

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of January 17, 2018
UNAPPROVED
Public Hearing

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

Absent: Mike Santa, Alt

Chair Tom Giffen called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes January 3, 2018:

J. Lindsey made a **motion** to accept the minutes of January 3, 2018 as presented. C. Robie **seconded**. R. Cartier, K. Kustra; T. Giffen; A. Hall **were in favor**. J. Bedard **abstained**. **Motion passed (6-0-1)**.

Present: Nate Miller from Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission

Planning Board Work Session with Carol Ogilvie consultant on the MTAG Grant and Nate Miller from SNHPC to continue work on the draft of zoning ordinance amendments. 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.

Note: Carol Ogilvie was unable to make the work session due to the snow storm and the travel distance.

T. Giffen said the Planning Board work session tonight is to discuss the draft as it exists. Discuss any changes that the Board sees fit to that draft and accumulate a list of changes. We've decided it's not going to ballot yet, we've got too much work in order to be deliberate, thorough and detailed on this. The time pressure is off.

K. Kustra commented the area is too long. T. Giffen replied it's apparent there's some vocal opposition to the size of the proposed area. K. Kustra continued the other item; the half an acre is quite large, too large. You're looking at 20,000 square feet. A typical building is probably 40' x 60' with the height of 35'.

T. Giffen said people seem to be afraid of the lot size as it stands. We haven't heard from the bulk of people in Town. There are two sets of views that have been reflected so far. One group would be the group that participated in the Master Plan. We're the Planning Board and we generally take the Master Plan as a set of instructions on which to act, we tend to go with that group. There's another group that are very vocal and they are very much against any change of any kind; any development, against the lot size and the size of the overall plan and against some of the provisions for zoning within. There seemed to be some confusion among that group as to exactly what zoning was thinking that it involved eminent domain and the Town spending money to develop. There's a lot of information that hasn't been disseminated to these people effectively. In turn, there's a lot of information that they're disseminating to all of their friends that is not fact based. We have a battle if we hope to do anything. As far as lot size, I'm not sure if anything smaller would go. But I don't think anything larger makes sense either, you need density otherwise you won't have a village district. I don't think an acre is appropriate for a minimum. I live on Jane Drive which was built before 3 acre zoning went in and all those lots are 1 acre or occasionally a double lot with 2. With the acre I live on if I wanted to put up a decent size multi-use building, I'd have more than enough room. If you look at the plan as presented with 800+ acres roughly, a great deal of that is non-buildable due to wetlands, ledge and various other constraints. It's going to be self limiting to a certain extent based on the

properties of the terrain. It's my impression that people are getting scared of an 800+ acre plan but in fact there's not a whole lot that can go in there because of the constraints.

J. Lindsey asked about one of the black areas on the map that was under publicly owned land. I can see the school, the fire department, town hall, cemetery but what is this one? N. Miller determined that it was the CYAA, not necessarily publicly owned but Carol wanted to show that. I guess it's quasi publicly owned. Carol's guidance was to hold that parcel out. Our calculation was 59.2% of the territory of the proposed district had some sort of constraint on it. T. Giffen said so there's roughly 40% that's usable. N. Miller replied roughly, yes and constraints as we define them on this map were flood plains, slopes of 25% or greater, water features like lakes and ponds. We used the soil data and mapped the poorly drained soils. National wetlands inventory wetlands and then we took the Town mandated 100 foot buffer around those wetlands. So if you take all of those areas and the publicly owned lands, that's 59.2% of the district, an 821 acre district. T. Giffen replied so roughly 41% is free of constraint.

N. Miller agreed and in this far northern section, we have well yield probability data. Its good data at the Town scale but when you start zooming in on that data it becomes less granular. It seemed to be one of the lower well yield zones, a little into this northern portion. The more granular you go with that data and zoom in on it, the less exact it becomes. It shows a good picture at the Town level but we did identify a potential well yield issue in the northern part.

