

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES of October 18, 2017**  
**APPROVED**  
**Public Hearing**

Present: Tom Giffen, Chair; Al Hall III, Vice Chair; Judi Lindsey; Rudy Cartier; Ken Kustra; Joyce Bedard; Carleton Robie, BOS Representative.  
Dennis Lewis, Road Agent and Dave Murray, Building Inspector.

Absent: Mike Santa, Alt

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

Others Present: Paul Frazier of 63 Currier Road; Carol Ogilvie with the MTAG Grant Project; Nate Miller of SNHPC; Bryan Ruoff of Stantec.

Minutes October 4th, 2017:

J. Lindsey made a **motion** to accept the minutes of October 4th, 2017 as presented. A. Hall **seconded**. C. Robie; K. Kustra; T. Giffen; R. Cartier **were in favor**. J. Bedard **abstained**. **Motion passed (6-0-1)**.

**17-011 Minor Subdivision Application:** Applicant: Roscoe Blaisdell, 22 Scribner Road, Raymond, NH 03077. Owner: Same; Property location: New Boston Road, Candia NH 03034; Map 402 Lot 1.4 Intent: To subdivide a 9 acre lot into two lots, creating one new lot.

Present: Applicant and owner Roscoe Blaisdell

Abutters Present: Paul Hunter of 392 New Boston Road

Roscoe Blaisdell handed out the revised plans. T. Giffen commented this is a minor. You were here a short while ago doing something similar. What can you tell us about this? R. Blaisdell replied this is actually less of a grade. We got state subdivision approval. There's a little bit of wet in back, very little wet and a few ledge outcrops further in the back. But my test pits are around 4 feet. The state's okay with 2 feet. We've got plenty of room. They want a 4,000 square foot area that's good. That's double size normal pipe and stone septic, enviro, which 90% of my septics would fit in there 8 times so there's plenty of room where I did it. These are 4 acre, 5 acre lots so there's lots of other spots. T. Giffen said the Road Agent has taken a look at your driveway locations. D. Lewis replied the first driveway locations that he had marked did not meet our site distance requirement so I had submitted a letter to the Board stating that. I called Mr. Blaisdell and explained it to him. He went out there Monday I believe and re-located the driveways to where they do have adequate site distance. They both got moved easterly. R. Blaisdell confirmed. D. Lewis continued and submitted a new set of plans because the driveway locations were on his plan that was first submitted. The new locations meet the site distance requirement of 250 feet. R. Blaisdell replied and they're shown on the plans tonight. T. Giffen asked if there were issues with the landing area at the top, we had that issue last time. D. Lewis responded he stated in his plan he would make the 20 foot flat area at the top. One of them is close to our cross culvert and they'll have to make sure they don't fill it in. There's some room there. You go out 20 feet level otherwise you'll be on too steep an incline to come out on the road. Our requirements are 10 feet back from the edge of pavement, 3-1/2 feet off the ground and an object 250 feet away 30 inches.

C. Robie asked we just did two lots, westerly of these? R. Blaisdell replied a couple of lots removed from that. So the other lots were closer to North Road. C. Robie asked and this is an existing house? R. Blaisdell replied yes. C. Robie continued so there are existing houses on both sides, so that's down the hill

a little bit further than the other ones right? D. Lewis confirmed it's up on the flat, almost across from the sign that says Walnut Hill. Down on that end. C. Robie said ok, no problem. I think we should have a directional compass on the plans. Do we have that? R. Blaisdell confirmed there's a north arrow on the bottom. C. Robie said alright. I missed that, sorry. R. Blaisdell said the locus shows you. J. Lindsey commented I have some concerns about the steepness of it. I was wondering if we'd want to consider a site walk. R. Blaisdell said the ledge is about 250 feet off the road. T. Giffen replied you've mentioned you've dug test pits. R. Blaisdell replied yes, I've peppered it. If you get one in the area that's less than 4 feet, the state wants more, ledge probes, so I didn't want to keep going out, I just probed the heck out of it and they were happy with it.

K. Kustra asked just to clarify something you have total number of acres 9 and under the current use, land use, change tax lien, it's 9.218. R. Blaisdell replied I didn't add up all the...it's 4.14 plus 5.07.

T. Giffen asked any other concerns. What do you think on the site walk? Are you satisfied with the degree of probing that he's done?

