

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES of February 20, 2013  
PUBLIC HEARING  
APPROVED**

Present: Sean James Chair; Ginny Clifford, Vice Chair; Albert Hall III; Judi Lindsey; Kim Byrd; Mark Siemonsma Alt; Fred Kelley, BOS Rep; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dean Young, Fire Chief; Dick Snow, BOS

Chair James called the meeting to order at 7:00pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes November 7, 2012, January 16, 2013 and February 6, 2013

A. Hall **motioned** to accept the Minutes of November 7, 2012 as amended. G. Clifford **seconded**. S. James, G. Clifford, A. Hall and S. Bradley by email **were in favor**. M. Siemonsma, K. Byrd, J. Lindsey, F. Kelley abstained.

F. Kelley **motioned** to accept the Minutes of January 16, 2013 as amended. A. Hall **seconded**. S. James, G. Clifford, A. Hall, F. Kelley, J. Lindsey, K. Byrd **were in favor**. M. Siemonsma abstained.

F. Kelley **motioned** to accept the Minutes of February 6, 2013 as amended. A. Hall **seconded**. G. Clifford, A. Hall, J. Lindsey, K. Byrd, F. Kelley **were in favor**. S. James and M. Siemonsma abstained.

**Major Site Plan Application: Millennium Engineering, Inc., 13 Hampton Road, Exeter, NH 03833**  
**Property Owner: Vignette LLC 20 Steppingstone Road, Nottingham NH 03290, Property location:**  
**378 South Road, Candia NH 03034, Map 410 Lot 150, Intent: To construct a 4800 sq ft**  
**addition to existing building in the LI1 District.**

Chair James opened the hearing. Henry Boyd, Millennium Engineering and Eric Paquette, Vignette LLC were present. Abutters John & Diana Nault, 58 Old Manchester Road, Stephen Hock 366 South Road, Lawrence Stacy 91 Deerfield Road were present.

E. Paquette said they fabricate structural steel for bridges in the existing 13,000 sq ft building. He said with the volume of work the past 4-5 years, they are running out of space so they are here tonight with a proposed 5,000 sq ft addition which would give them an additional bay and office space. He said with the additional bay they can spread out and be more efficient with each bay working on different aspects of jobs. He said the office will be on the second floor.

Chair James said he wanted to start with the original letter to avoid confusion as the second review was received today and the Board has not been able to review it.

H. Boyd started by saying he was impressed by Stantec and the town and how quickly they did their reviews and they are a pleasure to work with. He noted that the trailer will be removed. He said currently there isn't a storm water treatment on the property as it was built before they were required. He said with the proposed storm water plan they will be able to treat a lot of the run off that goes into the wetlands. He said a new septic system is proposed and they have received the approval from DES which they added to the plan. He said the pavement remains basically the same except for a small radius and a small portion under the existing trailers to allow for the flow of vehicles. He said originally they had shown gravel parking areas near the South Road entrance but per Candia's regulations pavement is required. The detention area is shown and they have changed the calculations from a 25 year event to a 50 year event. H. Boyd said on sheet 2 they show the site in a 20 scale compared to a 40 scale mainly to show the drainage and flow patterns, septic and traffic patterns in greater detail. He said they have hired a lighting consultant engineer and sheet 3

shows the proposed wall mounted shadow lighting that directs light down and the lumens. He said currently there are only 3 flood lights on the end of the building. He said sheet 4 has all the details for the drainage, silt fencing, detention pond, pavement detail, spill ways.

H. Boyd continued with discussing Stantec's first letter dated February 5, 2013, comment by comment:

#### General Comments

#1. He said the wetland scientist did not find any Hydric A soils and they added the wetland setbacks that were missing. He said the primary wetland is the stream to the east and there are wetlands on the south west corner as well. Rene LaBranche from Stantec said the wetlands 10.06 buffer provisions in the regulations specifically states no building activity shall occur within the setbacks. He said this will affect the detention pond and the parking area as they are within the setbacks and continued saying that what the applicant is doing is definitely an improvement to the property. H. Boyd said the area that is already paved is within the setbacks. He said the other parking is gravel and is existing. He feels there is no need to pave and would prefer to leave the gravel for parking which they have been using for many years. He said the drainage system can handle the additional pavement but he would rather not add the impervious surface. A. Hall asked if there were advantages of gravel over pavement. H. Boyd said it is a better treatment of storm water runoff with some penetration.

