

CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

ZONING & PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

BUDGET

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2015

7:15PM – NOTE NEW TIME

Aldermanic Chamber

PLEASE BRING YOUR BUDGET AND CIP BOOKS

ITEMS SCHEDULED FOR DISCUSSION:

- #96-15 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting Board of Aldermen authorization, pursuant to the 2013 Revised Citizen Participation Plan, to submit to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) the FY2016-2020 Consolidated Plan and the FY2016 Annual Action Plan for the city of Newton Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Emergency Solution Grant (ESG) funds and the WestMetro HOME Consortium. These Plans must be submitted to HUD by May 15, 2015. [04/13/15 @ 3:03PM]
- #426-13 ALD. HESS-MAHAN requesting periodic updates on development of the Consolidated Plan for the City of Newton Housing and Community Development Program and the WestMetro Home Consortium. [12/06/13 @ 9:51 AM]

BUDGET & CIP DISCUSSIONS:

INSPECTIONAL SERVICES

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

REFERRED TO FINANCE AND APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES

- #375-14(2) HIS HONOR THE MAYOR submitting in accordance with Section 5-1 of the City of Newton Charter the FY16 Municipal/School Operating Budget totaling \$361,997,264 passage of which shall be concurrent with the FY16-FY20 Capital Improvement Program (#375-14). [04/15/15 @ 5:08 PM]
EFFECTIVE DATE OF SUBMISSION 04/21/15; LAST DATE TO PASS THE BUDGET 06/05/15

The location of this meeting is handicap accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons requiring assistance. If you need a special accommodation, please contact John Lojek, at least two days in advance of the meeting: jlojek@newtonma.gov, or 617-796-1064. For Telecommunications Relay Service dial 711.

REFERRED TO FINANCE AND APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES

- #375-14 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR submitting the FY16-FY20 Capital Improvement Plan pursuant to section 5-3 of the Newton City Charter. [10/15/14 @ 3:01 PM]

REFERRED TO FINANCE AND APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES

- #375-14(4) HIS HONOR THE MAYOR submitting the FY 2016 – FY 2020 Supplemental Capital Improvement Plan. [04/15/15 @ 4:57 PM]

REFERRED TO ZONING & PLANNING AND FINANCE COMMITTEES

- #375-14(6) HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting that Sec. 17-6 **Fees for building, electrical, gas and plumbing permits.** of the Revised Ordinances of the City of Newton, 2012 be amended by deleting the section and inserting the following in to take effect July 1, 2015:

The fees for all building permits shall be computed at a rate of \$20.00 per one thousand dollars (\$1,000) of estimated construction cost or any fraction thereof, provided however, that in no event shall the fee be less than the minimum fee set out below.

PERMIT FEE SCHEDULE

All fees are “Per \$1,000.00 of Construction or Fraction Thereof”

1. Minimum Permit Fee – Residential (1 & 2 Family)	\$50.00
2. Minimum Permit Fee – Residential (3 Family and Up)	\$100.00
3. Minimum Permit Fee – Commercial	\$100.00
4. Building Permit (Including Signs)	\$20.00
5. Electrical Permit	\$20.00
6. Plumbing Permit	\$20.00
7. Gas Permit	\$20.00
8. Mechanical Permit	\$20.00
9. Demolition Permit	\$20.00
10. Sprinkler Permit	\$20.00
11. All other work requiring permits	\$20.00

If at any point, work has started before the issuance of a permit, the required fee shall be doubled.

RE-INSPECTION FEE SCHEDULE

1. Re-inspection fee –first re-inspection	\$50.00
2. Re-inspection fee – second and subsequent re-inspection	\$100.00

CERTIFICATION OF USE AND OCCUPANCY FEE SCHEDULE

1. Temporary or Partial Certificate of Use and Occupancy, \$50.00
per unit, per month
2. Condominium Certificate of Inspection (not required for new construction) \$100.00

Estimated Construction Costs shall be computed by multiplying the gross floor area (sq. ft.) by the average square foot costs as published in the latest edition of "Means Cost Data" by R.S. Means Co., Duxbury, MA or other similar recognized national survey data. [04/15/15 @ 4:57 PM]

