

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of January 4, 2017
UNAPPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: Sean James, Chair; Tom Giffen; Ken Kustra; Mike Santa; Judi Lindsey; Joyce Bedard, Alt; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dave Murray, Building Inspector

Absent: A. Hall; S. Komisarek; R. Cartier; C. Robie

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

S. James asked Alternate J. Bedard to sit in for Al Hall.

Minutes December 7th:

T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the minutes of December 7th, 2016 as submitted. J. Lindsey **seconded**. S. James; K. Kustra; M. Santa; and J. Bedard **were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0)**.

Residents Present: Dick Snow and Becky Sarra.

Abutters Present: Scott & Tracy Blevens of 39 Donovan Road, Candia, NH 03034; Phillip E. Packard of 614 High Street, Candia NH 03034; Carol West of 650 High Street, Candia NH 03034.

16-010 Final Major Subdivision & Lot Line Adjustment Application Continued: Applicant: 66 Vinton Street, LLC, 56 Manchester Road, Auburn, NH 03032; Owner: same; Property location: 608 High Street, Candia NH 03034; Map 405 Lot 45; LLA Map 405 Lot 44 and Map 405 Lot 45-1; Intent: To create 9 new lots in the Residential District & a lot line adjustment with lots 405-44 & 405-45-1.

Present: Joseph Wichert, LLC, Inc.; Applicant 66 Vinton Street, LLC represented by Cory Hill; and Bryan Ruoff from Stantec.

J. Wichert introduced himself; I'm Joe Wichert the surveyor and we're here tonight on behalf of 66 Vinton Street, LLC. Cory Hill is one of the LLC members and he's in the audience with us this evening. We were in front of you back in December. (*Handed out new plans to the Board*) A brief overview; the subject property is lot 45 on map 405. As it's configured now, it's a 65.4 acre parcel and it has about 385 feet of frontage on High Street/Route 27. What we're trying to do, the proposal called for 9 lot subdivision. There's 1361 lineal feet of road from center to center. There's a total of just under 9,000 square feet of wetlands impact, 1,225 sq. ft. of which is temporary. We have 3 total crossings, one of which may or may not happen. Last month the Board granted waivers on the length of road, so we're allowed to build the 1,361 as opposed to the 1,000 linear feet. The limits of the HIS map, we left out about 15 acres on the back of lots 5 and 6. Then on the drainage, there was a waiver granted to allow our engineer use the extreme 50 year storm vs. the 100 year storm. So since that meeting, we've met with Stantec and reduced the number of comments since the last review to 7. We can go through those later. The fire department had sent a letter that they were alright with the plan. Mr. Packard was in the audience and talked about an attempt to do an adjustment with him to adjust his property lines to relocate his driveway off of the new road. Mr. Packard has agreed to be involved with that so we've modified the plan to say that. We've done some additional test pits where we were missing some. We've met with DOT regarding the driveway and the cross culverts. We've met with Eversource regarding moving the poles. We've added these no cut, no disturb areas to the plan which were a function of EPA and Fish and Game. Our wetland scientist met with the Conservation Commission and just this afternoon we got the Dredge and Fill Permit and handed out a couple of copies of that to the Chairman. We are still waiting on

our Alteration of Terrain Permit (AOT). Now that the dredge and fill is approved, we can hit the final send on the State Subdivision and we're still waiting on the Driveway Permit issue.

J. Wichert continued regarding the Stantec Memo: On the 7 items, the first one, Bryan was saying the way we had it worded regarding the lot and the adjustment was a little confusing. So if you turn to sheet S3 Sheet 4 of 14, what we're doing is basically this. Mr. Packard's property, which is lot 44, is a small pre-existing lot of record; it's 150 x 150, like a parallelogram. His driveway as it currently sits would come out pretty close, 35 to 40 feet off of...East of the intersection of our new road and 27. So what we had proposed was to add this area that sits between the new road and his lot line and that would get added to the Packard property and this area to the South, which butts up to lot 45-1, which is the lot we subdivided last summer. We'd add those two areas to the Packard property. Mr. Packard's property is 22,208 sq. ft. and we're going to add 2 parcels to it. Parcel A, which is the 3,810 sq. ft. which sits in front of the property adjacent to the roadway and parcel B, which is the 2,822 sq. ft. Should the project be approved, his property increases to 28,838 sq. ft. Still undersized but certainly a little bit better than what it was. On lot 45-1, which is still owned by the applicant, we're trying to balance those areas out. We took this lot, added some of this land and moved the right of way over and took this 2,822 sq. ft. to match up to what we gave to the Packard property so there is no net change on lot 45-1. It basically stays as is. It starts at 3.13 and ends at 3.13. That lot is involved in the swap but there's no real substantive change to it. We can add additional notes if needed. I think that one's done.

Item #69, stop bar and street sign. For some reason that layer got turned off when we plotted the plan so we have no problem with that, it will be addressed. We'll go to the last 2 and then we can go to the 3 that we're kind of discussing.

