

**TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES**  
**SPECIAL MEETING**  
**WEDNESDAY, May 30, 2001**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm.

**PRESENT:** Chairman R. Dion, S. Sheidow, P. Rueppel, D. Pichette-Volk, R. Holley, M. Jolin, P. Ganley, D. Duford, M. Farrell-Town Administrator. T. Young – excused.

Chairman R. Dion called the meeting or order at 6:30pm

R. Dion declared the Public Hearing on the Proposed Fees for the Transfer Station open at 6:33pm.

D. Boyce stated that these are users fees on exactly what it will cost the Town to get rid of the material. **(Attachment #1)**

**Public Input:**

M. Dibitto , 2 Tay Road, Hooksett, asked if these will be fees and not tax increases.

R. Dion responded that they are fees not taxes.

D. Duford asked if the Council had to wait seven days to vote.

R. Dion stated the fee is separate from the ordinance because the fees are already in place.

M. Farrell stated that usually a 30-day notice is given before fees go into effect.

S. Sheidow moved to adopt the Transfer Station's proposed fees as presented in the May 16, 2001 letter. Motion seconded by P. Ganley. **Roll Call vote Carried Unanimously.**

R. Dion Declared the Public Hearing on the Building Department's Proposed Fee Increases and New Inspection Fees open at 6:50pm.

K. Andrews pointed out the following items need to be changed under electrical permits. On the handout the corrections would be the Receptacles, and the Thermostats, Etc. to be .30 each and Distribution Panels – Main, Sub, and Auxiliary to be .10 per amp. The fees have not been updated since 1983 and the fees are reasonable not staggering amounts. **(Attachment #2)**

**Public Input:**

M. Dibitto , 2 Tay Road, Hooksett asked if the revenue will cover the cost of running the Building Department.

K. Andrews stated the intent is to come closer to balancing expenses v. revenue to come in line with permit fees by increasing fees in anticipated construction. Section 4 part B – re-inspection fees and section D – minimum fees are new fees.

R. Dion Declared the Building Department's Proposed Fee Increases and New Inspection Fees closed at 7:10pm

S. Sheidow moved to accept the Building Department's fee changes as presented, to start immediately. Motion seconded by P. Ganley. **Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

R. Dion declared the Public Hearing on the Fire Department's Proposed Inspection Fee Increases open at 7:10.

Alan Cohen spoke to the Fire Department's handout that has been in effect since 1988 and they want to update the fees they do not include tasks that are done today. There are brand new items on the fee schedule because there is now a need for them. **(Attachment #3)**

M. Jolin asked for an explanation of the rough and the final inspection leading up to the second inspection and each subsequent inspection.

A. Cohen responded that he doesn't often need to do subsequent inspections, which cost \$100 per inspection; this is mainly to prevent contractors from trying to cut corners in an installation and not going by the proper procedures.

D. Duford asked if this is geared toward public safety to make sure things are done right.

A. Cohen stated that it is geared toward public safety and is also based on \$25 per hour, which includes anyone involved in the process, and the State requires an Assembly Permit Fee two times a year, which would be a new fee for us to pay out.

S. Sheidow asked how does this compare with surrounding towns.

A. Cohen stated that he compared Concord, Derry, Durham and Hampton and we are about in the middle and we are a lot less than Manchester.

A. Cohen stated that blast standby is new. This covers costs because every time a blast is done the Fire Department must send someone out to stand by.

M. Farrell stated that some time in late 1997 early 1998 that a blasting company caused damage to a home damage in the community.

Chief Howard stated that it was at that time that Mike instructed Chief Leduc there would be blast stand-bys. Up until this building boom the blasts were minimal but now there are as many as three or four blasts per day for a period of four to five months per year. There is significant loss of valuable time, effective use of personnel lost, and a significant strain on resources.

Mike explained on one occasion that the blasting company did not use mats, there was no pre-blast survey, residents were not warned, rocks were blown to another resident's property and there is a chance wells could be ruined. This is more of an enforcement issue that the blasting companies follow the best safety practices, which they don't do it if we are not present.

Chief Howard reviewed the last two years on inspection practices for the sale of fireworks. Initial inspection of a facility takes better part of a 10 hour day. The inspection includes an in house personnel of three people , camera person, video person. It takes time because license requirements are broken down in to quantities. One must review quantities, square footage to be measured, make sure everything follows Federal and State guidelines. Inspection report writing takes about three days. Follow-up inspection takes one day for K. Andrews and A. Cohen dealing with the inspection report and what needs to be followed-up on. **(Attachment #4)**

K. Andrews stated the ordinance is written so there will be no other fireworks sales in Hooksett again.

M. Farrell stated all fireworks sales in Hooksett are illegal, the one we have now was grandfathered, and there cannot be any new fireworks sales in Town.