J. Lindsey commented I don't know what that means. Seeing is believing; you can probe the heck out of a piece of land but when you actually see it. I know you can build it; you virtually can build anywhere because you have the technology but is it the smart thing to do; with a lot of ledge, slope. I'm a little concerned. R. Blaisdell said these will be mirror...there's already about 4 other houses. This is almost the same exact conditions. T. Giffen said I've driven the area, I don't recollect the specific topography lot by lot but in general I would say it's somewhat uniform from driving past. Not stopping and walking out there, I can understand a concern. J. Lindsey replied when I see those other houses, how steep they are, yikes. R. Blaisdell said the one with the steepest came to our last meeting and he loves his lot. That was the one, four lots. These will be flat for 20 feet. The other lots aren't flat for 20 feet; they're flat for 3 feet. With the *state's (unintelligible)* requirements they will have to be flat for 20 feet. J. Bedard asked so they're sloping down in the back. R. Blaisdell replied the road's high and it's dropping down. J. Bedard continued but the house is here and it slopes here. Where the proposed septic is, is that sloping as well? R. Blaisdell replied yes, it's all going downhill. What they'll probably do is put the septic on the road side of the house and the house kind of acts like a dam so rather than dirt going and going and going, you have the road; you have the septic and the house. It's like a retaining wall. It would be more efficient with fill if you put it in front of the house. T. Giffen commented it is quite a drop down in there.

A. Hall asked looking at this lot relative to the residential homes on North Road it occurs to me that all waters or septic, or whatever drains towards the houses on North Road. This lot abuts lots on North Road. R. Blaisdell said yes, the same drainage pattern will be continued. A. Hall continued the geographic lay of the land is from New Boston Road to North Road and some areas; you have to take a ladder to climb from part of your lot up to New Boston Road. There are some areas that are very steep. R. Blaisdell replied several of the lots; they've cut big areas for the views. I have a builder that wants these lots. He's already getting the other two and he wants these two. He knows; he's built a lot of houses; he's been on the ground, its a few extra loads of dirt basically. The house will be 600 feet from the property lines. These lots are 852 feet long, 4 acre and 5 acre. They're a long ways away. T. Giffen said there's a wetlands area in between when you get to the back of the lots. K. Kustra said there's a brook that runs through here into the pond on North Road. R. Blaisdell said yes but not on these lots. This isn't running water here.

Abutter Paul Hunter of 392 New Boston Road introduced himself and said I have a couple of concerns. Dennis may have addressed one. There is a culvert pipe, which I tend to try to keep open and my concern is what are the assurances that on the lot where he's going to build, right where he put the driveway stake, give or take five feet, one way or the other is the exit of that pipe. What's the assurance that it's going to continue through properly? Secondly, there's a natural flow in that area for water that runs down. My concern is that they start filling it, the house lot, is that going to drive the water over towards my property, which would be the water running from the culvert pipe, is that now going to be washing out my backyard. There's a culvert pipe just down the road from me that gets clogged a lot of times and the water runs across the street and washes out Tony's yard. I was looking at the grade of the road and my concern is

that if it does get blocked by this building, where will the water go across the street. Will it go across the front yard? Third, there's no full survey that I've seen. There's no markers put in, there's not a corner marker. Where my property is nobody knows where the markers are. When I bought it from previous owner's they didn't know. What assures where he's building it, it hasn't been fully surveyed as far as I'm concerned. That's basically it. R. Blaisdell responded I was out there two days ago and every corner is there except for the one next to your house. Because when they built your house, they buried it. I reset it. So every corner is there. I saw them a couple of days ago. I can't block the culvert. If I do, they'll make you fix it. We're not going to change the drainage pattern. They'll be a house right up near...40 feet off the road and the drainage will continue where it is. If we all of a sudden start pushing it on the side and there's a problem it has to be addressed. T. Giffen asked how wide is the house lot. R. Blaisdell replied 235 feet wide and the house would be centered. T. Giffen said and a house if 40-50 feet wide. The house would act as a deflector if water were flowing downhill from New Boston; tend to push it off to either side a little bit? R. Blaisdell replied depending on how they do it. T. Giffen replied I'm thinking it's wide enough it's not going to have an effect out to the lot line. Any effect from the house going in place will be restricted to the immediate vicinity of the house but I'm not a drainage engineer. R. Blaisdell replied this house will be as far off the road as his house is. T. Giffen asked the abutter if he was okay with the answer to the culvert question. P. Hunter replied yes, as long as it's followed through with it. T. Giffen said we've talked about the drainage. R. Blaisdell said I'm not allowed to push water onto someone else. We're not going to put the house right on the property line. I'm going to be doing the septic designs too. I do them for this particular buyer. We want to center it so everyone's got more privacy. From where the driveways; it's going to be pitching from one side to the other so you get a more gradual pitch to the house to meet it on that particular lot. T. Giffen asked the abutter about the third issue. P. Hunter replied he said he addressed that there is supposedly...*(unintelligible)*. J. Bedard said the survey. R. Blaisdell continued there's a granite bound flush on the edge of your lawn.