#2 H. Boyd said they don't believe based on the regulations they require sprinklers because the addition is less than 50% . He said the review letter from the Fire Department doesn't believe it applies either. A. Hall asked about the second story if it was added into the calculations S. James said with the two stories it is 9600 sq ft which is more than 50%. H. Boyd said their engineer spoke with a NH Fire Sprinkler Engineer and the way they interpreted the code it was not necessary. Chief Dean Young said his comments were based on the one level. E. Paquette said the second story doesn't run the entire length of the addition. S. James said there are 3 options to comply with the Fire Department; either a cistern, sprinkler system or some other item at the discretion of the Fire Chief.

#3 H. Boyd said with this being an existing building he is not sure about a bond and doesn't know what the Town would want them to post a surety bond for. S. James said he doesn't see any reason they need a bond as it is not a new building but said he was not speaking for the Board. H. Boyd said previously they had submitted a waiver on landscaping but now have hired a landscaper architect and they should have the plan ready by next week.

#4 H. Boyd said they are to show the type of boundary monuments to be set but first they need to determine whether they will use granite bound or drill hole once they are on site as there are stone walls. He said there are 3 to be set.

#5 H. Boyd said they added the NHDES subsurface septic permit number to the plans.

#6 H. Boyd said they have received comments from both the Police and Fire Chief and said the police did not have any comments and the Fire Chief is here.

#7 H. Boyd said they do not know exactly where the existing septic system is but believe it is under a portion of the payment and partially under the temporary trailers. He said the septic will be moved further back on the property away from the wetlands which has better soils for effluent treatment. S. James asked what the intent to clear is for the septic as there is a tree line marked where the septic is going. H. Boyd said they will mark the proposed tree line.

#8 H. Boyd said the existing well is no longer being monitored. They submitted a letter dated from 2005 from the State stating the well no longer needs to be monitored. Decommissioning the well was discussed. H. Boyd said they will look into decommissioning the well and add a note to the plan.

#### Waiver Requests

#9 H. Boyd said they withdraw the waiver for the landscaping plan. He discussed the landscaping and said they should have the plan next week.

#10 H. Boyd said they are withdrawing the lighting waiver as well and they have hired a lighting engineer. He said they have shown the new lighting on the plan which is wall mounted shadow boxes. Chair James asked them to include the existing lighting.

#### Sheet 1

#11 The zoning boundaries within 1000' were added to the locus map.

#12 The actual use of the abutting properties were added to the plan.

#13 The final mylar will have the wetland scientist stamp and signature. H. Boyd said it was first delineated in March 2011 and verified again in January 2013.

#14 Existing drainage infrastructure within 100' was added. H. Boyd said he showed a large 24" concrete cross culvert the state put in near the stream and said they found a pipe on the south east corner almost at the property line but not sure where it drains or if it drains as they did not find the outlet of the pipe. He said it is in the lowest spot on the property. D. Lewis said he is not sure either where the outlet is.

#15 Sheet 1 note 3 states construction is expected to begin in April 2013.

#16 H. Boyd said the typo on the setbacks to the wetlands have been revised.

#17 Notes on the decommission of the well will be added to the plan

#### Sheet 2

#18 The proposed edge of the pavement was added to sheet 2.

#19 H. Boyd they would prefer to leave the existing areas as gravel but the regulations say it should be paved. He said if paved it doesn't hurt the drainage as the drainage is oversized but he would rather leave it unpaved as it is better for the environment.

#20 H. Boyd said the snow storage areas are marked on sheet 2. Chair James asked as the snow storage melts where does it go. H. Boyd said it will go across the entrance as it always has. A. Hall said it has been doing this for years. R. LaBranche said he was looking at Google maps today and right along where the cranes are it was wet from one side of the site to the other side and asked if this would be an icing problem. E. Paquette said it depends on the weather and temperature change. H. Boyd said from the elevation they would not be able to get a pipe in for drainage as the building is close to the water table. E. Paquette said the main entrance is from Route 43 but they use South Road too.

#21 Sheet 1 has spot grades that show the intricacies of the grading and also the pitch of the water and how it is going to flow into the detention pond.

#22 H. Boyd said they have proposed that standard stop signs be added.

#### Sheet 3

#23 H. Boyd said they have increased the binder to 2.5" and the wearing course pavement to 1.5" on sheet 4.

