

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Flanders, Selectmen's Rep.; Dever, III; Kahn; LaBrecque, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

Sorell moved, Dever seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 8, 2008, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

### APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **JOSEPH E. TOWNSEND** – Proposed Site Plan Amendment to convert an existing apartment building to a multi-family condominium, Tax Map U06, Lot 10, located at 6 Waukewan Street in the Residential District.
2. **JOSEPH E. TOWNSEND** – Proposed subdivision of a multi-family use into condo ownership, Tax Map U06, Lot 10, located at 6 Waukewan Street in the Residential District.

LaBrecque – The site plan for this project was previously approved on May 24, 2005, so this evening we'll be reviewing the site plan as well as the subdivision application to convert the 3 apartments into condos. The property is located on Waukewan Street across from Waukewan Avenue. There are 3 existing apartments and parking. The application, abutters list and plans are on file, filing fees have been paid and it's recommended the applications for subdivision and site plan amendment be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Dever moved, Sorell seconded, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING. Voted unanimously.

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **JOSEPH E. TOWNSEND:** (Rep. Carl Johnson)

This project was before you recently and received the necessary relief from the Zoning Board of Adjustment and we did receive approval from the Planning Board in May of 2006. At the time, that project was owned by Rick Hagan and he decided to sell it as a whole and because of a financing issue, the proposed buyer could not obtain financing for it in that form so it had to be sold as residential apartments so Mr. Hagan actually dissolved the condominium and the associated documents. As a result, it was John's opinion that the dissolving of the condominium documents in essence voided the subdivision because it was a condominium subdivision. We changed the name on the plan and changed all the associated references to the plan. The name was changed on the floor plans and Frank Michel, attorney for the applicant, rewrote the Declaration of Condominium and it actually has the same name as it had for Mr. Hagan, 6 Waukewan Street – A Condominium. So for all practical purposes the Board has already reviewed this

project in terms of all of the necessary site plan applications and subdivision applications and we're here to resurrect it from what it was because of the way it was dissolved. If the Board were to conditionally approve the plan tonight, it would essentially be the same as before in that the condition would include the recording of the Declaration of Condominium along with the recording of the plan in the Registry of Deeds. I think we've worked out the staff comments. There was a question about the parking and the access to the limited common areas. I've added a small note to indicate where the access to those common areas would be, it's primarily a pedestrian access to those two areas identified on the plan.

Vadney – I seem to remember there was a snow storage or plowing issue on that.

Johnson – I think there was and I think its addressed in the Declaration of Condominium and we talked about the fact that if snow storage became an issue the snow would have to be removed from the site. Essentially what happens in that particular situation is this has been an existing 3-unit apartment building so we're not changing that, expanding the parking or doing anything different from what's there. It's also gone through staff in terms of the water hookups, the meters and it has gone through Chuck Palm in terms of the fire aspects and that has all been cleared.

LaBrecque – I went back into the old file and looked at the conditions. There was a driveway permit issued and I checked with the Water Department and found that each unit is on separate meters already. The Special Exception for the multi-family use as well as a Variance for the third apartment are both referenced on the plan. All utilities are existing. There will be one additional allocation of a space so there are essentially two spaces per unit. I have reviewed the Declaration of Condominium and those will be recorded when the subdivision plan is recorded.

Johnson – The elements of the plan that deal with the site plan portion deal primarily with the parking layout, access issues, lighting and landscaping. After Mr. Hagan received conditional approval but prior to receiving final approval, he did some work on the front and put some pavers in that were in the ROW and Mike Faller pointed out he did not want those in there and they were removed. The site plan aspect of the plan deals with those basic occupational issues of the site whereas the subdivision plan deals with the density issues and so forth.

Janet Carpenter – Has concerns about liability and requested the fence that was there previously there be put back so the kids would not be sliding onto her property.

Vadney - Does it sit on the halfway mark and you'd be willing to go halves on it.

Carpenter – Yes, I didn't bring it up before because there was no dealing with the neighbors that were there before.