D. Lewis said I did go over today because I couldn't find any bound there. I went over several times and couldn't find it. The Hunters were there one day when I was looking for it but he reset one today, right in the lawn, just to the right of your driveway. It's flush in the ground, it's hard to see but it's there. R. Blaisdell replied I didn't want the lawnmower to hit it. I put it in when you told me you couldn't find it. There's 3 feet of fill there and I started digging and said I might as well set a new one. There was one there.

C. Robie said did you reference off of Mr. Hunter's driveway going the opposite way and check his subdivision and make sure he's got 200 feet? R. Blaisdell responded I created his lot. It's all been surveyed. C. Robie replied okay. Did you verify that when you were out there putting in corner markers or did you just go from...R. Blaisdell replied no, I already had my survey. I didn't tape measure to the other one. C. Robie said you measured west to east to put in a corner marker in his lawn, is that the way you measured it? R. Blaisdell replied no I found my other bounds that are already there and I had a nail in the road and I used those to reconstruct it. But I set all of these. You don't re-measure it all over again. I've already done the whole subdivision. If that was a lot created by someone else, I would certainly locate again. C. Robie replied I'm just questioning the fact that you dug in 3 feet of fill, when you build on a lot; you don't fill a lot that isn't going with that house. We just talked about sending water onto another lot. R. Blaisdell replied they put the driveway about 20 or so feet from the property line and filled it just a little. C. Robie said I understand that but I want to make sure Mr. Hunter's lot has 200 feet of frontage according to the subdivision that...R. Blaisdell replied 204.35. Paul Frazier said I'm not an abutter, I was on the other lots that he did on New Boston Road. When did you do these test pits on these lots? Did you create them when you did all the other lots? Did you dig those test pits? R. Blaisdell replied I did a lot of them at the same time. P. Frazier said because you owned all the land and you created those three or four houses that are there, did you do the test pits on those two lots or that one lot? R. Blaisdell said I did them all. P. Frazier said at the same time so you didn't go out there a few weeks ago and do test pits. R. Blaisdell said no. J. Bedard asked how long ago was that. R. Blaisdell replied the first time I was there was 2000. Then when I started the subdivision again, I went out and checked the probes with my shovel and they were fine for

these lots. P. Frazier said you said you went 4 feet on that 9 acre lot where you're trying to make two out of? R. Blaisdell said I don't have the data right in front of me. P. Frazier replied I thought you just said when we were talking about the septic; I thought you said you were like 4 feet down? R. Blaisdell replied 4 feet or 5 feet, I don't have the. I did 30 test pits; I don't remember every single one. P. Frazier said I'm just surprised you went that deep because that's all ledge there. R. Blaisdell said it's ledgy further down. There's zero ledge. P. Frazier said okay. C. Robie said 18 inches to 2 feet is the state requirement. R. Blaisdell replied they want you to average a couple of feet and beyond your receiving area it has to be at least 3-1/2 feet and that's what I did when I was there a month ago. I got the pin and pounded it down, the state came out and they approved it. T. Giffen said the most recent work was related to probing, that was a month ago and the state was there. They saw the probing and they provided you with an approval. R. Blaisdell said I did have an excavator out there. T. Giffen continued but the test pits were actually dug back 17 years. R. Blaisdell said and quite often I do those older projects, they want me to verify it so I get a shovel. The soil doesn't change. Wetlands can change. T. Giffen replied but if conditions have changed with respect to drainage and flow of water on the property there might be some variance there and that 17 years is a long time. R. Blaisdell replied and that's why I did re-dig them with a shovel. I hit the water table at 2 feet. I dug down 2 feet and it stayed the same and the drainage hasn't changed. J. Bedard asked if he was a licensed septic designer. R. Blaisdell responded I'm a licensed septic designer, wetlands scientist, land surveyor. J. Bedard said you still need to get permitted for the septic install so they need to re-look at the test pits. R. Blaisdell replied no, these are good. J. Bedard said but you don't have a design yet. You just said you're going to design it. R. Blaisdell replied when we find out how many bedrooms the guy wants and the exact size of the house, I will go out and set bench marks. J. Bedard replied but that's still going to go back to the state to for approval, to get the design approved. R. Blaisdell replied yes. J. Bedard said so they'll have to approve those test pits and know when they were done. R. Blaisdell replied they'll be looking at it again. R. Cartier replied that the test pit data is in the application, both from the 2000 and from the update that he did in September, it looks fine to me.

