

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of March 1, 2017
APPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: Sean James, Chair; Ken Kustra; Joyce Bedard, Alt; Rudy Cartier, Alt; Carleton Robie, Alt; Mark Laliberte, BOS Alt; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dave Murray, Building Inspector

Absent: A. Hall, Vice Chair; T. Giffen; M. Santa; J. Lindsey and S. Komisarek, BOS representative

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

C. Robie sat in for J. Lindsey; J. Bedard sat in for M. Santa; R. Cartier sat in for T. Giffen; M. Laliberte, BOS Alternate, sat in for S. Komisarek.

Minutes February 1, 2017- no quorum - continued to next meeting.

Boyd Chivers on behalf of the people of Candia and the Board of Selectmen presented Chair Sean James with a certificate of appreciation for his years of service to the Planning Board and the Town.

Present: Dick Snow of Depot Rd; Boyd and Allyn (Lyn) Chivers of Depot Rd; Paul Frazier of Currier Rd; Bill Graff of High Street; Ed Fowler of Chester Road; Sue Young, BOS; Colleen Bolton, Master Plan Committee; Ricia Velasco, Master Plan Committee; and Derek Shooster, Assistant Planner from SNHPC.

17-001 Minor Subdivision Application: Applicant: Robert L. Johnston Trust, 24 Currier Road, Candia, NH 03034; Owner: same; Property location; same; Map 402 Lots 78, 79 and 80. Intent: To consolidate 4 Deeds (3 tax parcels) into 7 lots.

Present: Jim Franklin, Land Surveyor and Jim Johnston.

Abutters Present: Paul Frazier, 63 Currier Rd, Candia, NH 03034

R. Cartier and M. Santa met Jim Franklin on Thursday, February 16th at 5 pm at the Town Hall for a pre-application meeting and plan review.

S. James asked what the results were. R. Cartier replied there were some questions that we had and they were addressed and all the information is here. It's complete.

MOTION: R. Cartier **motioned** to accept the application as complete. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

J. Franklin said I was asked to prepare a drawing that shows the documents, existence of the 4 lots because there had been some questions; 3 lots, 4 lots how many lots are we creating, is it a minor subdivision or a major subdivision. (*Handed out plans*). What we are requesting is a minor subdivision for assessor's map 402, lot 78, 79 & 80, the land of Robert L. Johnston Trust. It's on the North westerly side of Currier Road and approximately 300 feet from the intersection of North Road, New Boston Road. We have 4 existing lots; the color coded map shows the 4 lots. We're proposing to basically consolidate them and then re-subdivide into a total of 7 lots. During the plan review stage there was some question as to the lot areas; subdivision approvals. We have received State Subdivision approval for all the lots that we're proposing, that's all 7 lots.

R. Cartier gave a summary of the review; you all have copies of the application checklist. We went through the checklist and we did find a couple of items that needed to be done and Mr. Franklin did do them. Houses within 200 feet of the parcel, was not initially done. There were well easements needed because the wells will be closer to the property lines than allowed by the State. Those are in the package. There were questions on drainage, there are a couple of culverts over there and we had him show the direction of flow in the culverts, which wasn't on there. There might be some information we can get from the Road Agent on those culverts too. The land is in current use so there was a letter that needed to be done and that is in there now too. There was a question just for informational purposes on the wetlands flags that were in there. So we asked if he'd show the contiguous land for putting a house in there and that's where you see the green hashed areas. There are no wetland crossings. They were able to re-do the driveways. There was the question that the tax maps do say 3 lots and he did provide the information from the Registry that deed references, it is a 4 lot current property. Test pit information was missing on 2 lots but that was taken care of. Other than that, the original review process was fine, everything was there. We couldn't answer from a tax stand point but taxes are being paid on all 3 properties as it is right now in current use. So we figured the total amount of the land that's in there is the same whether it's 4 lots or 3 lots, so the taxes are being paid on the property. J. Franklin said that's correct.

S. James asked as far as recording you have the subdivision plan. My own personal thought is this plan as well showing the deeds might be worth recording as well; it's confusing and you explained it well and laid it out well. J. Franklin said that's true. But the Registry will not accept colored drawings. S. James said you don't have to put it in color. You have it hashed. J. Franklin said there are overlaps there. It's up to the Board. If the Board wants it to be recorded, we can record it. S. James said I know it has to be in black and white but maybe you can tweak the hatching a bit. I think it's a good record of how you go from 4 lots to 3 tax lots back to this and where everything kind of ended. You've mentioned before that there was some work done on these lots that you did but you didn't do the whole part of it, the full boundary. It would clean everything up in my opinion. It would have the stamp on it for approval. J. Franklin said it's up to the Board. I'm pretty agreeable most of the time.

J. Franklin continued you asked me to include on the legend, the wetlands line that's over on the left side of the most recent drawing and I also put on there the soil demarcation line, the bold black line on there. They didn't print very well on the one's I did prior. To access the lot, there's no need for any wetlands crossing or disturbance. We don't envision any of these lots being built on within the near future, I can't say exactly, the purpose for doing this subdivision is for estate planning. Jim Johnston is with me if you have questions on that; he can answer them better than I can.

C. Robie asked you had 4 lots there, we had 4 lots there correct? J. Franklin agreed. C. Robie continued and we overlapped some of the new lots into some of the old lots vice versa correct? J. Franklin agreed. C. Robie said without anything recorded that those 4 lots were ever put together as one and then split up as 7, there will always be someone chasing that deed for a property line out through the woods there. There will be a dispute whether that line is from that deed or the new deed, without those 4 lots being combined into one, showing it in a deed and then split into seven. J. Franklin said I would agree. There are overlapping Titles on all of them. All of these properties are in the Robert L. Johnston Trust. C. Robie said I understand that. J. Bedard said I see 7 lots here and all of them are over 200 feet of frontage except for that middle one is 173? J. Franklin said plus the little L13.

S. James said so we have a letter from the Selectmen's office that says *402-078 and 402-079 also known as 24 Currier Road is in current use*. There's a letter from Chief McGillen in the Police Department that says *after reviewing the above plan, I find no safety concerns*. Memo from Chief Dean Young dated February 17, *no issues with the plan relative to the Fire Department and has recommended sprinkler systems when and if houses are ever built. To be noted on the plans*. So they note the deed restriction in 11.06 regulations. Did that come up Rudy in your review? R. Cartier said no, we didn't have the letter at that time. S. James continued so the regulation reads: *"11.06 Fire Protection and Fire Suppression Water Source Requirements: All Major subdivisions shall meet the approval of the Candia Fire Department*

regarding fire prevention, protection, emergency access and fire suppression water source requirements and shall conform to the specifications in Section IV, article 19.14. Minor subdivision of less than 3 lots may receive a waiver from fire suppression if safety is not a concern.” S. James said however we voted to accept this as a minor. Is that something you’d like to request a waiver from? J. Franklin replied yes if we need to yes, and we don’t have to write it. S. James said I don’t think so, we accepted it as a minor. C. Robie asked how does it read again. S. James said basically all major subdivisions have to meet and then minor subdivisions of less than 3 lots may receive a waiver from fire suppression. We had that discussion at the last discussion and we voted it to be a minor but it does have more than 3 lots, depends on how you count things. R. Cartier said it looks like he’s recommending it, not requiring it. S. James agreed. I think it’s a good recommendation the question is whether it needs to be on the plans or not. R. Cartier said I wouldn’t think so. Dennis did you have any issues?