Johnson – I would be more than happy to speak to the owner about this because I think you're right, I think he'd want to get together with you and get it done before it transfers into the 3 parties. In terms of the fence, there was a fence there and it's my understanding in speaking with Mr. Hagan, it was problematic with the snow removal, it kept getting damaged.

LaBrecque – I took a quick look in the condo documents and didn't find anything on lighting. Hearing closed at 7:12 p.m.

Bayard moved, Flanders seconded, I MOVE THAT THE APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR JOSEPH E. TOWNSEND, TAX MAP U06, LOT 10, LOCATED AT 6 WAUKEWAN STREET BE CONDITIONALLY APPROVED TO

CONVERT AN EXISTING APARTMENT BUILDING TO A MULTI-FAMILY CONDOMINIUM, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THE TREE AND FENCING ISSUES BE DEALT WITH ADMINISTRATIVELY BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES.
- (2) THE LIGHTING BE THE TRADITIONAL CUTOFF DARK SKY TYPE LIGHTING IF THERE IS ANY OUTDOOR LIGHTING; AND
- (3) THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND THE SITE PLAN APPROVAL PROVIDED IN THE SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATION NOS. 6 AND 17.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Bayard moved, Sorell seconded, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION FOR MULTI-FAMILY USE INTO CONDOMINIUM OWNERSHIP, TAX MAP U06, LOT 10, LOCATED AT 6 WAUKEWAN STREET IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND THE COMPLETED CONDOMINIUM DOCUMENTS BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

### **PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW**

1. **WINNIPESAUKEE PLAYHOUSE** – Neil Pankurst, Sonya Paul Fluet

Neil Pankhurst, Artistic Director of the Winnepesaukee Playhouse and a Consultant for Hidden Green Properties. The Winnepesaukee Playhouse was formed in 2004 by the 4 founders, myself, my wife, her brother and his wife. We were and remain a unique organization in both this State and we believe in the whole of the United States. In that we are both professional summer Repertory Theater and a community theater with an adult team and youth components for the other 9 months of the year. In our opening professional summer season in 2004 in our current space in Weirs Beach, we operated primarily as a receiving house and attendance was rather disappointing. In subsequent years we became more of a producing house and we now produce 9 main stage shows a summer and up to another 6 adult, teen and youth community shows. On top of this we have produced 4 children's shows that run throughout the summer season and operate 9 summer camps for children age 5 – 18 in a single year. There have been 67 professional artists performing on our stage and the community shows have had 620 characters created by local actors and 175 campers have gone through the program and performed in 38 camp shows. We now operate with entire runs of community shows at full capacity which is why we are looking to expand. We had to suspend the children's summer shows after the summer 2006 due to lack of space on stage and because they were negatively impacting our main stage designs. We intend to bring these back only once the organization has completed its second stage phase of the project. Our last 2006 children's series,

Recyclables, completed a three week tour of New Hampshire Elementary Schools where about 4,300 pupils learned about the importance of recycling while being entertained. September and January are now the only two months where we have no productions. Two years ago it was decided to (a) look for a bigger location for expansion purposes and (b) become a not-for-profit organization. Our search for larger properties centered on downtown Laconia until we were made aware of the Annalee property. As the 4 founders live in Meredith and we're all familiar with the rural settings of several theatrical facilities in the Berkshires in Massachusetts and Peterborough, New Hampshire, the potential site was very exciting to us. That culminated in us being granted a variance and special exception from the Zoning Board in December, 2006. Then, winning a legal battle with Townsend Thorndike in late August of 2007 and finally purchasing the property in October of that year, extensive amounts of snow delayed the surveying work pushing this meeting back by several months. The organization did become a non-profit in January, 2008. The organization is operational 12 months a year and has 4 full-time employees. Between September and May the administration and production staff operate between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. five days/week and the artistic staff between 7:00 and 10:00 p.m. 3 nights/week. Each month with the exception of January and September between one and three weekends we'll see a production take place. From early June to late August, the staff swells to around 12 at any given time. There are 5 productions over the season giving 11 performances including one weekday matinee. Our future plans include (a) housing our summer resident company, actors and technicians on the site, (b) building our main auditorium with seating for just under 250 which is going to be this site (old gift shop) here and which will house our administrative offices or rehearsal space, classrooms and associated theatrical space, (c) converting the other part of the old Annalee retail space which is actually this end section into a bar and rehearsal space and prop storage and lastly (d) convert half of the museum space into our second stage black box space which will be used not only for the children's theater but also as an alternate space for smaller scale shows. Sonya Misiaszek of Misiaszek & Turpin, PLLC – I'm going to take you through the site and tell you about traffic circulation, parking and those sorts of items. First off, I want to talk about the setting we're trying create on the site. It's a rural site in our mind, the structures are agricultural in that they look like a barn and we want to play up on that and make it feel like it's a camp nestled in the woods. We don't want lots of lighting glaring, we don't want lots of pavement all over the place so we're really trying hard to work within areas that are currently disturbed and maybe just doing some realignment of the existing parking. The park-like setting will be foremost in our minds as we're going through the design process. We are changing the circulation as it currently exists. The existing entrance takes you up to what was the Gift Shop of the old Annalee property. In the back is the small proposed Children's Theater that they used as their Museum space. What we're actually proposing rather than using this as the main entrance, we're going to enter on the other side of the existing Gift Shop and enter here where the site lines and visibility are better and have a one-way loop circulation of the parking that will go in that manner. The existing Gift Shop is a lease agreement with the Annalee folks