Item #96, there was a suggestion for a no future sub-division note. When I talked to Bryan this afternoon, I guess there was a concern somehow that this road could be extended. Our thought process was we were already here with one extension and these two wetlands would sort of preclude any future extension of the road but certainly if it's something the Board wants we're not opposed to doing it.

Last one was item #97, check culvert and basins for a 100 year event, but when Bryan and I spoke, because we have that waiver, I think we're on board and that's not really an item. Now we're down to the three outstanding items; Item #73 on their last review letter from December 27th and there's a bunch of additional construction details that Stantec has suggested. On one level, we're not necessarily opposed to them. I'm sorry, Jen McCourt our engineer is on vacation, she and I had emailed back and forth this afternoon. There's a concern over the cost to the applicant and there's concern over possible additional maintenance for the Town and not necessarily being in the standard. Bryan and I spoke just before the meeting and I think we're in a spot where when Jen comes back, we can probably talk through it and come to some sort of resolution or compromise. I don't know if that one's tragic. We've got the next one is sizing the rip rap, which is item # 84. Our concern and Jen's concern was with the Dredge and Fill already approved we want to stay at the same; we don't want to increase our wetlands impacts. But Bryan had said, I think we're using a 10, they wanted it 50. I think when Jen comes back we can come to some resolution on that. The last one we have is #87, which is *the box culvert does not pass the 25-year storm event; Candia design standards are for the 100-year storm*, which we've already gotten waived down to the 50 extreme. There was some concern or suggestions about what to do for our box culvert. We're kind of trying to make this box culvert fit into the area and minimize the wetlands impact. We're not making anybody's maintenance any worse we just had some concerns. There's a couple of cross culverts right here on 27 and one of the comments we had on the last one, was there was a concern that the condition of those culverts was lacking. We've actually talked to, I'm not sure which Road Agent she spoke with but she spoke to the person in charge of driveway permits and we also spoke with the maintenance supervisor, I think there's an email floating around. Those culverts were replaced in the last 3-5 years, so from DOT standards and point of view, they're in good shape and functioning well so they have no immediate plans to re-do those or expand them. I'll let Bryan go through the specifics of what those were. I think we're in a spot where we're close. Our hope would be if we can resolve the Stantec comments, when Jen comes back and we get the AOT permit, obviously something in the AOT process might

adjust our thinking or whatever, but if we can go in that direction that would be great and give Bryan a chance to go over his side of the comments and I'd be happy to answer any other questions.

B. Ruoff stated relative to comment #63, since Mr. Packard has been added to the project for a lot line adjustment, I don't know if he legally would then be an applicant at that point. I don't know. My thought was at a minimum, we need some kind of written agreement that he's on the same page because basically his property is being altered and he's not a signed applicant.

S. James replied we talked about that before and because of the timing and the noticing we didn't have an issue with doing the lot line as part of the subdivision but I do agree that we would need something.

J. Wichert commented we can give you a signed application. This is Mr. Packard so I'm sure we can get that signed application for the file. I think what was noticed was both a lot line adjustment and a subdivision so the only thing we're short on is the signed application for the record.

S. James said so that would work. B. Ruoff agreed.

B. Ruoff continued comment #69 seems like a non-issue, something that can easily be added to the plan. It was inadvertently left off. S. James confirmed that's adding the stock bar street sign and a no outlet street sign.

B. Ruoff continued comment #73, there is a note in the plan that indicates whoever the developer is that they need to pre-approve the box culvert with the Town and the Town engineer. Our opinion is that there should be certain standards set on what is going to be required for that submittal so there isn't an extensive process getting that approved or a misunderstanding of what's going to be required for that. The majority of these items are industry standards. Baffles, headwalls and what not should be included. The secondary portion of this comment is relative to the overall maintenance of the project. The concern we have in speaking with Dennis Lewis is that with the existing 18" inch vertical opening for the box culvert is that with over time, it would become difficult to clear out and you could get some backing in there so we would view baffles in that instance as a necessity, so rip rap. And really is where our comment comes from for designing the rip rap for a larger year storm. A belt and suspenders application so the box culvert doesn't clog. At a minimum, looking for a 32" opening. I can recall a couple of projects that we've worked on or been involved with where the 2 foot opening and those huge 100 year storms that happens every other year, pushed all the rip rap to the end to block the culvert completely. It's not much of an opening and it would be difficult to maintain that opening.

S. James asked I'm not sure what the concern is with these specifically (*addressing Mr. Wichert*). J. Wichert replied if you take the psi strength, 5,000 seems a little high. There is concern that if we go higher, it will get more brittle. What Bryan was talking about, we can take it down to 4,000 psi. The baffles; due to the flat slope and the low velocity, we weren't really sure those were needed. Removable box type, our concern was that it would have to be the standard and our concern would be over the cost of that.