T. Giffen mentioned the proposed 55 and older community to go in there and some work was done, some plans were approved. One of the partners has sold out and it's a single owner. This came to a head in 2008 when economic conditions went sour. I'm only dealing with rumor; I don't know the real reason it for its failure to go forward. There was talk that water was very difficult to find up there and that could be the case and there may have also been issues with finance given the economic climate at the time even if the people involved had perfect credit because of the risk. C. Robie replied said we shouldn't speculate on that; that's irrelevant. T. Giffen said there was a rumor around Town that there was a water issue. C. Robie said let me clear that up, that's been alleviated. They have a well and a good yield well at that.

T. Giffen said in looking at this, there's an awful lot of area that's not improved by roads. So for something to take place that's not directly fronting on any of the arterial roads; there would have to be quite a large expenditure to go in and make something happen. C. Robie replied that would be up to the developer. T. Giffen said the 800+ something acres starts to shrink a lot. You get down to the range of about 320 acres awfully fast just based on the nature of the land itself and then you get into the issue of how much is land locked and what has to be done to provide access and is that economic. I don't think the proposal is that much out of line in terms of its size based on that information but from a political expediency perspective you may want to reduce it anyway.

A. Hall was concerned about proceeding with a four corners village district development while it's part of a several million dollar future planning in the next 10 years.

N. Miller confirmed 2028; the transportation project, there are a couple of things to keep in mind; 1) there is no design at this point for the transportation project. The state DOT will evaluate a number of different designs and they will do that in partnership with the Town. They're not going to go to construction on a project that the Town does not support or want. Yes it's their infrastructure but it's the center of your community and the days of the state coming in and saying look what we designed for you in Concord, this is what you're getting, those days are over. It's a DOT that's much more collaborative now and they will work with the Town. The reason that the project is in the 10 year plan for the level of funding that it's at is because the Town had done such extensive planning for the area and you could point to a number of different documents from the Town's Master Plan, Transportation Plan, Road Safety Audits, that the Town had been thinking about making improvements to this area and that the transportation project could be one of the centerpieces of improvements to this area. Years before the project goes to construction they will start working with the Town. You can expect them to work with you 4-5 years before the project is scheduled to go to construction. They'll work with the Select Board, the Planning Board and they'll try

to craft a series of alternatives that best meets your vision for the area. I do think that the transportation project can support whatever you're trying to accomplish at the four corners area.

C. Robie commented on that note of 800+ areas and the area's stretched out, I think our Master Plan told us that they wanted to do something with a village district. That would be in our local four corners area. This is a rendering of the bypass that the state, somebody drew, that may be acceptable to the Town in an area; a small condensed area. If we don't change the zoning in our four corners area soon, nothing's going to change there. Buildings will be bought and sold and without a zoning change, it's not feasible to change their use. We'll end up with more of the same of what we have. If we change the zoning to be able to put something in there and make it feasible to make that happen, then you'll see a four corners area or village district start to grow. As far as Carol's portion, I think she did the best she could with the information that we gave her. A village district in this area, we go out on our arterial roads and look at areas where we don't impact our back roads and our back woods and look at places that village type housing would be feasible. You speak of Jane Drive, one acre house lots, everybody's happy. The soils are very sustainable on the side of that hill and you're not losing the side of the mountain when it rains. That's the direction we should look at; a small zoning change in our village district around the four corners with some thought as to where the state might be able to go. They'll listen to us, if we lay that all out, gee we'd like to put a road there, they'll say somebody did some work here. T. Giffen replied the road plan could actually support this district very nicely by diverting some of the heavier traffic away so it becomes a more walkable neighborhood. It ties in with the whole idea. The potential for the road plan to do something beneficial for this is quite high. We've mentioned the overall size of it and if you look at all the information, there's an argument for keeping it as it is. I don't know the answer but as it stands, there's an awful lot of education that would have to take place for it to be politically expedient. The level of misunderstanding that's been displayed is fairly surprising and people seem to be set and they don't want to listen and they have their mind made up.

A. Hall was concerned that the locals are going to plan and plan and that takes time and the state and federal are going to plan and plan. T. Giffen confirmed and you're concerned that big government might be more efficient. C. Robie replied let's not let them.

