

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of January 3, 2018
APPROVED
Public Hearing
Location: Henry Moore School Gymnasium

Present: Tom Giffen, Chair; Al Hall III, Vice Chair; Judi Lindsey; Rudy Cartier; Ken Kustra; Carleton Robie, BOS Representative.

Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dave Murray, Building Inspector; Dean Young, Fire Chief

Absent: Joyce Bedard; Mike Santa, Alt;

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

Minutes December 20, 2017:

C. Robie made a **motion** to approve the minutes of December 20, 2017 as presented. J. Lindsey **seconded**. R. Cartier; K. Kustra; and A. Hall **were in favor**. T. Giffen **abstained**. **Motion passed (5-0-1)**.

Present: Carol Ogilvie, consultant on the MTAG Grant/Zoning Amendments

Public Hearing on Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. The purpose of these amendments is to create a new and separate zoning district around the Four Corners area, in furtherance of specific 2017 Master Plan recommendations. The goal is to hear public input in order to finalize the amendment and submit it as a warrant article for the March ballot.

C. Ogilvie said I'll do a brief review for those of you that haven't been in attendance at our earlier meetings; what we're doing here, why we're here and how we got here. We had received a grant from NH Housing Finance Authority back in the summer to work on implementing a piece of the Master Plan that as you all know was recently adopted in Town. We're focusing on the Four Corners area. There were several areas in Town, some of you may have been involved in that Master Plan project; there were several areas identified in Town as being important planning areas, the Four Corners being one of them. The grant that we worked on focused on the Four Corners area. We couldn't take on all of the Master Plan recommendations to implement at once so we focused on that. We wrote the grant; we got the funding from NH Housing Finance Authority to move ahead with attempting to implement the recommendations that came out of the Master Plan for the Four Corners area. Specifically that was to create a separate district around the Four Corners area that would allow mixed moderate density residential with small scale commercial compatible with a village setting. We're keeping that in mind as we've gone ahead and drafted some zoning language to create that sort of opportunity in this area.

What we have done since we got the grant; we had public input sessions back in September. Some of you were involved. We established a Steering Committee and met in July and August and met a number of times to organize the public outreach sessions that are required by the grant. So we had those in September as part of that process. We had questionnaires that were distributed around Town, left at the Town offices, posted online for people to fill out. We also at the public meetings were able to do the questionnaires live on screen with the help of the staff person from SNHPC, Nate Miller was here and that was helpful. We also have a little spot on the Town website where the Town web person posts things, materials that I send to her, she posts them so people can go to the Town website and keep track of what materials we're creating and what information we're using. I've been back before the Planning Board twice to go over first of all the concept of the zoning that came out of this public outreach and the Master Plan

recommendations and then with an initial draft to the Planning Board to talk about that before we posted for this public hearing.

The area that we're talking about, the map on the left is you're existing zoning and the aerial on the right is giving you an idea of the area we're talking about. I have two maps that as we get into the discussion I'll put up on the screen so it's easier to see what we're talking about. This is the actual area of that for this initial concept, we have identified as a potential zoning district that is about 800 acres give or take, which is approximately 4½ percent of the total Town area. I have another map, a larger view of this particular area which shows various constraints that are attached to these lands; whether it's wetland or floor plain or lands that are publicly owned that can't be used for development, so those types of things that we can look at in more detail later. This is our first public hearing, state law requires that you have at least one for zoning and if any changes come out of the first hearing then you have to have another public hearing. After tonight's discussion, the Planning Board will need to decide whether or not to go to a 2nd public hearing. We have just time enough to have a 2nd public hearing in order to meet the deadlines again, statutory deadlines for getting this zoning amendment on the ballot. If that second public hearing happens, then the Planning Board has to decide at that point whether or not to take an amendment to ballot. So that's what we're doing here tonight and that concludes my explanation. I'll put the other map up so people can see that.

T. Giffen stated what we're here to do tonight is have a Planning Board work session followed by public input. This particular zoning amendment is a small piece of pursuing an implementation of the Master Plan. We've had Master Plans in the past. The Master Plans have generated a lot of good feeling but generally there hasn't been a whole lot of implementation of those plans. We come up with ideas, people seem to like them and there it sits. We're hoping to implement part of the Master Plan. As chair of the Planning Board we need to be guided by the Master Plan. We shouldn't have our own agenda. We should be attempting to do what the Townspeople wish us to do and the best expression that we have of that is the Master Plan and of course we get additional input at meetings such as this one. So that's the basic idea that I bring to it, I would hope the other members of the Board have similar feelings. What we're here to do tonight is discuss it among the Board, take public input. My goal tonight for the Board is to take the temperature so to speak, see where we stand, what our feelings are in terms of readiness and timeline on this.