S. James commented the baffles are so the fill material doesn't wash out in a big storm so are you just talking one at the ends, not in every section. B. Ruoff replied not necessarily every section, but something, definitely not nothing. These comments are interdependent. With an 18" clearance, I would want baffles, I would want the rip rap design for a larger storm and I would want a removable top in case you needed to clear out the box culvert. Obviously we wouldn't want to be in that situation where we needed to do that, but with that minimal clearing if you had a situation where you couldn't clear it out, you'd need to take the top off, clear up rip rap and open up the box culvert. All these comments are interdependent from that standpoint.

J. Wichert replied I don't think we're going to be able to obtain 32" clearance. We might be able to get a little more than the 18" but in order to maintain the proper cover above the pipe with the road grade you have coming in off of 27, I don't think we're going to get a full 32". I think if we, we're not necessarily saying no, but if Jen and Bryan sat down and went through A-B and Cory was there, he's the one paying for the culvert, we can probably come to some resolution to make that work. We thought we had enough of the details in there and we weren't necessarily going through all of those. We were hoping some of those would be addressed and would be taken care of during the construction process. Like go to k where *the box culvert will be designed and stamped by a PE...with structural calculations and plans submitted and approved by the Town of Candia...* our intent was to use a standard, pre-built culvert. Does the Town have a set of standards for

a culvert? B. Ruoff replied no it would be more DOT standards. J. Wichert said it's those types of things that we're kind of questioning. I don't think we're that far apart, I just think we have to have a chance to voice our concerns and go through the expense vs. the value it brings to what we're doing.

S. James commented said I don't think the PE is a big deal. J. Wichert replied to get a stock one; we're looking at about \$2,000 to get the full blown stamp on it. I think you can get a cookie cutter one, which is what we were looking at, they come through the manufacturer but if we needed to do an individual specific one, I think we have to go to a structural engineer and it's sort of like what we're looking at for that number. That's why we were looking at the *prefab (unintelligible)*.

D. Lewis commented the last two box culverts the Town has installed have removable tops and baffles. And it does cost about \$2,000 dollars to have an engineer's stamp put on them. But we do it strictly because if you get a bad storm and there's a lot of scouring in there, it will pile the stone right up in there and block the culvert. If you can't remove the top you're not going to be able to open it up. The baffles will prevent most of that. It still can happen in a real bad storm but the likelihood diminishes tremendously. And if anything goes wrong, we don't have to take the whole culvert out again. We can just cut the pavement, dig down, move the top off, clean it, do whatever we need to do and put it back on. There are no Town standards that I'm aware of but the Town's practice has always been to do that. My concerns are with the culvert. That's the way it should be done. B. Ruoff replied most of this is industry standards, baffles and removable tops. S. James commented baffles yes, that's a DES requirement. This is a pretty small box. D. Lewis commented it's very easy to clog up where it's only 18" high.

T. Giffen said I have a question for Bryan. 5,000 psi is that also an industry standard. B. Ruoff replied I don't recall if it's 4 or 5. S. James commented usually if you order 4 you get 5. 5 is not hard to get. Usually the mix, if you spec a 4,000 you'll get closer to 5,000 anyway. 5,000 is not uncommon.

T. Giffen said my other question is to the Board as a whole, it would appear to me that until Ms. McCourt and Bryan have a chance to get together and come up with some variation that puts them into agreement, that this is a moot discussion. And we really can't decide anything tonight, as far as that particular point goes or whether we address that as a condition that an agreement be reached or whether we postpone the whole thing. Jennifer and Bryan get together and see if they reach common ground and bring it back to us. Also applies to #84 and #87.

S. James agreed. T. Giffen said I would suggest that we wrap up what we can on the other comments and then defer the discussion on the remaining 3 until Jennifer McCourt is back from vacation and they've all been able to sit down to discuss. I don't think we're causing any delay and we need to have that conversation take place. S. James said let's go over the next couple and then we can check with the applicant how they want to proceed. I think you're right, those are the two choices. I was trying to get a sense of how far apart they were on this. It doesn't sound like they are that far. T. Giffen commented we're on the same page.

B. Ruoff said on #84, just to clarify, we're not looking for rip rap necessarily to be designed to the 50 year storm for all drainage features, just stream crossings potentially, which would be a DOT standard. Actually the 25 year storm event check for the 50 year storm event for a rural road, which this cul-de-sac road, would be considered.

S. James commented and the concern for that Joe is the area that you have for the storm rip rap has already been with the wetlands permit.

J. Wichert said this is the first time I've heard they're just doing one, so that's good. I think our sense was the comment was to all the rip rap and we thought that was overkill. But if we have to do it for that one to fit it in, part of me says we can wrap that into the previous comment. As Mr. Giffen pointed out, from our point of view, I think there are only 3 outstanding items, they are all intertwined and by the time we got the comments on the 28th, Jen was already on vacation so she hasn't had a chance to speak with Bryan directly. Whatever you choose to do is going to be what it's going to be. If we didn't have to come back that's great. If we make a conditional approval, that's fine. If we have to come back, I'm sure by the time we come back it's going to be before all the other loose ends are wrapped up so I agree there's no real sense of delay from our point of view. With emailing Jen and speaking with Bryan, I don't think we're that far apart. The biggest thing

I would look at if we're not going to get the 32" opening, getting a 32" opening is probably impossible for us to do. Whether we can get 24" to get more and if we have to do baffles and something else to substitute for the 18", maybe that's a good compromise. S. James replied yes and if you have the removable top, like you said, they all go together, if you have that.