T. Giffen continued if we wish to get this proposal off the ground, we need some significant amount of outreach. As one of our more vocal opponents said maybe we should do some mailings. I'm not going to be around for that, I'm going to be done in March.

C. Robie replied we did that. Carol came in, we hired her and she outreached with Steering Committee meetings, input from our committees. She had two meetings and nobody came. She puts something together and then it gets blown out of the water by a few, only a handful. **It's not up to us as a Planning Board to send out mailings. We post our meetings and we're having a workshop here tonight.** You speak of 800 acres I speak of 200 acres in a bypass and some village type housing, we have to pass zoning to move the community forward. T. Giffen replied 800 acres makes sense. If you want to get something done, you have to make it doable and getting the information out to these people and having them actually think may be impractical, it may be a fool's errand. Perhaps down scaling it to something that is politically expedient makes sense. If it works and there's demand to expand it, at that point, whoever is on the Planning Board at that time can consider it and put forth another zoning amendment to expand it. It has to help the Town economically.

A. Hall commented the Town has to okay it and the selling job to the general population of what we're trying to do. T. Giffen replied okay but we're talking about **no mailings and people don't show up at meetings** unless they've got pitchforks and tar and feathers. The selling job, A) if it's our job to do a selling job and B) if it is, how we'd accomplish that; what would we actually do.

C. Robie replied part of Carol's deal here was housing. We need to concentrate on the commercial element of this as much as the residential part. We missed on that. T. Giffen replied well we've come up with a set of rules for a mixed use district so I don't think we entirely missed. The funding was there because of the housing question. The plan incorporates more than just housing and I think it does it well if

you look at the proposed uses here. C. Robie said you don't want to get density housing in this small area of this circle. T. Giffen said you need businesses and housing would be a secondary use. C. Robie continued mixed use in here which would be good on acre lots or ½ or ¾ acre lots, whatever the soils will sustain. You could end up with some duplexes and line them right up like they did in the 80's. 3 or 4 duplexes in a row and I don't know if that's what we really want in Candia. I don't think that's what we want right now and that's why what was proposed here was a little bit off. T. Giffen responded a mixed use district with row after row of duplexes is not what we need so in the proposed zoning amendment is something stipulating that anything that's put up, incorporate a business use and the residential use would be secondary or ancillary to the business use. So you have a restaurant downstairs. You go into Deerfield and you have the Lazy Lion with a restaurant downstairs and you have other uses upstairs. The old funeral home, Patriot's downstairs and you have residential upstairs. I would envision an accountant, maybe an attorney, some restaurants, specialty shops, things like that on the ground floor that people would find attractive and use and would help the tax base with relatively low demand on services and some apartments upstairs. I think that's what the Town thinks of when they think of a mixed use village district, not necessarily multi-unit housing. C. Robie replied a small condensed area needs to be multi-use. T. Giffen said if you allow 100% residential for any of the new development on even one lot there you've started a bad trend.