C. Robie commented the Planning Board needs to have a work session here for a few minutes and discuss the draft that was put forward by Carol, seven weeks ago I think. I don't know how much time everybody spent with it, I know I've spent some time with it and I have some thoughts that I'd like to pass on that may or may not move this forward. C. Robie stated to my fellow Planning Board members and the public, after reviewing the draft before us, I have many concerns. Carol's component to this was housing and I understand that. The component that is before us tonight is a housing component that addresses our Four Corners and our business district according to our Master Plan. If you've read the Master Plan, which I'm sure most of you have, it talks about our mixed use district which is in the Four Corners area. With the limitations on the size of the lots it's very difficult if not impractical to attract and accommodate new growth and sustainable development in our Four Corners. That component of what she has given us is right on track to some extent. This is the first time that the Planning Board has had any type of workshop to work on this draft that Carol has presented. To look at the Master Plan, compare it to what Carol has given us, and make an assessment of what direction the community would like to consider. There is a need for some density or lot size change to make some housing more affordable for more people, which also attracts new revenue which we're going to need here shortly; we need it now. We need revenue and ways to increase that is through business and more density. I feel the size and the scope of the area that we've included in our first draft is extensive. I think we need to bring the size of our district to start with down to a size that is workable with the bypass. We're on a ten year plan with the State of NH to move some of the traffic through the Four Corners at an easier rate; I think that needs to be considered before we move too far ahead with any kind of ordinance or zoning change. Carol if you look at our #2 in our land use and planning

strategies, that's a very important piece of information. We need to do feasibility studies, build-out studies. All that information needs to be available before we can bring this to a Town vote. Personally, to my Planning Board members, I think we need some more time to get all of the elements of this together so when we do go to vote, we have something with some teeth in it that makes economic sense for our community now and in the future. Hopefully someone else (*on the Board*) will comment.

R. Cartier commented I do support the village district. I've supported it for many years going back to the Envision Candia, which was about 10 or 15 years ago that we did, that had a vision of having a village district basically what we're talking about there. I also helped out on one of the Master Planning committees that we did and the development for the Master Plan. I have to give Carol a lot of credit for what she did for work, there's a lot of good work in here. My biggest concern is the current size of the proposal. Its way beyond what I thought we had envisioned when we did the Envision Candia. My recollection is that we basically looked at an area from South Road going up High Street down to the Four Corners, then from the Four Corners down Deerfield Road to just after the school. Down Raymond Road to just about Blevens Drive and coming down Main Street to just where the cemetery and the church are. That was more the compact village district that I had envisioned and a lot of other people had envisioned back when we had this. One of the concerns with any zoning changes in Candia is to really look at what the land can handle as far as density and development. Jim Franklin actually gave me a map of the soil types and the water in the area around where the village district currently is now and that's one thing I think really needs to be looked at more than anything else. Is a half an acre lot proper for these areas? Some areas it's not. There's a lot of wetlands, the soils won't handle it. Going forward we need to take a look at that to see what the land itself can handle. The other thing that needs to be done is to reach out more to the property owners that are in that area to see what they would like. I'm talking about a more condensed and smaller sized area than we have in here because most of it right now is fairly commercial, there's some undeveloped land but the owners are the ones who are going to drive this. If we pass this, this is going to be an enabling of legislation because the Town's not going to do anything. All we're going to do is make it so the opportunity is there for someone who owns the property to do something with that property, hopefully and it should be, beneficial to the Town. We need some more time to work on this. I don't think we're going to be able to do this and have it on the warrant for this year. I think a lot of work needs to be done before we go ahead, just to do the actual details. The basic concept is there, that's fine. Some of the zoning, land use requirements in here, there's a few we need to look at in here to see if we want to allow that in the village district. I was looking at it of having small, medium commercial on ground floors with apartments or some kind of living space above them which is more of what I thought the village district was going to be, so those are my concerns.

T. Giffen said planning of course is for long range needs of the Town. What we'd like the Town to be a ways down the road. I don't think planning work should be done in haste and I don't think planning work needs to be rushed. To do a proper job for the Town, we need to take sufficient time to have due consideration. In this instance, we're still waiting for information from SNHPC that would map out some of the restrictions on the property; wetlands, how the lots could be built out. Without that information we're still just working around the edges of a concept because we don't really know what we can build in this district until we have that. It would be unfair to rush this, unfair to the Town. I'd like to take more time and see this more fully developed before it's submitted. Between now and deliberative session, I think it would be too much of a rush. The size of the district needs to be addressed. We can't address the size of it until we look at what the build out would be like and what we're actually trying to accomplish and compare the two. We need to have the information from SNHPC in order to facilitate an understanding of what the scope of this whole thing would be. Until we know the scope of it, we'd be crazy to put it to a vote, that's my personal opinion. The sense I got from Rudy and Carleton was proceeding with caution, with deliberation and with respect for the interests of the Town is the best way to proceed on this and that precludes getting it on the ballot this year. We need to be careful and thorough and there's not enough time to do that. What we have is a working draft. There's plenty of opportunity to take it apart piece by piece, look at it, decide what

we like, don't like and that should be done with as much input from the community as possible. We had a brief discussion of it at the last Planning Board meeting and there were strong opinions that came out and they need to be considered but I'd like to get a greater cross section of input tonight. I'm not sure how much we're going to accomplish at this meeting other than to decide if it makes sense to go forward this year or put it off to next so we can be more thorough on it. That's my feeling on it.