J. Wichert said when we had our last meeting it was relatively short and painless and we took care of most of the items.

S. James asked Bryan so that comment #84 on the rip rap, the box isn't a stream crossing it's more of a critter crossing. So which one are you talking about? B. Ryan replied based on the flows, I view it as a stream crossing. S. James said so that would be the one you'd be looking at. B. Ruoff confirmed that would be the one I'd be concerned with, yes.

J. Wichert said the velocity on that crossing we don't anticipate to be very great even on a larger event because it's so flat, the pitch of it. It's not a downhill but certainly if there's something we can do to ensure it's easier to maintain, we're not opposed to looking into that.

J. Bedard asked on *N*. it says *it is recommended that a minimum 32" high opening be provided* this is what we're discussing, how could you recommend something that's impossible for you to do is my question. *Addressed to both Bryan and Joe.*

J. Wichert responded from our point of view we have a fixed elevation of 27, you have to come up at a certain percent grade, you need a certain amount of cover on top of that so to get that extra 18" of the difference in the height of the culvert from 24 to 30, from 18 to 32, 14 inches, we'd have to steepen something up to make that work or we'd have to bury it down deeper which defeats the purpose. I think that's the reason for the difference. Is the 32 the written standard? B. Ruoff replied that's what we'd recommend. It's not a hard number necessarily but for ease of maintenance and future use that would be ideal, 30, 32 in there. I probably wouldn't design a box culvert opening with less than a 30" opening, vertically. J. Bedard said so you're saying it's impossible because it's a hardship (*to J. Wichert*). J. Wichert reiterated we'd have to then put the grade coming off of 27 higher or steeper or we have to bury it deeper in which defeats the purpose. Part of what this is is the critter crossing, as much as anything, that's why we're the size and configuration, it's not so much a drainage issue.

S. James asked how much cover did you have on it as designed. J. Wichert answered a hair more than 2 maybe 2-1/2. S. James said you only need a foot, I think that's what you were getting at, with a foot of cover you could get to 32. J. Wichert replied I think Jen had a concern that the foot cover was going to be less than what she'd prefer. I think that's something we can work through. We can have a sit down with Bryan and the Road Agent and make sure everyone's on the same *page (unintelligible)*.

J. Lindsey commented I just want to echo what Tom said that we need to get all this information figured out before we can make a decision ourselves.

S. Blevens said I agree with what Dennis is talking about with the box culvert because I've cleaned them. Maybe you could go wider and do a compromise. I know what he's against when he's got to clean them, been there. I worked for the Town years ago too.

K. Kustra asked you're going to disturb 158,000 square feet of earth, where is that? J. Wichert replied that area encompasses the road; all along the road, drainage ponds; 2 ponds and this area up in front. K. Kustra said you're going to submit a plan for that to us. J. Wichert replied it's been submitted. We've submitted to State of NH the AOT permit, which is what the state requires for any impact on over 100,000 sq. foot. We're submitted, we have not received approval yet.

S. James replied to answer your question we have a copy of that application. We've heard from two members that we have a couple of items, seem like they won't be show stoppers but there's enough outstanding that it may make sense to continue it to the next meeting. T. Giffen commented I think it's enough that we'll need to discuss their, whatever results from their discussions, before we say yes, sign off. S. James said and that will give you a chance to submit the lot line adjustment as well. Will that create any hardship if we had you come in in a couple of weeks, on the 18th? J. Wichert replied # S. James continued Bryan I'd say if you get everything resolved and can send us back a letter, you can save a trip out. I think that sounds

reasonable. So we are going to continue this to our January 18th meeting. If you are an abutter, we are not going to re-notice. We didn't notice this for this meeting but we'll be discussing it again; the final approval of this on the 18th.

The Planning Board will be holding a Public Hearing to seek input for a Transportation Plan completed by the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission. The purpose of this plan is to provide guidance to the Town of Candia in transportation planning and infrastructure improvements. If approved by the Planning Board, the Transportation Plan may become a part of the soon to be completed Master Plan update.

Candia Transportation Steering Committee Members Present: Ricia Velasco, Boyd Chivers, Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Jack Munn, Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission (SNHPC).

S. James said Jack Munn's here from Southern NH Planning. He put this together and spearheaded it for us. If you haven't seen the plan it is on our website and has been for a couple weeks. Jack can you do a brief overview of it?