D. Lewis replied I haven’t seen the plans yet. I need plans before I can send a letter. R. Cartier said there were some questions that came up because this is in an area where we’ve had another subdivision not too long ago, about impacts and drainage in the area. We didn’t call them impact fees but there were contributions made to the capital improvement fund for the other lots. Is this going to be the same thing for these lots being in that same area to keep it consistent with what went on across the street?

S. James said yes, that’s something we talked about before. If you aren’t aware, there was a subdivision just down the road from this and there was a lot of concern raised by residents, abutters on traffic, condition of the road etc. In that case for each of the lots, the four lots, they put \$1,000 towards work for the road. Any thoughts on this? R. Cartier said from fairness, the new lots, not the existing, it would probably be appropriate to do the same contribution. In fairness to the other subdivision that was across the way. S. James said so just to be clear are you considering that there are 4 lots there per the deed or 3 lots per the tax map? R. Cartier said I would say 3 because there were originally 4 according to what was in the Registry of Deeds information. S. James confirmed so 4 lots but 3 new lots? R. Cartier said correct.

C. Robie said I thought that was why we instituted the impact fee in the Town to collect some revenue for this type of instance. I understand on the other end of that road the road is deteriorating and I think at the meeting we discussed that and I think it was noted the first 600 or 900 feet of that road was in really good shape. I think that is what was said. S. James responded we do have impact fees but for when the house is built, not when it’s subdivided. C. Robie replied when there’s an impact to the infrastructure. S. James continued we’re looking to change it but as it is now, it would have to be a capital improvement type of project on that area. J. Franklin asked were notes put on the plan on that last subdivision plan regarding that. Do you have a note I could copy and put on this regarding the fee, the capital improvement fund fee for when the house is built? R. Cartier said I believe it was in the approval. C. Robie said that was the night it was approved.

J. Franklin asked if it was added to the plan. R. Cartier said no I don’t think it was I believe it was in the approval subject to the following conditions. J. Franklin said how would anyone know, if it wasn’t on the plans, how would anyone know? S. James said let’s hold on we have an issue with the recorder. *(Approximately a 2 minute break)*

J. Franklin said so the question I had was how would anyone know if these lots, if one of the family members was to sell the lot, a non-family member buys it and wants to get a building permit, how would that person know that there is a fee to be paid if it’s not on the plan. S. James said I’m trying to remember how we did that, was the fee at the time of the subdivision? C. Robie asked did Mr. Kelley bring you a check. A. Bickum replied yes. S. James said ok so it was done at the time of the subdivision as one of the conditions. I don’t believe there was a note on the plan. C. Robie said he just brought in the check. J. Franklin said whatever makes sense. So in this case, if it were approved, it would be subject to the Johnston Trust submitting a check for the amount of whatever driveways the Board feels appropriate. D. Lewis said as we all know that road is in tough shape. Drive up there tonight and have a look if you want, this time of year it’s worse. Any money we get to kind of help with the mud situation up there is a plus but it’s never

going to be a cure with \$1,000 dollars at a time. The road definitely needs to be re-built we tried it once with a warrant article and it failed. We do the best we can with it but the more you load the road with traffic, the worse it's going to be. We just have to keep that in mind. There will be a point where in mud season, we aren't going to be able to drive on that road because no matter how much stone we put into it or what we do to it, it's still going to be wet. The water table is right there at the surface. Until we rebuild it it's going to be a tough road to maintain. J. Franklin asked how many lots were approved on the last subdivision. C. Robie stated 4. S. James said it went from 1 to 4. J. Franklin said so total, this on the other would be \$7,000 to \$12,000 in that range? And would that be put into this portion of the road or somewhere else. I'm just curious as to how this works. S. James said we are talking about \$3,000 for this, 3 new lots, \$1,000 a piece, is what's being discussed. There were some suggestions from Stantec who looked at the cost and I don't want to say but the Cadillac one solution is to pave it and then you work your way down, you do some geo-textiles, you can do some drainage, keep it gravel and do different things and they're all different costs associated to them. Right now there's no funding for that. I think the issue to me on that road is when some of the bigger lots in Deerfield get developed, if they put in 30 or 40 homes back there, that's when it's going to be a real problem but we're not talking about that tonight.

C. Robie asked could we ask the applicant what he thinks. Knowing what his neighbors just went through and for what he's asking here. J. Johnston said obviously I would rather not pay money but whatever you guys vote on we'll do. \$3,000 dollars right? S. James said yes, which would be dedicated to improving the road generally in front of these properties. C. Robie added plus the impact fees most likely generated in that area now will go towards that road in the near future. J. Johnson confirmed so those monies will be used specifically for that road. S. James and C. Robie agreed. S. James asked if there were any abutters.

P. Frazier said I'm Paul Frazier, 63 Currier Rd, Candia, NH 03034 across the street from where their creating the lots. I'm just wondering why I never received any letters from the previous meeting. I just received a letter for this meeting. S. James said this is the public hearing, previous to this they came in just for an informational. The question that Mr. Franklin came in with was related to whether we accept the application and view it as either a minor or a major subdivision. That's all we really talked about at that time. The rest of this is at the hearing. Do you have any questions or comments on the project? P. Frazier said no.

S. James said as we're looking to approve, one condition we have is the new bounds to be set. Usually it's 60-90 days. J. Franklin said to set new corner markers. J. Johnston said 60-90 days is fine. J. Franklin said 90 days in case we get a snow storm. S. James said the other item Rudy raised regarding the fees, what's the Board's consensus on that. Three \$1,000 dollar fees to go toward the road.