C. Robie agreed with Tom. Once again, there's a lot to be done. Carol's portion...her element of this was done excellently. She brought up a lot of points that need to be considered through her work. It opened up a lot of stuff that maybe we hadn't considered. SNHPC is supposed to get some maps but it calls for that, it's based on the findings. The Planning Board will be better equipped to develop a new village zoning district for the Town with mixed use but we have to know what it will sustain and what techniques you're going to use to develop that. I'm sure Carol will be back to work on her element of this with us, I hope she will, and on some of the other elements. She's very capable of doing that but as a Planning Board, we need to consider these other issues. A bypass, commercial, residential; you're not going to have a vibrant center without people living in it or nearby it so it has to be that mix. You have to make that happen or at least put the zoning in place so it could happen. We can't make it happen but if we create opportunities for the people, the landowners, the developers and we have some type of mechanism where they can come to the Planning Board and be received and the Planning Board and the community is willing to work with them, we could accomplish some of these goals. It can be done, it's done in other communities and their thriving, doing well and people are anxious to go there and spend their dollars. I'm a budget and revenue guy; for the last 10 years in my community; and to me creating ways and creating value to collect new revenue is very important to communities in Southern NH today if they are going to be sustainable moving forward.

T. Giffen turned it over to public input.

Carmelle Druchniak of 23 Merrill Road asked can someone go through the map on the screen right now as it talks about development constraints. I can't read it but I think that would be helpful to know in that targeted area what are the constraints?

C. Ogilvie replied the categories of the constraints are; floodplain and lakes and ponds in blue, with the hatch it's wetland, the dark green is steep slope, the light green is the entire boundary, black is the publicly owned land, the line around the wetland and the water is the 100' wetland buffer that's required by zoning. Out of the entire 821+ acres here, around which this arbitrary line was drawn, 486 of those acres have some kind of constraint attached to them so they would be unavailable for development. That's 59.2% of this land and I would just quickly speak to the size, I've heard a couple of comments about the size of the district. Again, we did wrestle with that, I had a small revision when I started this project but then when we started looking at some of these constraints, the challenge is to try to include enough land so when you take out the land that's not developable, you've got enough left so you can actually do something with it but we may have gone too far in the other direction. That's why we're having this discussion tonight.

Boyd Chivers of 165 Depot Road had some concerns: Carol's already answered my first question; how did this thing get from 420 acres to 871 acres and I accept your answer; I understand it now. My second question is one of our objectives is moderate density housing. Is ½ acre lots considered moderate density and beyond that you can get this down to ¼ acre zoning. You could get two multi-family dwellings on a ½ acre. So that works out to one dwelling unit per every ¼ acre. Is that considered moderate density?

C. Ogilvie responded it depends. In many places a half acre would be considered moderate if you've got an acre or 2 acre zoning; Candia has 2 and 3 so it really depends. The primary reason with going with ½ an acre for this first round was its always dependent on the water and sewer; that's the minimum. The zoning could say a minimum of ½ acre. If the water and sewer can't accommodate it on that then the lot just has to be as big as it has to be to accommodate the proposed use. It's also from planning perspective, I thought about starting with an acre because it seemed less dramatic to what you have already but if things actually started to happen and people decided that they liked it and wanted it to be even more dense, it's very hard

to get to ½ an acre after that because things could be put in place that would make it difficult to go smaller. That was the reason at the time.

B. Chivers continued Carleton referenced our Master Plan and woven throughout that Master Plan is Candia's desire to maintain its rural identity. How can taking 871 acres out of the core of Candia and chopping it up into ¼ acre lots help preserve Candia's rural identity?

C. Ogilvie reiterated again everything being relative that represents 4% of the Town and I would say one more time that this was our initial attempt to grab the land that seemed to have the most opportunity. That's why we're here tonight, to have this discussion. It's not the whole Town, it's a piece of it, it may very well be too much but that's exactly why we're here tonight.

B. Chivers continued all those little workshops we had throughout the summer, they all contemplated a village district based on this slide that you presented right here. The focus of the project was the Four Corners area. That's 420 acres, I think a lot of people would have supported that but when this doubled in size, you get this kind of public opposition. My last question is this when this thing goes to the ballot, how do you describe this Four Corners area? Your proposal has a very odd shape to it so how do you describe this on the ballot for people to vote on? Is it by tax map and lot or is it a certain distance from the lights?

C. Ogilvie replied it could be a couple of different ways, in this case, we followed the property lines, it could be a combination of tax map identification as well as the official map, you have the zoning map for Candia so this would represent an amendment to that map. If this were to go on the ballot and pass, it would be replacing, so there would have been a couple of questions; to create this and at the same time changing the boundaries of the underlying zoned districts. So there would have to be a couple of questions to accommodate that. B. Chivers continued my last question is will you make any effort to determine whether the soils can support this thing before we do permit ½ acre zoning? Evaluate the soils and potential for water? C. Ogilvie responded we don't have the resources on-site analysis for all this land, even if it was a much smaller district, we just don't have that and most towns don't. That is why, as I said earlier, the water and sewer needs will always determine the lot size. Even if a state permit is needed, if they have a minimum of a certain acreage for a particular sized septic system, if the soils don't make it work then the lot just has to be expanded until they can make that system work. That's part of the permitting process.

