

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, June 20, 2016**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:03 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

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

ALTERNATES: Denise Grafton and Christopher Stelmach

EXCUSED: Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), T. Prasol, Michael DiBitetto (Alternate).

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 05/23/16 and 06/06/16

Both alternates will be voting.

May 23, 2016 Regular Meeting – D. Winterton motioned to approve the minutes of the May 23, 2016 meeting. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. M. Durakovic and F. Kotowski abstained due to not being in attendance at the May 23, 2016 meeting.. Motion carried unanimously.

June 6, 2016 Regular Meeting – D. Grafton motioned to approve the minutes of the June 6, 2016 meeting. Seconded by D. Winterton. D. Marshall and F. Kotowski abstained due to not being in attendance at the June 6, 2016 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION

1. FIRE CHIEF JAMES BURKISH

Not present.

2. STUART ARNETT/ARNETT DEVELOPMENT GROUP: FOLLOW-UP FROM THE MAY 2, 2016 PRESENTATION OF THE TIF STUDY FOR THE ROUTE 3A CORRIDOR

Stuart Arnett presented the Hooksett Sewer Line Feasibility and TIF Financing Report Executive Summary, which includes recommendations.

J. Duffy: I spoke with a large developer who was involved with the Londonderry project. He said that if the town decides to go along with this, even if they go slowly and get it on track, it is sending a message that the town is serious about development. It is a positive thing if you are looking to expand business growth on that side of the river. We have been asked for nicer restaurants and we cannot do that on the west side of the river.

D. Marshall: Sewer and water is key to expansion in any community. The problem is who would finance it. It is difficult to get through major public works projects in this town. Those who are currently on the sewer line have no need for this expansion. It is a town wide sharing in which the entire town would need to contribute. We would need to be careful on how to approach the voter to finance this. I think the best thing would be a private/public partnership to accomplish this.

J. Duffy: There is a short timeline to start for the public hearing. If you decide to go forward, the key would be to educate the community.

D. Marshall: Should there be a TIF for the Northern and Southern legs or one for the entire thing?

J. Duffy: The entire thing but not approve the construction end of things as a whole. The Planning Board or group that you would appoint would come back with a recommendation as to which option they would prefer.

S. Arnett: There isn't any proposed development in the pipeline that is significant enough to show that new development would cover it. That is why our plan says that the TIF is important but so are private connection fees, future connection fees, and pledges against future revenue. The issue of who should carry what will not get resolved if the entities cannot come up with an agreement.

F. Kotowski: Am I correct in thinking that the work that would go on between July and October would answer a lot of the questions we have about who is in control, how it would be financed, how much should be done, when it should be started, and if it feasible?

S. Arnett: Yes.

F. Kotowski: That would help with the problem the town has had in the past where one entity looks to another entity to pass it off. This would get all of those entities together to come to a consensus as to whether or not it is a good idea, if it can be done, and when it can be started. Is that what you are saying?

S. Arnett: Yes and also why the private sector is not doing this.

J. Duffy: The reason Mr. Arnett was recommending that the boundaries of the TIF be expanded first is because anything that is built between the time that the boundary extension is adopted to when things get started can be credited.

S. Arnett: We have listed all of the properties and the values as a total and in each of the regions that might be developed. As a starting value, if you put the TIF district in place today that would be the starting line. Anything above that going forward, when your reassessment comes up, would be the incre-

mental taxes that would have to be applied if there was debt that the TIF incurred. If you start the line today and do not incur costs for a few years, you are increasing the eligible amount of revenues that can be used once the costs are incurred. The question is why would you do that as opposed to pay for it from the general fund. By using a TIF you collect 100% of that new revenue to pay off the TIF Fund instead of a portion the town would get from the tax bills. If it is TIF increment, 100% of that goes to the TIF. It accelerates the paydown of that debt and the taxpayers would be paying less money for interest.