All other items before the Committee will be held without discussion.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marcia T. Johnson, Chairman

4/18/13 ZAP Report

REFERRED TO ZONING & PLANNING, LAND USE & FINANCE COMMITTEES

#273-12 ALD. CROSSLEY & HESS-MAHAN requesting a restructuring and increase in fees for permits charged by the Inspectional Services Department and fees charged by the Planning Department and City Clerk to assure that fees are both sufficient to fund related services provided and simple to administer.
[09/10/12 @ 1:17 PM]

ACTION: **HELD 7-0**

NOTE: Ald. Crossley said that this docket item originated from a Resolution at last year's budget. One issue is whether the fee is being assessed at the right point in the process of applying for a permit; and the other issue is whether the fee is proper. This isn't a measure to necessarily generate more revenue, but rather to be sure the work that is being done in the process is being compensated correctly. In terms of the fees themselves, some of the amounts could be rounded out to the dollar to make them easier to administer.

Ald. Hess-Mahan said there are probably more design reviews and memos that are generated than there are special permit applications. The zoning code official writes the zoning memo and identifies what relief is needed for a project based on the preliminary plans. The application is then filed or the plans come back modified for further review, which takes even more time, after which a special permit application may or may not even be submitted. A lot of time is being taken up by the Planning Department staff and there is no compensation at that point in the process. He did not want to discourage people from coming in for design review prior to filing a special permit application, but there needs to be some consideration for the time that it takes and the time it takes away from projects that are already moving forward. The fees need to be comparable and commensurate.

Commissioner Lojek said the fee structure is arcane and it not going to go well with an online system. The fee is based on \$18.60 per \$1,000 on building permit fees but there is no rounding. It makes for a lot of mistakes which then takes time to correct. It is confusing for everyone involved. He suggested \$20 per \$1000 or any portion thereof and that is what is being done in other communities with no complaints.

Candace Havens, Director of Planning and Development addressed the Committee. A list of Planning-related permit fees is attached to this report, as well as services that do not require a fee but for which other communities do assess a fee. A comparison chart with other communities is also attached. She noted that some other communities charge for some things that Newton does not and vice versa. Ms. Havens felt that the commercial special permit fee of \$750 should be

split between the zoning review that precedes it. There are three times as many zoning reviews as special permit applications. A huge amount of work that is done at the front end of this process is, therefore, not being compensated at all. There are also people who request plan revisions repetitively.

Follow Up

Commissioner Lojek will supply a fee structure chart and examples of what is being assessed in other communities. The Committee asked both Ms. Havens and Commissioner Lojek to make some recommendations on a fee structure. Ms. Havens said that Chief Financial Officer, Maureen Lemieux, has docketed an item for Finance Committee relative to fees in a more comprehensive matter. She said she would consult with her on this issue as well.

2/24/14 ZAP Report

REFERRED TO ZONING & PLANNING, LAND USE & FINANCE COMMITTEES

#273-12 ALD. CROSSLEY & HESS-MAHAN requesting a restructuring and increase in fees for permits charged by the Inspectional Services Department and fees charged by the Planning Department and City Clerk to assure that fees are both sufficient to fund related services provided and simple to administer.

ACTION: **HELD 7-0**

NOTE: Ald. Hess-Mahan explained that this item came from a discussion with Inspectional Services comparing their fees with fees charged in neighboring communities. In many respects, Newton was charging less. But it was also discovered that Newton calculates fees in a manner different from most other communities. The intent is to bring Newton's fees in line with other cities and towns in order to more closely cover the costs of administering services and to make the fees simpler to manage and calculate. For instance, in some cases multiple zoning reviews are undertaken but only one fee is charged and a significant amount of work is being done by staff. Commissioner of Inspectional Services, John Lojek was on vacation and unable to attend the meeting.

Candace Havens, Director of Planning & Development, said that the zoning reviews were an issue as some people did come in over and over again and a substantial amount of work gets done and then they may not choose to go forward with the application. She suggested, for example, instead of charging \$750 for commercial special permits, that \$250 is charged for the zoning review, and then \$500 for the actual special permit. At least then there would be some compensation for the zoning review. She felt that even a nominal fee on some things that are currently free of charge might make people think twice or be more thorough before submitting proposals. Other communities' fees are quite varied and it may not be as easy to standardize the fees as once thought.

