

1. Continuation of Public Hearing - Ambrose Bros., Inc. (24-4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)
(Holland Street) Subdivision Amendment

At the meeting on the May 12th, the Board continued the hearing to allow Mr. Merhalski to meet with Mr. Ambrose and his engineer. Mr. Merhalski has met with Mr. Ambrose and his engineer, Paul Fluet and they discussed the issues with the site and what the Board would want to see in a full set of plans. They visited the site and the applicant has directed Mr. Fluet to draw up revised plans. Due to the time needed to turnaround these documents, the applicant requested a continuation to June 9th.

Motion: Mr. Jensen moved to continue the hearing for **Ambrose Bros., Inc. (24-4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)** to June 9, 2010, seconded by Mr. Nelson, carried unanimously.

VI. Informal Discussions

VII. Unfinished Business

VIII. Other Business/Correspondence

1. Review of Planning Board Application Materials and Requirements

Mr. Merhalski provided the Board with a memo outlining his proposal to the Board detailing the types of materials required in applications to the Board, and the number of copies to be submitted, based on the current reviewing requirements of different Boards and Departments. Included in the material was a Draft Planning Board Application Work Sheet for a Major Subdivision which would be amended to reflect the required materials for each type of application (Site Plan Review Permit, Boundary Line Adjustment, Special Use Permit, etc.). The Work Sheet also included a requirement for PDF copies of the Applications and Plans for distribution to the Board. The Work Sheet would become a part of the application, which would detail the materials and number of copies applicants are required to submit.

After reviewing the current requirements for Subdivision and Site Plan applications, Mr. Merhalski and the Board discussed the proposed number of copies of the application materials and the possibility of the submission of electronic documents (PDF, etc.) to offset some, but not all, of the amounts of copies. Board members expressed their concerns with the proposal to increase the number of copies of applications and materials from the current five (5) for applications and plans, and one (1) for Drainage Reports, to a total of seventeen (17) copies of almost all documents. Many felt that this was unnecessary. Board members discussed what they would like to have included in their file folders, as well as what could be sent via email from the Planner for review of material at home. It was noted that included in the application package is a checklist. Mr. Merhalski noted that as part of his review of the application he prepares a checklist. Board members would like the checklist generated by the Planner to be included in their folders.

After a lengthy discussion the following motion was made:

Motion: Mr. Nelson moved that applicants be required to submit six (6) copies of of full size survey plans, one (1) copy of electronic documents (PDF, etc.) of same, two (2) hard copies of the full application, nine (9) copies of the cover sheet(s) of application and nine (9) copies of any request for waivers. Seconded by Mr. Jensen, carried unanimously.

2. Review of Planning Board Fee Schedule

Mr. Merhalski stated as part of the 2010 Work Plan, the Board had directed him to review the current Planning Board Fee Schedule for possible revision. Mr. Merhalski stated that he had reviewed the fee Schedule and compared it to nine other municipalities in the Lakes Region and the State and found the average among them. He provided the Board with a Memo and Excel Spreadsheet with graphs of his findings. The Spreadsheet had both an example of the fees for typical projects, to enable an “apples to apples” comparison, and the actual fee schedules from the nine Towns analyzed. Mr. Merhalski noted a few of the current fees being charged (such as an amendment to a previously approved plan) may wish to be removed, while the majority of others appear to be below, or far below the average of these other communities. In some cases (Special Use Permits) the Board has no fee schedule in place. It was also noted that there were some municipalities that do not charge a set fee for mailings and recording fees, but simply require the applicant to pay all. They charge a flat fee which does not include fees such as recording fees or the L-CHIP fee. Statute now requires that all Notice of Decisions either has to be recorded with the plan or on the plan with the full wording, which is a per page charge from the registry. Mr. Merhalski has suggested a flat fee and the applicant pays for all additional fees at the registry of deeds. They will pick up the signed Mylar and provide the Land Use Office with a stamped copy. That way the applicant will be paying their own fees as necessary. This would be a change in procedure, requiring the applicant to record all of the necessary documents.

Mr. Merhalski commented an increase in fees would help recoup some of the costs to taxpayers for staff time and materials in reviewing applications, costs for notices in the newspapers (which the Town currently pays 100% of the fee for) and other costs incurred in carrying out the responsibilities placed upon the Board and Town staff by statute and regulations.

Board members discussed the different fees charged by other municipalities shown on the spreadsheet. One question asked was when the last time the Planning Board reviewed and or increased the fees. Ms. Whitney stated that in the 11+ years that she has been here the fee schedule has not been reviewed. Board members noted their comments and concerns with increasing fees, along with what basis or guidelines they would use to determine the fees. The Board reviewed the spreadsheet item by item and suggested taking an average of the fees. It was noted common practice to do a fair average, is to eliminate the highest and lowest amount and then average the remaining fees.

Motion: Ms. Ryerson moved approved the changes to the Planning Board Fee Schedule as debated during the hearing, and recommended by the Planner and to authorize the Planner to forward them to the Board of Selectmen.
Seconded by Ms. Fairchild, carried unanimously.

3. Mr. Charest briefly updated the Board on the tax exempt status of the Lakes Region Conservation Trust (LRCT). Mr. Charest stated the BoS had received the Planning Board’s letter in support of approving the Charitable Exemption for the LRCT. Representatives from the LRCT and the Castle Preservation Society (CPS) were present at the BOS meeting on May 20th. Ann Hackl of the (CPS) has invited the Selectmen to tour the Castle in order to learn more about what the CPS does, and what they are planning for restoration. The Selectmen agreed to tour the Castle on June 1st at 9 AM. Mr. Charest stated the BOS has not made a decision regarding the tax exempt status of the LRCT, and will wait until after the tour.

4. Zoning Board of Adjustment Draft Minutes of May 19, 2010 were noted.

5. Selectmen’s Draft Minutes of May 20, 2010 were noted.

6. Letter dated May 19, 2010 from State of NH Liquor Commission regarding a liquor license for the

Castle Preservation Society, DBA Castle in the Clouds was noted.

IX. Committee Reports

- X. Adjournment:** Mr. Charest made the motion to adjourn at 9:05 PM, seconded by Mr. Nelson, carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bonnie L. Whitney
Administrative Assistant