C. Robie said if Mr. Johnston doesn't have an issue with that I make a motion that we request that. It's not a requirement. We negotiated with Mr. Kelly and that's what the negotiation came down to. It wasn't a request or a requirement, it was a negotiation and we got down to \$1,000 per lot. R. Cartier said but it was one of the conditions we had in the approval. S. James responded it was a requirement of the approval, you're right, we negotiated to that point but it was a requirement. I think we would want it to be a requirement. C. Robie said I don't like that word, requirement. R. Cartier stated condition. C. Robie continued we don't have the authority to require that I don't think. S. James disagreed. We do have the authority for off-site improvement, to request those. C. Robie commented I thought it went back to the impact fee; I thought that's why that was instituted. It requires you to pay an impact fee when you impact that highway. S. James said that is part of it yes that is the intent of it but the off-site...Crowley Road is a good example. When the subdivision went in there, again because of the condition of that road, we requested off- site improvements as well. That road was 2 phases. D. Lewis confirmed 2 phases, \$200,000 each. Each developer put in \$200,000 because that was another case where it was a gravel road, it would be overloaded and there would be no way to maintain it with that volume of traffic. S. James said I'm not saying this is the same but we're using the same logic that we used there. R. Cartier said you have a good point about semantics on it; it should probably be listed as a condition of approval, not a requirement for

approval but a condition for approval, which is different. J. Bedard asked how it's different. R. Cartier said as Carleton said if you require something you usually have a zoning section in there that says you will do this, this is not black and white, and it's a negotiated item for approval of this subdivision. It's an off-site improvement that's not necessarily in the regulations per se. So it's a condition as opposed to a requirement. J. Bedard said because it's case by case. R. Cartier said yes. S. James commented that we do have in the regulations; there are requirements that can be made for that and that's what we're doing. R. Cartier said ok if you want to put it that way but that's why I was saying, you were talking about the off-site requirements, this is a condition to meet those requirements. I guess you could keep it as a requirement but I know when we do the approvals, it says conditions of approval.

S. James said ok we're getting into semantics but it's important so the condition would be the \$3,000. I think they way Carleton read it the condition would be we request the \$3,000. There's a difference there. C. Robie said so if Mr. Johnston doesn't object, we can call it whatever we want, whatever the Chairmen pleases, that's what I'm going to go with. S. James said let's do it this way. We have 2 conditions; one would be bounds set in 90 days. The other would be a payment of \$3,000 to be used on, at the discretion of the Road Agent, for road work in the vicinity of the properties.

C. Robie asked anything about combining the lots into one? And then subdividing them? J. Franklin said the deed display sheet; you had mentioned might be recorded? S. James said yes we can make that a condition. C. Robie stated I think that needs to be very clear in the deed process. Chasing those deeds I think it needs to be very clear that they were all incorporated into one deed and then split into seven. J. Franklin commented that might require a lot consolidation application to the Board. If we were to do that, following the paper trail, we combine them all into one lot and then we're going to subdivide it into seven thereby being a major subdivision. S. James said right, which is what you were trying to avoid. R. Cartier replied I think we went over that the last time. J. Franklin responded yes, well that's now consolidating everything. C. Robie said it would be a condition of the minor after we accept this conditional approval on these things. Just to clear the paper trail, that needs to be done. You can call it whatever you want but it has to be done. S. James asked so you're suggesting we approve the minor subdivision to go to seven. C. Robie stated conditional approval to go to seven with the conditions listed and one of the conditions is combining the 4 lots into one to make seven. S. James said but if he combines them into one, then he has to come back for another application to sub-divide it at that point. J. Franklin commented and we have 1, 2, 3 buildings. 2 buildings are on one lot and on another lot there's a building. There are two residential uses on separate lots and the Town doesn't allow that which might require a variance and I guess your opening up a can of worms if you follow the paper trail. C. Robie stated it's going to open up a can of worms down the road. J. Franklin said I think recording the boundary plan of this prior to recording the subdivision plan will provide enough information so someone searching the Title can see where these came from. It's done all the time. I've seen being part of lot such and such and such and such in Deed descriptions. Meaning to convey part of lot 3 and lot 7 and they have all kinds of changes. Putting the boundary line plan on file first would be a big help.

S. James said ok so we have 3 conditions; bounds, funds for the road and recording of the boundary plan. C. Robie asked how about a letter from the Road Agent? D. Lewis said I need a set of plans to check the driveways. S. James said we can add that. J. Franklin said I don't know, the plans have been here a month. D. Lewis replied I didn't know that. J. Franklin said we've had this concern before where the Road Agent said I didn't get them, the Fire Chief said I didn't get them, the Police Chief said I didn't get them but the plans sit here for a month. Who's responsible for distributing them? I can hand carry them to everyone's house but that seems ridiculous. C. Robie said so we'll put that as a condition and the Road Agent will look at the plans, he'll send a letter and as long as the letter is acceptable, the condition will be met. So we have 4 conditions correct? S. James agreed.

MOTION:

R. Cartier made a **motion** that we accept it with the conditions noted. C. Robie **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

J. Franklin said thank you and I will run everything here by Andrea before I go and record it. Boundary plan so she knows, I'll give her a copy for that requirement. S. James said you need to bring it in to sign it anyway. J. Franklin said not the boundary plan. The boundary plan can be filed without it (*PB signatures*). C. Robie suggested that we staple a boundary plan right to that set of plans (*subdivision plans*) in the file when we put it away so anyone looking will know. S. James stated we'll get you the notice of decision out in five days.

Public Hearing for the Master Plan Update: The Planning Board is seeking input for an Update to the Town of Candia Master Plan completed by the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission. The Master Plan is intended to assist the Planning Board in protecting and preserving the qualities on which residents place great value while allowing the Town to grow and prosper in a responsible and controlled manner.

S. James said I'll do an overview. Derek Shooster is here from Southern NH Planning. What I was planning to do was to give an update to how we got to where we're at, open it up to public input and we'll go from there. So the Master Plan update is something we've been talking about on the Board for the past 4 years. We did receive some funding for it last April 15th and 16th we had the Candia Community Profile Event over at the school that was run by UNH Cooperative Extension. There were 62 plus or minus residents who participated. And from that came a report, this Community Profile in a summary of basically needs and concerns and gave guidance to SNH Planning and ultimately the Steering Committee to steer the Master Plan update. The last Master Plan update was in 2003, 14 years old. There's no law that requires you to update it but it's recommended every 5-10 years. In the interim, we've had opportunities and different reports written and included; the Capital Improvement Program, Energy Chapter, Natural Resource Inventory, Open Space Plan and a Build Out Report. Those were reports that were done after the original Master Plan and then incorporated to the new one as they came out. So as a result of the Community Profile, there were 5 action groups that were started. One sort of combined with another which left four and I think 3 of them are still pretty active; to focus on different things, communications and different topics. From that we set up a Master Plan Steering Committee which started meeting last June 7th. I was the Chair of that with Scott Komisarek, the Co-Chair. And recognition of the people who were on that; Colleen Bolton is here tonight, Ricia Velasco, who is also here tonight, Carmel Druchniak, Matt Woodrow, not everyone was at every meeting but; Carla Penfield, Jim Argeriou, Boyd Chivers was at several meetings as was Paula Bond. We had a total of 8 meetings, generally monthly, and work on it went back and forth with SNH. As part of that we reviewed the last Master Plan, again this is an update, it's not intended to be a full Master Plan. It wasn't a start from scratch. Our last Master Plan had a lot of recommendations and a lot were overlapping and it became unwieldy. A lot of the low hanging fruit and the mid hanging fruit, if you will, were done but parts of it weren't really addressed. It's been on the website, paper copies were given out to the Select Board and we recently completed a Transportation Plan that was incorporated into that and that was a separate group that met with Jack Munn. Several people here were on that committee as well and that was approved at the February 1st Planning Committee Meeting. The Transportation Plan was done at no cost to the Town. SNH obtained some funding and the only cost to the Town was the \$10,000 warrant article for the Profile Event and the Master Plan update. So the current draft, and that's why we're here tonight for input and to talk about it, is basically long term guidance for the Planning Board. The Planning Board meets twice a month generally but on the second meeting of each month, after the regular meeting, we have a Zoning Review Committee and look at zoning, subdivision, earth excavation or whatever and try to look at keeping it up to date. This year we have a zoning article that Boyd helped put together on accessory dwellings. So we look at those things and bring them to the Town as needed. As far as the overview, there are 5 chapters in it, we have a copy here if anyone wants to look at it