Jacqueline Wilkins of 134 Adams Road commented all things being *rallied (unintelligible)* during this land grab, where's your house? C. Ogilvie replied I don't live in Candia. J. Wilkins replied exactly. So as a person who owns livestock and lives on Adams Road, *running (unintelligible)* a little green area, I'm totally against this. A little village community with cute little shops is one thing but when you're bringing in housing development, multiple units, you're taking away what makes Candia village great. So I'm opposed. As far as notification not everybody's online, not everybody makes it into Town Hall or the Library or goes on the website so is there a way to do a mailing for the outskirts and the whole population of Candia to become aware of this? If you could send a booklet to everybody, I think everybody could get a little notice and find out the full gist of this. Thirdly, why are we taking this land and I don't know who owns it so who's buying it? Are we purchasing the Four Corners spots where the Farmer's Wife is where the...what are we doing, who's getting that money and who's paying that money? Why aren't we developing the mall that exists where Granite State is and making that into something? If you have to spend money why not take it put it where there's already a development, a community of businesses? That's it.

T. Giffen replied the basic idea behind zoning is not for the Town to spend any money but instead to provide for zoning that supports the type of Town that we wish to have. J. Wilkins said you have to purchase that property. T. Giffen replied no, no we don't. The Town doesn't purchase anything. J. Wilkins said they'll be no rent paid to the people that own that land? T. Giffen responded the people that own that land would be freer to develop it in accordance with the regulations than they are under the current regulations. For example they'd be able to have a building that might have a restaurant in the first floor and a single unit apartment on the second floor. That could exist where it couldn't now. J. Wilkins commented about financing. T. Giffen replied there's no financing of any kind. The Town doesn't spend anything. All

we're thinking of doing is putting something in place that would enable the landowners to do something that would benefit the Town and produce a build-out that would be more like what we want. J. Wilkins replied right but wouldn't it be better in a place that's already developed than take away the natural look of the rural setting, that's my thought. T. Giffen replied, again, we're still working on a concept, this is very preliminary, as it's drawn right now it includes the area where Pasquale's had been, the bank and so forth. It's all open to discussion, nothing is set in stone. This is not a finalized concept by any stretch. But the big idea with any type of zoning is to put something in place that enables the type of use that the Town wants and then it's up to whomever owns the property if it makes economic sense for them. J. Wilkins commented we don't want the housing developments. T. Giffen replied we'd have to modify the proposal and again, we're at early stages. J. Wilkins reiterated and then the mailing. T. Giffen replied typically what we do when we have public hearings is that we notice them by posting in the Post Office, the Library places where people commonly go. I suppose mailing is possible if there was some sort of large meeting planned, we haven't contemplated it but mailings have been done in the past, it's not out of the question. Does that help? J. Wilkins replied if it gets done it would be really helpful.

Josh Pouliot said I'm new to Town, the last lot on Patten Hill Road, #62. I like the idea of this and in fact with the property I have I was envisioning it someday having some business capabilities to it. I was wondering how you chose the weird shape, why it's cut off in some places? C. Ogilvie reiterated again, it really wasn't a specific science to this. I met with Nate Miller at the Planning Commission who has a lot of mapping already developed for Candia. So we sat down and looked at properties that he had some knowledge already of what some of these constraints were so that's really how the lines got expanded a little bit because he recognized that there were huge pieces of property that simply would have to be taken out of the calculation and just for practical reasons we tried to follow property lines so that lots wouldn't be divided by the zoning boundary. J. Pouliot replied we're talking about 4 ½ percent of the Town so I get the whole we want to keep Candia rural thing but I think we can definitely find between the community and the area that everyone can agree on that can be developed for what we're trying to do so I'm supportive of it if we can just arrange it so everyone's happy.

A. Hall asked Carol as I recall the original design of the village was approximately this size but then because it extended to Adams Road, seemed to be a little far. You shrunk the village area down but now it seems like you've expanded it again. C. Ogilvie replied it was only expanded once. The first time I came before you it was smaller than it is now but when I went back and met with Nate and we looked at...one of the things we're taking into consideration was your school situation here with declining school population and it just seemed at least to us at the time it would make sense to try to get some properties in there that could accommodate some starter homes. And that was the reason for the expansion to the North. It's really only expanded one time since the original presentation. A. Hall continued is the intent to convert commercial zoning to residential zoning because much of the area on this map is commercial zoning of different types to put residences there, you're going to have to change that. C. Ogilvie replied within the draft, because you have a carefully organized zoning ordinance right now, I tried as much as possible to stay within the format of your existing ordinance and not write a brand new thing. So within your existing table of use I included for the new district pretty much everything that is currently allowed in the mixed use district and in the commercial and to some extent the residential. I've heard this a few times tonight, if there is a concern for more emphasis on business right around the Four Corners as opposed to residential, it would be possible to draft this in such a way that within a specified area close to the Four Corners that business would be the principal permitted use for example and that residential would only be allowed as an accessory to the business for example; business on first floor, residential above that and then beyond that commercial, whatever that area might be, then residential as it's already allowed in the zoning in the table of use. The big thing is that I stayed within your existing table of use. The primary difference is the area and the lot size, that's really the big change for this proposal. A. Hall replied from a valuation point of view commercial properties are a greater value than residential and then this proposal would in effect reduce the valuation and lessen the taxes, we'd have to jack everybody else's taxes up to offset it. C. Ogilvie replied

potentially if the zoning changed and if people did those things that the zoning allowed, as the Chairman has already indicated, you have no control over that. All you can do is propose the zoning and wait and see what people choose to take advantage of.

