

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES of August 6, 2014**  
**APPROVED**

Present: Sean James, Chairman; Albert Hall III, Vice Chair; Ginny Clifford; Judi Lindsey; Ken Kustra; Michael Santa; Boyd Chivers, Alt BOS Rep; Dave Murray, Building Inspector; D. Lewis Road Agent; Rene LaBranche, Stantec Engineering

Absent: Amanda Soares

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

Minutes July 16, 2014

It was the consensus of the Board to postpone voting on the minutes until the next meeting on August 2014.

Chairman James re-opened the public hearing for the continuance of Major Site Plan Merrimack Valley Paint 274 Main Street at 7:02 pm.

**Continuance Major Site Plan: Applicant: Tony Fiore 103 Chadwick Street, Bradford MA 01835 & Michael Pelletier 31 Garfield Street Lawrence MA 01841 owners of Merrimack Valley Paint Ball, 103 Chadwick Street, Bradford MA 01835; Property owner: Rita Hobbs, P.O. Box 11, Candia NH 03034; Property location: 274 Old Candia Road, Candia NH 03034 Map 410 Lot 160; Intent: To re-establish and operate an outdoor paint ball facility in the woods & fields within the Light Industrial I District. For additional information, please call the Land Use Office at 483-8588.**

Tony Fiore, Merrimack Valley Paintball and Doug MacGuire, PE. Dubay Group were present for the applicant. No abutters were present. D. MacGuire started by giving an update on where they are out at the site. He said they have made a lot of progress and are working towards getting the fields and the area stable. He passed out photos taken a few days ago and said he has since spread out some additional loam and are getting ready to seed. He said you can see that the field has been leveled out and put in place working within survey controls where the field needed to be. He also handed out the latest plan set that Stantec's second review letter is based on and continued they have not made any changes saying they wanted to keep everything consistent when discussing the project.

D. MacGuire said one photo is a shot taken from the top of the area where the entrance is coming in looking out over the fields at the main field area which is basically the extent of the project. He said the SWPPP is fully in place and T. Fiore has implemented all the requirements of the erosion control protection and continued the owner can do inspections but they have suggested having a professional come out since he has put everything in at this point and evaluate the situation based on the SWPPP. He said he suggests Gary Springs who works for NH Springs Environmental Consultants who is a certified erosion control specialist who specializes in SWPPP and is the one who prepared the SWPPP. He said he went through the entire property and did his standard inspection wetland crossing, limits of where the field has been pushed out, noted the condition of all the erosion control protection and G. Springs said everything was acceptable and nothing was in nonconformance. He said he was sorry he did not have copies of the report to give out but he does have the report available with him tonight to review.

D. MacGuire said he would like to go through Stantec's second review letter dated August 1, 2014, as he has some detailed responses.

General Comments

He said comments #1 and #2 are basically both referring to the wetland crossing.

Comment #1 D. MacGuire said this is regarding the dredge and fill permit where they are asking about updates to wetland impacts and to show the installed silt fence update. He said what may not have been clear to Stantec at the time is they are not going to complete the other two wetland crossings. T. Fiore said the one crossing is sufficient which allows access to the woodlands and now he wants to concentrate getting the completion fields up and running. He said he thought he had removed all reference to the other two crossings and will remove the references to the other two crossings. He said if the applicant wants to come back at a later date they will have a more detailed plan.

B. Chivers asked if they have a permit for the crossing they intend to keep and D. MacGuire said they do and they have enlarged the crossing which they need to update. He said he is working with Bruce Gilday from Bagland Consultants who did the original permit and he is in the process of updating the permit for the additional impact and will be removing the other two crossings and should have it submitted within a week. R. LaBranche asked for the timetable it will be done to be clear. D. MacGuire showed a picture of the actual wetland crossing showing the silt fence in place and the stabilized side slopes of the crossing and that it is in compliance. He said one of the comments is to survey in the silt fences and said he felt it was not necessary at this point as they have established growth at the wetland crossing and the silt fence is installed correctly and being review by SWPPP.