P. Scarpetti: If we acknowledge the TIF now, how long can we collect that money before this is started?

S. Arnett: The only time frame the statute requires is when to end it. There are some TIF's that are decades old. The end is when you pay off the debt the district incurs. There is no deadline of when to start.

J. Duffy: Haven't we already started with Exit 11?

S. Arnett: Yes. The Cabela's TIF was adopted. To amend the existing district is almost the same process is putting a new one in place.

P. Scarpetti: Walmart's septic was in failure. Is there any money coming from them or have they spoken about this?

J. Duffy: They let their site plan approval expire for their own wastewater treatment facility and they have not been in touch with us.

S. Arnett: They would be an example of a private user.

D. Winterton: It seems that the stumbling block when those five parties get together would be who would contribute and how much and trying to find out what the right numbers are. Is there anyplace to look for guidance?

S. Arnett: No. I was thinking to bring the engineers back in and have them put a dollar per capacity number in. We would look at trying to find some examples. Another issue would be when they would or could pay.

J. Duffy: We don't have any other money budgeted for this. We got the final numbers at the end of last week. The date has passed as far as getting this into the list of encumbrances. Mr. Arnett has an existing contract tied into that so it would be a matter of extending it. If it was possible that something could be done to extend the contract while we are still in this budget year that would be an option. It is something to think about before next Wednesday.

S. Arnett: We are also thinking about getting some outside resources to come up with a formula.

F. Kotowski: Has anyone in New Hampshire taken advantage of the senate bill that allowed for public-private partnerships to be developed for the purpose of developing sewer and water infrastructure? Are you aware of anyone that has used that?

S. Arnett: I am not.

F. Kotowski: Would that not be somewhat of a selling point that people may not be aware of? It is a big problem to get it financed. The short fall is we do not do a good job at selling ideas. If this group decided if this is feasible it would be beneficial to work on promoting the concept. The public needs to be made aware of what is in it for them.

S. Arnett: I agree.

D. Marshall: Who is responsible for assembling this group?

J. Duffy: Mr. Arnett was thinking it would be the Planning Board.

D. Marshall: The money was taken from our Master Plan, however, we did not know about that until it was too late. We were not the ones that entered into this agreement. Aside from that, if the Planning Board needs to spearhead this we need to start that process right away.

S. Arnett: We are speaking with the Economic Development Committee tomorrow.

D. Marshall: Your recommendation is that someone from this Board, someone from Planning staff, Sewer, and someone representing private industry be included. Who else would you recommend?

S. Arnett: Town Council, Public Works, the Town Administrator and Finance would be contacted to see if they want to participate.

D. Marshall: This group will need to be assembled this week.

F. Kotowski motioned that the Planning Board recommend to Town Council that an exploratory committee be formed to determine, between July and October, the feasibility of development of a TIF District from one end of Rt. 3A to the other end of Rt. 3A.

D. Marshall: If that motion goes through, Town Council will be in charge of this process? Is that what the Planning Board wants or does the Planning Board want to be the lead agency?

F. Kotowski: I want the Town Council to authorize us to do that.

D. Marshall: We do not need their authorization.

D. Grafton: I would like to volunteer.

D. Winterton: I would think that we would want as much citizen involvement as we can without making it too large. When we have a qualified person that wants to step up and be part of it, and since the Planning Board is taking the lead on this, it might be appropriate to have two Planning Board members be a part of the committee.

D. Winterton nominated D. Grafton to be on the committee.

D. Marshall: D. Grafton from Planning Board, P. Scarpetti, D. Winterton from Town Council, and someone from Sewer would be needed.

F. Kotowski moved that the Chairman of the Sewer Commission serve on the committee.

P. Scarpetti moved that David Scarpetti from the Economic Development Committee serve on the committee.

D. Winterton: I am sure that staff will communicate with administration as to who they would like to serve on the committee.

D. Marshall: Could a package be put together to go to Council with that information as well as how many members they would like on the committee.

J. Duffy: I will also put something in there about the funding and an estimate to extend the contract. Did you want to include any business people?