but it's generally an overview of it and then there goals and strategies which were organized by Natural Resources, Land Use, Housing, Economic Development, Community Facilities, Transportation and Cultural and Historic Preservation are kind of the main topics. In each of those, there was a goal or two or three and then a strategy. The other part which came out of the Community Profile was some planning areas and there were 7 of those that come up over and over. Four corners area here, other Candia Villages, Main Street, Raymond Rd, Exit 3, land South of NH Route 101, and then more broadly, rural residential land and Town Conservation land. There are also a lot of snapshots on where we're at; population, housing and growth and one question on that was (to Derek), there was birth data in here that we had a comment on, was that updated in the draft on the website or was that after or not yet? D. Shooster said I have it in my copy and I can email you a PDF if that's not what you have. It wasn't much different. I think it was 26 births per year was the forecast for the Town and in the plan, I want to say 19? S. James said that was something Mark had brought up. M. Laliberte said it was forwarded over to me from the school district, they had done their studies of future enrollment and that's where the information had come from and you got that copy. D. Shooster said right I did, thank you and the projections are just a flat line after the year 2015 from that report so that number for that year referred to in the report was 2021 was consistent with the report. I'll make sure you have the latest PDF. S. James said the School Board next Thursday at 6 pm is having a meeting on school population and projected school population growth. They had a report done that they will be talking about next week. So with that I'll open it up to anyone on the Board or the audience who may have questions or comments.

B. Chivers said Mr. Chairman I'll rise as a resident and not as a member of the Board of Selectmen. My first question is how many paper copies of this were delivered to the Town? Gary provided our Board with 6 copies and one for the Land Use office. Is that all, the extent of how this has been publicized in the Town of Candia? D. Shooster replied no a PDF was also distributed to the Steering Committee, I believe there were Planning Board members on their as well, and from what I gather it's been shared on the Town of Candia's website. B. Chivers commented I'm talking about paper copies. Do you expect people in the Town of Candia to read a 200 page document on the website? D. Shooster replied its 50 pages. J. Bedard said it's not 200 pages because I read it today. R. Velasco commented but with the appendices, the Transportation Plan is another 60.

S. James said without the appendices, the paper copies are what you talked about. All the Board received PDF copies. It's been on the Town Website, it's been advertised on Facebook as well as our normal public hearing but we didn't make paper copies, no. B. Chivers said my second comment, I'm going to have a few; 64 people that showed up on April 15th and 16th to provide their vision for this town, there's about 21 people in this room right here, that's about 1/3rd of the number of people that showed up, is this going to be our last opportunity to have input on this Master Plan?

S. James said it depends. My opinion is we tried for 3 years to get this going and then with the help from the Select Board and we appreciate it, got the warrant article. Since then, the comments I've received are why aren't you done, why is it taking so long. This is what I've been hearing; so you have a warrant article, how can we possibly vote on a warrant article if we haven't completed this. We've had a lot of meetings on it and they've all been open to the public. My intention, unless there's overwhelming dissent or hatred of the plan or major issues, would be after the hearing to have a vote on it tonight. And that's what we discussed at the last meeting. B. Chivers asked page 2-3 of the Community Profile. The Master Plan says: *Encourage greater diversity in housing choices to attract young families to the community while enabling the town's older population to age in place.* That's in the Master Plan and I've looked at the vision statement and on page 23 under the housing section, there is no reference to this goal. How did this goal get incorporated into the Master Plan when it was never clearly expressed at the Visioning Session on April 15th?

S. James replied we debated about that. Should only the words that are in that profile; visioning be in the Master Plan update or should we look broader? The general themes were discussed at the community profile; housing affordability, recreation and transportation. Again, this is a guideline. We changed the

language several times in the Master Plan to soften it and make it a guide and to investigate those options. We also had at one of the meetings, representatives from NH Housing Authority and the issue of work-force housing came up and that's what this is hinting at. My opinion is strict interpretation of those regs, we meet it for housing based on mostly price but I don't think we meet it in the intentions of our regulations the way they're written and we definitely do not meet it for rental properties. After hearing that and what was expressed in the Community Profile, that's where that came from. It's not saying it's mandatory. There are some other parts, talk about agricultural and looking at different zoning.

B. Chivers continued one thing that was clear in the Community Profile was that residents of Candia have a desire to keep it a rural environment yet on page 3-16 of the Master Plan under Land Use Planning and Strategies you recommend this: *Evaluate the existing R-Residential District to allow a minimum lot size of 2 acres.* My question to you is how do we maintain Candia's rural character by increasing, by decreasing the lot size from 3 acres to 2 acres. How does that maintain our rural character? On that Community Profile, where was it ever mentioned that we should reduce our lot size in the residential district to 2 acres? S. James responded it wasn't in the Community Profile specifically. B. Chivers asked so how did it get in the Master Plan? The promise of that weekend; the Community Profile; was the vision expressed by the people of Candia would be incorporated in the Master Plan and the Master Plan would reflect that vision. That's why everybody showed up for two consecutive days. Now all of a sudden we're getting a document here with all kinds of new stuff in here that nobody in Candia ever thought about.

C. Bolton responded first of all, the people on the Master Plan committee are from Candia. To say that nobody in Candia ever thought of that. I don't remember our charge being restricted to only what was discussed and decided at the Vision Sessions. I think the charge was to look at the Master Plan, obviously take in what happened in the Vision weekend, certainly, but I don't remember saying if it wasn't discussed or in the final report on the Vision weekend, then we cannot consider it. I don't remember that being a restriction. S. James said it wasn't a restriction. We talked a lot about whether it should be or not but decided it didn't need to be. These are recommendations, there's no power in this. If it says all lots shall be 5 acres, it's not going to make it happen necessarily. There is a recommendation to keep 25% of the town Derek?