A. Hall asked you did the test pits 17 years ago, how many houses were built in that time in that local that might have been affected by this engineering study. R. Blaisdell responded the houses downhill the lots already had houses on them. We're not building a shopping center with 500 foot wide pavement. It's just a house with a little driveway 900 feet away from the nearest property line and another 400 feet per house so by the time you get there, all the leaves...goes in. These are 12" culverts, ditch minor runoff. We have culverts every 200 feet catching those small pockets. There's no major drainage.

D. Murray commented I wonder if Mr. Blaisdell can assure us that the driveways won't be any more than 10% grade. R. Blaisdell replied on one of the lots he didn't build it right and you said re-build it. If you don't build it right you don't get a permit. D. Lewis replied I think when I checked that one it was 16% and they did change it and it just makes it. It's very steep and they don't park down there in the winter time. They have to park up by the road. It's a steep driveway. R. Blaisdell replied these houses will be 40 feet off; he's like 150 feet off. D. Lewis said the setback is 50 feet off the wall so you go in 20 flat it's going to drop off immediately down to the house. R. Blaisdell said it will be like the houses next to it. They don't make it work then you make them make it work. C. Robie said on the 10% rule here is that something we have in our zoning? Do we have anything in the zoning that says the driveway has to go to the house? D. Murray said I don't believe so. C. Robie continued so if you went in 30 feet flat and made a driveway and a set of steps down to your house, how's that? D. Murray said I would think that's sufficient. C. Robie continued so we ought to re-look at the 10% rule for the driveway. You have to park your car off the street out of the right of way. It's a gray area. D. Lewis replied if the driveway does go to the house and it's over 10%, the fire apparatus and ambulance or something and it's icy, that's a steep driveway. Go in flat and have steps, we shouldn't do away with the grade requirement for the driveways. P. Frazier said who's going to build a house, put a driveway in at the top of the hill and then walk to the house. T. Giffen said people like to drive to their house and park in the garage or immediately in front of it. P. Frazier said whoever's going to develop this; they need to make it presentable to the buyer so they'll love living there

versus just being a struggle going into their house all the time, into their driveway all the time. They're going to keep handing the problem off to someone else. These are tough lots to do. They'll be pulling miracles out of their hat to do that. But like Judi said you can build anywhere and you can as long as you bring in enough fill and make it look good. Is it going to look like a house that belongs in the country or like their trying to build on the side of Mount Washington? R. Blaisdell replied these houses are beautiful. C. Robie agreed, they're fine. T. Giffen replied you've got a piece of land and people would like to build something and if it's practically achievable and safety concerns are met. C. Robie said the driveway at Maple Hill Farm is directly across from you and its way over 10% straight uphill. T. Giffen commented I'm sure it's achievable within the regulations that it can be done. P. Frasier said and they walk to that house in the winter time.

T. Giffen said we need to accept the application and since this is a minor, we normally handle it the same night. Once we accept the application, if we do so, we would then act on that application.

R. Cartier said I did the review and the only comments I had was we needed a letter on the driveway from the Road Agent and that's here. And the other was that the driveways on the abutting properties are not shown. Based on that, the application appears to be complete.

MOTION:

J. Bedard **motioned** to accept the application as complete. K. Kustra **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (7-0-0).**

A. Hall commented park up near the road instead of way down. Candia is rolling hills. From the front it look like a Cape Cod house and from the back is 3 stories. R. Blaisdell replied they'll be a walk out basement. A lot of these lots they made it clear cut for several hundred feet and now they have a heck of a view. To each his own, some people want to live in a field. I have a builder who wants these lots. They look south.

T. Giffen asked the subject of a site walk was raised, how do you feel? J. Lindsey replied I'm okay. R. Cartier said I have two suggestions on the driveways; you might want to get approval from the Fire Chief on what the final design is for safety access to the house. If it doesn't go to the house, they'll be an issue from a public safety standpoint. R. Blaisdell replied driveways always go to the house from what I see. R. Cartier continued the Fire Department changed two driveways in that section, Lencke's driveway was moved because of the pitch. There are ways to do it in that area. I'm comfortable that the driveways will be done properly but 10% is a steep driveway. The culverts, there are 3 shown on New Boston Road. You don't have any problems with the culverts. D. Lewis replied no. The one Mr. Hunter was referring to is further down where all the water comes off from Walnut Hill field and drags leaves down, during a good hard rainstorm I can go there 3 or 4times to clear it open. None on these three. Just make sure the driveways don't plug them up.

