, and be given a reasonable time frame?

J. Donison: Regarding the next chapter, I am waiting for information and am not sure when I will have that. I would like to give you the draft a week before our meeting. A time frame for Chapter 4 should be two months.

D. Grafton: Can you request information for subsequent chapters to give them notice that you will be requesting information?

J. Donison: Yes.

The next workshop was scheduled for July 25, 2016.

T. Walsh: We should save Chapters 1 and 2 for the end.

2. OTHER BUSINESS

J. Duffy: There is a program called Solar Up. Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission asked if Hooksett would like to participate. They talk about and find out if residents or businesses are interested. They put it out to bid and get a package deal. Then Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission guides them through the process. The town would talk about it and get as many people involved as possible.

D. Winterton: Is that Planning and not Council?

J. Duffy: It is usually Planning but it could be Council.

D. Winterton: There is no money involved for the town and I am more comfortable due to the bidding process.

J. Duffy: They were successful in other town's they have done this in.

D. Winterton: Would this organization make a proposal to us in person?

J. Duffy: They could. The deadline is May 27, 2016.

T. Walsh: That is not a lot of time.

D. Marshall: Has anyone checked on the fence at the FireBird?

J. Donison: DOT installed the fence. They were asked to fix it and they said they will not fix it.

D. Winterton: Please provide detailed information of that conversation to the Town Council.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:27 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**