Ald. Johnson noted that fees were brought up at budget discussions last year. She wanted to hear from Maureen Lemieux, Chief Financial Officer, if any work had been done over the year on this issue. She remarked that there are some odd fees in Inspectional Services that need to be made more easily manageable. The intent had been to look at the fees in a comprehensive way but the project fell by the wayside. She said David Olson did some research on fees in all the departments based on ordinances, by policy, and by what was being charged in reality and found those didn't always match.

Ms. Lemieux said that in 2003, the Board adopted an ordinance that all department heads could set their own fee structures without coming before the Board of Aldermen, which she was unaware of. The Executive Department had docketed an item to work with the Law Department in Finance Committee to look at fees. By the end of the term, they weren't ready to move forward with that so Finance voted No Action Necessary. She said they intend to get back to looking at the fees, but they are not yet ready for the comprehensive review work. Perhaps the ISD fees needed to be worked on independent of that process. She felt the fees were generating the appropriate amount of revenue to cover the department's costs, but she felt the fees needed to be changed to make them simpler and easier to administrate. She would support adding a fee for zoning review and perhaps between now and budget presentations, there would be a couple more they could amend or add as well. Some Committee member said they would like the Historic and Conservation fees reviewed.

Marie Lawlor explained that Chapter 40, Section 22F, was a local option the City adopted to allow department heads to fix reasonable fees. It was felt that staff recommendations should be made, however, and not have fees set independently.

Ald. Crossley said she would like to do a thorough review to understand how enforcement is being done and if the department is sufficiently staffed in order to meet the need. She noted that the City has received a lot of criticism that ISD is not responding in a timely manner. In respect to building permit fees, she wants to be sure the revenue is enough to provide the services or if more inspectors are needed. It was also suggested that the City look at independent inspector contracting services for larger projects, to free up staff for other projects. It was also suggested that there needs to be a balance between work that staff should be doing as part of the functions of the department, and fees for certain other work that is particularly time or resource consuming.

Follow Up

The docketers would like to see some suggestions from John Lojek and Candace Havens and then will bring this back to Committee. The Committee would like to be able to have something in place for the beginning of the fiscal year. Ald. Sangiolo said she would talk with Maureen Lemieux on a small working group to discuss fees.

The Committee voted to hold this item

4/10/14 ZAP Report

REFERRED TO ZONING & PLANNING, LAND USE & FINANCE COMMITTEES

#273-12 ALD. CROSSLEY & HESS-MAHAN requesting a restructuring and increase in fees for permits charged by the Inspectional Services Department and fees charged by the Planning Department and City Clerk to assure that fees are both sufficient to fund related services provided and simple to administer.

ACTION: **HELD 5-0 (Ald. Sangiolo not voting)**

NOTE: Candace Havens addressed the Committee. She noted that this has been in Committee discussion previously and as requested, has prepared a chart that shows what is being charged in surrounding communities for similar services/permits. An updated version of that chart is attached as there were some misprints.

Ms. Havens explained that some fees are administered by the Planning Department and others collected in the City Clerk's Department. She reviewed current fees for each as follows with recommendations:

Administrative Site Plan: \$350

For most reviews completed by the Planning Department, this fee is adequate and no change is recommended for non-major projects. However, for major projects a fee of \$250 for the Zoning Review could be added as it can be very labor intensive for a major project. This would result in a total fee of \$600 for an Administrative Site Plan Review with Zoning Review for major projects.

Accessory Apartments: \$100

Of the communities surveyed, none charged a fee for Accessory Apartment review. Because there has been an interest in the City to encourage accessory apartment creation and an effort to assist homeowners with illegal units to make them legal, the Committee felt that eliminating the fee would be preferable.

Conservation Fees: \$50

The Wetlands Filing fee of \$50 is established by the state and is unalterable by the City. There are no other ordinances that mandate charges of fees for this nor has the City given the Conservation Commission the authority to impose fines for violations. Ms. Havens has spoken to the Conservation Planner, Jennifer Steel, and she felt that it would make more sense to institute authority to charge fines for violations. James Freas explained that the Conservation Commission works with John Lojek's staff in Inspectional Services when there is a violation of the Wetlands Act. The violation notice can be issued and attached to a deed which gets recorded at the Registry of Deeds. The Committee would like to docket an item to give authority to the Conservation Commission to charge fines for violations.

