

These minutes are subject to possible revisions/corrections during their review at a subsequent Planning Board Meeting

**Town of Chester
Planning Board Meeting
Wednesday, September 28, 2016
Municipal Complex
Approved Minutes**

Members Present

Brian Sullivan, Chairman
Evan Sederquest, Vice Chairman
Elizabeth Richter, Member
Richard Snyder, Member

Members Absent:

Cass Buckley, Ex-Officio
Michael Weider, Member

Staff Present:

Andrew Hadik, Planning Coordinator

Others Present at Various Times

Rhonda Lamphere
Jack Munn, SNHCP

Chairman Brian Sullivan called the meeting to order at 7:13 p.m.

Agenda

- Review & Sign Invoices
- Review and approve minutes for 9/7/16 and 9/21/16
- Review bond reduction letter dated 9/23/16 from Scott Bourcier for Phase IIB of Mill Pine Village-Map 10 Lot 1. Discuss and vote to reduce the bond amount to \$107,681.25 based on the recommendation in the above mentioned letter.
- Appointments: None scheduled.
- Public Hearings:
 - Adopt a new Town impact fee for the Chester Library.
 - Adopt updated Town impact fees for: Police & Fire Departments, Traffic & Recreation.
 - Continuation of the Public hearing for the subdivision application by Dion Construction, LLC (Applicants,) 802 Amherst Street, Manchester, NH 03104, for a 3-Lot Subdivision of Map 2, Lot 49 on Town Farm Road.
- Future Meeting Dates:
 - October 5, 2016 -PH McCartney HB

These minutes are subject to possible revisions/corrections during their review at a subsequent Planning Board Meeting

- October 12, 2016
- October 26, 2016

Review and approve minutes for 9/7/16 and 9/21/16

The Board reviewed the minutes from 9/7/16 and made corrections. On line 58, the name “Babin” was added to the name “Michael.” On line 191, an “s” was added to “Peter.” Mr. Snyder made a motion to accept the minutes dated 9/7/16 as amended; Ms. Richter seconded the motion. Motion approved 4-0-0.

The Board reviewed the minutes from 9/21/16 and made corrections. On line 92, “retro-actively” was changed to retroactively. On line 115, “have” was changed to “has.” Mr. Sederquest made a motion to accept the minutes dated 9/21/16 as amended; Mr. Snyder seconded the motion. Motion approved 4-0-0.

Review bond reduction letter dated 9/23/16 from Scott Bourcier for Phase IIB of Mill Pine Village – Map 10 Lot 1. Discuss and vote to reduce the bond amount to \$107,681.25 based on the recommendation in the above-mentioned letter.

The Board and Mr. Hadik discussed a letter from Dubois and King Inc. regarding the Mill Pine Village – Map 10, Lot 1.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to reduce the bond for Mill Pine Village – Map 10, Lot 1 to \$107,700 per the letter from Dubois and King dated September 23, 2016; Mr. Sederquest seconded the motion. Motion approved 4-0-0.

Cedar View Estates

Mr. Hadik noted that Cedar View Estates is breaking ground on their new road next week, Hemlock Drive, which will connect to Ledge Road. He gave a brief history of the Cedar View Estates project to remind the Board about the project. Mr. Hadik described how the Subdivision was initially planned for 20 houses in 2005, but was reduced to 19 houses during the Town’s engineering review process. Mr. Hadik said that then during the NH DES and federal wetland permitting process, the project was further reduced to 18 houses. He explained that the most recent, comprehensive plans possessed by the Board is the 29-page 2008 plan set by Sublime Engineering. He noted two addendums were filed to the original conditions of approval and Public Hearings. The first addendum was to adopt the 2008 plan set, which depicts 18 house lots. Then, because of the Great Recession, the construction of the subdivision was postponed.

In 2014 the Board was approached again by the developer. By that time the wetlands permit had expired and Sublime Engineering had gone out of business. During the renewal of the wetlands permit, changes in regulations required some redesign of the runoff and stormwater treatment swales. The developer had presented the Board with a single sheet "red-line" drawing showing the changes to six of the runoff and stormwater treatment swales along the proposed road. This sheet had been generated by a different engineering firm because Sublime Engineering was no longer in business. At that time the Board had held another public hearing for a second addendum to the original conditions of approval, which set the construction bond amount for the road, the phasing of the issuance of building permits, and amount of the fair share contribution.