#24 The compaction detail notes have been added to sheet 4 under pavement notes #2.

#25 The detail of how the proposed gravel and pavement are to be tied into the existing gravels and pavement are shown with a saw cut detail on sheet 4.

#26 The general erosion control note #6 was revised to specify 6" of screened loam rather than 4".

#27 The silt fence detail specifies straw bales to be installed with the fence, the applicant does not plan on installing the straw bales they have been removed from the detail.

#### Architectural Plan Comments:

#28 and #29 R. LaBranche said the regulations require that you put a break in a structure that is over 100' long, to make it more architecturally aesthetically pleasing and often it is done by putting an offset or bump out and in this case they have the stairwell that is on the front of the building. R. LaBranche asked the board to determine whether the stairway and bump out as the break in the 100'

line of the structure would meet the regulations. E. Paquette said the stair structure is a significant bump out on the front elevation breaking up the 100' line is going to be the main entrance. Chair James said he agreed it is going to look a lot better and it is a good change as it does dress it up but it doesn't match a lot of the key parts of the architectural standards including the flat roof where you would have the HVAC units with no screening or parapet wall. He said he looked up the material they are using for the siding and it looks like metal panels and said it is different colors and sizes but still a metal wall. H. Boyd asked if they should ask for a waiver on this. Chair James said they have done a lot with the windows coverings and the stairs do break it up. He suggested a parapet or some screening for the HVAC units. E. Paquette said they can put up a parapet wall. He said the design of the treatments on the front of the building were picked out by their designer and are high grade metal panels in different colors which breaks up the first floor from the second floor and said there are soffit and fascia treatments that go on the corners. He said they also put a curved roof on the stair tower to break it up the roof line and they used a metal screen panel system that is a different treatment from the main building. M. Siemonsma asked if there was a second set of stairs inside and there are. E. Paquette said he will produce drawings with better color detail of the treatments for the front of the building. M. Siemonsma asked where the water would be dumping from the existing building and now with the addition. E. Paquette said it must go to the existing drainage and will get the information. F. Kelley said he would like to know as well.

#### Drainage Comments:

#30 H. Boyd said they have revised the 25 year storm event to a 50 year storm event. He said there is 6" of free-board not the required 12" but it does provide for the 50 year storm and based on the 25 year storm event they have 8" of free-board. He said this does not require an alteration of terrain permit and feels they meet the regulations. He said they are reluctant to go 12" of free-board as it is a very high water table and they have gone down as far as they can into the soil. The test pit done at the sight showed a water table depth of 14" if they go down another 6" they are going to have a standing water situation, maybe not if they could drain it continually but it will be still very damp and not a pleasant situation. He said he would prefer to stay on what they designed as it more than meets the regulations. E. Paquette explained that free-board is standing room capacity in the pond. R. LaBranche continued free board is the dimension of height above the level of water to the top of the berm which is the spare capacity. He said the reason they ask for the height in the storm water design is because they are seeing extreme weather events. H. Boyd said if the existing building was not there they could add fill and build the building a foot higher but it already exists. R. LaBranche said they are comfortable with the design and is appropriate. He said the Building Inspector had talked to the Road Agent and they have never seen any flooding on the site. He said 6" of freeboard is better than no freeboard and a 50 year design is an improvement over a 25 year design.

#31 H. Boyd said the proposed detention pond basin is to be cut into the existing ground but without an outlet the pond will likely be full most of the year and will not function as designed. The water is getting in but it is so close to the water table. He said Stantec suggested a pipe which they added to weep or flow out at an invert elevation out of the pond. He said they added a galvanized trash rack on the end of the pipe so the pipe does not get clogged.

#### Discussion with the Board

Chair James said it appears the applicant has addressed most of the items from Stantec's letter and the plan looks good. One potential issue is the first comment on soils 10.6 requires 100' setbacks which they cannot waive. H. Boyd said they found Hydric B soils which require a 50' setback. R. LaBranche said they are still within the 50' setback for the pavement expansion and the detention pond. H. Boyd said they are removing some pavement and adding some. R. LaBranche said the regulations say no building activity within the setbacks and asked what constitutes building activity. H. Boyd said when the detention pond is built there is going to be grass and stones where

there is pavement now so they do not consider that building activity but construction activity. He said they are not building a building. He thought the whole purpose of the ordinance is to protect the wetlands and when they build this detention pond they will be meeting the spirit of the ordinance where as there is no protection right now. He said they would like to ask for a waiver from paving the gravel areas. J. Lindsey said she would like to see the gravel areas remain because the less impervious area the better. A. Hall agreed. R. LaBranche said in the wetland buffers areas they allow leach fields within 75' and many other towns allow detention ponds to occur within the setbacks because they consider them an environmental enhancement however Candia's ordinances do not specify. R. LaBranche said that is why they want to bring it up to the Board to decide if a detention pond is a building activity or not. H. Boyd said if a septic system is allowed within the setbacks, a detention pond should be and said the only manmade item is the pipe and the basket, the rest will be stone. He said he considers it landscaping.

