

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING SPECIAL BOARD WORKSHOP
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, April 22, 2019**

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

PROOF OF POSTING

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Marshall (Chairman) and Paul Scarpetti

ALTERNATES: Matt Reed and Brett Scott

EXCUSED: Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), Tom Prasol, David Boutin, Christopher Stelmach, and Robert Duhaime (Town Council Rep.)

STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)

DISCUSSION

1. Discussion for Public Input Session for Master Plan Update

N. Williams: We have been working on updating the Master Plan and working with SNHPC to update and weed out things that are not needed to condense it. We are ready to move this into the public input section of the process. We have already had two town wide surveys. I have talked with most of the town departments and employees to update myself and to get staff perspective on where we want some of the action items to go. I think we should take those ideas to the voters. I would like to talk about how, where, and when to do this.

D. Marshall: My first exposure to the Master Plan was in the early 1970's. The Master Plan was done under a program financed by the Federal Government. That included a series of policy statements broken down into categories. It was followed by the guidelines for Master Plans in the RSA's and was adopted by the Planning Board in 197. That Master Plan stayed until the 1980's and a vast majority of that Master Plan was implemented for zoning changes. We developed site plan regulations and subdivision regulations. We went from a large booklet to a 10-page booklet. In the 1980's they went to redo the Master Plan again and we contracted it out to SNHPC. They did everything in coordination with the Planning Board. We held a series of public informational meetings to present it to the people and to get public input. As a result of those meetings we developed the Master Plan. Public hearings were held by chapter to approve the Master Plan. When that was done we held the last of the public hearings where we took final input. About two weeks later the Planning Board adopted the Master Plan. Master Plans are adopted by the Planning Board and signed off by each person. In the 1990's we reaffirmed

the existing one with small changes. A large change came in 2004. We held a two day charrette. The public was invited and it was a really good turnout. We had input from various groups and adopted the Master Plan with an official hearing. The vision statement was done in 2003, 2006, and 2013. What came out as a vision of the community varied very little from 2003 and 2006. The only thing changing in the Master Plan at that point is data. The Master Plan, as published today, has too much data. The Planning Board had decided the Master Plan should come down to a small document. The appendix would carry the data and back up material. The Master Plan, that people would read, would be a series of goals and how they would be accomplished. Very often in doing a Master Plan you are working in a vacuum. A notice about doing a Master Plan will be put out and a lot of people will show up and a lot of people will not come. It is different when there is a item in an area that has public interest. We need a way to get people to tell us what they really want and at the same time letting them know that in order to do things we need funds. My question is where do you see Hooksett in 5 years, 10 years, 20 years from now? It is important to get out of the people what they want. Everyone will also not be satisfied because the Plan has to be realistic. It might be better to have things read as a goal along with a way that it can happen.

N. Williams: The Plan includes the results of the survey, the action items we have going forward, and relevant data. We have thirteen chapters in the Plan and all we are required to have is visioning and land use. I really want to find out from people what they want.

D. Marshall: We have to be careful because we collect impact fees and we need the data to be able to continue to do that. We need to have something written that says what we can use those fees for. The impact fees have rules of their own for growth, not maintenance. If it is a need today you can't use the impact fees. If it is a need in five years you can. Very few communities are allowed to collect them. We are allowed to because of the case we laid at the Senate. We agreed that the money would be first in, first out, and they could only be used along corridors. To give up impact fees goes back to a time I don't want to go back to. Enactment, extraction, extortion. Most of our improvements were minimal off-site improvements. We could manage to get some improvement but not a great deal. We could not widen roads. Impact fees also said that originally they could only be used on local roads, not state highways. That has changed because local roads intersect state highways. I would not like to go back to the old system. That being said, I believe the impact fees table should be reexamined. If you are talking about changing them, you would have to contract out to a firm that is adept in doing that.

P. Scarpetti: On impact fees, could we use the money to buy houses in order to widen a road?

D. Marshall: Yes.

D. Marshall: 28 by-pass is going to be part of the Master Plan. It is already there. I would fight tooth and nail that those four lots never be developed commercial because it too dangerous, unless the developers are prepared to spend a lot of money to make that safe. You have to think of the ramifications. One of the goals of the Master Plan is to develop commercial.

N. Williams: Are we talking about having multiple sessions? How will we market this?

P. Scarpetti stated that the Economic Development Committee could have a role in putting an event on.

As far as location it was a consensus of the Board that the event could be held at a school or the library.

As far as advertisement, it was suggested to ask businesses with digital signs at the corners of the corridors to advertise on their signs, Facebook, twitter, WMUR, the Union Leader, and the Town website, a bulk mailing, and e-alerts.

D. Marshall: What is the message we send and what is the goal to get out of the public?

N. Williams: My goal is to condense the current Master Plan. We want it to be easy to reference for people. It is best to give people parameters up front, and then the real issues. How do we synthesize that into effective feedback? We need to create the topics. That could be something we take from the comments we have already received back. With the software we have we can extract those main ideas to shape this.

It was suggested to put items together: Economic Development and Land Use; Housing and Population; Transportation would stay alone; Committee facilities, natural resources, recreation, and schools; Public safety would stay alone. There would be overlap.

N. Williams: We don't want to end up with a wish list or things that are not feasible. If we break into groups we want to make sure each group is given a goal. There need to be parameters set by a facilitator and something visual that people can relate to.

It was suggested to extract the top items from the consensus of what has already been done and come up with main action items from that.

It was a consensus of the Board to have a one day event to be held on June 1, 2019 preferably at Cawley Middle School, with an alternative of Memorial or the Public Library. A timeframe to be returning the information to the public would be toward the end of the summer, a second informational session to be held at the end of the September, and a November date for adoption.

As far as facilitation it was suggested to have facilitators who are familiar with an area but not directly involved.

ADJOURNMENT

M. Reed motioned to adjourn. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**