Mr. Hadik explained that Jeff Adler, the Planning Board's civil engineer, had recently called, wanting the Board to be aware of his concern that the project was commencing without having these design changes incorporated into a revised, comprehensive plan set for the project. The Board and Mr. Hadik then discussed the plan changes, Mr. Adler's concerns, and what the Board has approved in 2014. The Board questioned why a new plan set had not been required. Mr. Hadik related that he and Mr. Adler had also discussed, because of the lack of a final integrated plan set, that more inspections would be required to ensure the final construction outcome conformed to the plans and Town's regulations. He advised that he and Mr. Adler had also discussed the need for surveying at periodic intervals during construction to ensure there would be proper post-construction as-built plans.

Mr. Snyder agreed that a more intensive inspection schedule is called for. Ms. Richter asked about the details of the plans. The Board and Mr. Hadik then decided to review the different plans on file and the minutes from the different meetings relevant to Cedar View Estates at a subsequent meeting.

Public Hearings

Ms. Richter made a motion to open the Public Hearing; Mr. Snyder seconded the motion. Motion approved, 4-0-0. The Public Hearing opened at 7:45 pm.

Continuation of the Public hearing for the subdivision application by Dion Construction, LLC (Applicants,) 802 Amherst Street, Manchester, NH 03104, for a 3-Lot Subdivision of Map 2, Lot 49 on Town Farm Road.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to continue the Public hearing to October 5, 2016, for the subdivision application by Dion Construction, LLC (Applicants,) 802 Amherst Street, Manchester, NH 03104, for a 3-Lot Subdivision of Map 2, Lot 49 on Town Farm Road; Ms. Richter seconded the motion. Motion approved 4-0-0.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to open the Public hearing for the Town of Chester Impact Fees for Traffic, Police, Fire, Library and Recreation; Ms. Richter seconded the motion. Motion approved 4-0-0.

The Public Hearing was opened at 7:48 pm.

Public Hearing: Adopt a new Town impact fee for the Chester Library. Adopt updated Town impact fees for: Police & Fire Departments, Traffic & Recreation

Mr. Jack Munn, of Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission, joined the Board at the Meeting table at this time, 7:48 pm.

He noted all five Impact Fees have been updated universally in terms of getting them up to speed with the State statutes, and incorporating all the new departmental costs for improvements and facilities including Recreation to the new Capital Improvements Plan that was adopted in April. When Mr. Munn was asked by Mr. Snyder if the changes were substantive changes, Mr. Munn said that they were more housekeeping changes. He did note that some substantive changes were from the new Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) numbers given by the Department Heads.

Traffic Impact Fees

Mr. Munn agreed to discuss the Traffic Impact Fees first, noting that Traffic was nearing the end of its six-year period so it required some updating. He said the Town Road Agent was asked to recalculate the new cost of constructing a single lane-mile of road. Mr. Munn said that that figure, as well as, a Department of Transportation index adjustment used for their transportation projects, were incorporated into the report. He expressed the thought that the Town's impact fee for Traffic six years ago was overstated in terms of the cost estimates of a single lane-mile of road, reflecting the decrease in Traffic impact fees currently.

Chairman Sullivan asked for Public comment.

Ms. Rhonda Lamphere said she came into hear the Impact Fees explanation first hand. She said wanted to know why the Traffic Impact Fees were being reduced. Ms. Lamphere noted that although she understands what Mr. Munn is saying about the cost six-years ago were overstated, she pointed out that the costs to maintain and rebuild roads are not cheaper today than it was six-years ago.

Mr. Snyder stated that there is a caveat to the Traffic Impact Fees. He read a notation at the end of the fee comparison spreadsheet, "Traffic impact fees will increase once Chester adopts an official road improvement plan." He noted that the Town has not done that yet. Mr. Snyder asserted that once a road improvement plan is adopted, the Traffic impact fees will be more in line with the other fees. He said the Traffic Impact Fee amounts are strikingly low when the fees were compared, such as Traffic versus Library.

Ms. Lamphere asked what went into making the Traffic Impact Fee number change so dramatically.

Mr. Munn said that the methodology stayed the same but a different cost factor caused the change. He explained that the cost factor is not based on future road repairs, but is an average cost estimate of the actual costs incurred by the Town Road Agent in the past number of years. Mr. Munn said that once an official road improvement plan in line with the Town's CIP is adopted by the Planning Board, the methodology won't change but the cost numbers would change.

Chairman Sullivan stated that there are different steps, and getting the Impact Fees approved and in place is step one, then adopting the road improvement plan is the next step. Mr. Munn agreed this is the case, noting that then they would just update the numbers. When asked by Mr. Hadik how a road improvement plan would make the fee go up, Mr. Munn explained that the cost average for roads in the improvement plan would include more roads making the fee cost go up.