D. Shooster commented under Cultural and Historical Preservation the goal is to *preserve Candia's rural character, traditional settlement patterns and cultural heritage.* It was discussed by the Steering Committee to be left somewhat vague so that's its less restrictive than some of the objectives in the last Master Plan. The 25% under land *as recommended by the Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests (SPNHF), the Town of Candia should consider preserving 25% of the town as open space.*

S. James added the other part of that is the current use change tax, currently 25% of that goes to the Conservation Commission, there was a recommendation to bring it back to 100%, which it used to be. B. Chivers said I have another comment for the record; 2004 Master Plan page 6 prepared for Candia by some company up in Vermont and adopted by the Planning Board includes this statement: *based on a 1994 soil survey ratings, SNHPC has estimated that nearly 60% of Candia soils have severe limitations for the installation of septic systems.* On page 8 of this same document: *Groundwater resources, especially recharge potential, have significant limitations in the Town of Candia* and it cites the Geologic Survey there. My question to you is, if that statement was made in our 2004 Master Plan, why isn't in this Master Plan? That is a significant limitation on the growth potential of the residential district. The geology hasn't changed; the re-charge potential of the aquifer hasn't changed, nothing's changed so why isn't that in the plan?

S. James responded the idea of it Boyd, was again, this is an update of it. I'm not sure that there's really any language from the old one that made it verbatim into the new version. It's an update. As far as the lot size, that's related to the discussion regarding a Village District which there have been designed charettes for, which were held in the Town and supported by some residents.

M. Laliberte commented by saying that, you validate #2; *Evaluate the existing R-Residential District to allow a minimum lot size of 2 acres depending upon availability of suitable soil conditions for both on-site septic and water systems.* So there you go. They're going to evaluate the zoning area and you're saying yourself (to Boyd Chivers), if that condition exists, that's going to be part of the evaluation process to see whether or not the 2 acres can incorporate that based upon the availability of suitable soil. B. Chivers replied so it's not by lot then. C. Robie said area, district; certain district.

E. Fowler asked wouldn't that have to come before the Town for a vote as a warrant article? It's not going to change to a 2 acre. S. James said absolutely. The idea is not to put forth a warrant article to go from 3 acres to 2 but to look at all these factors and the idea is that there certain parts of Town that would warrant that, make sense? Currier Road, do I want 2 acre housing on Currier, no. We don't want more houses on that road. There are certain areas of Town, you mentioned soils but there's also water. There's been some good planning from SNH where the water in Town is down there by the water park. Beyond that it's hit or miss. You get near my road and you get uranium and arsenic in the water, you filter it out. Innovative Land Use; the OEP has, that would be conservation, agriculture, subdivisions, I think that's something we should look at. If we did go ahead with that, it would be a warrant article and the whole Town would choose, whether they decide to do that.

R. Cartier replied we talked about this in one of the Zoning Review and Revision Committee meetings and you brought up that exact fact; where in the Town can you actually support less than 3 acres building. Some areas in Town you shouldn't be building on anything less than 5 or 6 acres. Other areas maybe it is okay to do 1 or 2 acres depending on whether everything is supported from both the citizens and what the land can handle. We put in a grant application to take a look at the 4 corners area to see physically what it could handle for septic systems, wells etc. That's the type of thing that would need to be done before anything went to the Town to vote on minimum size acreage. Where did the 3 acres come from? No one knows. It's been on the books for a long time. Now we're at the point where we want to keep the rural character of the Town but have some Town centers or some more commercial development. Where can that actually happen? We don't have Town sewer and water and never will. It should be done Town wide so we have an overall plan for build out, it's an evolving process; soils were done in 1994. The geology doesn't change but we may have more structures in place putting a strain on it now. It needs to be updated again.

B. Chivers asked my last question if anything this Master Plan contemplates is an expanded Village District from here all the way up to the Congregational Church. How is that defined? That's going to encompass a lot of older homes up through there, mostly single family detached residences. Whose idea was it to run that thing all the way up the hill beyond the Congregational Church? My idea of a Village District ends within 100- 200 yards of 4 corners here for commercial, now it's close to a mile.

R. Cartier replied back about 15 years ago there was a charette done for this whole area, and there are drawings, I have a copy of it at my house I can give it to you, the feeling was they wanted to tie the 4 corners in to the Smyth Public Library area and up to the church and have that as the overall village feeling although it wasn't at the time, the other thought process was to go down Raymond Road toward Birchwood Plaza to encompass that area as an overall idea at the time. There were artist renditions of sidewalks, lighting, all of that. B. Chivers said this plan envisions multi-family dwellings all up and down route 27 from here to the church on the hill. I can't imagine that.

R. Cartier replied the original one didn't have multi-family, it had mixed use. B. Chivers said well this does. R. Cartier clarified multi-family? B. Chivers said yes. Unlike the Affordable Care Act I think we need to find out what's in this thing before we pass it.

J. Bedard commented we've read it. I read it today.

S. James said you have valid comments but to respond, the Town and the Planning Board can't make anyone do anything. We can allow for zoning and encourage certain things but we can't make anyone do that. We have, it's got to be the oldest conditionally approved project in the entire State, for the 55 plus

housing. There's 40 units approved right up there. Whether it ever gets built or not. That was approved by the Town, a warrant article and plan approved.

B. Chivers commented the Master Plan provides a basis for any challenge to our zoning ordinances. That was made clear by some representative (*S. James said Jack Munn*) from SNHPC. If these ideas are incorporated in this Master Plan and we don't follow through with them in a couple of years, we're open for a challenge. D. Shooster replied I don't know if that's accurate, I don't know I can't comment on that.

S. James said I don't think that's accurate Boyd. If it says evaluate 2 acre zoning, we evaluate and if it doesn't make sense for this Town for whatever reason, I don't think we'd lose any challenge on that. Work-force housing could absolutely be challenged and we'd lose. That's my opinion; there are a lot of people in Town that disagree with me.

R. Velasco said on page 3-4, there's a section that's headed *Conservation Lands*: and then there's a lot of discussion of downtown bustling business on that? It seems that information is out of place and should be under #1. There's no discussion on conservation land and information about the downtown area should be under the prior one. It also lists (*Area #7: second column on page 3-4*) that looks like a different insertion than the original discussion of the 4 corners area and it sounds a lot more retail than I had envisioned. I thought drug store etc. on a smaller scale but this sounds like downtown Nashua, bustling and vibrant. It says: *Hopefully a full, pedestrian-friendly downtown with bustling businesses, more retail and bring back retail's prominence, need to capitalize on history and DeWitt's small town character*. D. Shooster replied it's an incorrect heading. R. Velasco continued *more lighting to link neighborhoods with downtown, limit the number of homes due to parking needed*.

M. Laliberte said I think this may be for a separate document altogether. That was going to be my question, that doesn't look right. Was this a cut and paste for something else?

R. Velasco said there are a few tweaks here and there but overall I thought it was a well thought out document.

This was followed by a discussion between R. Velasco and M. Laliberte regarding p. 3-4 Area #5: only one existing gas station the Irving but there are two; but that's reference to Exit 3, we have Mobil but that's not on Exit 3. *Page 3-4 Under Exit 3 and Old Candia Road*. Suggestion; tweak it to say only existing gas station in area. S. James agreed and said however, that whole column has to do with that area.