R. Cartier commented from what I've heard, people think it's too big. T. Giffen said they envision 800 acres full of duplexes or four family units all with 5 kids in each unit going to the school. R. Cartier continued in the proposed zoning, in the residential there should be a number of them that aren't permitted in the zone. We shouldn't be permitting one family, we shouldn't permit two family and multi-family, boarding and rooming houses or any of that because that's defeating the purpose of what the multipurpose district was supposed to look at. Everybody that I've talked to thought what we were proposing was going to be what we were saying, we'd have commercial allowed but maybe 2 and a half story structures that would have an ancillary use. That was one of the big things that set people off. 800 acres allowing ½ acre lots, no. There's tremendous amount of resistance to that. I would recommend from the north and the south; we eliminate 2/3 of it. A strip along Raymond Road that encompasses the businesses that we do have but allows for a little bit more development in that area. T. Giffen commented so from CoPart and the credit union, go up to the drive for the proposed senior housing and not much more than that. You do ½ acre and you stipulate that the primary use is commercial and that secondary uses in addition to the commercial use that must be built would be residential; you could even limit the size or the square footage of the residential within one of those structures either on an aggregate or per unit basis. Let's say you have a building with 3,000 sq ft as a footprint. Do you want a 3,000 sq foot apartment above it or do you want to stipulate the maximum size of any given residential unit be smaller. R. Cartier replied I would say no. I would say just go ahead with commercial and whatever's up on the 2nd can be commercial or residential as you might want to have a two story office building for example the funeral home; offices on first floor and second floor might also be offices. The combination of the size and that we're allowing too much is what's setting people off. T. Giffen replied if you have 3,000 sq ft apartments that could hold how many bedrooms and in theory, how many kids, if you've got opposition based on the increase in the school population, build them smaller; 3 bedroom units maximum. R. Cartier said there would be limiting factors in here by looking at the wetlands map. One of the areas that have poorly drained soils is the junkyard, I find that interesting. Where that slopes down in the back, focusing down more local, these become less accurate. I know that there are some issues in here that would need to be looked at on that. 800 acres is never going to sell. It goes way beyond the envisioning of what a village district is. T. Giffen replied there's uproar about preserving the rural charm. Start at Clarence Blevens and head west. Each individual lot, what the current use on that lot is and how much rural charm it contributes to the community. I think you'll have a tough time finding much in the way of rural charm with the exceptions of the school building, nice old school, the Town Hall, nice interesting Colonial looking structure, the Court House to some extent; doesn't detract from the rural charm. R. Cartier asked how many acres is the Town Offices. C. Robie said very little, we took it from the

park. R. Cartier said and how many acres is the library and on that corner; where people were concerned about the ½ acre lots, we already have ¼ acre lots that are supporting businesses and some residences. The apartment building on the corner is a postage size lot. They've got 4 apartments in there. T. Giffen said people don't want more of that. R. Cartier continued the point is the area is already handling small parcels, can it also be expanded. Yes. I think the big thing that people have said at the Public Hearing and in private to people like myself; they're worried about the ½ acre building lots and single family homes on them.

T. Giffen commented they think it will blow school costs out of proportion, that's the undercurrent that I hear. R. Cartier replied I hear they just don't want to have Candia grow. T. Giffen said that too maybe but one of the real disincentives for this group that's vocally against is that they don't want school costs to increase. Our school population is getting so ridiculously small you could probably increase it by 50-100 students without substantially changing the cost of running the school. You have to have a teacher in every grade, whether there are 12 students or 18, there's one teacher. You have to have so many grades. There's limiting factors here. Judi do you know what the class sizes are at the Moore School right now? J. Lindsey replied it can vary from 12 to 22. It depends on if you have a larger class, those divided by two teachers would be higher and then you have some low classes, first, second grade. It can vary. We shift the teachers around to meet the need. J. Bedard said the 8th grade class now has about 60 roughly so they had 3 classes between 20 and 22. J. Lindsey replied I think 5th or 6th grade is where you might have 22. T. Giffen said when you start looking at class size going down to the lower grades you have diminishing numbers the lower you go. If you look at a timeline 3-4 years out even....R. Cartier commented you also have to look from a state level too. I do a lot of work with school districts in Maine and New Hampshire. There's only one that's staying level but every other district that I have, in Town's that are growing, Pembroke's a good example. They're considering closing one of their elementary schools and combining them. That's probably going to happen. T. Giffen replied the point I'm making, is that you have so much overhead cost and you've got so much in the way of personnel that can be limited. I don't think it's going to have a huge effect. I don't think it's going to blow the school budget out of proportion at all. R. Cartier commented there aren't any more baby boomers. We're not having kids and our kids are not having kids. They're smarter. T. Giffen replied millennials can't afford to have kids; a lot of them are living at home in their parent's basement at the age of 28, they're not reproducing.