D. Duford asked is this a yearly fee.

Chief Howard replied yes, it's a yearly fee. I feel with the enormous volume of time used that the \$5000 is a conservative fee.

R. Dion Declared the Hooksett Fire Department's Proposed Inspection Fee Hearing closed at 8:00pm

D. Pichette-Volk moved to accept the Hooksett Fire Department's Proposed Fee Schedule as presented with the exception of firework sales, one year, by \$5000. Motion seconded by D. Duford.

**Roll Call Vote:**

D. Pichette – Volk	yes	P. Ganley	no
D. Duford	yes	S. Sheidow	yes
R. Holley	yes	P. Rueppel	no
M. Jolin	no	R. Dion	yes

**Motion carried 5 to 3.**

P. Ganley moved to accept fireworks fee schedule as presented, effective immediately. Motion seconded by M. Jolin.

P. Ganley said this is the same fee schedule as presented a year ago for \$5,000 the homework has been done on this pretty intensive project.

**Roll Call Vote:**

D. Pichette – Volk	no	P. Ganley	yes
D. Duford	no	S. Sheidow	yes
R. Holley	yes	P. Rueppel	yes
M. Jolin	yes	R. Dion	yes

**Motion carried 6 to 2.**

S. Sheidow moved to reconsider D. Pichette-Volk's motion for the fees to be effective immediately. Seconded by P. Ganely.

R. Dion asked all those in favor say Aye, those opposed say nay. **Motion to Reconsider was unanimous.**

S. Sheidow moved that the Hooksett Fire Department's Proposed Fee Schedule be accepted as motioned by D. Pichette-Volk, to be in effect immediately. Seconded by R. Holley. **Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

R. Dion declared the Public Hearing on the Planning Department's Proposed Fee Increases now open at 8:15pm

P. Ganley stated that in the Proposed Fee Schedule the revenue is increased by 100%, not the 50% as printed. **(Attachment #5)**

C. Watson stated that 100% increase would be correct.

**Public Input:**

M. Dibitto , 2 Tay Road, Hooksett asked how does this effect covering the cost of operations.

M. Farrell said it's not meant to cover department operations but to cover the expense of an in-house Town Engineer. The Planning Board was directed by the Council to revamp fees to pay for Town Engineer.

S. Sheidow stated that it was discussed at a previous Council meeting, that if we started collecting new fees and could pay an engineer that's what the money would be used for and if construction fell off or we didn't need an engineer that engineer's hours would be cut back or that engineer would be eliminated.

M. Farrell stated the Planning Department isn't going to be involved in the impact fees it will be building and finance. The impact fees would be to cover the cost of another person in finance.

P. Rueppel asked if comparisons have been done with other towns.

C. Watson responded comparisons were made with Bedford, Bow, and Concord, and Candia.

R. Dion declared the Planning Department's Proposed Fee Increases in Subdivisions Regulation and Site Plan Regulations closed at 8:45pm

M. Jolin moved to accept the Proposed Fee Schedule as proposed by the Planning Board, effective immediately. Seconded by P. Ganley. **Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

**ADDENDUM #1.**

Ken Andrews presented three items - a letter dated May 18 from Attorney Barton Mayer, subject is Town of Hooksett v. Brenda Wright; RSA 155-B on Hazardous and Dilapidated Buildings; and order looking for approval and signature (**Attachment # 6**). Please view the pictures I am passing around which represent the current condition of the home that burned on Stevens Drive. The building is currently in the state of disrepair; it is opened, un-boarded and generally not safe. The only course of action the Town has left is to go thru a Hazardous and Dilapidated Building Procedure as outlined in RSA 155-B. Which leaves it totally and completely in the hands of the Council. Warm weather is bringing on maggots, flies and vermin into the building. The owner has refused to do anything about the condition of the structure and is a life safety health hazard and an overall hazard to the community. The home is beyond repair. Attached is an Order of Removal and we need to take steps on the condemnation of this structure.

Chief Howard stated that the area smells, tarps have become unattached and are in the trees in the neighborhood. With the warm weather season coming up we are concerned with the smells, there is a fair amount of small children in this area, the house is wide open, and the inside is very deteriorated, windows have been broken, there is no control over the house at all. We ask the council to support K. Andrew's efforts.

D. Pichette-Volk asked if there is any hardship to the family,

Chief Howard stated the family had no insurance on the building but the bank had insurance on property and thru our fire investigation the building is not repairable.

K. Andrews stated that RSA 155-B allows the town to attach the property to get our money back.

Chief Howard stated that the bank will get rid of the property as they have the insurance on the building and the owner has been cooperative through she doesn't have the means to remove the building.

D. Duford motion to move ahead as suggested to adopt the order of removal. Seconded by S. Sheidow. **Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

R. Dion declared meeting adjourned at 8:55pm

Respectfully submitted,

---

Tina M. Paquette  
Administrative Assistant

---

Denise E. Pichette-Volk  
Town Council Secretary