

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

August 30, 2006

ROLL CALL:

Phil LoChiatto, Chairman – Present	Ruth-Ellen Post, Vice Chairman – Present
Nancy Prendergast, Secretary – Present	Walter Kolodziej, Regular Member – Present
Ross McLeod, Regular Member – Present	Pam Skinner, Regular Member – Present
Neelima Gogumalla, Alternate – Present	Rick Okerman, Alternate – Present
Margaret Crisler, Selectmen Member – Present	Alan Carpenter, Selectmen Alternate – Excused

STAFF:

Al Turner, Director of Planning and Development – Present
Rebecca Hebert, Town Planner – Present

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Glen Greenwood, Rockingham Planning Commission

Mr. LoChiatto opened the meeting at 7:30 pm.

WORKSHOP WITH RPC – HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT IMPACT FEE DISCUSSION:

The Rockingham Planning Commission has committed to funding a Highway Traffic Impact Fee Study in Town. Before the establishment of impact fees, off-site (or front-door) improvements were accomplished only through exactions. Impact fees are a scientific method of calculating developmental impacts on a community.

The Planning Board can assess community impacts through impact fees once an ordinance is developed, through exactions, or through a hybrid combination of the two.

Simply stated, once an impact fee ordinance is established, the formula has been already been devised and the developer can plan for these calculated costs.

Exactions require a great deal of knowledge of Town impacts amongst PB members, and a large degree of upfront cooperation between the Planning Board, staff and the highway department. The Planning Board needs to make clear to the developer as early as reasonably possible the extent of required improvements.

In towns that use a hybrid, they have established a corridor in which impact fees are assessed. This corridor typically is a main corridor where large developments are planned. In such cases, the funds are collected and placed in a fund. These funds must be spent within 6 years of collection, or they must be returned. Any impacts outside of the established corridor can be assessed exactions for off-site improvements.

The process for developing an Impact Fee is as follows: 1) identify a corridor 2) conduct a study that identifies required capital improvements, 3) enter capital improvements into CIP, and 4) develop an impact fee formula.

Impact fees are typically created for larger block developments. With many smaller developments, the amount of funds needed may not be collected within the 6-year timeframe and thus would need to be returned.

Impact fees cannot be assessed for maintenance costs.

Currently the Town is out to bid for an Impact Fee Study of the Fire Department response times throughout the entire Town. DOT is also funding a corridor study of Route 111 from exit 3 to Center School. The DOT study is expected to get underway within the next 30 days.

The Planning Board will make a recommendation to the Selectmen at a future meeting of whether or not the Town should proceed with Highway Traffic Impact Fee Study.

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS:

- Mr. LoChiatto would like to review and update the workshop agenda;
- Mrs. Crisler has safety concerns about the Selectmen's recent decision to table discussion of the Faith Road roundabout;
- Mrs. Post would like the Selectmen to provide strong support in upholding Planning Board decisions.

WORKSHOP DISCUSSION – EXPEDITED REVIEW FOR SMALL BUSINESS SITE PLANS:

Mrs. Post has been pursuing information for an Expedited Site Plan Process. Mrs. Post distributed and discussed a memo with her findings so far. Her memo included rationale, statutory authority, sample ordinances, and typical structures of expedited review process.

The Planning Board discussed the need for the process. Members would like to see the problem with the existing review process quantified and defined. How many are impacted and what is the cost of these impacts? Some times it is the little guy that drums up the worst problems. How do we define "minor site plan"? Highlight issues that would automatically kick a plan out of "minor" to full site plan review.

Mrs. Hebert had drafted proposed changes to the Site Plan Regulations and distributed to the Board.

The Planning Board will review the materials provided and continue discussions at a future workshop.

BONDS:

- Villages of Windham, new bond for \$42,834. Ms. Prendergast motioned to accept. Mr. McLeod seconded. Passed 7-0.

CORRESPONDENCE:

- Letter from Mr. Nassar dated August 23, 2006 regarding that he did not propose a bridge at the crossing location;
- Letter from Mr. Nassar dated August 26, 2006 regarding any conclusions that may already have been reached and obtaining video copies of several meetings;
- Letter from Mr. Nassar dated August 27, 2006 regarding the draft minutes of the August 16, 2006 minutes.

Discussion: Letters should be read into the record during a public meeting. Mr. LoChiatto asked staff to draft a letter in response to Mr. Nassar's inquiries for his review and signature.

MINUTES:

- Mrs. Crisler motioned to approve the August 2 minutes as amended. Mr. Kolodziej seconded. Passed 5-1-1. Mr. McLeod opposed. Mrs. Post abstained;

- Mrs. Crisler motioned to approve the August 9 minutes as amended. Mrs. Post seconded. Passed 5-0-2. Mr. McLeod and Mr. Kolodziej abstained;

A lengthy discussion took place regarding the minute taking process.

Ms. Skinner motioned to adjourn. Mr. McLeod seconded. Passed 7-0. Meeting adjourned at 10:20 pm.

These minutes are in draft form and have not yet been reviewed and approved
Respectfully submitted, Nancy Prendergast