Matthew Woodrow of 201 Brown Road commented I'm the Chair of our School Board here in Town and so I put together, I can't take credit for the information on here, but I was going to pass this out. The NH School Administration Association put together about a 40 or so page report for our School Board last year based on historical enrollment data and projecting out about 10 years. I thought it was important information to share where our current situation is. I can understand some of the concerns in regards to this; I fall somewhere in between; what we see tonight and maybe some sort of balance. Some reasonable growth I think is important. Going back to 2007 and 2008, we had 474 students here in Moore School and this year right now we are at 297 with it estimated next year at 270 or upwards of 280. Roughly that's about a 40% decline in enrollment over the past 10 years. If that trend continues, which we're anticipating it will, we're going to have fewer than 100 students here in the Moore School in ten years. This building was designed for roughly to hold 500 or so students. I don't know if building more houses necessarily means we're going to have more students, it seems to suggest in our neighboring towns that that's the case. Auburn right now is having an issue with capacity at their school and needing to build another building. I think in other towns they're seeing that as well. I don't think Candia is an anomaly. Declining enrollment is nationwide but Candia seems to be at a much greater rate of decline than some of our neighboring towns and communities. I don't have an answer to why that is but one I do believe are constraints for housing. If you look, we don't have any homes that a young family can get into unless you're spending \$350,000 on that home which really isn't necessarily a starter home these days. I wanted to lay out some facts; it's a concern from the School Board perspective where this trend is going. I'd be glad to email out that report and you can send that, I would like to have more conversations, get our Boards together because I think this impacts more than just the Planning Board. I think it needs to be a joint effort between all the Boards in Town as we move into this in the future.

T. Giffen commented one observation when you're looking at the operating cost of any type of structure that provides any type of a service, there are fixed costs. You've got a certain amount you need to spend on heat, electricity and so forth. In the case of a school you're providing services to a given number of classes. Class size would be expected to go down with a dropping enrollment but you still have to have a teacher for 1st grade, a teacher for 2nd grade and so on. Whether the class size is 12 or 16, I don't think you're going to pay the teacher on a per capita rate, you're going to pay them a salary that's competitive in the area as well. *Someone mentioned maintenance costs.* There are some variable costs as the result of a change in the size of the student population but the impact may not be linear like you might first guess.

Rob Jones of 109 Patten Hill Road said one question you started to address it. We're always concerned about costs. The school population's gone down at the way we're staffed right now, could you let us know how many more students can you handle right now without driving those costs up any higher than what they currently are. The other question that the Board started to address was that I was getting the feeling that there was a concern of something along the lines of eminent domain. We're not talking about eminent domain here. We're not classifying 800 acres as a Town center and the Town's going to come take it away. We're talking about zoning changes versus eminent domain and those are two very different things; giving an opportunity to a property owner to do different things with their property than maybe they were allowed to do previously. T. Giffen agreed, correct. R. Jones continued and the other question is for Carol. I was part of the committee when we started and I know this has expanded quite a bit beyond what I had envisioned the Four Corners to be as well. I think my vision was along what Rudy had described earlier. If we look at that smaller area, what's our constrained acreage versus non-constrained acreage if we know what that is? It's probably hard for you to tell. I think that may be of interest to some of the folks here. I know that all the research that you've done up until this point hasn't cost the Town any money because we were able to get a grant for it. So understanding that you still have to do research, do we have any grant money left right now that we can exercise for this?

T. Giffen replied the Town put up \$2,500 that was a requirement to get the grant. The grant was \$10,000. The Town will have put up that money in its entirety fairly soon as well as a little additional money for SNHPC to provide more detailed information so we can make a better judgment on this. But the bulk of the money was grant money. *Tom addressed the other question; zoning changes versus eminent domain; eminent domain is nothing the Town or the Planning Board would contemplate.* A) There's no budget for it and B) There's no stomach for it. Zoning changes basically provide latitude for a landowner to do something along the lines of what the Town would like to see done, hopefully no more than would be permitted. *Question from the audience (Rob Jones?)* and what's there currently is grandfathered in they don't need to make any changes if they choose. T. Giffen replied no changes of any kind, whoever owns a piece of land in whatever area ends up going to the voters, would simply have an expanded prerogative of what they might be able to do, so to expand their economic opportunities for these pieces of land and hopefully the guidelines would be well written so they could do something that would promote what the people in Town want, that's the basic idea.

R. Cartier commented you all have a copy of the draft of the zoning amendments in here, I wanted to point out that of all the allowable usages in the zoning area most of them are already being done in this particular area, Four Corners area, such as multi-family dwellings with the apartment building on the corner, there's two buildings that were commercial on the first floor and an apartment on the top; Candia House of Pizza and the former Funeral Parlor; with residential units above it and all the other things with light commercial are all being done in this area. I think the biggest concern I've heard so far is the expanse of doing that to the 800 acres seems to be the biggest concern. It's not that we're proposing drastic changes to the zoning itself, this current proposal is changing more the size of this current district. Just an observation.