Comment #2 There was a discussion of the type of wetland crossing it was and D. MacGuire said it was for emergency vehicles mainly a walking path. K. Kustra asked what the narrowest point of the crossing was and T. Fiore believes it is 18' which is enough to get a vehicle through. R. LaBranche said they have come to their office and had a discussion that it is no longer a 12' pipe but a 24' pipe. D. MacGuire said they have made significant effort in stabilizing the crossing saying which was a concern of Stantec's. He said for clarity before they got involved the work had been done so it is more of an asbuilts survey of what they had put in.

Comment #3 & #4 D. MacGuire said pertain to the boulder slopes retaining walls onsite and guardrail. He said he will work with Stantec and work with the Town to come to a resolution on this. He said he talked with Stantec about their concerns and went out on Tuesday and performed a thorough investigation of the site himself. He said he prepared a memorandum regarding these items and reviewed each item starting with the wood beam guardrail. He passed a copy of the memorandum to the each Board members. D. MacGuire said the height of the railing is a little under the typical standard guardrail you would see on a road which is 30". Chairman James said it is 31". R. LaBranche said it appears 24" in the picture. T. Fiore said they used the 30" measurement. Chairman James asked about the post spacing as it looks variable from the photo. D. MacGuire said they typically like to see 8 feet max may be some areas it varies and will say this was not built exactly per spec he would have specified on a standard wood beam guardrail but can say that they posts and railings are much larger then need be and in some areas the railing was so large needed to be notched to accept the lag bolts.

A. Hall asked if a lot of the questions the Board has would be answered by a site walk. He said the Building Inspector has been down there many times and if there were any red flags he would have brought it to the Board's attention which he has in the past.

Chairman James said part of the purpose of a guardrail is to absorb energy and impact it safely and deflect vehicles and if you make it too stiff it could be doing more harm than good. D. MacGuire said at the entrance there should not be any significant speed and is more of a safety barrier if a car slips or pushed into it and he said he is comfortable that it would provide that level of protection. He said he would not want this on a subdivision roadway that was seeing a lot of traffic and higher velocity but it makes sense on this site. R. LaBranche said he felt the overly robust guardrail is good and he doesn't worry about it taking an impact and keeping a car from driving over the edge. He said it does look low to him but the reality is all standards for DOT has are for interstates and state roads. He said you are just trying to keep someone from slipping on ice and going over the edge. A. Hall said safety is number one and if that is being met intent is there. Chairman James said if you came in and said I wanted to put a guardrail in that doesn't meet the standard height or standard spacing and any particular code the Board

would say no but now we are in the position where the Board either makes you rip it out and make you put in something that is compliant or allow this. He said he gets the point it would serve its purpose and stop people from driving over the wall.

A. Halls said the Building Inspector felt that the curve and driveway were well done. D. Murray, Building Inspector, said the Fire Chief also went down there to inspect it and he was more than impressed and was pleased. A. Hall said he would like this noted.

M. Santa said in their letter dated July 25<sup>th</sup> item number 5 indicated that you recommended an onsite load test to confirm viability of the guardrail and asked if this has changed. D. MacGuire said he talked with Stantec about how using an excavator up is how you know how hard you are really pushing and it is not as viable a solution.

D. MacGuire said on plan sheet #4 the first section is reinforced slop and is along the edge in between limits of parking. He said this area of this section transitions 2:1 or flatter measured and went back 5 to 6 feet. He said his evaluation of this area is it could have been maintained without any stone. He said the applicant had extra rock material and decided to stabilize the slope with rock instead of being vegetation. He said the applicant has been honest in how they constructed the wall and they did not use any fabric in this area or any small stone base and in the area but in his opinion not so much a concern because this slope did not need any reinforcement as this area does not lend to any surface runoff draining and he said considers this area stable as it is. R. LaBranche asked for him to clarify where this was on the plan.