Comprehensive Permits: \$350 - \$2,000 +

Ms. Havens explained that there are different rates charged to for-profits and non-profits dependent on the size of the project. For-profits are charged \$2K plus \$50 a unit; non-profits with more than 6 units are charged \$1K plus \$50 a unit; and non-profits under six units are charged \$350. Cambridge charges \$100 which is considerably lower than other communities because they want to encourage people and it just covers administrative costs and mailings.

Otherwise, Newton is in line with neighboring communities. No change is recommended to the current charges.

Special Permits

Commercial: \$750

The Planning Department felt that charging \$250 for zoning review up-front would be preferable and then collect the remaining \$500 if the application for a special permit is submitted. The zoning review work is intensive and some applicants come in for multiple reviews, therefore, zoning review after the initial one would incur an additional \$250 fee.

Residential: \$350-\$2,500

Ms. Havens would also like to suggest an up-front \$250 fee for residential zoning review for projects that are more than one unit with other fees remaining the same.

Other Districts: \$2

The zones that are specified are sufficient and it is recommended that this be deleted.

Clerk's Note: This was a typographical error in the Ordinances. The fee was to be \$250, not \$2.

Zone Change: \$350

Many communities do not charge for this, but some do in a similar range. The Committee felt that citizens exercising their right to petition for a zone change should not be charged. The City is not charged when it changes a zone. Ms. Havens is going to get some clarification of when these charges would apply.

Freestanding Signs: \$350

Ms. Havens felt this special permit fee was high. It was felt that the sign regulations should be looked at in Zoning Reform review and be dealt with then. The Committee agreed, therefore, no change is recommended at this time.

Historic Reviews: No fee

Ms. Havens felt the will of the Committee at a previous discussion was not to charge for initial reviews, but to charge for repeat reviews. Committee members felt that there is significant overload of staff on these reviews and fees should be charged. The Historic Commission agenda is quite long and there is a lot of work to be done as there are so many more applications coming in. Ms. Havens suggested a fee of \$50 but she would check with staff to analyze actual costs for different reviews, such as demolition delays. It was also suggested that the fee could increase with each subsequent review for the same project.

Mixed Use Residential: \$750

Ms. Havens said these reviews are more complex. She suggested combining the fee for both and charge \$850, with \$250 for zoning review as described earlier.

John Lojek, Commissioner of Inspectional Services addressed the Committee regarding fees in his department. The Temporary Certificate of Occupancy is something that should incur a new charge each month it is in effect, for each unit. It would generate more money but it does also require quite a bit of tracking by his department. The developers are making money by allowing space to be occupied prior to all the conditions being met in the special permit. The cost of the Temporary Certificate of Occupancy would be more than fair.

The Commissioner said he has prepared a document of revised permit fees and recommendations as requested by the Executive Department, but thus far it has not been reviewed by them. He noted that a big problem is that the fees being charged are using odd numbers such as \$18.60 per \$1,000 of a project cost. This causes accounting errors and difficulties in figuring out fees. If the amounts are off by a penny, it can take a significant amount of time to reconcile. He recommends rounding the number up to \$20 as it has not been changed since 2001. It will not represent a significant overall increase in costs for people and is reasonable. He pointed out that Brookline has been charging \$20 for about 20 years so it is comparable for the area.

Electrical, plumbing and gas fee schedules are complicated and use standards such as number of fixtures and outlets, etc. He would like to eliminate those standards as they are difficult to compute and are often done incorrectly by contractors. It's also easy for contractors to game the system to pay the lowest possible fee. He feels the fees should be calculated by project cost. The minimum fees need to be revised as well because they do not begin to cover the costs of staff and resources.

Demolition permits are \$15 no matter the size of the demolition. It could be a small garage in a yard, or all the buildings at Chestnut Hill Square. He felt that needed to be changed.

Ald. Crossley said her concern was to collect fees that were used in an efficient manner to provide enforcement services.