Todd Keating of 595 North Road commented fortunately the part of North Road not part of this plan. One of my first questions when I saw you put up your presentation it had a graph and there were a lot of questions that you survey monkeyed our Townspeople and residents and some of those questions were if they wanted multi-family or restaurants and you saw the *blip up (unintelligible)* for restaurants but then when you saw the key to the side it said 40, I assume you meant 40 answers was the high. In a Town that has 4,000 people give or take, I would say part of your problem is that right there. Because you got no response from the community and quite honestly this Town from what I see when there's a lightning rod in Town we all come together and we're either for something or against something. When I ask my neighbors, my friends what do you guys think Four Corners is after I saw this plan, they thought it was basically here to Exit 3 and then when I tell them no it's 900 acres, 850 acres whatever the number actually is and it goes from your house to Exit 3 and your neighbors house to Exit 3, they're a little bit in shock. I think the information doesn't get out and then the information gets out and we come to these meetings all pissed off because we didn't know. Call us fools but I think the real problem was with your survey, you got no response from the Town and now you're getting a response from the Town that you don't want.

C. Robie responded on that note, I think if we have too many more comments to that effect, I think they need to be addressed to the Planning Board. Carol was hired or selected by us to do a job for us. I think she has done what she was asked to do for us. We're the ones that should take the criticism for not having work sessions and getting through a lot of these questions and concerns before we opened this up to a public hearing. A woman that worked very diligently for our community on what she thought we wanted according to our Master Plan and the small surveys that she did do and people didn't participate, so let's just give her a little bit, take it out on us please.

T. Keating asked, I should have asked first who put out the survey monkey. C. Robie replied the Planning Board asked her to do that. T. Keating replied so you put out the survey monkey? Another audience member asked why is that relevant? C. Robie replied that's irrelevant. T. Giffen commented we authorized it so anything that's wrong with it is on to the Planning Board. C. Robie commented she's not going to be chastised for us. T. Giffen said people, just a moment if I could. Participation in surveys is something that can't be forced.

J. Wilkins reiterated that goes along with my thing about getting the entire community with the mailings because people don't know what's going on. And his point, maybe not to be addressed to her but to you, but she is you're representative so it kind of encompasses, it's not insulting or attacking her, it's stating that the entire community is unaware of your Master Plan. *Someone stated this is not our vision.* T. Giffen said silver lining, we're getting more participation, that's a welcome thing.

Larry Stacy of 91 Deerfield Road said whether the plan is the original plan or the expanded plan, my property will be directly impacted. One of my concerns is the size of the lot. You can take a 3 acre lot which is the minimum here. It's not eminent domain as the Town's not taking property but when you create a small lot size your neighbors can change the entire nature of your house. So if you have a 3 acre lot and you live outside of this zone, you don't have to worry about but your neighbors coming in and potentially putting in a development with everything that goes with it whereas if you do live within the zone, it becomes a potential issue. It's a concern; a ½ acre is really small in Candia. When you're addressing the size of the scope, please pay attention to lot size.

Tom St. Martin of 464 Currier Road commented I'm very encouraged to hear the recognition of the difficulty it is for young starting out families to come to Candia because of the price of real estate in Candia is very tough. When we first came to Candia we couldn't buy the ordinary lot size, we were fortunate we were able to find a place that was a lot smaller. I've got a lot of sympathy for the need for getting young families in, starter homes, making the Town more vital. I'm getting older and I'd like to see a lot more younger people come into Town so that's a good thing. My question, I think its RSA 624 perhaps on work force housing. Is Candia's zoning currently in compliance? Does it provide work force housing? T. Giffen replied I don't have the complete information at my fingertips however it's my understanding that based on a statistical evaluation we're there. Having said that, there are a lot of people that might find it difficult to move into Town based on the economics that we're facing; whether we meet the letter of it statistically or do something else, it's up to the Town. Hopefully the Planning Board doesn't have an agenda other than to follow the wishes of the Town, at least while I'm here. That's the way it works. T. St. Martin replied it is difficult to believe that we're in compliance...T. Giffen replied I found it surprising when I got the information; a year, year and half ago that came to light. T. St. Martin replied that's encouraging to hear. My second question is perhaps directed to Carol, I'm not sure if you have the resources to be able to answer it and it's a crystal ball question. You're talking 400 acres more or less that could suddenly have ½ acre lot sizes. Obviously not all of that 400 acres is going to be used that way. Is there any kind of; can you give some sort of windage estimate of how this would play out demographically? How it would impact the population, perhaps even the population available for the school, within the time horizon of the Master Plan for example.