right now. It is a 3-year lease and has the option of being extended for an additional 3 years. If someone were to come to the office space here, they would enter into this parking. We're looking at the ability of maybe tying the parking together or come back out here. There are approximately 52 spaces here and we feel that's sufficient to handle the current capacity of this building. Additional benches would be added near the pond. We would also be adding about 10 parking spaces in this area. The existing storage building would be the future small Children's Theater but there would be drop-offs so if people needed to be dropped off at the door, they could be. It's all working on the proper side of the vehicle so as a car approaches, people can enter out safely and have access into the building. In terms of parking calculations for the main theater we need 83 spaces, that is a ratio of 1:3 based on the requirements in the Town ordinance and for the housing structure, we would have 8 spaces and we are looking at accommodations of hotels as a similar sort of requirement and that is 1 space per bedroom and we have 8 bedrooms in that building. We are not counting parking spaces for the small Children's Theater because these two facilities will not be having a performance concurrently so a performance would be happening in one of the spaces so we're using the one with the 250 seats rather than the 80 seats. We've calculated 69 parking spaces using a ratio of 1 per 200 for the office and retail that exists in the building and 1 per 600 for the storage in the building so that would bring our totals up to about 160 spaces and what we currently have showing are 124 spaces so we're proposing the 124 on-site because we feel its adequate in that this structure currently has 22 employees in the office and the Gift Shop. The retail space is only open during the summer hours. We really don't want to put a lot more pavement on the site. We could try to push it and accommodate it in some areas but we're wondering if when we come back if it's possible to request a waiver on the parking. Vadney – There was a theater group about 3 years ago looking at this site and we did at the time talk to them about off hours and double use of spaces because different buildings are used at different times and I don't think we'd have any problem with doing that as long as it makes sense. I didn't remember that the front building is so large. It seems like a huge number of required parking spaces. Sonya – We've actually gone with two different sources, we looked at the tax maps on it but the playhouse also had an appraiser in and he also determined some of the square footages so they were right on in terms of numbers that are existing there. We'd love it to be less. Vadney – We had made some allowance for where buses could pull up on that far lot. Sonya – Currently, there exists a gravel access around the building and as part of our zoning approval that gravel access needs to be removed and that area will be naturalized. The topography will become more what it should be in that area and we'll plant some appropriate native vegetation. Tim Jordan will be helping us with the landscape selection there. Vadney – Before you get too deep into that, you might want to check with our Fire Department and check on fire access around that building. You don't need to have a road but you may need to leave it somewhat clear. Sonya – When we initially went to the ZBA, we talked with Chief Palm and he was OK with us maintaining the access at the front of the building. Paul Fluet – At the entrance this building has been torn down. We have talked with Chuck and we