Phil Herr addressed the Committee. He asked that the Committee consider lowering fees for those developing affordable housing. He noted that it is in the Comprehensive Plan as well as the Consolidated Plan. It was also the final recommendation from the Citizens Advisory Group. Ald. Johnson asked the Planning Department to take that under advisement as they continue their work. The Clerk received an email relative to this issue and it is attached to this report.

Follow Up

- Ms. Havens will follow up on the questions in Committee.
- Commissioner Lojek will update the document that he has and submit that to the Committee.
- Ald. Johnson said she would like to see new fees implemented July 1, 2014. She would like to get this back to Committee soon and then be able to send this to Finance Committee in time to accomplish that goal.

The Committee voted to hold this item.

6/9/14 ZAP Report**REFERRED TO ZONING & PLANNING, LAND USE & FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#273-12 ALD. CROSSLEY & HESS-MAHAN requesting a restructuring and increase in fees for permits charged by the Inspectional Services Department and fees charged by the Planning Department and City Clerk to assure that fees are both sufficient to fund related services provided and simple to administer.

ACTION: **HELD 6-0**

NOTE: Candace Havens, Director, Planning & Development addressed the Committee. She presented a memo and chart comparing current and proposed fees and it is attached to this report for reference. She noted that this chart was updated based on input from the last Committee meeting on this item.

Fees Collected in the Planning DepartmentAdministrative Site Plan

As discussed in previous meetings, the recommendation is to collect a \$250 fee for zoning review for major projects. An additional \$350 would be collected with the special permit application for a total of \$600. The current charge is \$350. The Committee agreed on these recommendations.

Accessory Apartments

She explained that the current fee for a by-right accessory apartment review is \$100 and is proposing that be eliminated entirely. However, where a special permit is required, the recommendation is to make no change to the current \$250 fee as that does require extra work. Ald. Johnson felt that the fee should be eliminated in order to provide a small incentive for people to come forward to make accessory apartments safe and legal. The Committee agreed on these recommendations.

Conservation Fines

Currently there are no fines for conservation violations, however, the Conservation Commission has the ability to adopt their own regulations for this purpose and that can be pursued if the Board desires. The Committee expressed their support for imposing fines. Mr. Freas explained that there is \$50 fee that goes to the state for a Wetlands filing. The City also has an additional \$50 fee in the ordinance but it is unclear whether that is actually allowed.

Historic Reviews

There is no fee for historic reviews and the recommendation is to charge \$50 for repeat reviews in a one-year period. There is also a recommendation for a nominal fee for the application. Ald. Baker suggested a line needed to be drawn between what is a repeat application and an amended application and agreed staff time should not be abused by someone coming in over and over. Ms. Havens said most people do not abuse this, but there is the occasional occurrence. Ald.

Baker suggested that Ms. Havens speak to the Historic Commissions for their input on this before a final decision is made. Ald. Johnson felt the Commissions should be consulted as well.

Fees Collected in the City Clerk's Office

Zone Change

No change is recommended to the current \$350 charge. It had been asked at a previous meeting if there were any exemptions for this fee and the ordinance does not allow any. A citizen seeking a zoning change would be charged the fee as well as developers.

Special Permits

The current charge for a non-residential special permit is \$750. The recommendation is to charge an up-front fee of \$250 for zoning review and collect the remaining \$500 when the special permit application is submitted. The zoning reviews are currently conducted at no charge and a tremendous amount of work goes into them. There are times when that work is done and then the special permit is not sought so the entire fee is lost.

A similar charge is being suggested for the residential special permits if more than one unit is being considered. The current fee is \$350 plus \$100 per unit (not to exceed \$2500). An additional \$250 would be charged for zoning review in a project of more than one unit. A single unit project would not require the additional \$250 charge.

The mixed use residential fee is currently \$750. The recommendation is to raise that to \$1100 which is merely the combined costs of the non-residential and residential fees. (\$750 + \$350).

There is mention of a \$2 fee in the ordinance for "Other Districts" but no legislative history could be found to explain this. The only other zones are recreational and open space which would only apply to City-owned properties. All other districts are covered by the previously discussed categories. This fee does not make sense to the Planning Department and recommends eliminating this.