C. Ogilvie replied you're right to some extent; this is a bit of a crystal ball because we don't know. We do know that if something doesn't change to accommodate what we believe people's needs today are, then we know those things won't happen. There's a lot of information being generated these days, not just in NH but NH is leading the pack in terms of a rapidly growing aging population. Young people are not staying here, they're leaving. Older people are staying or retiring to NH and the kind of housing that NH has always had, most of its single family. In our part of the world single family on larger lots in the countryside but today those needs are changing. Older people are trying to downsize, need to downsize. They want something smaller, that's walkable and closer to services. That's also the type of housing that young people want. They don't want the big house on a big lot. That is exactly the type of housing that most zoning in NH does not accommodate. We have been consistently behind the eight ball. It's easy to not see that trend in a state like this but it is in fact happening and other parts of the state are seeing it more dramatically than we are. That's the big issue. With one and two acre zoning or two and three acre zoning, you will definitely won't get small homes on small lots, you won't get a village because you can't have a village on acre zoning and you won't get that kind of development that could lead to the sorts of things we're talking about. It may never happen but if you don't change the zoning you know for sure it won't, because it can't.

T. St. Martin asked do you have an idea currently of what a starter home would likely cost in Candia now. I just saw some real estate statistics but you guys might have a better idea. C. Robie commented there is none, there is no such thing in Candia, a starter home. T. Giffen replied I'm thinking that the least expensive homes that come on the market in Candia are in the range of \$250,000 to \$300,000. Probably closer to the higher end. C. Robie clarified I'm talking about new construction, excuse me. T. St. Martin said so if someone came into Candia to buy a house at the lowest end, where would they typically wind up. T. Giffen replied probably in the ballpark of \$200,000 to \$250,000 if they look really hard and wait. There might be something that comes on the market they could deal with. The bulk of the homes in Candia are more. Revisiting an earlier point, the reason our workforce housing number worked was because our demographic in Town with respect to income is very high so the affordability of homes relative to the Town's actual income numbers was good. Not so much that we have cheap houses but we've got people that make a heck of a lot of money relative to the value of the houses that are here. People that live in Candia do fairly well. T. St. Martin replied the Town is pretty high, Rockingham though, the surrounding areas are \$15,000-\$20,000 less in income than we are.

Robin Laliberte of 43 Deerfield Road commented what happened to the 55+ community that was behind the school, what happened to that? T. Giffen said the development stalled, I can't speak specifically to the reason why it stalled. It's my understanding that there were some difficulties getting a well up there. R. Laliberte continued I own 3 ½ acres on 43 Deerfield road so this plan is going to say I can put 6 houses on my land. T. Giffen replied within the constraints that you'd need to have for septic and water, I think that you'd find it probably wouldn't be practical to do so and there would be some frontage issues as well. R. Laliberte continued so there's an access road on Raymond Road out behind my house. What do they want to do out there, is that where they want to put all these houses? T. Giffen replied no idea. It depends on what the property owner wants. The whole thing is provide something, some sort of zoning that would enable a build out that the Town would like to see, that's the idea. Right now we're in a preliminary stage. It's entirely open to discussion.

Dana Buckley of 211 Horizon Lane stated I have some reservations about this plan myself but I've heard you all repeatedly say we're in the very early stages so I think before we all beat up on the Planning Board tonight, we need to take a step back and realize that they've said repeatedly this is a very early stage plan. They seem genuinely interested in hearing from the public as to what our concerns are so I think we need to keep that in mind.

T. Giffen asked on that positive note, does anyone have a new point that we haven't discussed. I'm going to close the public input session now and return to a working session of the Planning Board. You're welcome to stay and I would encourage everybody with any kind of opinion on this to let it be known. Admittedly the survey didn't bring in a huge number of responses. The participation rate on the survey was not too far from what you'd expect in any survey but people tend not to pay attention to those. J. Wilkins yelled out follow it up with mailers; thank you. T. Giffen replied we'll be discussing how to publicize that.

R. Cartier thanked the audience for coming out to express their opinions and mentioned that the members of the Planning Board are always available to listen to you and your concerns. He mentioned the Facebook page for Candia, *Community Awareness*, which seems to be a good venue for opinions. He suggested that comments be submitted in writing to the Planning Board as some people don't like to come up to the mike (*microphone*) and speak publicly but they do have an opinion. R. Cartier said you're opinions are the most important thing the Board can get so you can write an email to the land use office or submit something in writing to the land use office. We want your input, it's important.

BREAK – Approx. 10 minutes

Planning Board Work Session:

T. Giffen said it's apparent from what we just heard and talking amongst ourselves that we have an awful lot more to do before this goes to ballot and it would be very premature to attempt to get this on the ballot this year. If we agree on that, the next step would be to determine what the process should be and establish a timeline for future meetings on the subject. A) Decide as a Board if we like to put it forward this year or not and B) If we decide not to or if we decide to; what's our next step and the timeline going forward so we can have a finished product that we can feel comfortable with putting in front of the Town?

A. Hall said there is work that's not done by SNHPC, when can we expect to hear from them and receive a finished product. Is it eminent tomorrow or next month? C. Ogilvie said no, the Selectmen might know more than I do. It had to do with what that detailed analysis would cost and that was beyond the scope of work we were working on here. C. Robie confirmed \$2,500 and then we approved another \$3,500. It's pretty hard to ask somebody to do an analysis as it spells out here, it's our responsibility. What Carol has really done, that's our job as a Planning Board. We selected her and paid her to do our job. With that being said, we're not going to pay somebody to do a build out analysis and a soil study and a feasibility study until we define an area. We haven't got that defined yet. Once we get that defined...there's no sense paying SNHPC to do a survey and a feasibility impact study on 1,000 acres when we end up with a 400 acre village. That's my opinion so until we get that figured out....T. Giffen said you've got a good point but we're getting off track. The first order of business I'd like to have is for the Board to figure out whether this is going forward to warrant this year, yes or no. We're too far away from it.