D. MacGuire said there are two boulder walls constructed. One wall is at the top end of the parking lot and the other is at the bottom end. Both walls were constructed with a batter angle of roughly 1:1. This is conservative as a boulder slopes can typically be built with much steeper batter angles. The lower wall measures no more than approximately 4 net feet in height with the upper wall closer to 6 feet in height. Additionally, it was noted that the runoff from the gravel areas sheets down the gravel access drive and not over the wall section. There is a noticeable lip created during the guardrail installation that prohibits water from flowing into the boulder wall. The lack of water flowing onto the wall further limits the possibility of erosion or washout within the wall system. He said it is built using larger stones as a base and built up smaller. He said because there were no filter fabric or crushed stone used behind the wall construction he recommends supplement both walls with additional stone using 6" minus rip rap to fill in the larger voids between boulders and once large voids are filled smaller crushed stone should be chinked into the wall to fill the remaining small voids. This supplement will further secure the placed boulders and limit the possibility of wash out. He said the good news is the guard rail was build up and he can tell by how the water has flowed in recent rain events saying the water does not go up over the wall and goes along the guardrail not entering the wall.

R. LaBranche said he would like to comment on a couple issues he has. He said the gravel roads parking area gravel will be moved around when it is plowed and the water may be going down the access gravel road now but after next spring it could be go over, behind and through the walls so fabric is critical for the walls. He said on plan 3 key the wall detail which shows the wall being built 3 feet below grade but in the picture it looks like the stone is on the top of the ground which would be an issue. D. MacGuire this was more of getting a border line to set the limit of the parking area and can certainly be cleaned up and if they extended the grade out two feet could just do a grass slope.

R. LaBranche said if water flows towards one of these walls you can create a sinkhole behind the wall because there is nothing there to prevent washout that is why fine crushed stone or fabric is used to actually stop the dirt from going through and said the detail of the fabric on the plan would not allow water through. R. LaBranche said water running parallel down the road is not a good idea and to design the water off the road. D. MacGuire said the road is graded uniformly and it isn't forcing all the water against that edge. D. MacGuire said he definitely hears R. LaBranche's comment and together they can come up with something but do not feel it is something as significant as rebuilding the entire wall and he said the goal was to have this entire area sheet flow like it did before.

D. MacGuire said the work done has actually reduced the runoff onsite because before as there was more gravel area and now the field area is flatter with loam and seed which promotes more infiltration. R. LaBranche said potentially you could remove the top 6" dirt along the back face of the stone wall to the front side of the guardrail and put stone so when the water hits that stone and it doesn't pick up the dirt and carry it. D. MacGuire agreed.

D. MacGuire said the runoff stays toward the field and not towards the edge goes but off the back edge of the field which is flat the runoff is able to soak in. K. Kustra if there no waiver given and they required paving would that create a better sheet flow D. MacGuire said they are trying to avoid paved surfaces that run off quicker and increase velocity which is another reason to keep it gravel. A. Hall said it keeps the site in a natural state as possible. Chairman James said the applicant has submitted 4 waiver requests; paving, granite curbing, boundary survey and landscaping plan.

D. MacGuire said on page 4 it showed the upper parking area section. It was asked does it drop down 4 feet very quickly. D. MacGuire it is deceiving as the rock is built up. Chairman James asked if there was any reason for the wall and D. MacGuire said no, not really. T. Fiore said they can remove it. D. MacGuire said the rock does do a nice job of delineating the parking area and is very clear where you park and if not a huge concern he recommends leaving it.

Chairman James said the only wall that you are going to do anything with is the upper wall. D. MacGuire said he maintains chinking in and using R. LaBranche's idea on the top edge. D. MacGuire said they were going to install a similar guardrail to the lower wall and continued he could be more specific with requirements on spacing and height.

D. MacGuire said he felt these were two of Stantec's biggest concerns because they were structural components of the site and continued there isn't anything else that is structural. He said on page 5 it shows boulder piles to the left of the entrance solely for delineating the limits of the drive isle. No material is held back on either side and is not very high and does allow them to be able to put a gate in which as been added to the plans.

#### Comment #6

D. MacGuire said he thought all references to Phase II had been removed but there were a couple left and will remove them.