R. Cartier said my suggestion is we condense it horizontally and get rid of the part with having single family houses in the district; it doesn't fit with the village district. T. Giffen said there should be a requirement that the primary use is of a business nature and that secondary uses residential in nature are permitted as an accessory to the business use. R. Cartier replied and you can do that in here if you eliminate the one family, two-family and multi-family dwellings. T. Giffen agreed, get rid of it; not permitted. J. Lindsey agreed. T. Giffen said if you want mixed use you don't make it all residential. If you permit it on any given lot it can spread. C. Robie said I think we need some residential in some way in that area like I said, along our arterial roads and some commercial mixed use in the center here. Without residential, you're not going to get what you're talking about with a little shop at the bottom and somebody living upstairs. Without rooftops and people living under them, nobody's coming. Nobody's going to build because it's not feasible for them to open something such as what you said; an attorney, a dentist, a little store, or a restaurant. If there are no people to support them, nobody's going to come and buy a piece of property in this small area and develop it according to our zoning.

T. Giffen replied I think the idea of the zoning for this 800 acre parcel needs to be revised to establish more than one zone within that area. One zone would be the small central area which would be compact and would require business use and then as you branch out, start to go with multi-use but do so on the fringe, not in the center of it. J. Bedard asked aren't some of these house lots this way by the school smaller? C. Robie said they're all small. A bunch of small house lots in Candia. We had five villages at one time. All the houses, you drive down Main Street the houses are right there, down Candia Village, East Candia they're all right there. Go up Jane Drive and they're right there. They were villages, a neighborhood, kids grew up, kids played, and they had fun.

A. Hall asked to make these modifications it will require more Carol type consulting work. T. Giffen replied it depends on how quickly you want it done and how professional a job you're looking for if there's no further budget for it and Carol's work is ending so the Planning Board would have to decide to take it on. I don't think we're going to accomplish it by the time my terms done. A. Hall said that means more bucks. C. Robie replied that's what we budget for planning for. T. Giffen said we have budgeted for planning and the Budget Committee let it through and assuming it passes at the SB2 vote, goes through the deliberative session, the Planning Board will have money to do something. That's the whole point of this exercise, to move forward and implement the Master Plan. C. Robie agreed. T. Giffen continued unlike any previous board in my memory. C. Robie replied Carol did her job, she did what was expected of her and if we need to hire somebody to write the zoning whether it is SNH or some other outside source, we can do that or we can do it ourselves. T. Giffen said we could hire Carol back for an additional round or use SNH or someone else that they recommend. C. Robie responded and she said she would be willing to come back and tweak what she had done but you can't expect her to do too much more above and beyond what she's done for us. T. Giffen replied she's already spent a lot of time on this, I agree. The deadline for her is February 1 anyway so it comes to a close. She's earned her money and she's paid and that's that. So it would be an additional phase.

J. Bedard said I wasn't at the meeting so I don't know how many people were there or how much opposition was expressed. Do you think that people understand that it's not 821 that it's cut back more than half? Most of the Board said no. T. Giffen replied by the constraints. J. Lindsey said they didn't understand it at all. T. Giffen commented they don't have a clue. They thought we were buying that land for the Town to develop. J. Bedard replied it's a horrible pattern here, people don't show up to the meetings and then they show up to a public hearing not having any information. T. Giffen said not completely uninformed but highly uninformed. And then they go ballistic and create a big stink, they get very hostile. They have the tar heating up on the side with the bucket of feathers and their pitchforks. R. Cartier commented that's not necessarily a bad thing. Candia has always been a reactionary Town. Someone's going to propose something and everybody's going to be up in arms about it or they're going to support it and come out in droves, either pro or con. What we've got here so far is a great start in taking the Candia charette and the Candia group that we had over here came up with one of the topics, the only thing that happened is that it kind of grew and took on a life of its own and got huge. I think if we shrink it back down and we return a little bit towards what the original plans were, we'd be in good shape. T. Giffen and J. Lindsey agreed. R. Cartier continued and then people already know about this now. It's the talk of the Town so there's not a heck of a lot more advertising we need to do about it. What Carol did; she's got things laid out here that's very easy to read. Take what she has in here, eliminate a few things here and there and clean it up and then we have something that will be a little bit more palatable to people. It is up to the Board to sell it if we're proposing it. It's not something you can just throw out there and say there you go. T. Giffen replied there's a lot of information that's gathered. Any planning has to be deliberate and very thorough because once it's in place, it's difficult to change. You need to take that approach. You can't rush it and have a quality product. What's clearly come out from the process so far is that we've got a plan that was prepared according to a specification shall we say but we need to modify things in order to have it more closely fit some of the vision that was behind all this and scaling it back so we're having more intensive development in a smaller area is a good place to start. If it becomes economically viable and it helps the tax base as it should if it's generating commercial uses at that point, it would be a relatively easy sell. Think of your medieval cities, you have an inner walled areas and then you have the circles going out and out. The further you get out from the center, the larger the lots and the more residential the uses; it's the same idea. You have a very compact area that's intensively developed in a commercial way with residential uses permitted as an ancillary use and then you go out to the next ring and you have more residential in the mix but still defined and then you get out to the next ring and it's all residential but maybe you allow multi. R. Cartier asked if we still have funding for Carol or Nate left over to tweak this a bit. C. Robie said no but 2017 budget it's been closed out. We have to budget proposed, I made sure we have planning money in the