Mr. Snyder clarified that there are two numbers that drive the fee, one number is the number just discussed and the other number is the average miles per trip. He noted the average mile per trip number stunned the Board. Mr. Snyder said that the average trip number of 3.19 miles per trip seems unreasonably low. Mr. Munn stated that the number is based on the transportation model of actual traffic data and it does seem conservative. He said he would discuss this number with their Traffic Engineer at SNHPC and see what she would recommend in terms of an update. Mr. Snyder asked if a number that seems more reasonable could be used by this Planning Board even if that number hasn't been adopted yet. Mr. Munn said yes, they could do some research into other trip model standards. He further explained the updating work could be done under the Transportation Assistance to Communities under the line item of providing technical assistance to towns, which would cover the cost of the work.

Chairman Sullivan asked about the logic of using "half a road" for the cost calculations for the methodology. He said that when a road is built, one doesn't just build a single lane-mile of road. Mr. Munn explained that in the methodology of the ITE trip generation manual, when it estimates trips for different types of uses it only factors the use of one lane. He stated that this is a sound methodology.

Chairman Sullivan stated that the road improvement plan will increase the Traffic impact fees once that plan is adopted. Mr. Munn agreed.

Speaking to the waiver request section, Chairman Sullivan asked under what circumstances the Planning Board would provide a Traffic impact fee waiver. Mr. Munn explained that a circumstance such as elderly housing where the residents may have significantly fewer cars could be waived.

Ms. Richter asked when the deadline is for adopting the updated Traffic impact fees. Mr. Hadik said they need to adopt something before the original fee expires in December. The Board agreed to table the Traffic Impact Fee while Mr. Munn researched other national household travel studies in lieu of using the travel demand model in the report to derive a more realistic average trip length for Chester residents. Mr. Munn said the necessary revisions could be made and new Traffic impact fees could be adopted before the old ones expire.

Police and Fire Impact Fees

Mr. Snyder stated he was confused about the methodology used for the Police and Fire Impact Fees. He asked about the level of service being reflected by the vehicle trips the department makes. Mr. Munn explained that that is a service demand indicator as a measure of demand. He said the best way to measure the demand is by counting the number of trips for which those departments are called. Mr. Munn pointed out that the impact fees are also used to cover the cost of vehicle and equipment replacement.

The Board and Mr. Munn discussed the charts and graphs within the report. It was found by Mr. Snyder and agreed upon by Mr. Munn, that the number on page 15 of \$40.31 was incorrect and should be changed to \$149.93.

Mr. Snyder stated that although the documents are terrific in terms of clarity and scope, they are not really an ordinance. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the Impact Fees have already been adopted, the Planning Board is adopting the updates. Mr. Hadik reminded the Board that all the impact fees are enabled by Article 14 (Fair Share Contribution) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to adopt the updates to the Police and Fire Impact Fees updated September 2016; Ms. Richter seconded the motion. Motion approved, 4-0-0.

Recreation Impact Fees

The Board and Mr. Munn had discussion about the Recreation Impact Fee methodology regarding the Condo/Townhouse versus Single Family Detached home. The discussion by the Board focused on the number of children in those dwellings and the multiplier ratio, as well as, mobile homes. Mr. Munn explained that the mobile home numbers are based on a statewide average. Ms. Lamphere asked if the Town has very few mobile homes, and doesn't allow mobile homes, and there are very few children in mobile homes, and money has been set aside to update the fees every year, why is the report then using a projected number for mobile homes. Mr. Munn explained that it is part of the six land use types allowed, and Chester does have a number of mobile homes currently.

Mr. Hadik clarified that mobile homes are allowed if mounted on a proper foundation per the regulations.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to adopt the updates to the Recreation Impact Fees updated September 2016; Ms. Richter seconded the motion. Motion approved, 4-0-0.

Library Impact Fee

These minutes are subject to possible revisions/corrections during their review at a subsequent Planning Board Meeting

245 The Board made a couple of grammatical changes to the report.

246

247 Mr. Snyder made a motion to adopt the Library Impact Fees for September 2016, Mr. Sederquest
248 seconded the motion. Motion approved, 4-0-0.

249

250 Mr. Munn noted he would do the research into the Traffic Impact fee trip mileage issue. Mr. Munn
251 departed the meeting at 9:00 pm.

252

253 **Adjournment**

254

255 Ms. Richter made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Snyder seconded the motion. Motion
256 approved, 4-0-0. The Meeting was adjourned at 9:03 pm.

257

258 Respectfully submitted,

259

260 C. Molly Qualters

261 Recording Secretary