are going to sprinkler the theater building and when the children's theater building ever happens that's going to be sprinklered as well. At this point on Reservoir Road, there is an existing 8" water line with a dead-end hydrant, we're proposing to continue it down the same side of the road and there's a 48" diameter concrete culvert that we have to get under which is the main brook passing. We are going to try to stay out of the pavement and we'll probably end up taking one piece of the pipe out, putting the water line in and then putting the pipe back. We know we're going to get into some road restoration here because we are very close to the cemetery. We originally were going to stay off the road but I met with Bob Hill and met him on-site for the second time and we talked about pushing the pipe into the lane of pavement and there are some wide cracks in this piece of road so I think what we will do is saw cut on the centerline and just rebuild that half of the road and those cracks will then disappear. Our original idea was to go all the way down around and come back up and follow our sewer route but in looking at it now, we knew we had a wetland right in here through the middle and last fall when we looked through there you couldn't see anything. Now that the snow has everything matted down, Bob and I both agreed that there's a pretty easy path to have a temporary wetland impact and go right across. There's a little stream that is probably a foot wide and maybe a foot deep and even right now its not running that much and even what I thought, this being wetlands, I walked through there with loafers and didn't get wet so it wasn't even mushy on your feet. I'm not even sure why it's mapped as wetlands Vadney – No ledge under it or anything? Fluet – I have no way of knowing that but when I stood on the road, I could look right up into the parking lot. There are hardly any trees that have to be cut. There are no big gullies or changes in terrain, just the stream with a nice gradual rise up to the stonewall and then we're in the parking lot where we want to be. This is an 8" line that's fed to a hydrant at the end of the line, we have a 4" for sprinkler and a 2" for domestic for the theater and a future similar connection for the children's theater and we're going to tie in the 8-bedroom housing building which is an existing building and a sewer connection to that as well and then a water service connection at least heading in this direction to this building, this is on the well right now and I understand the water isn't that good for drinking. We're thinking this would be a possible future connection into this building for water supply. The existing sewer line goes right down Reservoir Road to a manhole and we're coming up through the parking lot through the road and bringing the sewer line up to a dead-end manhole. The road has a big dip in it and we're going to raise that dip by adding fill about 4 or 5 feet high because there's a 30" culvert that crosses there and originally when I met with Bob I was thinking I was going to have to go under that 30" but I was still figuring on raising the road 3 feet but he preferred that we raise it a little bit higher and go over the top of that 30" so the profile you see reflects that. The only other thing Chuck Palm talked about was the dry hydrant that's in the pond; he feels the hydrant itself is pretty much deteriorated. He thinks the pond is pretty good in terms of depth but the hydrant is kind of welded to itself and he would like us to rebuild the dry hydrant. There's a table in the top right-hand corner that talks about the amount of water we need. Fortunately, a theater only needs 3 gpd per seat so we're only talking about 750 gallons per theater and