Ms. Havens explained that they are recommending no change at this time to the \$350 fee for Freestanding Signs because they anticipate to be discussing fees in the zoning reform process and it would make sense for this to be part of a larger conversation.

As mentioned earlier, a fee for accessory apartments is reasonable for the amount of work that needs to be done and is in line with the other special permit reviews.

Comprehensive Permit

There was a discussion at the last meeting about lowering this fee as an incentive for affordable housing. Many cities are charging less for this to encourage creation of affordable units. The

Planning Department's original recommendation was to make no change to the current charges of \$2000 plus \$50 a unit for for-profit developments; and \$1000 plus \$50 a unit for nonprofit developments greater than 6 units; and \$350 for nonprofit developments under 6 units. The Committee felt it should be left as is.

The Committee agreed to all of the recommendations.

Follow Up

Ms. Havens will follow up on the Conservation Fines with the Conservation Commission and on Historic Reviews with the Historical Commissions and report back to Committee. It was also suggested that language be added to make it clear that the \$250 charge for zoning review would be charged for *each* subsequent zoning review of a project.

Commissioner Lojek joined the Committee to discuss fees in the Inspectional Services Department. He distributed a schedule of proposed fees and it is attached to this report. He explained that the current fee schedule in Inspectional Services is lengthy long and is confusing and somewhat outdated. Construction costs were used as a measure and were put in the ordinances, but should not have been because those costs change routinely.

Currently, the permit fees are being charged at the rate of \$18.60 per \$1000 of construction value. The recommendation is to make that rate \$20 per \$1000. The rates have not been revisited since 2001 and should be updated accordingly. It is a 7% increase over 13 years, which he finds reasonable. The Town of Brookline has been charging \$20 for the last 20 years and many communities are charging that amount. The motivation for this change is simplicity of calculation for staff and builders and to streamline the process for both as well. The goal is not necessarily to make more money. Online permitting is much easier to use with a round figure. Sometimes the staff spends an inordinate amount of time reconciling the odd numbers that come out of the current calculations. It's easier to make a mistake when the numbers aren't straightforward.

There are two proposed fees on the schedule that are not in effect at this time that he would like to pursue:

- Temporary/Partial Certificates of Use and Occupancy (CO), per unit, per month : \$50 residential and \$100 commercial
- Condo Certificate of Inspection: \$100 (not required for new construction, just conversions of existing units)

Commissioner Lojek said some communities will not give temporary COs at all and it is a favorable gesture by the City to allow builders, developers and businesses to have their spaces

occupied while they are still finishing up the conditions of their special permits. They are able to make money so the City should be able to collect a fee for this. Staff time and resources are expended on administering them.

The Condo Conversion inspection is necessary. He has seen some instances of unsafe conversions and he wants to capture that activity and make sure units are safe and up to building code. There was an item in Zoning & Planning Committee (#95-11) to charge a fee for condo conversions which is now in Finance Committee. Commissioner Lojek said that while he is authorized to set and change fees, he felt it was better to go through the process with the Board and move forward with their recommendations in mind.

The electrical fees are confusing as they are currently administered and contractors have figured out how to game the system in order to pay less. He would like to institute flat fees as noted on the attached schedule. Solar installations have been particularly difficult because installers are still learning how to do this and the City has to go back for multiple repeat inspections and there are no additional fees for that. He would like to be able to charge for each inspection. As he was reviewing the fees, it was found that the electrical, plumbing and gas permit fees were barely covering the cost of the inspectors. Charging the flat fees would increase the revenue on these particular permits as well provide simplicity.

Commissioner Lojek has reviewed all of the proposed fees with the Executive Department and has their support.

Committee Comments and Questions

Ald. Baker suggested considering a CO charge in the special permit phase. Part of the concern is that the conditions need to be complied with and that charge could help support staff time to perform reviews. Commissioner Lojek said that most of the special permits are for large projects and substantial fees are being paid for that so he wasn't sure about that suggestion. Ald. Baker said there has been concern about having enough resources in ISD and this fee could help. He wondered if collateral reviews by the Engineering Department are being covered in some way. Commissioner Lojek said the Engineering Department would have to be consulted on that and he cannot suggest fees for that department. He said that ISD has changed its procedure in that it will not start considering the special permit until the engineering review is done because they only have 30 days to act on it once they receive it. The Committee asked the clerk to find out what fees are charged in the Engineering Department. The Committee suggested that the Public Facilities Committee take a look at fees in the Engineering Department if they don't seem sufficient. A schedule of their fees and charges for services by the Engineering Department is attached.