T. Giffen commented a driveway permit can't be granted until the subdivision has taken place. When the builder goes for the driveway permit it will be subject to the normal oversight and approval that would have to take place so we have assurance that it will be a safe driveway when it's done. That's when the Fire Chief would weigh in. R. Blaisdell commented I have it in writing on the plan; he has to be held to it. T. Giffen said I'm not concerned myself.

MOTION:

C. Robie **motioned** to approve the application as submitted. R. Cartier **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (7-0-0).**

R. Blaisdell commented I've been coming to meetings here for 40 years; you're one of the better boards this Town has had. T. Giffen replied the idea is to treat everybody equally, fairly and act in accordance with our regulations with the intent of the master plan. That's what we're here for. If we deviate from that it's by mistake. R. Blaisdell replied I appreciate it.

**Informational MTAG (*Municipal Technical Assistance Grant*) Grant Update with SNHPC:**

Carol Ogilvie and Nate Miller to speak to the Planning Board regarding mapping and data analysis for the MTAG grant zoning project.

Present: Carol Ogilvie; Nate Miller from SNHPC

C. Ogilvie said we're here so Nate can give you information about the request I had submitted in writing last week for some mapping work that we feel is important to the project as we get a little farther along. I forwarded the September monthly report that went to Plan NH so that you are aware that we had 2 public input sessions in September that were both not hugely attended but I was satisfied with the attendance. Nate came to both of those meetings so we could do live polling of the questionnaire. Since then I've continued to collect responses from the online survey, I have 60 back as of today. Those all continue to support the master plan interest in the four corner areas. I'm not hearing anything contrary to what we thought we knew when we started. Friday night (*October 20<sup>th</sup>*) we're having another public session and Nate will provide us with some maps, I want people to draw the boundaries where they think this district should be around the four corners. I have about 30 photos and we'll do a visual preference survey. I have from the questionnaire survey what people say they want for uses in this district, so I have buildings that represent various designs for residential and non-residential. After that, I will be ready to start sketching out a zoning draft and will be back in front of you on November 1<sup>st</sup> to give you the outline as to where my thoughts are going. Dependent upon your reaction, I will prepare the first draft ordinance and I will be back late November or early December to hopefully get into public hearing.

T. Giffen commented the full picture of what this would all work out to be, it would be productive to do something along the lines of a build out study. To do the build out study, support that property, would require assistance from Southern New Hampshire Planning.

N. Miller from SNHPC stated there are two things at play here. First is that as Carol mentioned she's requested some mapping assistance to get her to the end of the project that she's working on. We put together a draft agreement for the Town's consideration. It's a series of four maps that Carol has outlined and we can provide those maps. Base maps over aerial photos showing parcel lines in the four corners area; existing land use with parcel lines in the four corners area. Once Carol's gone through the public process and has reached some level of consensus among the members of the community about what a district may look like, we would provide some assistance in developing some base mapping of that district to complement Carol's work. There's the mapping component, that's one thing. Once Carol's work is complete on this project, ultimately her deliverable is going to be some recommendations related to a potential four corners zoning district essentially that recommends some changes in the land use regulations as it relates to housing and non-residential development in that four corners district. One of the things that's been discussed is the product of Carol's work, if that was to be implemented, what would that mean in real life in terms of development potential in the four corners area. To develop that picture of development potential, we would do what's called a build out analysis. We would take a look at all of the property that comprises any potential four corners district. We would look at that property in the context of what the development constraints are. What properties are already built out? We have to go property to property to determine what's been built out, what's underdeveloped and could be developed more and what is completely undeveloped. Then when we focus in on the underdeveloped and undeveloped properties we need to take into consideration the constraints to development. So where are the wetlands; steep slopes; flood plain areas; those types of environmental factors and we do that using something called Geographic Information System or a GIS. I've started to put together a cost estimate of what I think a build out for the four corner areas would cost. The trickiest part of developing a build out analysis, it has to be done with GIS. The Town doesn't have GIS parcel data. You're parcel data, which shows on your tax maps, are AutoCAD lines. So there's some pretty tedious work that needs to go into making those parcel lines,