H. Boyd said they would like to submit a waiver on the gravel area for parking that already exists. Chair James said the only reason to go with paving is it would be easier to maintain in the winter. A. Hall asked if they had any problems and E. Paquette said they have had no issues. Chair James said the Board will address the waiver on the paving when they receive it. Chair James said as far as the building activity he doesn't believe this is. J. Lindsey was in agreement and said the end result will be a benefit. She does not consider it building activity. M. Siemonsma said they could put a condition in that the gravel never be paved.

G. Clifford said when she thinks of detention ponds she thinks of it as creating wetlands on purpose. H. Boyd said is it called mitigation or replication.

R. LaBranche suggested drawing a straight line to follow the wetland buffer on the portion of the pavement not currently paved at the hard turn so it will not be within 50' setback. He said regarding Fire Department requirements, if they go with option A whether it is either a cistern or fire pond that should be part of the site plan. E. Paquette said he wants to talk to his engineer because he had specific conversations with them and feels very confident that a sprinkler system was not needed. Chair James said the regulations say you have to do one of the three items listed for the Fire Dept. R. LaBranche said to put a note on the plan once they decide what they are going to do. Chair James asked if there were anymore comments from the Board and hearing none opened the discussion to the abutters.

#### Discussion with Abutters

Abutters John & Diana Nault, 58 Old Manchester Road, Stephen Hock 366 South Road, Lawrence Stacy 91 Deerfield Road abutters viewed the plans. John & Diana Nault had no further questions. Stephen Hock discussed other abutter concerns.

R. LaBranche said the larger items they need to resolve is the Fire Department options, lighting, waiver on pavement and detailed architectural drawings of the building to include a parapet and treatments to the front of the addition and also to see how the water is being handled coming off the roof.

H. Boyd said it was a pleasure working with Stantec and meeting everyone. Chair James thanked H. Boyd for his presentation. Chair James thanked him for his presentation.

The public hearing was continued to March 20, 2013. Chair James said this is the only notice to the abutters and closed the public hearing.

#### Other Business

##### Memo from SNHPC

Chair James said SNHPC wants to build closer ties between themselves and planning boards. He said they would like to take a representative of the Planning Board to lunch at a location of our choosing in our town at a mutually agreeable time. It was discussed and A. Hall and Chair James decided to meet with SNHPC.

SNHPC Certified Site Plan “Ready Set Go”

Chair James said SNHPC gave a presentation at the last meeting on February 6<sup>th</sup>. They talked about the Certified Site Plan and SNHPC said language has to be added to the regulations to become part of the program. He said the only problem is where does it apply to and is it the Board’s intention is to make it every zone except residential? G. Clifford asked if they wanted to promote all of the zones besides residential for development. F. Kelley said SNHPC was focused on the exit 3 area. After discussion it was the consensus of the Board to include all the zones except residential.

Chair James said the next step would be to hold a public hearing to accept the site plan review article for Certified Sites in the Site Plan Regulations. He said other changes previous discussed about erosion control to the Subdivision Regulations could be voted on at the same public hearing. He said he will work on these for a public hearing.

NH Community Planning Grant

F. Kelley said he signed the paper work for the NH Community Planning Grant so SNHPC could submit before the deadline. Chair James said they should know in a month or so if they will get the grant.

Master Plan Update

Chair James noted the Budget Committee did not recommend the warrant article. He felt it should have been as it is important to start working on the update.

The March 6, 2013 meeting has been cancelled. The next scheduled Planning Board meeting is March 20, 2013 at 7pm at the Town Hall. It is a Public Hearing meeting on proposed Earth Regulation changes.

A. Hall **motioned** to adjourn at 8:45 pm. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor**.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sharon Robichaud  
Land Use Secretary