the housing which is 8 bedrooms I used 150 gpd per bedroom that's 1200 so we're under 2,000 gpd/day. Obviously, this is not a 7-day or 5-day week business; it's a weekend type of flow. I don't know how that factors into getting permission to get the water. I don't know if we have to do a development agreement and all that kind of stuff. Flanders – First thing we're trying to get our hands around what we have, if anything, for excess capacity. We're not there yet. Fluet - I think that's a good idea. I know there's a senior housing project that's working right now and they will probably consume any excess capacity we have at this time. Flanders - There's a possibility as we get better information, I'm sure you're aware we had a bit of a crisis last summer. Some of that was due to malfunctioning equipment at the plant and we've since fixed that but we don't have a solid handle on what percentage of the problem that was. Some of the metering equipment was not giving us accurate readings. We're in the process now of trying to get real readings over a period of time so we can tell where we're at. (inaudible-no mike) We had a waste gate that was flushing finished water back into the drain system, we also had several leaks that added up to a fairly substantial amount so we can't say that we've got X amount of water available. We've got all of the equipment working properly, we've got the measuring devices working correctly and now we just need to go through a season to see if the water level in the tank is going to drop or we're going to be OK. (inaudible-no mike) Usually when there's a dead-end, they have to blow off so if you could create a loop up in there somehow, that might create some capacity by eliminating the gallons that would be wasted blowing the end of that line off. Fluet – Is that one of the dead-end blowoffs in Ray's report? Flanders – No. Fluet – I think what you're talking about is they flush the line through there. Normally, even if it's a dead-end, you don't have to blow off brand new ductile iron pipe, it's old cast iron that the water just doesn't move through there fast enough that you're going to start to get tuberculation inside the pipe and that creates that black rusty water that you have to keep fresh water moving in through it. I'm pretty sure Reservoir Road is fairly new pipe. Flanders – Probably within the last 10 or 12 years. Fluet – If its cement lined its probably OK. Flanders – In some other areas we've been able to pick up some capacity by eliminating the dead-end. Fluet – I think this is in the new service category. The ordinance says we take the last 3 years maximum day demand and that's what we use and then we take 10% of that away for a safety factor. We take 10% of the capacity and that's 900,000 gpd so that gets us down to about 810,000 and the way the ordinance is written if we apply it, we would have to take into consideration their maximum daily demands last summer but those numbers are somewhat flawed so that's something the Selectboard is dealing with or we're going to have to deal with even before we can approve the senior housing project because if we use the numbers as specified in the ordinance, we don't even have water for that but we know those numbers are flawed. Fluet – I think you're using a peak factor of 2.5 times any new service connection for max a day and it assumes anybody new coming onto the system is going to have their max day on the same day. I know Meredith uses 3 or 4 hundred thousand gallons/day and their peak day is somewhere in the 8 or 9 hundred thousand. Flanders – It used to be 665 I believe and then last summer it went to 875 or something like that. Vadney – There are so many things out there

that there's not a lot of sense in putting time in it tonight. Fluet – The point I was trying to make was your average day now is like 350, if you apply the peaking factor of 2.5 to that you don't have any capacity for anybody else so that's why I think the peak factor of 2.5 across the board for everybody on the same day is conservative and probably overly conservative in my opinion. Flanders – We reduced it from what it was, it was 3. We certainly can't get ourselves in a situation where we're giving away water that we don't have. Fluet – I think the key to this whole thing is to really get a handle on what the real numbers are and are you in a crisis as bad as everybody thinks you are. Vadney – This being a pre-app its good that we've raised it as an issue and there is plenty of time to think about it. Fluet – The good thing is we're only using 2,000 gpd and it's not everyday. With regard to the water, I was asking if we would have to do a Development Agreement which sort of scares me because I know senior housing has been doing a development agreement for the last 3 months. Bayard – It scares the heck out of me because of the amount of money that's involved with that. Fluet – This is a pretty small project, 3 or 4 houses would be equivalent in terms of flow. Pankhurst – Does that mean we couldn't get Planning Board permission because you've got to wait and see what your numbers are on the water? Vadney – There's a possibility of that. Flanders – His question was does that mean he couldn't get planning approval and I think all the site plan and all the other stuff we could do, the issue might be after you get all this stuff done there might be a period of time before we'd be able to supply the water you need. Pankhurst – What would we do in the meantime? If we need to drill wells, we need to do that before we start constructing buildings. Vadney – We could give you approval to go ahead with a condition that you might not want to start moving until you can fill that condition. If the one condition is you've got to get water first, we might as well not give you approval. Flanders – What's your timeframe on this, you're certainly not going to be up and going this year? Pankhurst – No, correct. I do have the phases. Phase I is the construction of the water and sewer lines with the construction of the actor housing. We were initially hoping to do, given the snow and everything else, that's not going to happen but we were hoping that this summer the actor housing would be in place and we could use the actor housing for actors this year. We actually own something else in Laconia but it's a long ways away from where we work. Phase II would be the actual construction of the theater space and we're hoping the theater space will be open by summer of 2010. If that happens and the music festival happens in 2010 as well which I know is their plan, then I thought that was going to be a really special summer for the Lakes Region, Meredith and Center Harbor creating a culturally very aware center. Phase III was the conversion of the second part of the retail building and Phase IV was the conversion of the existing museum into our second stage and that would depend very much on when we can source the money. We'll probably be looking at a capital campaign for those types of things so those might not come on for 3, 5 or 10 years. Vadney – Water is an issue for tonight's purposes and we'll leave it at that. There is a lot of activity happening on that right now so I think there will be some tentative improvement or some beginning improvements fairly quickly. Other comments on your plan, I'm pleased to see you go in to the west side and loop your driveway like