J. Munn introduced himself, I'm Jack Munn with Southern NH Planning Commission. The four committee members are Dennis, Boyd Chivers, Ricia Velasco and Scott Komisarek. We were fortunate to have NH DOT agree to fund doing this project for the Town of Candia so it cost the Town of Candia Dennis's time, the volunteers time and our time, which we got paid doing. The project was roughly \$18,000-20,000 dollars. Candia was selected by the Planning Commission to work with the NH DOT and UNH in doing all the infrastructure inventory of all the transportation improvements; drainage, streets, highways, bridges within the Town and part of what they call a SADES network of data and that will eventually come forward to the Town of Candia, it will go to the Select Board and Dennis. We will begin to use that as part of the capital improvement programming so that you'd be able to get more detailed information about road pavement conditions and so forth and how to deal with that and plan for road improvements in the future. In terms of the overall scope of the plan itself, I think this is the first time a major plan of this nature has been prepared for the Town of Candia. Your old Master Plan had a chapter on Transportation but didn't really get to the level of detail that this plan does. It's advisory, so it's not set in stone. You can adopt it, take into account public input. We encourage the Board to do a public hearing and we can make changes. If we need further substantive review, we could elect the sub-committee. You can hold a meeting to go over those things. Overall the plan sets forth some key goals;

- 1) The Town of Candia maintains its current road infrastructure. You have a bond that is maturing next year and it may be a good time to focus on your capital improvement programming and whether you may want to do a bond for any future road reconstruction programs or repaving projects over the next couple of years. Maintaining the roads and keeping this as a high priority.
- 2) Major intersections; Adjacent to the four corners area, the committee looked at what plan NH had come up with 10 years ago doing a charette with everyone in the area and looking at a new bypass around the four corners to make the four corners a more livable and walkable village center. The idea that came out of the committee was to consider a roundabout instead of a traffic light or four legged intersection. The goal is to consider a warrant article, which I believe the Select Board has pushed forward, which would go out for the Town vote at the Town Meeting to consider some preliminary engineering to come up with what the right of way impacts would be and what the cost estimate would be. Once that is done by the Town, then that would become the basis for the Town's application back to the State of NH to consider the project as part of the State's 10 year improvement program. It's a lot of money but it's a little bit of money to show the State, if the residents support the project or not, but it shows the State that the Town is committed or there is support for it. We met with the DOT officials to look at the traffic operations and safety of the intersections and the idea of doing the bypass in a roundabout. We wanted to see if they could identify any red flags and they did not. It works in many

other communities and the DOT officials felt that it provides the best operational safety vs. a traffic intersection.

- 3) We did a Transportation survey of the community to gauge how residents feel about the road systems and the need for any improvements. Bicycling and walking was identified in the survey as a need in the community that should be addressed at some point in the future. You have the highways that provide breakdown lanes for bicyclists but there are no sidewalks. So we looked with the committee at the four corners area, connecting some sort of pedestrian path between the school, Town Hall, four corners area and the CYAA. Could be a school project, a Town project, local contributions but there are a number of ways it can be looked at and the plan identifies funding opportunities for the Town to look at. This goal is secondary to the roundabout idea, because if that was supported and funded in the state CIP most likely that would include sidewalks in the future. This was a backup plan if the State CIP didn't happen.
- 4) Impact fees: The Town had collected impact fees but didn't have the right ordinance in place for spending the fees on certain sections of the roads. The ordinance was based on the specific collection of the fee tied to the area that the development was occurring. The ordinance was originally set up into 4 or 5 traffic sectors within the Town and if a project didn't occur within that zone then the Town was restricted from spending the money in an area where really the traffic improvements needed to occur. They did not always occur within that zone. The ordinance was viewed as something that was not easily implemented and the committee discussed and felt that perhaps the ordinance should be improved in the future and that impact fees would present a very viable way to help pay for transportation projects. It can be based more on a Town wide traffic network system approach. If the Town does consider a bond in the future, you can use your impact fees to pay a portion of the interest down on the bond. Chester uses traffic impact fees to help pay bond payments as well as capital reserve funds that the Town sets aside for doing transportation projects CIP.

J. Munn continued those are the four big recommendations that came out of it. The plan covers a lot of topics from previous studies, safety studies, safety audits to bicycling. Maybe in the future, the Town can look at its trail network. You may want to develop more of a detailed bicycle, pedestrian plan and connects to the trails better, links them to the road system.

R. Velasco commented that we also talked about improving the signage like where Healey crosses High Street and goes into South Road. It's a difficult intersection from the Healey South Road access and maybe better signage to warn motorists.

J. Munn responded each intersection did have short term recommendations like that. (*Unintelligible*) A lot of that is based on the DOT audit information studies. Dennis this would help you out in the future in terms of your capital improvements.

D. Lewis yes, we're selling warrant articles at deliberative session and this is a bit of backup. J. Munn said and the SADES when that comes out. We've included a preliminary SADES analysis of your payment rating system of your streets but it's not the final formal rating system. That is coming out down the road. The goal is to take that and use that level of detail to help inform CIP planning (*unintelligible*).