budget for 2018. T. Giffen said \$10,000 (*2018 budget*). R. Cartier continued so we could hire them under that money. C. Robie replied certainly. R. Cartier said so we could get Carol and Nate to continue to work on this and bring it down to something that will be..... T. Giffen said yes in the next phase of the planning process makes sense. I would be reluctant to commit to it until such time as the election is run (*won*) (*unintelligible*); you never know what's going to happen at the deliberative session and the SB2 vote. The budget could get shot down. What happens if it goes default? C. Robie replied we still have it. It was in the budget last year and DRA's going to look at that and say gee we aren't going to take you're planning money away. Here's a community that's trying to do some planning for the future. They're not going to take it out of the budget. It's a necessary thing for this Town to plan and figure out a way to get some revenue. It's a necessary thing. If you look at the median age, it's 57.

N. Miller said the median age varies greatly from town to town. The median age is going up across the board.

T. Giffen said from a big picture perspective I think the plan should be to regroup and attack this project in a phased manner and the next phase should be a revision using the existing draft as a base; focusing on a smaller central area that would have to have a commercial use to be permitted.

N. Miller commented I hear you talking about this block in 3 different ways. You have this whatever you end up defining immediately around the four corners area a few hundred feet in each direction of the four corners or however you end up defining that boundary. That's the most intense use. That's where you take what Carol put together and say this will be our mixed use; non-residential uses are primary. Residential uses are secondary to the non-residential use. This is our most intense area, the center of the four corners. You have to think about what goes on the arteries within a certain distance of 27 and 43 that lead into the four corners. That's your next step down; your transition area into that more dense village. Maybe that's medium density residential however you end up defining that. Maybe mixed uses are allowed but it doesn't have to be mandatory...however you end up defining it. The 27 corridor east and west leading into the four corners and the 43 corridor from north and south within a certain distance of that artery, a couple hundred feet or whatever it is that's your transition area. And then you have these blocks if you decide to keep them and maybe that's where you focus your lower density residential or maybe you take it out all together from the proposal. As Carleton was saying, where do the people live; maybe that's where some people live but maybe not to the scale that's proposed here. You have 3 tiers; your highest tier of use is right in the center of the four corners, your 2nd tier of use is within a certain distance of the arteries leading to the four corners and then your less intense uses are the adjacent four squares; the peripheral. You can craft what uses and densities are allowed in each of those using Carol's work as a starting point. I think in order to do that type of analysis, it would require another work session or two with the Planning Board really thinking about what those boundaries are and honing in on what the uses and densities would be allowed in each of those.

T. Giffen said on a positive note, we have a bunch of people in Town who are taking an intense interest in this. It's not a positive interest but they're taking an intense interest. I've seen situations where in a business environment there were employees against a particular type of program. What management did in order to make the program thrive was to put one of these people in charge of it. Because all of a sudden they own it and they start thinking about it in a positive way. What I'm thinking is we co-op all of these people who are absolutely out with the tar and feathers and we say hey, how would you like to help develop the plan. And you bring them in while we have their interest before it lapses and the next reality TV show comes on and you get these people to actually participate instead of coming out to scream when they think it's hitting the fan.