S. Arnett: We would like to talk to current and possible future users.

3. SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN LEG OF THE PARKWAY
David Campbell and Ron Corriveau – Manchester Sand and Gravel
Erik Stevenson - Brox Industries

David Campbell (Manchester Sand and Gravel): This has been on both the town's Master Plan and on Manchester Sand and Gravel's MUD 5 Master Plan for a long time. This is a roadway that runs all the way through the Manchester Sand and Gravel property from the Allenstown border, down to where Manchester Sand's offices currently are, across the road to Industrial Park Drive, and down to the end of Manchester Sand's property where it would continue across Martin's Ferry Road and into the property owned by Southern New Hampshire University, and come out near Exit 9. It was a good idea in its time. Right now it is set up for a double throated 115' wide right-of-way which could accommodate two lanes in each direction with a median. The evolution of development in the town, the cost of roadways, and the fact there is not enough usable land to drive the economic engine to pay for such a road, which would be millions of dollars, makes this non-affordable. We do not see how the state or local government could afford this and private developers cannot make enough money on what little land is left to develop in order to pay for it. We would like to have a traffic light on Industrial Drive on Route 3 which would be a key to development in that area. We will be coming in soon with an application to consolidate the lots at the end of Lehoux Drive and finish that cul-de-sac and continue to have the right-of-way which we would probably deed to the Sewer Commission that they would hold in perpetuity for whatever time in the future that could tie into the Brox Land. As far as the terminus point and the elevations those were worked out in the past with Brox and we are not changing that. The reason we are going to go for the cul-de-sac is the timing.

Ron Corriveau (Manchester Sand and Gravel): *(Showed an overview of what the southern leg of the parkway would entail to build, the size, and what areas the traffic study included).* At the time Southern New Hampshire University co-paid for the traffic study because they wanted to retain River Road

and keep their campus consolidated. We have about 55 acres of flat available land. It totals almost 100 acres when the green space is factored in.

Erik Stevenson (Brox): We are in full support of what Manchester Sand and Gravel is proposing. We want to maintain our ability to tie into Lehoux Drive in the future and want to preserve that right with the Sewer Commission. This makes sense. The parkway is a grandiose plan. Prior it made sense but currently it does not.

D. Campbell: We are going to be making a formal request to remove the parkway. From Manchester Sand's point of view this would allow them to sell land and from the town's point of view it opens up industrial land. There will be site plan issues, however, the parkway creates limitations. The northern leg is also an issue. The town owns the old gravel road in fee. It runs through conservation land and the great marsh. The permitting required would make this near impossible. The town controls that and it is up to the town to decide whether they feel it is necessary to have a road that probably will never be built. The road was only meant to be for a public roadway up to municipal and state standards. Brox is present, Southern New Hampshire University is not. We have not been in contact with them.

J. Duffy: Southern New Hampshire University relayed to me they could not be here. They met with you a few months ago and it seemed as if they do not have any use of the southern leg going through their property.

F. Kotowski: What do you hope this Planning Board or the town would do? Give up the right-of-way completely from SNHU to the Allentown line?

D. Campbell: There is no right-of-way south of the Manchester Sand property. Manchester Sand made an accommodation on it's Master Plan for a right-of-way. It would be to remove it from the Manchester Sand and Gravel property.

F. Kotowski: Years ago wasn't the road going to come out almost at the Allentown line off of Rt. 28?

R. Corriveau: The spine road of the corridor has not changed from the initial concept. We deeded a part in fee to the town.

F. Kotowski: If Southern New Hampshire University were still on Board, the road could only go to Rt. 3.

R. Corriveau: If they were on Board there would have to be an economic engine to get it from Point A to where we would finish our road as part of the construction.

F. Kotowski: How many acres of developable commercial land would be garnered if we gave this up?

D. Campbell: Currently Bear Paw has first right of refusal for that land and it is not developable. On the other side of the pond we are landlocked where the parkway were to go in. For developable land there will be the same problem of if anyone can afford to build a road to get there. The quarry would be the developable land which is on the other side of where the proposed parkway would be.