#### Comment #7

D. MacGuire said this is the first waiver request and requiring a full certified boundary be completed. He said in the effort to minimize the overall cost to the applicant they used a plan done by True Engineering in 2008 that was a complete boundary and topography survey. He said Bagland delineated the wetlands on those plans and is the same wetland scientist that is working with them. He said they used those plans along with an on ground asbuilts survey of the area of impact. He said the existing condition sheet in the plan set shows the entire limits of the property and on sheet 2 there is phantom line showing where they did their onsite survey. He said he was hoping this would be sufficient as they are not proposing any structures or any significant infrastructure of any kind and all is internal to the site and not close to any boundaries. R. LaBranche said he hasn't read the detail of their notes and suggested they make reference to the plan they used. . D. MacGuire said this plan was not registered and subsequently the engineer has passed and they obtained copies from CLD. He said there was a boundary survey done in 1971 that was recorded which is referenced on the plan, D-91571. He said if they are to come forward with a Phase II, a full boundary and topographic survey will be performed. Chairman James asked R. LaBranche if he would be comfortable with a waiver and he said yes.

#### Comment #9

D. MacGuire said they apologize that Stantec did not get a copy of the driveway permit from DOT, they have their copy and the town had received their copy and will get them a copy.

#### Waiver Requests

#### Comment #10

D. MacGuire said this refers to #2 & #3 waivers requests concerning paving and granite curbing if paved.

Coversheet

Comment #11

D. MacGuire said the 4th waiver request is the requirement of a landscaping plan. He said the site is surrounded by vegetation shown in the pictures with mature growth and he was hoping to save the applicant some money and not have to have them do a landscaping plan. R. LaBranche said typically a landscaping plan is not for the benefit of the user but for the entire town to look good however in this case there are trees right up to the entrance of the driveway and not sure where you would put any landscaping and you would have to take down trees to plant. He said he was okay with the waiver.

Sheet 2

Comment #12

D. MacGuire said he has been working extensively with T. Fiore on the business sign issue. T. Fiore said the town told him the sign had to be out of the right of way and they contacted DOT. He said Scott Looney, survey engineer for the State, came out took measurements and marked the ground with paint where the sign was to be placed and since then they have been trying to get something from DOT to state that is where they are to place the sign. D. MacGuire said one of the pictures submitted shows the sign back within the tree line. He said the sign is shown in the right of way on the plans. R. LaBranche showed where the right of way line was to the Board. D. MacGuire said they can move the sign back if DOT wishes and continued the sign being in the right of way does violate the state permit. He said they will continue to try and get something back from DOT saying the location is acceptable and leave it there and if DOT is not okay they can move it further back. D. MacGuire said R. LaBranche recommendation is to ask DOT cut back some of the vegetation within the right of way to have more visibility. A. Hall said he has been to the site a number of times and the general comment from the public is why the sign is so far back in the woods. Chairman James asked the right of way to be labeled on the plans as it is unclear.

Comment #16

D. MacGuire said there is one missing lot corner monument. All the other points were located and said typically in a full boundary you would locate boundary markers and if they were missing you would add it in but in this case where they are requesting a waiver on a full boundary. He said when they do the full boundary survey on phase II it can be added then. R. LaBranche said he would like to see it set and he doesn't believe you have to do the full survey to set the bound. He said there are two metes and bounds on two points they can set that point back in and said he would like to know why setting the bound would be a problem as he has not heard of that being a problem. D. MacGuire said they will do that.

Comments #19, #21 & 20

D. MacGuire said everything was addressed on this comment except field location of the silt fence. He said he understands their concern that they want to make sure the silt fence is in but at this point everything has been put in and are working under a SWPPP with inspections being performed and they are comfortable with every limit of potential erosion protection being in place and doesn't see any need to survey in the silt fence. He said they will keep maintaining the SWPPP and inspections. Chairman James said the silt fences are shown on the SWPPP. R. LaBranche said he is okay with this and asked if the field had been seeded. T. Fiore said they are finishing putting the soil down and will be seeding.