R. Velasco commented that there is a lot happening on this page. If you look further down under *Constraints, Area 5*, it has limitations, transportation improvements needed and then it says *on-site sewage capacity*. It doesn't say, limited, where as the other one's were constraints. If you say on-site sewage capacity it could be an opportunity or it could be a negative. If you say lack of capacity or sewage infrastructure, then it's a constraint. Maybe say lack of? M. Laliberte replied but then you're intimating that people want sewage lines coming in from Hooksett or wherever. That's a different argument. I think they kept it vague on purpose.

R. Velasco continued at Exit 3: Before we recommend going out and working with real estate professionals, we work with the State Economic Development Office and see what their resources are; what they believe the Town would need to have in those lands to make them attractive to develop. I worked for DRED. M. Laliberte said I would be that person. My sense was as a member of the Selectmen we talked about looking at putting together an Economic Development Committee but it was important to get this done first. Scott Komisarek was very excited about it and he's talked to people like Laurel Bistany over in Raymond over at Rockingham Economic Development, and others, about some of the things that are needed. When that time comes, I can talk about the resources; 79E, zones TIFS, and those sort of things and I'm happy to do that as a citizen. I agree with you completely. I think having Laurel come in to discuss because she has a really good perspective. Laurel is the President of Rockingham Economic Development Corp. and she does a lot of economic development. R. Velasco continued I was thinking Mike Bergeron because he's the one that works with companies that are looking in the State. He's on the recruitment side of economic development and he would know about what site selecting companies are looking for when they're looking at land. They used to have a database. M. Laliberte said we have a website now called

chooseNH.com which is going to have the (*unintelligible*) MLS listings. We can authorize someone from the Town, whether it's a Selectmen or the Building Inspector to put that information on there as well. That would have to go through the Board, Planning Board or Selectmen or however we do it. R. Velasco continued we should use any free resource before we go and get real estate professionals and people looking to make a buck for planning out the economy and what companies to attract. Utilize free before we pay for anything. Revitalization zones will help; old buildings put to new use, there are revitalization tax credits from the Department of Revenue that you can get.

B. Graff responded it seems like you might have to nail down the requirements for sewage and water supply. Possibility of septic, don't you need to have criteria? Are there guidelines? S. James said yes, planning standards out there. B. Graff continued it's hard to offer a homogeneous town center unless it's already there. You have some business, a school, some Town buildings and you've got houses scattered around, even the 4 corners; to imagine a place with a thriving metropolis with a barbershop, drugstore. Fitting that all in a pre-existing Town seems kind of difficult, it would be easier in an area with no settlement where you're building fresh, but rehabbing and re-fitting a downtown center is tough. Great job with the Library and Town office but it seems difficult to fit that all in with the various houses around the center of Town.

S. Young replied I agree with Bill I (*unintelligible*) in eminent domain and taking people's homes and like that to make this happen. First I want to thank the committees who've done this; it's a lot of work and effort. I look at it as the Community Profile Event of 68 people and the Steering Committee or two of a dozen members; that this Master Plan is not intended to make binding decisions for the Town of Candia legally or otherwise. It's intended to give us some guidance, some options, some direction to consider when making decisions for the community. I'm not sure if I'm not making enough of the Master Plan or others are making too much of it. I still think people and individuals still matter, legally and otherwise. The Town and the community I believe will vote on things that are legally binding before they're able to happen. I don't believe that when this is published, all of a sudden we're going to have to do exactly what it says and if not, we'll be in legal trouble. We do have to go by the State RSA's such as the accessory dwelling but my interpretation is that this is a guide to guide the growth of the community. It's not something we need to be scared to death about. I didn't think it was legally binding if in fact it meets NH RSA's. Am I correct that this is a guide? S. James said that's absolutely right. S. Young continued it's a generating of ideas from the Profile Event and the people here who worked on the committees; we should embrace them, doesn't mean we have to approve of them, we should embrace them and go from there. M. Laliberte said I think we should look at it and say hey this is something we should investigate, evaluate. Zoning, we should evaluate it, consider it, would it help with future growth? S. Young said a handbook. S. James commented if you look at the last one, there's a lot of anti-growth in there. It's interesting how it's changed in 14 years. Limit the number of houses; we've got too many houses. Now it's the opposite, look at the school and how many kids it's gone down, it goes up and down. It's headed down like the rest of New England. It gives guidance. Anything that goes to change the zoning has to go to a warrant article. Those will be the major changes.

R. Cartier commented I looked at this plan and if you wanted to have a Village District in here, what would the Town need to do to either, encourage that, allow that and how far can we go? Then you take it forward and you do the hard work;

- 1) Seeing what you can do
- 2) Convincing the Town folks to vote in the affirmative to do that.

S. Young reiterated that I consider it a guide and a lot of hard work; again, to help plan, nothing definitive, it's to help plan which I'm glad the Town of Candia is doing.

S. James commented and the appendices too, there's a lot of good information in there. They looked at the Natural Resource Inventory that SNH did; looked at where's the water, steep slopes, wildlife in Town and here are some areas you need to focus on. That's something the Planning Board can take into account.

D. Snow said I have a statement I want to file and I will read it to you first and then I'll give Andrea a copy. It was my understanding, and I spent a couple of hours this afternoon looking at this stuff and I had

some things that I wanted to make sure got on the record prior to the time that you had jumped through that last hurdle which would allow you to accept the update to the Master Plan as completed. I wanted to make sure this got on the record so that 10 years from now when someone points to the update of the Master Plan and says that's gospel, I want to be able to say I told you so. This is addressed to Sean, Chair of the Planning Board; D. Snow read from his letter dated March 1, 2017 addressed to Sean James:

Dear Sir...

The Candia Planning Board is today hearing comments related to the proposed Update to the Candia Master Plan. The Planning Board, the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission, the UNH Cooperative Extension Service, Town and School District officers, officials, boards, committees, commissions, employees and most importantly, the Citizenry of the town, have worked diligently over a period of several years to create this document. This document is a necessary part of the future planning decisions for the future of Candia and forms the legal basis for establishment and enforcement of the regulations and rules that will manage and control growth and development. The results of the effort are commendable. It's now more readable and has lots of pretty pictures.

I've been a resident of Candia for 55 years now and this is only the third time in all those years that Candia has made a significant change in their Master Plan. What strikes me most about this effort is that, while we still want to retain our rural character and keep taxes low by resisting or restraining development, that's no longer the primary focus. The primary focus now appears to be that there will be development and maybe that will result in lower taxes.

The major concern that I have is that we haven't fully considered or properly defined the full extent of the necessary infrastructure improvements that should be a part of the desired growth. As a community, we have, over the years, made decisions based on cost rather than need. To address that concern, I offer the following items that I would hope that future generations will use as guidelines for things that need to be done.