Ald. Baker noted that the fees are based on construction costs and asked how they determined an accurate accounting of those costs. Commissioner Lojek said that there is enough experience in the department to know if a builder comes in with a wildly unlikely cost of construction. If they feel there is any type of inconsistency, they calculate estimated construction costs by multiplying the gross floor area by the average square foot costs as published in the latest edition of "Means Cost Data" by R.S. Means Company, or other similar recognized national survey data.

The Committee asked why this item has also been referred to Land Use Committee. The clerk determined that because the special permit fees are involved, it was felt Land Use should be consulted.

Follow Up

Commissioner Lojek is to add the commercial fee for Temporary COs to his list because only the Residential fee was listed on his schedule. He is to come back to Committee with a comprehensive schedule.

The Committee voted to hold this item.

11/10/14 ZAP Report

REFERRED TO ZONING & PLANNING, LAND USE & FINANCE COMMITTEES

#273-12 ALD. CROSSLEY & HESS-MAHAN requesting a restructuring and increase in fees for permits charged by the Inspectional Services Department and fees charged by the Planning Department and City Clerk to assure that fees are both sufficient to fund related services provided and simple to administer.

ACTION: **HELD 8-0**

NOTE: The Executive Department, Clerk's Office and Law Department are working on a comprehensive fees and fines program and would like to have the discussion in that larger context when they have finished their work. Mr. Freas explained that all of the materials that were prepared in the past in this Committee on the fees and fines will be shared with the CFO as part of the larger discussion.

Follow Up

Ald. Johnson will speak to Ms. Lemieux to find out when this might be ready for action.

The Committee voted to hold this item.

City of Newton



Setti A. Warren
Mayor

Submitted 6/9/14
Inspectional Services Department

John D. Lojek, Commissioner
1000 Commonwealth Avenue
Newton Centre, MA 02459-1449
Telephone: (617) 796-1060
Fax: (617) 796-1086
www.ci.newton.ma.us

#273-12

Building/Zoning Inspectors
(617) 796-1060
Zoning Board of Appeals
(617) 796-1065
Plumbing and Gas Division
(617) 796-1070
Electrical Division
(617) 796-1076
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089

Inspectional Services Department
Preliminary Proposed Permit Fee Schedule

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1) Minimum permit fee- | \$50.00 |
| 2) Building Permit- Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$20.00 |
| 3) Electrical Permit - Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$20.00 |
| 4) Plumbing Permit- Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$20.00 |
| 5) Gas Permit- Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$20.00 |
| 6) Mechanical Permit- Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$20.00 |
| 7) Demolition Permit- Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$20.00 |
| 8) Sprinkler Permit- Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$20.00 |
| 9) All other work requiring permits- Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$20.00 |
| 10) Work started without permits- Per \$1000.00 of construction value or fraction thereof | \$50.00 |
| 11) Re-inspection fee- first re-inspection | \$50.00 |
| 12) Re-inspection fee- each subsequent re-inspection | \$100.00 |
| 13) Temporary or Partial Certificate of Use and Occupancy, per unit, per month | \$50.00 |
| 14) Condominium Certificate of Inspection (not required for new construction) | \$100.00 |

Flat fees Electrical: Residential

- | | |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Service Change | \$100.00 |
| Temporary Electrical service | \$100.00 |
| Swimming Pools/Spas | \$100.00 |
| Transformers/generators | \$100.00 |
| Solar | \$100.00 |
| Security and Fire Alarm | \$50.00 |

Commercial

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| Service Change | \$1.00/ amp |
| Feeder lines | \$1.00/ amp |
| Security and Fire alarm | \$100.00/floor |

Estimated Construction Costs shall be computed by multiplying the gross floor area (sq.ft.) by the average square foot costs as published in the latest edition of "Means Cost Data" by R.S. Means Co., Duxbury, MA or other similar recognized national survey data.

*Strict code enforcement makes the city safer
Before buying, renting or leasing check zoning*