Sheet 3, 4, 5

Comment #27

D. MacGuire said this comment was concerning storage behind the container being added to the plans. He said the applicant has moved picnic tables and chairs behind the container while they graded the fields and have since been moved and nothing is behind the container.

Comment #30

D. MacGuire said section 10.09A requires a Special Use Permit be granted for the wetland crossing. He said there are three criteria for the Special Use Permit. Criteria #1 *“The construction is essential to the productive use of the land.”* D. MacGuire said it is essential in this case as a large part of his business is woods ball area and he needs to access the land. D. MacGuire said criteria #2 is to make sure there is no detrimental impact during the construction of the wetland crossing. The crossing has been installed and silt fence is in place loam and it is seeded and is fully stabilized and is being actively monitored as it continues to grow in. Criteria #3 is there is no alternative route to cross the wetland that would be less detrimental and D. MacGuire said there is not. He said they crossed at the narrowest point which was least impact. He said he has felt they have met the 3 criteria.

Chairman James said they were to submit a performance surety before construction was carried out but the crossing is already completed and beyond the point to waiver. B. Chivers asked how they determined the culvert size. D. MacGuire said the culvert size was initially done by B. Gilday as part of the wetland crossing permit application which he was not part of. He said there are 2 - 15” culverts that come onto the property from the road. B. Gilday upsized the culvert to accommodate both assuming you may get a combination flow of two different of systems. A 24” culvert has about 3 ½ times the capacity to transfer water then a 15” culvert pipe and even though they are not 3 times the size there is much more available capacity. He said if 2 - 15” pipes are coming onto the property and because he did not do a full in depth analysis of what is draining, if there is a large water event you will have a much larger pipe below. He said there can only be so much flow that comes from the 15” pipes and the larger pipe should be sufficient to handle that based on flow availability. G. Clifford said with only one crossing at the bottom asked how they access the top area. T. Fiore said it is a very small stream and this time of year it is dry and they can walk over it. He said that area is not the best for woods ball and have not used it very much and he sees no reason to get a vehicle back there.

Sheet 6Comment #32

D. MacGuire said this comment was the modification of the drainage trench detail he will update, as he must have used an older plan.

Comment #33

D. MacGuire said they have already extensively discussed the walls will provide a detail of what needs to be done to supplement the existing walls.

Comment #34

D. MacGuire said this comment talks about the boulder detail. He said they will not be adding anything else. R. LaBranche said what they were asking for was to add a detail to the plan on what was built to be shown on the plan. R. LaBranche said in the end you are certifying what is on site by saying the wall and slopes are going to work and show the detail. D. MacGuire said he would add the detail. He said because these were built before he started his work he treated them as already existing and that is why he did not add the detail.

Drainage AnalysisComment #35

D. MacGuire said he prepared a full drainage memorandum with a copy going to Stantec and the Town. He said their goal was to compare predevelopment conditions to post development conditions onsite. They did a drainage area that took the limits of the site and where it was draining to. He said the comparison of the run off rate in the predevelopment to the post development conditions during a 25 year storm is a reduction of a 2.1 9 cfs which is reduced from predevelopment by eliminated gravel areas and flattening areas promoting infiltration causing a natural reduction. Chairman James asked if anyone wants to see the study. B. Chivers asked if this was field measurements or done by a computer. D. MacGuire said it is all done on a program called Hydrocad. He said he has been doing this for quite a while and there have been sites designs and he has gone out on heavy rain events and it is pretty

accurate. D. MacGuire said regulations are becoming more stringent and some of storm models are even more aggressive the rainfall amount for certain storms are even higher than what they used to be with the factor of safety built in.

D. MacGuire said the issue of offsite flows coming onsite through the 2 - 15" culverts they did not model all that area and how it comes through the site to check on the 24" pipe. He said with the size of this project all the water comes to the low point shown along the rail trail and the water is always going to go to that area. He said the concern is to make sure there is capacity in that pipe and as he has stated before there are 2 - 15" culverts going into a significant higher capacity in the 24" pipe. He understands what they are asking and they could certainly do an analysis to address their concerns from an engineering modeling standpoint but would like to avoid this cost to the applicant to model the whole area. B. Chivers asked if the 2 - 15" culverts pick up runoff from the Irving Station. D. MacGuire said it is entirely possible and being relatively new they most likely had to do some level of storm water management for their site. B. Chivers said would the 2 - 15" culverts be adequate now considering how much runoff from Irving is draining into that area. D. MacGuire said unfortunately that is so far off from their site that he does not have the actual grading of their site.

