



SALISBURY PLANNING BOARD

**Planning Board – Public Meeting
Academy Hall
June 21, 2021 @ 7 p.m.
Approved Meeting Minutes**

Doug Greiner, Chairman	Present	Loretta Razin, Member	Present
Joe Schmidl, Vice Chair	Present	Jeff Blanchard, Member	Present
John Herbert, Selectman Ex-Officio	Present	David Hostetler, Alternate	Present
William MacDuffie, Jr, Alternate	Present	Wendy Pavnick, Recording Secretary	Present
Jeff Nagle, Alternate	Present	April Rollins, Admin Assistant	Absent

Visitors: Joseph Landry, Mike Tardiff from Central NH Regional Planning Commission

Zoom Attendees: None

Chairman Greiner opened meeting at 7pm

Review & Approve the draft minutes of May 17th

Selectman John Herbert moved to accept the drafted meeting minutes from May 17th, Vice Chair Joe Schmidl seconded the motion, motion to approve May 17th, 2021 minutes passed unanimously.

Alternate Member serving on both the Planning Board and Zoning Board

Per, Natch Greyes, Esq, one person may serve on two boards as members and/or alternatives, however if there is an issue with acting/voting on one board that may affect the other board then that member would need to recuse themselves to avoid conflict

Work Session Re: Impact Fees

Chairman Greiner admits that his schedule was so busy that he was not able to do any work on this or invite anyone to speak about this. However, Mike Tardiff from the Central NH Regional Planning Commission was invited by April to speak about impact fees. Mr. Tardiff questions if there are benefits to developing impact fees and if they are worth it, they must be used for specific purposes, and the crux of it all is that there needs to be **increased capacity**. Examples of increased capacity are: a new middle school classroom, a new town office, a new fire facility, or a new bay in the garage for a new fire truck. Increased capacity is NOT for maintenance of a road or upgrading a road due to the increase of capacity. A Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) must be in place, Mr. Tardiff states that we have a great CIP in place. Example: a developer comes in for a 30-lot development, and there needs to be an increase in the size of the road, a portion of that cost is from Impact Fees, and there is a 6-year time frame that needs to be done, this is difficult for small towns to implement and make sure the improvements have been done in time and within the guidelines. Increased capacity must be used as a community and defensible, impact fees **MUST** be very specific; there must be a separate account with careful accounting done, and there should be a defense about why there is a need for Impact Fees.

Chairman Greiner states that we should look at all the roads and structures in town and put them in the CIP so if plans come along that can show an increased capacity the town is aware of what the needs are and what could possibly be done to make improvements. Chairman Greiner asks Mr. Tardiff if there are ordinances that say what a developer must do in order for a development to go in, for example: roads, roundabouts, drainage, etc.? Is there language, in other towns, that offer improvements in the regulations rather than implementing impact fees. Mr. Tardiff will ask his staff to research and see if there are regulations/wording that may help with improvements rather than impact fees.

Bottom line regarding Impact Fees: There must be a specific increase in capacity to enforce impact fees, and they must be defensible in the court of law. Impact fees must be spent for the specific increase in capacity with six years, the funds must be kept in a separate account, and all funds, including interest on the money must be kept track of carefully, if the money has not been spent or there is money left over at the end of 6 years then that money must be returned to the developer. Chairman Greiner states that developers want to know the bottom line of what they have to spend. This may be a burden for entry level buyers/entry level housing.

Mr. Nangle states the town needs to tighten up the subdivision regulations to help ensure that there are improvements made where they are needed to be made. Mr. Landry states that most of the improvement issues are regarding the roads in town: drainage of said roads, gravel roads, some are so narrow that there is only room for one car at a time to get through. An increase in permit fees is mentioned as a possible way to offset the cost of improvements that may be needed on some roads in town.

Requiring the Preliminary Design Review Process in the Subdivision Regulations before Applications are Submitted:

A simple paragraph and the language needs to be changed, needs to be written and posted at a public meeting, and then it needs to be voted on and put into action. If there were a lot of issues with the proposed ordinance, then we would need to revise and present to another town meeting.

Mr. Nangle makes a motion to discuss, Mr. Herbert seconds motion to discuss. Requiring a preliminary design would be beneficial to the project manager and the applicants so that they are aware of what possible barriers may be for developing a specific piece of land, which in the long run would save the applicant money. With each revision of plans there is a cost associated with the revisions. There is discussion regarding if ALL subdivisions would require a preliminary design review or just subdivisions with more than 2 lots/ question of using the language of minor versus major subdivisions. Chairman Greiner states that the language needs to include ALL applicants and should be noted that approval of a preliminary design does not guarantee that the final design will be Board approved

Mr. Nangle motions and Mr. Herbert seconded the motion to require a preliminary design review in ALL subdivision applications to the planning board. Approval: 6 - Negative: 1

Any Other Business: Mr. Nangle asks if we could start the working meetings at 6:30 p.m., will need to check with April, if April has no objections to starting the working meetings at 6:30 p.m. no one else on the board has an issue with an earlier start time of 6:30 p.m.

Next Meeting – Monday, July 19, 2021 at 7 p.m.

Adjournment - Ms. Loretta Razin motions to adjourn at 8:21 p.m., Mr. Schmidl seconded motion. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.