MOTION:

R. Carter **motioned** that we defer this and not put it on the warrant for this year. J. Lindsey **seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried (6-0-0).**

T. Giffen continued let's consider our next step or steps and develop a timeline and work that out. You have a good point Carleton about asking SNHPC to come up with something, we could have 800 acres or 400 acres with what we have them look at. If they cover the area that was proposed originally, it could be a waste of time because no one's in favor of that expanded area or very few people, a small percentage. But if you study the whole thing you'll get the information on the smaller piece within that. It won't be a full detailed build out in any event. It can't be for the budget we're talking about; we don't have that much money. People don't envision the Four Corners as being that big, a small compact area. Maybe downhill towards Deerfield, just past the Fire Station; maybe as far as the Credit Union or the Mobil; maybe going up to the border of the Purington's property. I don't think we're prepared to discuss the specifics of the plan tonight; we're better off discussing the process. I'd like to set aside another full working session and dig into the meat of it and make some suggestions for changes and work it out and do it as a working session not as public input.

A. Hall inquired again about SNHPC and asked if what we asked them to do was completed. C. Ogilvie replied to this point, yes. C. Robie asked what happened to that \$3,500 dollars that we appropriated. I've seen nothing from that. C. Ogilvie replied Nate was supposed to send in a memo to the Planning Board and I'm guessing that that didn't happen. Where he was going to spell out what additional mapping he could do, not the complete build out but some level of analysis. T. Giffen replied we need to make an arrangement with Nate as to exactly what's going to be done and the scope of the project is and until we have that understanding we don't have anything to work with from them.

C. Robie said what Rudy said earlier, what the Master Plan spells out is a village district in the Candia Four Corners here. What Carol's portion of this is, is village type housing. We tried to combine both of those things into an area where, in my opinion, I don't want village type housing in the Candia Four Corners. It needs to be a mix of residential and commercial and to make that happen, you need to decrease the lot size, you need density. You can't put one unit of mixed use on a 2 acre lot, it's not feasible. You'll never get any development. Now that being said, density in a small area around our Four Corners will create a village type atmosphere with some people in it. Now we hear a lot about these village districts like

what Carol talks about; she designed and had something to do in Peterborough. A little bit outside the village and we have these arterial roads with some parcels of land that would be feasible for a little more density, maybe one acre probably not ½ acre in our community because the soils won't sustain; there's not too many places you can go, we need to ask Carol to expand her village type housing onto our arterial roads. Stay off our Town roads because we don't want to impact them any more than we have to because of the traffic flow, but her work, can go out along ways, east and west. We still are working on the village, which is what it's all about. If you have a village and you have these neighborhoods, people will come to the village. I think that's the direction we need to consider.

T. Giffen said we've got a project for the village that we want to accomplish and if we branch out, we may be biting off more than we can chew. I would like to layout out a process; at this point it might not be much more than getting a meeting scheduled, so we can have some working sessions and come up with some fine tuning within the Board that will enable us to come up with a process that is more in line with what people seem to want.

R. Cartier said so the next meeting we could focus on what the village district reasonable area would be so we then have that core. Carleton is on the right tack if we concentrate on the core village district and we get people to buy into it, then expanding down Deerfield Road where you can have a "hey look we have this village district why don't we do more high density housing in here" so we bring them along step by step and not too much all at the same time. C. Robie suggested that we need to finish our zoning revision with Stantec.

T. Giffen agreed, we have to do that. This project won't be on the ballot this year. I'd like to schedule the next meeting so that we can start working on the substance of it and go from there. I do not want to do that tonight. We need to devote some time to it and start early enough so we're not running into 8:30 or 9:00. If we have nothing else on the 17th, I'd like to schedule the next Planning Board meeting to be a working session devoted specifically to this project.

C. Ogilvie offered to be here for the 17th and I think that our deadline for the grant concluding the responsibilities of the grant is somewhere around the end of January, beginning of February. I will of course make myself available to do whatever you think that might come out of the 17th, to get perhaps get another rough draft ready for you to then take it forward. Once the grant is over with my official job would be done but certainly I would be happy to come back next year and help in some way to get this moving forward again. T. Giffen replied we need to sink our own teeth into it and work out a lot of this stuff ourselves. We have better access to the public and therefore we'll have a better feel for what is going to be workable and doable in this Town. It's going to fall on us to come up with a workable plan based on the work that you've provided. R. Cartier thanked Carol for the remarkable work. T. Giffen added good job and asked again for a description of the scope of work and what he (*Nate Miller of SNHPC*) could do for the money. Perhaps he (*Nate*) could come to the meeting on the 17th. Andrea, could you invite him?

C. Robie said Carol has offered her services to us and I want to thank you for that and if you're willing to come and help us through this process, which you're very qualified to do, you will be invited.

MOTION:

R. Cartier **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 8:40 pm. A. Hall **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (6-0-0).**

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary
cc file