D. MacGuire asked if there been any over topplings in that area during large rain events. R. LaBranche said whenever they review any project in town, they have the applicant provide pre and post runoff especially if there is a culvert they are not installing and in particular make sure that they are not increasing the flow to whatever culvert that is existing and is satisfactory prior, He said the only thing Irving did potentially was reduce the flow going into the culverts and that is why it is an onsite exercise for the record that all the culverts are adequately sized. He said his position in this case is go through the exercise demonstrate all the culverts are adequate. He said he doesn't believe it is a huge engineering exercise but would be good to have on file. A. Hall said it appears the drainage from the Irving Station would go to the 11 acre parcel the Town owns. R. LaBranche said he does not know the details just talking about how they do any review and to make sure a parcel is appropriately handling their storm water and not adversely effecting anything downstream. Chairman James asked, so what Stantec is suggesting is to add to their analysis the 2 - 15" culverts then check the 24". D. MacGuire said it will add a cost as a site walk is needed and to see how Irving is draining then a larger picture of where the entire town is draining needed. R. LaBranche said he could give him a copy of the Irving drainage study.

#### Waivers #1 Section 8.03A

Chairman James said seeing no abutters asked the Board if there any questions and seeing none said they will address the waivers.

Waiver #1 Section 8.03A – Driveway and Parking Areas; to waive paving.

A. Hall made a **motion** to grant the Waiver request J. Lindsey **seconded**. M. Santa asked if the gravel onsite is what they will get and has it been tested and is it adequate. R. LaBranche said a gravel road cross section is 6" bank run and 12" crushed. D. MacGuire said it is preexisting gravel and he has personally driven on it and it is stabilized and sturdy and both the Building Inspector and Fire Chief have been out there. M. Santa said he is a little uncomfortable with that and asked if there was any way of verifying what is on site. M. Santa asked if they could amend the waiver to include instead of pavement will get the standard gravel road. D. MacGuire suggested doing a test pit to show what it's there and if more gravel is needed they can add it. He said they do not want to re-impact that entire area and reiterated that it was originally used as a gravel access and parking area and felt they would be taking a large step back when this area is fully complete by starting over. Chairman James said generally when they have waived paving in the past the gravel road is built to the typical cross section that R. LaBranche talked about but this exists. B. Chivers said it is a good point it may be solid since it is the month of August but what is it like in the spring, nobody here can say what is under the gravel. M. Santa said it is the Board's responsibility to uphold the regulations and they we are asked to waiver the regulations and the Board doesn't know what exists. D. MacGuire suggested test pits. Chairman James said test pits can be done to verify that enough gravel is there. R. LaBranche said he could go out and

inspect the test pits to verify existing gravel. D. MacGuire said if there isn't sufficient gravel can they be allowed to bring in gravel. A. Hall asked the Road Agent if he had any input and D. Lewis said most was covered and continued you do not know if it turns into a mud hole in the spring and said test pits would be good. He said he would not like to see them redo the entire gravel road and remove the existing material. Discussion continued and it was all agreed upon to do 6-18" test pits. A. Hall said could this be contingent? Chairman James said right now he has been keeping track if they are headed toward approval with 4 conditions he had written and then you are talking about a waiver that is conditional. D. MacGuire said they can do the test pits and if R. LaBranche said if they had only if more gravel is required they will comply.

Chairman James said they have a motion and second and asked for an amendment.