that rather than have any two-way traffic because I think it will certainly be better for circulation and it probably will help your parking and the way you can do some of the pull-in parking and stuff. When we looked before at those parking lots and had to accommodate traffic coming and going and backing around, it was troublesome. Bayard – I have questions about the retail space. That's currently an Annalee Shop right now? Pankhurst – Are you referring to the corporate office? There's a space here that is retail, the rest of it is either storage or office space. They have 22 employees on site even though the square footage indicates they could have a lot more. Given the parking they are supposed to have, they are pretty well maxed out as far as people in this building are concerned. Sonya – The breakdown of the space is 50% is office, 25% is storage, 25% is retail and that's how we determined our numbers. Bayard – Should bus parking be noted on the plans? Vadney – From my view of it, I think it will be a nice thing and we'd support it from a pre-application review perspective, you've actually given us more detail than we frequently see on pre-applications. I don't have a problem with it. Kahn – The only thing I see is I remember when we were going over the Annalee contraction into that building that the buses were going to be in the lower parking lot and the flow is contrary to the flow that you're positing and if you're doing matinees and they are doing tourist buses you're going to have a problem within that parking lot and I think you need to work that one out because there's going to be a problem between your matinee traffic and their tourist bus traffic. It's going to have to be worked out because the system they have now is the buses pull into the lower lot and they're coming in against your flow. Vadney – Would you intend they continue coming in that exit? Pankhurst – I wasn't aware that was what they were doing but I think if this had something like "buses only" entry, this could still continue to be a bus entry only. I think that probably would solve the problem. Vadney – The thing liable to hold it up is the water and there is progress being made as we speak. Flanders – I think this would be a great redevelopment of this site and be an asset to the community. From a pre-application standpoint it certainly seems like a nice concept and a good idea and I hope it's not totally non-profit. Hearing closed at 8:10 p.m.

### **TOWN PLANNER'S**

#### **1. APPLICATION FEE ANALYSIS: Angela LaBrecque**

When it comes time to redo this fee schedule, we'll have to hold a public hearing with a 10-day notice to the public and we'll have to amend the Site Plan Regulations and the Subdivision Regulations in two spots where it talks about the fees. I would propose rather than having the fees written in the regs, have it refer to an Appendix and then we can update the fees without having to go in and change the text each time the postage rates go up. I have put together some numbers and in putting these numbers together I tried to figure out basically what the easiest methodology would be while trying to come up with a fee that increases as the level of review increases. That is why it's a per lot fee which we currently have but is low and a site disturbance fee. I have looked at other towns' fees and