polygons that we can then attach data to in a GIS system. It's a little bit technical but my estimated cost for a build out for the four corners area is \$5,600. \$1,280 dollars of that is GIS parcel data development. If the Town has access to GIS parcel data, we could reduce our cost substantially but it is a tedious job to convert AutoCAD lines to functional GIS parcels. They really need to be functional GIS parcels in order to determine what's existing today there. So we need to attach the building and assessing data to those parcels in order to do the analysis. We can't do that with AutoCAD lines. That's the biggest hurdle. The Department of Revenue Administration has a state wide parcel mosaic. They collect the most current parcel data from every Town in the state. I asked them what they had for Candia and they sent me what they had and it's AutoCAD lines. If you look at the publicly available, for instance DRA parcel data, there's a big hole in Candia. All the Towns around have it but Candia for whatever reason, whoever your vendor that did your tax mapping in the past, worked on AutoCAD. And that's fine but I took a look at the AutoCAD data that was provided and there are stream banks crossing parcel lines and wetland delineation crossing parcel lines and a lot of AutoCAD layers that we need to be removed from that in order to make usable parcels that reflect your tax maps. It's a tedious process.

J. Lindsey asked is the Granit the same as GIS? N. Miller replied Granit is statewide and an acronym for geographic resource something of information. Basically it's a publicly accessible GIS data repository. You can download things like wetlands. J. Lindsey asked can you use Granit. N. Miller said yes for those constraint analyses when we're looking at wetlands; steep slopes; environmental constraints, we can get a lot of that from Granit but we still need the GIS. The parcel data is what Granit won't be able to give us and we have to develop that. If I could rely on Granit data and the Town had existing parcel data, my cost is \$1,300 dollars cheaper to be able to do that. But we need to go through a conversion process. AutoCAD lines don't intersect, you end up with a parcel that doesn't connect and you have to manually flag all those error points and correct them and make sure they reflect what your actual tax maps are, it's tedious.

A. Hall asked would that be only for the four corners area or for the entire Town. N. Miller replied once we do it, we would do it for the entire Town. It behooves us to be able to have that data accessible for future planning work. We would make that available to the Town if you had use for it. The last time that parcel data was developed for the Town was 2009. That's actual GIS parcels that have been converted from AutoCAD. They're 8 years old. I could use those for the purpose of mapping but when I go to attach assessing data, every time you guys approve a subdivision or a lot line adjustment from 2009 to the present; those parcels have changed a little bit. They won't really be usable. Now there are 3 or 4 lots where there was one. We need a current data set.

N. Miller summarized so there are two different things at play. One is Carol's immediate mapping needs to support the four corners planning effort and that's the agreement for the four maps; that I've sent for your review. The build out analysis would happen after Carol's work is complete. We really need Carol's work product to do the build out because what happens if the regulations change.

C. Ogilvie reiterated the Planning Board's contribution of \$2,500 (*for the MTAG Grant*) has to be a cash match which is 25% of the \$10,000 so its \$12,500 total. C. Robie replied you're going to take some of the \$2,500 that you didn't spend and use it for the mapping. N. Miller said yes, it would be an eligible match for the Town to document as part of your match commitment. C. Robie confirmed so you need some funding for a build out analysis. You have the funding for the mapping for Friday out of the \$2,500. C. Ogilvie agreed. C. Robie continued they're looking for the funding for a build out analysis for after. If you're going to spend \$12,500 to write a zoning ordinance, she ought to have some documentation on what it's going to do. Have it fail or pass, you need to have that documentation. A Hall asked about the spending and invoicing. C. Ogilvie said with the NH Housing and Finance Authority you have to spend the Town money down first before the Town gets reimbursed so no invoices have been submitted yet. When I put the budget together, I anticipated that the \$2,500 would go for things like food for the public events, any printing, press releases, and those sorts of things. I was unsure at the time what we would be doing for

mapping. For the other things that I've been doing, I never would have gotten to \$2,500 and we need the mapping.

J. Bedard asked how come you haven't submitted any invoices. C. Ogilvie explained that the Town has to spend its money first before the consultant can be paid and we're not there yet. J. Bedard asked so the Town's money can't be spent on your work, your invoices? C. Ogilvie said no. I will be paid from the grant itself so that goes to plan NH but the Town has to spend its money down first. Just from bookkeeping perspective I would rather do 2 invoices. When we're at a point, I'll submit one and then at the end I'll submit one. I think with this mapping we'll be at a point where I'll be able to submit that invoice for the Town. The grant is \$10,000 and the Town has to match 25% cash. C. Robie said we spend \$2,500 and we'll get \$10,000; \$12,500. Now Mr. Miller wants to know if we want to do a build out analysis so when all this information comes in we can tell people this is what it's going to look like in so many years or not. There's no sense of spending \$12,000 if we have no idea what's going to happen.