- 1. The Town Salt Shed is within the boundaries of the Moore Park, a gift from Henry W. Moore to be held in trust for recreational use and it also sits atop a tributary of the Lamprey River, a protected river under the Rivers Management Protection Program. Find a new home for the Highway Department.*
- 2. The Town Office Building is also within the boundaries of Moore Park. Find a better place for the bigger and better Town Office facilities that will be required and use the current building for the Recreation Department.*
- 3. There will be, sooner or later, a need for a Emergency Management "Safety Center" to handle the Police and Fire Departments. It should be in the CIP as such. (And the CIP did not appear to be on the website where I was looking for it today).*
- 4. The town spent better than \$50,000 to develop the plans for a Community Center / School Gymnasium Building. Not a center of the community building but a Public Building that the Community could use for all those things that the new Master Plan envisions. I still have copies of the plans. See me before I depart this planet, please?*

L. Chivers had a few comments. As I read through the Master Plan, the diversity of housing issue came up repeatedly. I feel like we're working on someone else's agenda. If you look at SNH, moving SNH forward, those are their priorities but I don't think they're the residents of Candia; diversity of housing is one of our priorities. I spent two days at the envisioning meeting. You said you don't have to follow what went on there but I didn't hear that. I think that the Village Center that was envisioned is now looking like something completely different. The other thing that concerns me is the apartments above the commercial establishments. If you think of downtown Raymond, you have all these buildings with apartments upstairs and I don't consider that an attractive downtown. I don't think at all that's what the residents of Candia had in mind when they're talking about a Village Center; these big buildings all stuck together with apartments on top. I feel like this isn't coming from us. The other thing, I can understand aging in place however, as a

senior citizen, I consider aging in place in my house. There's a section in here multi-family senior housing with congregate care and skilled nursing facilities? I don't think that's a good idea for the Town of Candia where we don't have transportation. The next section talks about *community and public transportation for our elderly residents*? I don't think that's Candia, if elderly people, including myself, cannot live in our homes and we need transportation, then we'd have to move to another community. We can't possibly provide all the services for the 90 year old people in Town within Candia, assuming they don't live with their children. I'm not sure how that got in there.

S. James said the one that you just mentioned came up quite a bit in the Community Profile Event. Not specifically skilled nursing but if people need assistance in their house or otherwise to allow them to live here. L. Chivers commented I just didn't envision that as a nursing facility. S. James commented I believe that's allowed in our zoning anyway, I'd have to check.

C. Robie said I envision that as somebody having the opportunity to build a facility such as *The Inn at Deerfield*, which is probably the best facility in the State for people with Alzheimer's and dementia, they get the best care. They figure out how to transport them. Anyone in our community with the disease is working diligently to get in over there and they're very fortunate to have that so close to us. Secondly, on the Village District idea, if we go back 60 or 80 years in our community, we had 5 village districts. We spoke of the Hill already tonight and all of the houses up there are side by side and most are on one acre lots. We go down to Main Street where the depot was and we had a train station, a car dealership; two thriving stores and people bustling around in a village and all of those houses are on one acre lots. We go to East Candia we have the same thing. All the people in East Candia live on one acre lots in beautiful old houses with some new ones in between them and that's the 3rd village. We go to Candia Village with houses side by side on one acre or two acre lots. We go to Beane Island and we have the same thing. We had 5 villages in Candia that thrived and today we have nothing. So the opportunity for our community, the people that came together in April, seemed to think they wanted a Village District; I think that's what they envisioned. One community with some congestion where people can thrive and my opinion is a dollar spent in Candia stays in Candia. When we take all our dollars to Raymond and Hooksett and spend them, that's where they stay. The people working in the facilities, building the facilities and paying taxes on the facilities, pay the taxes with our dollars in their towns. I think this Master Plan and the Village District is very important to our community.

L. Chivers asked I had a problem reading the maps, the keys are so small and they aren't clear, illegible. Perhaps we could make the key big enough. The Village District is in the map there on page 5-4 but I objected to the size of the Village District. I don't think it needs to go up the hill and encompass all the property up there. C. Robie to S. James it's in the 2004 plan do we show a build-out right now? S. James said, sorry Lyn, go ahead. L. Chivers stated it's a public hearing; you're supposed to be here to listen to public input. S. James replied he was just asking a question on what you were talking about on the build-out up the hill. I have a question; you raised objection to diversity of housing, what is your vision and what do you think other people's vision of housing should be? L. Chivers continued diversity of housing means to me anything goes. We could have mobile homes, condominiums, apartment buildings, anything, duplexes. I can understand in the Village District you're going to have to reduce lot sizes. I'm assuming people are envisioning a nice little village gathering place. We have every little establishment on 2 acre lots it doesn't really look like a downtown community. But diversity doesn't limit it to anything so are we going to have mobile homes all along the road? We need to be more specific of the kind of housing we're talking about. I object to the apartment buildings above the retail. It looks like a *tent or tenement (unintelligible)*. S. James said for commercial and mixed use we do have architectural standards that would deal with that so that's already in place. We do have mobile homes and they are allowed on 4 or more lots.

L. Chivers said it leaves the door open for anything, you do have some zoning changes but I would like to be a little bit more restrictive in the kind of development, I'd like to be more specific, not restrictive, specific in the kind of development that we'd have in the Village District. S. James said I think it would, anything we come up with would have to be specific and voted on.

D. Lewis made the suggestion that it would have been nice to have more hard copies here tonight for reference. C. Robie agreed. It's on PDF but why can't we go to Kinkos and get 50 copies printed? Secondly, I'm not going to vote on this tonight. I think the regular Planning Board members, Mr. Santa, Mrs. Lindsey, Mr. Komisarek and Tom Giffen should do that and not the alternates. M. Laliberte said we have corrections anyway and we wouldn't vote on it tonight. I would recommend the same thing. That section is totally off and until we get a good intention of what that is, I don't think we can vote on it because it's not....C. Robie replied I think we should make hard copies available and come back in two weeks. Whenever the next scheduled meeting is.

R. Velasco commented one of the things Jack had mentioned is that we talked about agritourism as being a way to promote some economic diversity. And it could be the vineyard and it could be Charmingfare farm. It was on the hill area. There are some funds; there were anyway, towards promotion, also economic development funds for promoting the Town in certain ways. So all those things could be looked into also as direction for an economic development committee or another group. We have the water park, we have new ownership, maybe they can combine with other groups to promote and market Candia. I would also love to see bus transportation at the park and ride. But if there were a regional bus from Portsmouth to Manchester which connected up with the Boston Express to North Londonderry. I'm dreaming big as we're talking 10 years here. If you want to be able to age in place, it's easy enough to get in a car and go to the park and ride. It's harder to drive to Boston.

M. Laliberte replied to be fair there are people who move here and live here that don't want that for the simple fact that if they wanted that, they'd live in Londonderry or Salem or Manchester or Concord, where the Concord Express goes. I'm playing devil's advocate. Some people move to Candia to get away from the big city accoutrements that other parts of the State have.