D. Lewis stated that we were a pilot program for the State because they are going to try to implement this in every town so that every town has this data. The state can look at ours and know what the Town needs. We were on the beginning of all of that. A lot of time and effort and maybe the State will get every town on board with it.

R. Velasco said this study pulled a lot of data from different sources together. Dennis asks for certain things at the Town Meeting every year, pave this road or that road and he usually gets it but he doesn't ask for nearly enough that he really needs because he doesn't want to sink the entire request. I think this database is a chance to see that we are following farther and farther behind on our road improvements every year and the budget...any time there's a storm, a lot of snow it sets us back even further. The things that would be timely to do now are not possible because you have the things that are really in failure to take care of. If we can be proactive on timely things, it would save a lot. Dennis provided statistics to show how much investment now

can really save down the line. He's not asking for exorbitant amounts of money, it's all things we took a hard look at and said yes that makes a lot of sense. I hope you'll get a lot out of reading the report.

S. James thanked Jack and the members of the committee for a job well done; it's a lot of hard work and a lot of time. I had some comments, reading the plan, it read fine but parts of it read that parts of it was done a long time ago and then parts were updated. Example in July this may happen and it's now January. I think some of those need to be updated. One section on the bridges, only the red listed bridges get inspected and it mentions 2 bridges in Town, we have a third on New Boston Road.

D. Lewis replied the third on New Boston Road actually belongs to the State. We never paid for that because it was never done properly as it keeps sinking on the approaches. The State still owns that. Eventually we may pay them if it ever stops sinking but it hasn't yet. Now it has a large bump now on either side. It's gone down a total of 4-5 feet since 1984 on the approaches. The bridge is fine; it's the approaches that keep going down.

J. Munn commented that Dennis did make sure we identified that as being State owned. D. Lewis said they took out about 18-20 inches of hot top 20 years ago and then put in another 18-20 and now it's down about a foot so 4-5 feet. S. James said the State lists it as Town owned. D. Lewis said and we list it as State owned. Every year in the report you'll see this \$30,000 something dollars sitting there that's the New Boston Road bridge account.

S. James asked the bypass option, I read that. Different options, more advisory but what is the thought process there. J. Munn said I wouldn't call it a bypass, more a realignment, you're having more of your traffic flow to Deerfield North go around the four corners and not be stuck at the traffic light. S. James said it's also important to reiterate what you mentioned that this didn't cost the Town anything. In the past the Conservation Commission's done the Open Space and Natural Resource Inventories, those are updated and done without a cost to the Town. The Master Plan update is coming. As with the Open Space Plan, it was parcel based. That is my concern with this bypass is that you can't build those without taking land so I get concerned about putting that in a public document.

D. Lewis replied we were concerned with showing the bypass and taking it out and not showing it but to do that, wouldn't be honest with the people of Candia, that this is part of our plan. We showed the other two options that DOT has with T intersections. We showed the bypass but it's a concept, not etched in stone. We want to be right up front with it, if you want to do something different like a Village Center, it would require something like this and people need to understand that it would be the taking of someone's property.

B. Chivers asked how do we resolve that. Our Board of Selectmen are prepared to endorse that \$15,000 warrant article and we want to put up some posters around Town to show people, encourage support for that warrant article and that poster has a diagram on it showing that layout. You (*to S. James*) say we shouldn't show it because it shows land that will be taken for this proposal but how can we solicit support for it unless we show them what we have and what we're thinking.

S. James said I'm not saying don't show it, I'm cautious about it. My recommendation would have a Board representative talk to the owner/s and say as part of this multi year plan, this keeps coming up, what do you think? Maybe they'll say wow, this is great, I can't wait to sell this land to the Town and get out from under this or the other side, this is the worst ever, I hate it, I'll fight you to death on it. Look at Currier Rd. People that lived on the road hated the plan and fought it and killed it. D. Lewis said and that was only paving.

J. Munn commented to keep it general and to get the word out to Town residents, in that flyer, have you seen it...Scott Komisarek's wife designed a more generalized concept of the alignment with the roundabout and it doesn't show property lot lines. If you prefer to have that graphic in the plan instead, we can insert it in. S. James said the fire station, the Town owns, presumably it would be in there but there is a lot of wet areas back there.

J. Munn continued but in terms of talking to property owners and getting more input on the project there are two schools of thought; you can keep it as a general concept in your Transportation Plan and not get detailed on the property level. But on the warrant article with the Board of Selectmen, the idea of a flyer going out with the Boy Scouts distributing it like the Transportation Survey, would be a good way to spread the

word and get people educated about it. Maybe put something up on the Town bulletin board see a bigger image of it and then you can open up a forum on your website to get feedback on the project or you can organize a public forum or workshop. I think the warrant article makes a lot of sense to get a gauge as to how people support it with the majority of the vote of the Town residents at the Town meeting but you still have that question with the property owners. There aren't too many property owners but there are some property owners where there would be right of way *views (unintelligible)*.