T. Giffen summarized the Town needs to spend \$2,500 to facilitate this whole thing. That's our match. The \$10,000 MTAG Grant goes to fund all of your efforts (*Carol*) and then the build out analysis is additional, above and beyond and that would help provide a really accurate picture of what the whole thing would look like. The Planning Board has spent a little money with Stantec and will be paying the \$2,500 for MTAG, so we have the funding. It's available to do within the budget. C. Robie said it has to be completed so it can be ready to vote and have public hearings. T. Giffen said if it runs over into January, we can encumber the funds.

R. Cartier asked if the maps to be done would show the zoning or straight area maps. C. Ogilvie replied for Friday's exercise it won't show the zoning. I want people to just look at the area and think about where a district should be without being encumbered by existing zoning.

R. Cartier also suggested they look at High Street and the Purington property regarding that they can't have any more access to the state road because of a state law put in place in the 60's. He wanted to develop and he was told by the state that he couldn't add another access because of a state law that was in place that if certain frontage was on a state road you could only have two access points on the entire thing. T. Giffen replied it's a law that came in around 1970 that has to do with subdivision that took place after that where there was a limited number of driveway accesses permitted for a given lot that was subject to subdivision.

C. Robie said we're going to show maps with just space. No houses, no zoning, just lots. It's an existing lot with issues that can be worked out over time. You could put in a road and two driveways off a new road, there's numerous ways to get things done.

R. Cartier said also for the build out analysis there are also problems with water availability, which is why the 55+ housing has not been built due to significant water issues; that should be looked at in the build out analysis. I'm not sure about septic, those would probably be ok. Potential financial impacts of the re-zoning, what kinds were you looking at? T. Giffen replied changes in the tax base. C. Robie replied revenue. C. Ogilvie replied yes, once we have a sense of what kinds of development could happen in that area in the future, and then we can get an estimate of what the value of that development would be and what impact it would have on the tax rate. R. Cartier said would there be an impact on safety services, schools, things like that. You'll have commercial but if it has residential above it; I was wondering about the financial impacts; income vs. potential cost to the Town. C. Ogilvie said I don't think we'll go that far at this point. N. Miller confirmed that we're not going to quantify the cost of community services, that's a different animal. We're looking primarily at development potential. R. Cartier continued and so you're going to come back to the Board with some recommendations for re-zoning of the area that's come up with by the groups that are doing this and that will be the first step. It's not the end all. A good solid beginning.

C. Ogilvie said the meeting on Friday is at the school at 6:30 pm with pizza.

N. Miller replied you make a good point about water availability. I believe we have access to some Town wide well yield data. We just looked at similar data for Chester for the Crowley Woods development of regional impact. That area we did flag in our comment letter that the well yield data for that area of the

Town of Chester was the lowest anywhere in the Town of Chester. I think we have similar data for the Town of Candia so we should be able to do some level of analysis looking at water availability.

T. Giffen summarized said so we need to get the mapping done and spend the money to provide the match. We're talking about spending \$1,280 out of the money that's already committed of that \$2,500 for this specific purpose that will get us closer to expending the total of \$2,500 that we need to expend in order to have the grant funds flow. The grants already approved and we're committed to spending the \$2,500. It's a necessary step.

A. Hall asked Nate if you can conceptualize the potential impact of the state federal 10 year budget; the safety effect of 27/43 (*road improvements*) part of that corner is right in the middle of this project and conceptually if that goes forward how is that going to affect or destroy whatever we do for the four corners, center of Town. Do we put the center of Town at the top of High Street? N. Miller replied the first thing is if you look at the 10 year plan for Candia, improvements to route 27, 43 and Raymond Road. That's the entire description of the project in the 10 year plan. There is no engineering design, nothing has been pre-determined from an engineering perspective. DOT when they start preliminary engineering on that project, they will come to the Town and develop a series of design alternatives that may look very different and the Town will work with the DOT through their public process which includes both public informational meetings and public hearings to refine a design that meets the consensus of the people in the Town. There is a considerable budget, \$6.1 million in the 10 year plan, 2027 or 2028 for this project. The DOT will work with the Town on an engineering design when it gets to that point. About 12 years ago in Meredith DOT had a reconstruction project there and DOT came in and told the Town of Meredith that their main street needed to be six lanes wide based on traffic. The Town was not interested in that and they worked together for some time to develop a design that did fit the vision for the Town. They've come along way.