More discussion ensued regarding aging in place; elderly driving into major metropolis's that a bus service would provide. M. Laliberte commented that may be getting away from Candia's rural character, which has been expressed by many in the Community Profile and the Master Plan. R. Velasco suggested at Exit 3, transportation, having a park and ride there, would be a great idea. DOT could be convinced. R. Cartier commented that we look at pre-existing; there is a bus service that runs from Portsmouth to Manchester that maybe could be tied into that. It's a private company. Those are things to look at, what's already in place. The Master Plan, these are the ideas, how do we get to them. State already owns land but they won't sell it.

C. Bolton asked is the approval process for the previous Master Plan similar to this where the Planning Board voted to accept it? S. James agreed. C. Bolton continued so it's not a warrant article, it's not posted on the village green. The Planning Board voted to accept it and use it.

S. James said the process is we have a public hearing and then have a vote, which we're not doing tonight I guess. The other issue is we did have a limited budget which we did expend and then some. The Select Board did help out with other funding along the way but we have to be cognizant, we can't go crazy on comments and dragging this out; making 50 copies in color. If we want to, we can do that but we need to find some funding for it.

R. Velasco asked regarding a Town Manager and Fire Department professionals; this may need to be addressed in the next 10 years. How do we know when it's time to get a Town Manager? How do we know when the Fire Department needs funding to pay for people to be there? I didn't see anything addressed, maybe under *Cultural Resources* or *Infrastructure*? How do towns take those steps? M. Laliberte said Town Administrator was discussed at the Profile. R. Velasco continued and a Town Planner. R. Cartier said it's reactive with small towns. I read an article about Maine with 15 people on the Fire Department and the youngest one is 47 years old and now they're trying to figure out what to do? We can hire people to come in and do an evaluation to compare us to other Towns. Talk to other towns. New Boston has similar issues that Candia has.

C. Robie commented a couple of years ago, as Selectman, I presented to the Select Board as leaders of the Town, that we needed to make some decisions to look at the future and have a plan for our Fire

Department, which is aging. They are doing it for next to nothing and going on 300 plus rescue calls a year and 15 fire calls, it takes up a lot of time. Very shortly we'll need something over there for a staff. The same with our Highway Department; we're all getting up there. We won't be fortunate to find somebody that does the job that Mr. Lewis does on our roads now for the amount of money that we pay him. That generation, this is the end of it. Same with the Fire Department. The elected officials are the people that need to drive that bus and change the zoning and planning to figure out a way to get some new revenue to figure out a way to pay for these things. That's very important and some of that is in this document. The revenue will be needed and whether we get it from all of us in here with more residential taxes or we create some new value and tax that value to offset that cost because the operating budget in the Town now is 2 and a half million dollars. In ten years that will increase by a million dollars without a problem.

B. Chivers said Ricia we've taken that first step; there's a warrant article this year for a \$50,000 Capital Reserve Fund to improve the Fire Department, structurally. S. James said and SNH Planning is a real good resource for that. We can ask can you look at 10 comparable towns to Candia, size, demographic etc. and do they have these things and how long have they had them? There are towns bigger than us that don't have Town Administrators and there are smaller ones that do. It's a local decision and it's not a simple one. There's a lot in here, we should do this, we. Thank you for coming, it's been a great discussion but we need to be on those committees. We have Zoning Review committees and there are 3 of us here. We have 4,000 people in Town and 3 are here. It's important, let's get some more people.

S. James confirmed so as for moving forward. There are some revisions that need to be made, comments reviewed. We cancelled our next meeting on the 15th because the elections were so close. I'm not running again, we'll have two new members and there wasn't enough time to be sworn in so our next meeting is April 5th.

Discussion ensued regarding having another public hearing or not, time for noticing, decision to just continue this public hearing until then, don't close it.

D. Shooster asked if you'd like hard copies in public places, where would you like those. They discussed locations; Town Office, Library, Town Clerk. C. Robie said specifically say available at the Land Use Office so they all don't disappear. Cost \$250. Website, Facebook...make revisions, new hard copy, send us 25 of them.

D. Shooster said we could have another Steering Committee meeting; feedback on Chapters 3, 4 and 5 are more technical, Chapter 2 had the most work. I do need feedback from more than Sean, Ricia and Carmel. Anyone and everyone, we need your feedback in order to give you the plan you want. I have the comments from this meeting and the minutes from this meeting as well in order to incorporate that and discuss with the committee. We can do that electronically.

S. James reiterated the Title, the graphics, 25 paper copies of that version with those minor changes and a new PDF for the website. Conservation section.

R. Cartier suggested a couple of color copies for the maps to stay here and review here but if you want a copy, take a black and white one. R. Velasco asked about a big map at the Town Hall; discussion that they were hard to see.

D. Shooster asked which map. Page 5-4, future land use? We can print that on a larger sheet and it can be a fold out in the report if your prefer that. We'll look into that. D. Snow asked Sean if Andrea could get the CIP on the website.

S. James reiterated ok so we're agreeing to 25 paper copies, 5 color copies, get them to the Land Use office and distribute with those changes, within the next week or so and continue the public hearing to April 5th.

C. Robie said do we have money? No, then we should make a cut off here and say this document here will be our guideline for now and then a review committee can change that throughout the years. There's nothing wrong with the Planning Board making recommendations to the document as we go along. We have no more money.

M. Laliberte said I think the graphics and the conservation was an error. Discussion ensued about

Exit 3 ever developed entice them into building a park and ride for a bus. M. Laliberte commented but not in this current draft? R. Velasco said I'd like to see it in. We have to show that the Town is interested in that for DOT to respond. We would prefer to have DOT build park and ride. C. Robie commented we are doing a survey for the 4 corners area and we hope get DOT involved on a 10-15 year plan 8-10 million construction project.

S. James summed up so we get some more paper copies out there, we continue the hearing, people come back in a month with more comments and we deal with it then? J. Bedard replied it's too late for a major change. It's almost to the final stage. You can't bring up all these new ideas at this point and try to get every single thing in there. C. Robie said we can continue with public hearings and keep kicking this can down the road, at some point you take the public input but the Board needs to make a decision to vote to adopt what we have in front of us.

S. James addressed Derek so make the changes we talked about tonight. The section changes and grammatical ones. D. Shooster reiterated so 25 black and white copies, 5 color copies, legible maps on each of them, figure out on page 3-4 and meeting on April 5th. I should have these changes here within a week or two.

S. James said and with that we'll continue the public hearing to April 5th.

Other Business:

S. James said under other business, approval of minutes we don't have a quorum. We'll postpone those to the next meeting. SNH Planning; David Preece is retiring June 2nd. There's a roadside safety audit; DOT will do those, they're looking for applications by December.

MOTION:

S. James **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 9:10 pm. C. Robie **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (6-0-0).**

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary
cc file