F. Kotowski: The land would be on the west side of Rt. 3?

D. Campbell: Yes but that is limited as well.

F. Kotowski: If we gave up the road would you have larger parcels to market?

D. Campbell: Yes. There are only so many parcels that are 100+ acres in the Rt. 93 corridor. None of them can generate the income that would justify a roadway that will cost the amount of money this would cost.

F. Kotowski: If we did not move away from giving up that roadway the town would have less opportunity to have something built on those pieces because they are smaller?

D. Campbell: Yes.

D. Winterton: What would be an optimal time frame to complete the right hand part of the “W” up to Legends Drive?

D. Campbell: That would be driven by the type of user.

D. Winterton: That is more feasible than a parkway?

D. Campbell: Yes. It could be as small as a fire road and as large as a two lane roadway versus a parkway. The responsible thing is having the right-of-way and we would probably deed it to the Sewer Commission with the stipulation that any abutters whether existing, the successors, Brox, the town, or the state would have the right to finish the road. Brox would have the final say.

D. Marshall: Did you want to discuss the zoning?

D. Campbell: MUD 5 has strict requirements. Manchester Sand and Gravel has sold off a large area to mixed-users and those are still burdened with MUD 5. A sub-committee asked that I draft an amendment to come up with the list of the lots that have to be changed which was provided to you. That would have to go to your legal counsel. I advocate that it would be easier to do this as one amendment to avoid leaving anything out.

R. Corriveau showed what the zoning of the area should be.

D. Campbell: We are doing this because the lots were all zoned MUD 5 and we want to have them re-zoned into their proper use.

D. Marshall: We will put this on the list that will go to the town meeting. For Brox, relative to what you are doing on your property, what time frame are you looking at?

E. Stevenson: Possibly 25 to 50 years.

CHANGE OF USE

J. Duffy: Trevcom Asset Management, LLC/Ron Jawidzik, 1261 Hooksett Road, Units #4 & 5, Map 31, lot 93 – existing use is a dance studio. Proposed use is office space and indoor internet auto showroom. Approved.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

J. Duffy: Regarding the matrix for the roadway impact fees, we put the issue out for an RFP and we had one person respond. It was from Marty Kennedy of VHB who wrote the initial roadway study. We met with him and he came up with a price of around \$5,800. He would take the matrix, redo it, and add additional categories. I thought it was going on the Town Council's agenda for Wednesday evening to encumber the funds, however, I did not see it on there. Jim asked me in a email if the Board could take a vote as to whether or not they were in favor of updating the matrix.

P. Scarpetti: I think we should discuss it at the Economic Development Committee meeting prior to taking a vote.

D. Marshall: What would the discussion be regarding?

P. Scarpetti: Impact fees for commercial development and whether or not to keep them.

J. Duffy: I received an email from Jeff Larrabee. I am putting him on the Planning Board agenda for July 18. The Town Administrator asked him to come in and show the Board three proposed locations where he might put one section of the Lilac Bridge which he has bid on to move over to his property.

D. Winterton: The New Hampshire Historical Association has a concern that pieces of it will end up as scrap. They are asking Dr. Shankle to show them, if this is sold for \$1, where it will end up and what will happen to it. This is the method he is taking in order to do that.

J. Duffy: The next regular meeting is July 18. July 25 is the Master Plan workshop. The TIF meeting will start in July. Tomorrow night at 5:00 the Economic Development Committee is getting back together after approximately one year. They have been working on the BR&E program.

D. Marshall: P. Scarpetti, T. Prasol, and D. Grafton have been nominated to serve on the Planning Board for another full term. I have been asked to serve again on the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission.

APPROVAL OF STANTEC INVOICES

*D. Winterton motioned to approve the Stantec Invoices and authorize the Chairman sign them. Seconded by F. Kotowski. **Motion carried unanimously.***

ADJOURNMENT

*F. Kotowski motioned to adjourn. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**