D. Lewis said speaking not as a member of the committee but as a citizen, the unfortunate part of the warrant article is that we haven't accepted the Master Plan, we haven't got that out there yet but this is a chapter of it that we're asking for money to implement when the entire picture hasn't been finished and accepted by the Town. I was assuming when we were working on this that it was going to be done before we had a warrant article. That is a little uncomfortable.

S. James replied we are meeting on the 19th, the Master Plan Steering Committee; we have a draft to be reviewed. After that meeting we can put the draft on the website and have it out there for people.

B. Chivers commented this Transportation Plan is a proponent of the Master Plan so do you accept this chapter first and then the Master Plan or accept the Master Plan. Timing...what do you consider first, this little component of it or do you consider the whole thing first and then kind of endorse these subcomponents. Monday night our Board has to vote on the warrant articles, if this is premature, we're putting this warrant article out there before the Master Plan been adopted and approved, adopted by the Planning Board, I think it's premature to even suggest that warrant article. This has to be in the Town Report in January and it goes to the Budget Committee next. I don't want to send this thing forward until the Planning Board has endorsed the whole concept; the Town has seen the map and this concept. What's you're thinking on this.

S. James replied so we're having a public hearing, which we are required to do on it. This is the public hearing for the Transportation Plan and my thought was to close the hearing and have a vote on it. My plan was to vote on it and approve it tonight. We can do that separately. We did that with the Open Space Plan and the Natural Resource Inventory. We adopted them as a part of or an addition to the Master Plan. Ideally we would have had the Master Plan earlier but we wasted a lot of time approving a vision statement and that put us behind. I think the Transportation Plan stands on its own. It doesn't say anything about growth or to do this or that. We're not premature on the warrant article and we could approve the Transportation Plan part of it followed by the draft of the Master Plan and that would give the people the information they need.

R. Velasco added I would like to have an executive summary that is appropriate for widespread dispersal. I'd like a summary of the high points. There was no one place to go to. J. Munn agreed. R. Velasco said I can take a stab at it. B. Chivers said in theory that should go back to the sub-committee. R. Velasco said I don't want to make the process take any longer.

J. Munn suggested a fact sheet of the Transportation Plan which contains your bullets. Provide that fact sheet to the Planning Board and sub-committee and any Town resident. Put it up on the website and then the other elements of your Master Plan, this Transportation Plan, this fact sheet can then be a summary as the committee gets through developing the Master Plan and you could use that as a guide for that section of the goals and objectives of the Master Plan. Doing that is worthwhile.

B. Sarra commented whatever the plan is to communicate with the community, we're very small and it's easy to make assumptions as to where those lots are that it would be going through. Assumptions will be made no matter how you communicate it but it might be nice to approach some of the assumptions beforehand and is this not similar to the 2003 plan. So it shouldn't be a total surprise. J. Munn replied it's very similar.

R. Velasco commented that DOT was impressed that two of, some of the landowners in the area, and that's Scott and Ron Severino, were there at the DOT and are fully in favor of it. It may not necessarily go through their land, I don't know, but they are definitely on board.

T. Giffen cautioned if something is put forth without being specific enough, that could convey the impression that things are being hidden, which would create distrust and limit the buy in, especially if you're a property owner. I would suggest being as open and transparent as you can be given that's its still conceptual. Big bold letters that it's conceptual and it has not been settled as to its location, not yet approved, however

there is a possibility that it could pass through the range of the land that goes from here or over here and cover all the bases. That way it's open and transparent and everyone can grasp it and understand it and would help avoid the problems I just mentioned.

S. James reiterated it is largely the same idea from the 2003 charette.

R. Velasco commented we heard about that in a profile session too. Establish a village center and we took that to heart, plus the accident counts, safety issues.

J. Munn said I believe it's transparent and well explained in the Transportation Plan. T. Giffen replied if there's doubt as to what particular parcels of land would be affected that's going to be the hot button emotional issue. J. Munn said that's why the preliminary engineering needs to occur so property owners can see exactly what the options are.

B. Chivers said so you'll accept the transportation subchapter tonight after you close the public hearing and then communicate that to the Board of Selectmen and the Board of Selectmen can make a decision on that warrant article based on what happens here tonight.

S. James said we'll close it and discuss. We'll close the public hearing on this.

We have 2 Choices:

1) Vote to approve the Transportation Plan as part of the Master Plan, making it an addition to the current Master Plan, future Master Plan

2) Hold off until Jan. 18th and vote then. I had hoped to vote tonight.

M. Santa commented I can't approve something I haven't read. I'm looking forward to reading it. T. Giffen agreed. I haven't read it, I can't vote on it.

S. James said Boyd, we're not going to vote tonight but in general, the Planning Board does support it, some people need to read it and look at the details of it. R. Velasco mentioned that the problem is we would need the engineering study in time to get it into the 2018, which is why there is a timeliness. The deliberative session could kill it at that time.

