

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, November 4, 2019**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: Richard (Dick) Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), Paul Scarpetti, David Boutin, Christopher Stelmach, Matt Reed, and Robert Duhaime (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Brett Scott

EXCUSED: None.

STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 2019

October 21, 2019 Meeting – P. Scarpetti motioned to approve the minutes of the October 21, 2019 meeting. Seconded by C. Stelmach. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

APPOINTMENTS

**1. EVAN LOWRY, SNHU
2500 North River Road
Relief from CETA Impact Fees**

T. Walsh motioned to remove from the table. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

Patti Lyotte: I was conveyed your feedback from the last meeting. We take your concerns very seriously. We respect and appreciate our partnership with the town. I think there are some misunderstandings relative to the campus. In 2017, the Board of Trustees gave me a mandate stating that they wanted to hold enrollment flat. As an institution we are not sure what the future of higher education will be. For the foreseeable future, we have no short or long term plans to increase the campus. We are shifting the students as far as majors. In terms of the master plan, we do not have a finished one. We began that work in 2017, but because we shifted direction it is not complete. We are going to take two more dormitories down but nothing will be replacing those. We are not growing the campus.

Attorney Lowry: At our last presentation we focused on the legal argument as to why the impact fees are not appropriate. I want to supplement that with the data. The undergraduate enrollment has stayed

around 3,000 over the past five years. In the past couple of years it has been less. We think the right number is around 3,000 students and we have a mandate from leadership to not grow that number. The CETA building does not house graduate students. Our culinary major has been downsized and now we have the engineering program. We have the same number of students and, therefore, no additional impact on Hooksett roads as the students are primarily walking on campus. According to the Hooksett Traffic Impact Fee Matrix, if you look at the manner as to how the town uses college impact fees, the assumptions are not relative to the CETA building. "University" has a unique category based on the number of students. The assumptions are that each one of the students will be taking a certain amount of trips that are not currently occurring. There is no logical reason to assume that the 400 students using the CETA building will be making new trips. That is not true.

D. Boutin: Where do the 2.38 trips come from?

N. Williams: The consultant that the town hired in 2005.

Attorney Lowry: No traffic study was required at the time the CETA building was approved.

R. Duhaime: What is the number of commuter vs. residential students.

Attorney Lowry: The percentage of commuter and residential is staying the same.

R. Duhaime: Do you have night classes in the CETA building?

P. Lyotte: That building is only for day students.

R. Duhaime: Will night classes eventually be offered?

P. Lyotte: Night classes are going away. The number of people who are going to college in New England is going down. We want to offer majors that will provide meaningful work. We don't want people coming out with \$80,000 in debt and only making \$35,000 per year.

T. Walsh: You are telling us that you have no plans to increase the population of the student body. For that I guess we are just taking your word for it. We do things differently in Hooksett as far as impact fees. Nicholas, how do other towns, that do not impose impact fees, address future growth and impacts.

N. Williams: Permitting fees are much more substantial.

T. Walsh: Those are not refundable?

N. Williams: In Concord and Manchester they are not.

T. Walsh: I think we do things fairly here. When Mr. Boutin was senator his got something passed that impact fees could be used within corridors. If no impact fees are used you get that money back.

D. Boutin: You have to be able to justify the impact fee and I am not sure we can do that in this case.

T. Walsh: If we decide to go forward and accept the appeal, what does that do for our impact fee schedule for anyone in town. Should we be looking at our impact fees and schedule. Precedent is a big thing and you are asking us to set a precedent on future growth in this town.

Attorney Lowry: The use of the impact fees are publicly available. We looked at that record and the record we have at SNHU. Overall the University has paid over a half million dollars. We had several large projects and the impact fees totaled \$112,063. The impact fees for the CETA building are more than all of those projects combined. As far as precedent, in March of 2017 we were before this Board and the Monadnock Hall had over \$100,000 in impact fees. The town planner consulted with the town engineer and town council and it was decided and unanimously decided by the Planning Board that the impact fees could not be imposed lawfully. The impact fees with regard to traffic were reduced to \$0 and that was rightly decided.

T. Walsh: What is the fate of the CETA Annex?

P. Lyotte: That is a state of the art classroom. It has a wind tunnel and turbine.

D. Boutin: Tom, when you look at traffic roadway, are you looking at campus or town wide?

T. Walsh: The Rt. 3 corridor.

D. Boutin: Additional students is the issue on the surrounding roadway. We take care of the roads. If we take away the traffic and roadway impact fee, would you have a problem with police and fire?

Attorney Lowry: In the past we have been okay with that. As part of modernizing our campus we have spent over \$8 million on roadways. We hope that will reduce the impact on Hooksett and Manchester roads.

P. Scarpetti: I don't think we are setting a precedent because this is for a University and, therefore, per student. I can't see another commercial entity arguing this because it is per student, not square footage.

R. Duhaime: I want to thank you for adding this to the town. Hooksett can be known as a college town. When it was a warehouse it was a tax base which Hooksett has lost. Percentage wise on a permit what does Manchester charge instead of an impact fee? I think that percentage would be fair. This is seasonal for students, but there needs to be a certain number of police and fire on duty all year.

D. Boutin motioned to approve the release of the impact fee on transportation and maintain the impact fee for police and fire for a total of \$21,960. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.

C. Stelmach: What about the future for Alice Avenue leading into Victory Lane. It was recently paved but will have to be dug down and repaved. Who will pay for that?

Attorney Lowry: There is often a misunderstanding as far as taxes. SNHU is the seconded highest taxpayer in the Town of Hooksett.

M. Reed: Are you going to expand your graduate program?

P. Lyotte: We are not looking to increase any student base on campus. We are looking to increase our on-line base.

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

We need something from the university that says yes or no.

Attorney Lowry and P. Lyotte both agreed.

WAIVERS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

2. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES SUBCOMMITTEE

Recommendations

D. Marshall asked each Board member their feedback on the guidelines and feedback was given. Awnings and metal buildings were discussed. Board members expressed their opinions on the types of buildings they would like to see in the Town of Hooksett. Enforcement was also discussed and it was recommended that applicants be required to present extensive detailed plans.

The guidelines were sent back to the town planner and committee for updates based on the comments of the Board. The Chairman advised Board members to send their comments via email to the town planner.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

*B. Boutin motioned to adjourn. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 7:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**