R. Cartier said what you're doing is pre-emptive because it will be a plan of this area that has been determined by the Town so when the state does decide what they want to do, we can say look this is what the Town wants to have for this area, this is going to be perfect. C. Ogilvie responded you want DOT to know what your wishes are even if it hasn't happened yet, but the plan is in place and DOT knows what you envision, they'll have to accommodate that. N. Miller continued regardless what happens from an infrastructure perspective in that area with the roads, what happens with the land and the land adjacent to that infrastructure is going to be governed by what's in the Town's regulations and presumably what comes out of Carol's work. What happens development wise doesn't change based on what happens to that intersection or that general area from a highway or bridge perspective. R. Cartier asked about the land uses on the contract. What do you mean by land uses? N. Miller said we have data from a Town level that shows where residential uses are, commercial uses are, based on where governmental or institutional uses are. There's a data set that exists statewide. It is reasonably accurate at the Town level. It's not a zoning map it's just showing whatever building this is or whatever's in this parcel is generally a non-residential use or a commercial use today in this area. This is a residential use. Its five broad categories of land uses; residential, commercial, industrial, institutional/governmental and open space. R. Cartier confirmed so it would show existing, even before zoning came in. N. Miller replied that land use data that I'm referring to is what is existing today.

#### MOTION:

C. Robie **motioned** the Select Board signed off on the \$2,500 on the Planning Board's recommendation. Carol is doing the project and she's recommending that the Planning Board release \$1,280 dollars of that \$2,500 to SNH for some mapping. A. Hall **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (7-0-0)**. *In answer to Rudy Cartier's question Tom Giffen is authorized to sign the contract as the Planning Board Chairman because this is part of that piece that's already been approved by the Select Board (\$2,500).*

C. Robie said why don't we see what Carol brings back with the drawings and maps and look at the first zoning recommendations and then as a Board we'll decide if we want to spend the money on it to see what the build out analysis will be. Because if it's nothing close to what the majority think it's going to look like to go to vote with, we have to vote on the change, if we're not going to vote to accept the zoning change, there's no sense in voting now to spend more money on an analysis that we might not even approve. N. Miller agreed, that's very prudent. C. Ogilvie said November 1<sup>st</sup> I'll be back. C. Robie said let's get that done, see what we've got say yes this looks like something the community might be interested in or no this isn't what we're interested in. T. Giffen replied procedurally that makes a lot of sense. We'll defer action on the second recommendation.

#### Other Business

R. Cartier asked about the Tremblay issue we continued that to November 1<sup>st</sup> and she (*Andrea*) hasn't heard anything about if it's on or not. A. Bickum replied I did get an email saying they found 8. T. Giffen said which is in agreement with what you thought. Good catch. Otherwise they could have had more pain and grief later on. Total of 8 lots they thought there were 5. A. Bickum said their lawyer came back with they found 8. T. Giffen said there are 3 across the street as well as the 5 on the side they're on. A. Bickum said I just put it back on them to go with whatever you're lawyer is finding out. C. Robie asked those ones across the street are they on the same subdivision though. T. Giffen said they certainly are and they're subject to the same restrictive covenants. C. Robie said we looked at that. It was two subdivision approvals. Two separate subdivision approvals. One for this side of the road, one for that side of the road. T. Giffen said really, okay. C. Robie continued so the one that they're on is 5 lots correct? T. Giffen said I think they want to include all 8 in this though to make sure there's no question *about (unintelligible)* getting a majority.

#### Lamprey River Report:

A. Hall said as a member of the Lamprey River Advisory Committee last spring a group from the committee prepared a report 20 years of progress 1996 – 2016 of the wild and scenic Lamprey River in New Hampshire and 3 copies of this report were given to each Town. One to be presented to the Selectmen, which I will do next week, Conservation Commission which I did last night and tonight to you as Chair of the Planning Board and would suggest each of the Planning Board take some time to read through it.

#### MOTION:

J. Lindsey **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 8:27 pm. A. Hall **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (7-0-0).**

**\*\*\*\*\*Zoning Review & Revision Committee Meeting to follow this meeting**

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrea Bickum  
Land Use Secretary  
cc file