calculated what our fee would be based on the draft Fee Schedule and found that we would fall more in the middle to upper range depending on what application we were looking at. I don't think we want to be the highest but we don't want to keep them the lowest like we are now. A comparison sheet is also included indicating the fees we have collected on some of the latest applications and what the fee would be using the proposed new Fee Schedule. What I found is if you have a very large project with lots of disturbance, your fee can rise quite quickly. When you hit about 4 acres of disturbance, the fee ends up being approximately \$5,000.00 so with really large projects I was thinking a cap might be a good idea for site plan review. Vadney – One of the issues is what do these fees really cover? Do they cover Mary Lee, Chris, Angela and John and how much of Bill's time? Some of his comes in through other fees for Building Permits and the like so this is more Planning Board oriented. The last time we looked at some of those per square foot fees and they do go crazy when you get up into a couple acres and one of the questions I asked, how do you define disturbed area? There is a difference between moving a parking lot and digging and putting up a building. Are they just disturbed area, should we have two categories? Flanders – We shouldn't be too bashful about changing our fees. The fees for the Planning Board are on the short end of the stick pricewise by an awful lot. If we make a mistake, I prefer us to make it on the uphill side. Do we want to try and have a way to keep sites from ballooning into something that would be unfair? Bayard – I would recommend we have somewhat of a graduated schedule. LaBrecque – I pulled our operation budget which is \$409,000.00 and our total revenue is approximately \$103,000.00(+/-). Our PLB application fees brought in only about 6½ thousand dollars including recording fees. A couple thousand dollars was received for certified mailing. The total department income is approximately \$103,000.00 and \$90,000.00 is more Bill Edney related. Vadney – There is no question that our fees are very, very low. It would seem to me that a Boundary Line Adjustment application ought to have something in the range of \$250.00. Flanders – The Selectmen have been trying to move to a user pay fee system because the elderly person on a fixed income shouldn't be subsidizing these types of projects. The ICC has gone into this in quite a bit of depth and their recommendation is that at least 75% of what would fit into our Community Development Department be paid for by fees, assuming the other 25% would be code compliance issues that are generated that the whole tax body probably should take care of so if we are not paying 75% of our total Community Development budget out of the fees we collect, both building permits and these types of fees and so forth, then we're not doing what good planning would indicate you should. Vadney – I can't argue with that but that would be a huge change from what we're doing. Right now we're at best 25% when you figure in Edney and if you just look at Mary Lee, Angela and John, you're paying \$6,000.00 of \$300,000.00. Kahn – If you went to these new fees what does the \$6,000.00 turn into. If it quadruples, we haven't accomplished anything. LaBrecque – You'd have to make some assumptions. I would have to go through a year's worth of agendas assuming we have the same level of applications this year, see what the fees were and then what the new fees would be. On average subdivision fees do not increase a whole lot. If I take all of the

applications, old and new, and then all of the theoretical applications I had in the previous fee comparison analysis, if you just took that small snapshot which may not be characteristic of the whole, subdivision fees only increased 2 1/2 times and then the site plan fees would increase 27 times greater. Vadney – It seems to me the old fees even though they are 30 years old, even when they were set back then were aimed more at just covering the pure administrative costs. It seems there was a philosophy at that time that the staff itself was donated by the Town and the additional administrative costs would be picked up by these minor fees. I'm not against having more of them paid by the fees but it is a major change that we'll have to really dig into. Bayard – You don't want to have the fees so high that you discourage development. Partly because of that and partly because of the economy, you may see very little development this next year, whereas last year we had a fair amount. It's going to vary a lot depending on the level of development going on in the Town. LaBrecque – It's something we could revisit down the line too, it's not like we're stuck with it for another 30 years. Bayard – I think it's a good step in the right direction. Again, given the economy and everything you may not want to make them the same rate as they have down in Nashua or something like that but I can see where some of them could be a bit higher. Flanders – If somebody has a good sized development and its going to make them a bunch of money, they come in and ask what the fee is, you tell them and they write the check. Vadney – I agree with you on any large development but I'm more concerned about the fellow that owns 10 acres and wants to split 3 acres off for one of his kids or something without kind of gouging them to just do a very simple procedure. Dever – In the situation we're talking about, that's a minor subdivision and that's \$100.00. Kahn – It's not a minor subdivision if you've got lots that can be further subdivided. If it can be re-subdivided, it's a major subdivision. Kahn – We could work that out so if somebody's doing something small and leaving the possibility of further subdivision down the road, he pays when the further subdivision comes. We could work it out that something that ends up with 3 lots or fewer regardless of the possibility of further subdivision is not more than a couple hundred bucks but I do think that we ought not to worry about what we're charging here because I have a feeling we've got to move some of our expenses onto other people. Flanders – I don't think we want to gouge people but I think this is a good start, Angela, but I think we've been too bashful with these fees that you're proposing. LaBrecque – I understand that and when I was calculating them or trying to come up with something, it was really hard for me to put the fees too high. Vadney – Home Occupation, these are the new ones of \$30.00. If somebody wants to do a home occupation unless they are willing to invest \$100.00 it's probably not worth doing. A Change of Use – you went from \$50.00 to \$75.00, I would think we could easily go to \$100.00 or \$150.00 for a change of use in a commercial building. Flanders – On the change of use, you should have a fee and then you should have a sq. ft. fee for the number of square footage involved. LaBrecque – A lot of times we don't even have a submittal that shows the square footage of the space they are occupying. Town Recording - Flanders - If we're only charging \$5.00 to send somebody on a \$150.00 errand, we've got a huge problem. Vadney – What we can do here rather than just tackle this all at once,