J. Munn reiterated so at your next meeting on the 18th, your expectation would be everybody will have read it, comment on it, hopefully be prepared to vote on it.

K. Kustra asked Ricia if she would post the summary on the website. R. Velasco replied I can send it to Jack and committee members and then share it with Sean and he can distribute it to the Board. D. Snow asked why don't you open a public comment period since you're not voting on it tonight. S. James asked what would be the benefit of that as we noticed the public hearing and only 2 people showed up. If people would like to comment on it, they can come to the next meeting.

Accessory Dwelling Units Zoning Warrant Article: Review the proposed zoning change warrant article to section 15:04 E to conform to the State Regulations SB 146 on accessory dwelling units. A copy of the Transportation Plan and proposed Warrant Article are available for public review on the Town web site and at the Land Use Office during normal business hours.

M. Santa asked J. Munn if he had a professional viewpoint on the present law on Accessory Dwelling Units. J. Munn replied I haven't read your current proposal but overall accessory dwelling units are a very good option particularly as your community ages. As an overall concept, they are appropriate and the State statutes that have come out are appropriate. On a personal level, my mother lived and died in one, with an aging community it helps fill a lot of needs. It will vary but these standards are really good safeguards to protect property values. Existing buildings can be added on and expanded to not be overly aggressive in terms of the look and character of the single family home. The concept has a lot of merit, not only from an aging standpoint but from an affordable housing standpoint. It helps attract professional students and young people that can't afford a starter home, it gives them another option and it meets a lot of needs.

M. Santa asked on #9 of our ordinance, I like this but I'm not sure if it's legal or could be enforced. A lot of communities are doing something similar where the owner's going to live in one of the units but how do we enforce that? Is it legal? J. Munn said I would suggest you get your Town attorney to weigh in on it. You

could say owner's family. Look at your existing definitions. It leads towards this goal of keeping to the primary owners. M. Santa asked so in the latest SB146 bill that was passed, it talks about regulating the architectural enhancements to the structure so that it maintains the look of a single family home but who is going to do that. Do we grant a special exception where the ZBA reviews the architectural features? D. Murray replied you can only go so far, same color, you can't get crazy. M. Santa said I see the merits of it but it's a challenge. There's no real difference between an accessory dwelling unit and a plain dwelling unit. That's why we put this information in that it has to meet State fire and building code so we can regulate some of the construction of one of these.

J. Munn suggested that you can approach accessory dwelling from a mechanical standpoint and get more Planning Board involvement. It would be through the conditional use permit process instead of a special exception. With a conditional use process you can require architectural renderings and have more input from the Planning Board on those renderings and you could then impose conditions on the permit so they would have to address those as part of your approval process. So this is your formal amendment that you're putting forward right now? You can always amend these in the future. You can begin with this and see how it works and you can always come back and make amendments.

S. James commented we have a section on it now and it doesn't meet the SB146 so we were trying to amend what we had and we just replaced it with this. The intent is to get input on this and vote as is. D. Snow asked who drafted the amendment. S. James replied Boyd started it and it's been tweaked. It's not substantially changed. D. Snow asked if it was all in house or did they run it by Bart? S. James responded in house. It should have (*been run by Bart*) yes, but I don't know if it did.

D. Snow said I have a personal concern about the intent to keep it as an individual building because the ZBA has a number of times has allowed it to be a different building. The history of Candia the big house, the small house, back house and the barn were all one thing. That would be consistent with the architectural part. Why is there an insistence on it being one building? I have a problem with that. I have a concern with whether the language for SB146 specifically said it doesn't have to be one big building, it can be multiple buildings or not. I can't remember. So whether we have decided that we want it all in one building because that's the concept we like, I don't know if that will fly or not. M. Santa said I think the law said it has to be attached but I can't remember. There is something in the law that addresses it I think the accessory dwelling can't be detached. But I'm not sure.

S. James said to answer a previous question it says here (*State regulation on his phone*) *a municipality may require owner occupancy of one of the dwelling units but it shall not specify which unit the owner must occupy. Each dwelling is deemed work force housing.* That's good. I feel that we have something here, it meets the spirit of the new law, and it gets us close to compliance and there's a mechanism through the ZBA for relief. You never know until someone comes in with something. D. Murray stated that it goes to the ZBA and they can do a case by case analysis on it. It's pretty clean and solid, it's well written.

D. Snow commented you can't amend a zoning ordinance amendment after deliberative session so if you're going to do anything to it, it has to be done ahead of time. I don't believe you can go into a deliberative session and change a warrant article that is a zoning warrant article. The Board agreed.

T. Giffen said as long as it's been approved by Bart I see no other point of contention. I'm good.

MOTION: T. Giffen **moved** to accept the warrant article as written. M. Santa **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

MOTION: T. Giffen **motioned** to adjourn at 8:45 pm. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (6-0-0).**

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary cc file