M. Santa made a **motion to amend** to required 6 - 18" test pits to be overseen by Stantec and corrected if necessary. B. Chivers seconded. **All were in favor. Motion to amend carried 7-0-0.**

Chairman James asked for a vote for the waiver. **All were in favor to grant the waiver. 7-0-0.**

#### Waiver #2 Section 8.03I Granite Curbing

Chairman James said the next waiver request is the requirement of granite curbing when there is pavement. A. Hall made a **motion** to grant the Waiver request Section 8.03I. J. Lindsey **seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried 7-0-0.**

#### Waiver #3 Section 4.03D Boundary Certification

Chairman James said previous plans discussed will be referenced on the plan. He said he was unsure why R. LaBranche wanted to see the notes and review them. R. LaBranche said as they are going through and submitting their final set of plans they review references on the plan to see if historically it is complete and he suggested in their motion ask them to install the missing bound. Chairman James said that can be made a condition.

A. Hall made a **motion** to grant the Waiver request. J. Lindsey **seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried 7-0-0.**

#### Waiver #4 Section 4.03N Landscaping Plan

A. Hall made a **motion** to grant the Waiver request to not supply a landscaping plan. J. Lindsey **seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried 7-0-0.**

#### Special Use Permit request under Section 10.09

Chairman James said this is for the one 24" culvert that has already been installed. A. Hall made a **motion** to grant the Special Use Permit to allow the wetland crossing to be used for emergency vehicle, maintenance and foot traffic. J. Lindsey **seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried 7-0-0.**

A. Hall made a **motion** to approve the Major Site Plan with conditions as follows: Provide NHDOT approval/resolution of business sign location. 2. Set northwestern Lot corner. 3. Bag Land Consultants to certify wetland delineation. 4. Address all outstanding items in Stantec letter dated August 1, 2014 to update the plan. 5. 6 – 18" deep test pits to be completed and review by Stantec and gravel added to parking and driveway areas of the site as recommended by Stantec. J. Lindsey **seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried 7-0-0.**

Chairman James said thank you for their hard work and patience and T. Fiore thanked them for their time. Chairman James closed the Public Hearing at 8:50pm.

#### Other Business

##### Informational Farm Stand, 20 Main Street Map 409 Lot 204 Entrance Amendment

Chairman James said they had a request for informational but they called and said they were not quite ready and will be back at a date to be determined.

##### Request for public hearing, scenic road tree removal, Depot Road by Town of Candia

Chairman James said the Planning board had received a request from Dennis Lewis for a Scenic Road Public Hearing for Depot Road, Green Road and Lane Road for projects scheduled for 2014. D. Lewis said they need to hold a hearing for approximately 4 trees that need to come down. He said the work is being done through the section from the tracks about 700 feet out on Depot Road. He said he



will mark the trees with orange tape before the hearing to view which trees they are. He said the largest one is approximately 15” across. He said the trees are right on the edge of the road and one of them is between the wall and road and almost at the brook where they can’t get the water to flow. He said there is also brush that has all grown in during the last 20 years. He said on Lane Road where you come up to the stop sign heading north there is a row of brush in the ditch line about 150 feet that needs to be removed and if you drive by there and look you can see it and it. He said it is from the town not mowing it for the past 40 years. He said the rest of Lane Road just needs tree trimming and at the very end of Lane Road at the Raymond line there is one big dead pine that needs to come down which doesn’t require a hearing just an okay from the BOS but will bring this up at the hearing.

Chairman James said just to go over the procedure the public hearing is going to be August 20, 2014 and needs to be publically noticed twice and will be noticed August 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> in the Hooksett Banner. It was confirmed that you do not have to notice the abutters individually. D. Lewis noted again he will flag the trees to be removed with orange tape and will flag the beginning and end on Lane Road where the brush will be removed.

#### Planning Board Alternates

Chairman James said the Planning Board is in need of alternates and that they can have up to 3 alternates. He asked if anyone new of anyone that might be interested and continued he said he will have the notice republished.

The next scheduled Planning Board meeting is on August 20, 2014 at 7pm at the Town Hall. There will be a Scenic Road Public Hearing.

A. Hall **motioned** to adjourn at 9:15 pm. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Sharon Robichaud  
Land Use Secretary