**Present:** Chair Paul Powers, Vice Chair Andy Kohlhofer, Jack Karcz, Jack Downing, Brett Hunter, Roger Barham, Tim Lavelle, alternate member Mike Wason, Senior Planner Jenn Rowden, and Land Use Administrative Assistant Casey Wolfe

Mr. Powers opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

#### I. MINUTES

Mr. Lavelle made a motion to approve the minutes of May 1, 2019. Mr. Karcz seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0-0.

### II. CONTINUED BUSINESS

# Planning Board Rules of Procedure proposed amendments

Ms. Wolfe explained that proposed changes are exactly the same as the way the Board saw them at their last meeting. Since then, she has only changed the formatting to clean up the document. After some discussion, Mr. Karcz made a motion to approve the revised Rules of Procedure as written. Mr. Kohlhofer seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0-0.

### III. NEW BUSINESS

Motion to approve the release of remaining funds in the Kasher Corporation escrow account to the applicant

Both Mr. Lavelle and Mr. Powers abstained from this discussion. Mr. Kohlhofer appointed Mr. Wason to vote on behalf of Mr. Lavelle. Ms. Wolfe explained Kasher Corporation is done with their subdivision application on Copp Drive. Because this subdivision is for single family homes, there is no reason to keep funds in this account any longer. The builder will be working directly with the Building Inspector to get permitting for these new homes. Mr. Bahram made a motion to release the remaining funds to Kasher Corporation less any town fees and changes that are applicable. Mr. Karcz seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0-0.

#### IV. OTHER BUSINESS

# RFP Submittals & 2019 Earth Removal Permits

Mr. Lavelle and Mr. Powers rejoined the Board as voting members. Mr. Wason reported that he met with Ms. Miner the previous evening to look over the RFP submittals that came in. He, Ms. Miner, and Mr. Powers plan to meet again on the 30<sup>th</sup> after having a chance to read over the submittals. There was some discussion about what to do with the pending earth removal permits in the meantime. Mr. Barham felt that the Board should hold off on the earth removal permits until the new firms are hired. The Board can then make a determination on which firm should do the inspections and calculate surety amounts for each gravel pit. Mr. Barham felt asking Stantec to do this work before the new firms are chosen would cause problems. Generally speaking, he felt that a good way to avoid toxic situations would be to allow applicants to choose one of the three approved engineering firms to

review their application. Ms. Wolfe confirmed that she has received the applications from all four gravel operations in town. These application are due by April 1<sup>st</sup> of every year and typically need to be renewed by July 1<sup>st</sup>. It's likely that the Board will need to extend the deadline this year to allow time for the new firm to do the inspections. The Board will need to make a motion to extend the deadline at one of their June meetings.

#### Gristmill Road bond - discussion

Mr. Barham explained that a resident that lives on Gristmill Road has issues with the developer of this ongoing construction project. This resident has questioned whether or not the Town has adequate bonding in place for this unfinished road. Mr. Barham mentioned that the engineering firm that represented the Town at the time that this project was approved is no longer in business. The road bond was collected back when the developer got his approvals. The question now is whether or not the bond needs updating. There was some discussion about the status of the road. Ms. Rowden stated that the Town does have the ability to call the bond and revoke the approval, however, this is not necessarily the best option. It would also not make sense for the Town to accept the road as a Town Road until the road meets the Town's standards. For the Town to hire an engineer to assess the bond, the developer would need engineering escrow in place to pay for the work. The Town has yet to reach out to the developer. As far as anyone could remember, Stantec was never involved with this project. One of the new firms would need to be assigned/chosen to do this work. The Board will not be able to do this until the new firms are hired. There was some discussion about the gate that separates this development from Copp Drive. This gate is still locked. There is also a cement block at this gateway.

# **Small corrections to the Zoning Ordinance Table of Contents**

Ms. Wolfe described a few corrections for the Board members to make to the table of contents in their new Zoning Ordinance books. The version that is up on the website has the corrected table of contents.

### V. CIRCUIT RIDER BUSINESS

Ms. Rowden was prepared to answer a question about reducing the school impact fee that Mr. Kohlhofer had at a previous meeting. The way it works right now, the Town collects the impact fee and holds onto it for six years, and then because the student population is not growing, the Town returns the fee to the developer. Ms. Rowden stated that the Town can change the impact fee to zero, however, if the Town ever wanted to reinstate the fee, the Town would need to go through the process of establishing the fee amount. The studies to do this research can cost about \$10,000. To raise the school impact fee, the Town has to go through this process. The Town cannot alter the amount of years that the Town holds on to the fee as it is State law. The Town paid for this study about 15 years ago. Ms. Rowden stated that Fremont, percentage wise, is one of the fastest growing communities in this area. Fremont has had greater increasing in living units than most of the surrounding towns. Mr. Kohlhofer stated that even though the population has been increasing, the school population has been decreasing for about ten years. The school impact fees typically range from \$2,000 to \$3,000. Mr. Barham stated that he has a problem with the Town charging developers an impact fee that the Town cannot even use. Mr. Kohlhofer was not convinced that impact fees mitigate tax increases anyway. Ms. Rowden recommended keeping the impact fee in the ordinance,

otherwise the Board would need to re-amend the ordinance again later on if they want to reinstate the impact fee. She recommended getting from the Town Administrator information about how much money has come in and out from these impact fees and to ask her about the administrative cost for managing these fees. Mr. Barham felt strongly about abandoning these fees if the Town cannot actually use them. If the school population increases later on, then the Board can take action to reinstate the fees.

There was a brief discussion about the Town's sign ordinance. If the Board wants to make changes to this ordinance, they will need to get it on the March 2020 Warrant Article.

Mr. Lavelle made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:51 pm. Mr. Karcz seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leanne Miner

Land Use Administrative Assistant