we might think of something like going to Home Occupation and make that \$50.00 or \$100.00 and then 2 years from now you can look at it again and go up another \$100.00. One of my fears is that we put something out and everything's gone up by a factor of 37. Kahn – I think if we present it that we are trying to take the burden off the taxpayer, I think people will applaud. I think if we go to SB2 we've got to move these fees to the point where this Department is paying for itself. I'm not saying we should do \$250.00 for sending somebody to Laconia to record but I think the fee should be closer to \$250.00 than the \$5.00. Bayard – Do you do multiple recordings when you go down there or is it usually one at a time? Most of the time it is one unless we have other plans that are ready to go. Vadney – I'd be willing to go further on the direction and we'll just throw out some numbers and I would agree its almost doubling what you had. LaBrecque – What about the abutter notification, now it's \$4.00 per abutter and rather than doing per notification and then maybe because we spend approximately \$200.00/month for Planning Board on publishing notices in the newspaper but we actually publish a lot more than is required by statute and that's our own choice so rather than having it per abutter fee plus a publication fee, I just figured round it to \$10.00/abutter. It's really easy to calculate. Kahn – Again, I think we should be distinguishing between the guy who's carving up 3 lots and everybody else. If you're carving up 3 lots, the odds are you're going to have less than 10 abutters and if you pay \$10.00/abutter its no big deal. If we pay for the advertising, I think we ought to raise that to \$20.00/abutter or have it the abutter fee plus public notification fee. (People talking –inaudible - no mikes) Bayard - \$50.00 + \$12.00 sounds good to me. Vadney – Since we usually have two or three items on the agenda, if we charge each applicant \$50.00 for public notification and that would be paying a lot more than it is today, we could even go higher than that. (People talking – inaudible – no mikes). LaBrecque – When looking at other towns, the most expensive abutter fee is \$10.00 but there's no newspaper fee associated with that. All the ones that have newspaper fees range from \$25.00 to \$50.00 and the notification fee is approximately \$5.00/abutter. Vadney - \$5.00 basically pays the postage for the abutters and \$50.00 actually pays just for the newspaper so there's still no profit to pay for the help. Dever – I think \$10.00 for abutter notification and then we come up with a number for publication. Bayard - \$50.00 + \$10.00 or \$50.00 + \$12.00 sounds reasonable. Vadney – For tonight, why don't we set this one at \$10.00/abutter, \$50.00 for public notification and then we'll review this again. I think Home Occupation should be set at some even number like \$100.00. Change of Use – I would think \$100.00. Flanders – You've got to get the square footage in there. (inaudible - no mike) The square footage fee could be \$.10/sq. ft., for the change of use, you've got to have the Fire Department involved, usually Water and Sewer is involved, it may involve Public Works and it certainly involves Bill Edney and it may involve John Edgar or Angela because the parking calculations may be different and then you have to evaluate the site plan to see if its got enough parking to absorb an increased number. It takes a while to figure that out in the office and we need to be paid for that. LaBrecque – On the note of site disturbance, I did talk to Dave Dolan, what if I had on a checklist for site plan applications, disturbed area and having that on the plan and he said for just about

everything that wouldn't be very difficult because that's basically one click for the engineer and if you don't have an engineer, its basically where you're going to set up your orange fencing, the limit of what you're building or creating. On another note I was figuring what if they were off 10, 12 or even 100 square feet, it's only 3 cents so even if they are off it doesn't amount to much. My preference would be \$150.00/lot whether it's minor, major or whatever. Flanders – I think we've given Angela pretty good guidance as to the fact this is a good start but we've got a ways to go. LaBrecque - I don't want to shock the community with our new Fee Schedule. LaBrecque will continue working on new Fee Schedule and new checklists for site plans and subdivision.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey  
Administrative Assistant  
Planning/Zoning Dept.

The minutes were reviewed and approved at a regular meeting of the Planning Board held on \_\_\_\_\_.

---

William Bayard, Secretary