C. Robie commented on that note Tom, this agenda's been posted for two weeks and it says on here that the Planning Board's going to have a work session to discuss what we're discussing here and where are they? There's not a soul here but I'll tell you if we ever put something together and go for a public hearing, the same group will be out to shoot holes in it. T. Giffen said guaranteed. C. Robie continued and I'm tired of that because if you don't have a better plan than mine, try not to criticize the one that we have. But

there's not one of them here tonight. T. Giffen said it's a bad weather night. J. Bedard and C. Robie said no, that's not an excuse. C. Robie said the entire Board is here. T. Giffen asked how do you co-op these people. How do you bring them in? C. Robie replied we work on this until we think we've got it right. We agree on it and we put it to a vote. And then let that group shoot holes in it on the outside and if they want to campaign against it, that's fine. But if you have a whole group of Planning Board people and the community supporting it, I think you have a pretty good chance to get it passed. J. Bedard replied I think they're loud but I don't think they're many. T. Giffen said I would like to co-op them; bring them in and have them work on it positively. C. Robie replied they've had all the opportunities in the world to come and work on this for the last 6 months. T. Giffen said it only crossed their radar recently. Before that it was completely off their radar. C. Robie said they don't have a better plan but they'll come blow holes in ours. T. Giffen commented put it to them; come up with a better plan. C. Robie replied they're not going to because they like what they have now, nothing. No really, it's the way it is here. I've been here my whole life Tom. I've seen this action for 40 years. I've seen this go down. D. Murray said that's exactly what I was going to say. They don't want anything. No change. J. Bedard said but I think its fewer people than you think. C. Robie said they're getting old and dying off but my point is still the same. We need to come up with a plan that we agree to and support it and put it to the voters. J. Bedard agreed.

R. Cartier commented there are some people in Town that feel the boards in Candia aren't responsive to suggestions and that's been going on for a long time too. J. Bedard said they don't show up. R. Cartier said they feel it's not of any use to do that. There's truth to that. I've only lived in Candia for about 35 years but I've seen people say boards don't listen to us. Why do we bother going you're going to do whatever you want anyway. T. Giffen replied its human nature to be better at accepting constructive criticism than the opposite. What do you get? Do you get constructive criticism? It's hard to characterize what we've heard lately as constructive. R. Cartier said I wouldn't either but a lot of it has to do with they're misinformed. Yes, a lot of the people at that hearing were saying things like eminent domain; where in hell are they getting that? C. Robie said Rudy, that's not our fault. R. Cartier said yes it is. J. Bedard and C. Robie disagreed. No it's not. R. Cartier said as a public board we should try to be getting more input from the public. C. Robie said how would you even think about having to cover that at a public hearing. How would you ever think about that; that someone would come up and say you're going to take all this land and where are you going to get the money to develop it. That question wasn't on my radar. So how do you come up with an answer to combat that?

T. Giffen said here's where we are right now. We have these really animated people who are all excited about this program in a very negative way. While you've got their attention I think you need to do something with them. You could post a public meeting saying we're considering changing this altogether and putting different uses in and that some of those uses may or may not be popular. Get a rumor going around Town that it's going to be for adult bookstores or something that absolutely everyone will come out with pitchforks and you grab them in. C. Robie commented you could start the whole process all over again Tom and you'll get the same group of people that go to the meeting and you'll end up with the same thing. We have to do this ourselves. We're the only ones capable and that have stepped up and come to these meetings twice a month and put in the time. We're the only ones. T. Giffen said so Rudy's got the idea that you grab these people and try to use them and educate them. You think it's a complete waste of time. I'm somewhere in the middle. I don't think you think these people have anything to contribute. C. Robie stated I didn't say that. If they want to come contribute they're welcome to but they don't come. T. Giffen said and they're not going to from your perspective. They're not going to come contribute but come tear it down after it's presented time after time after time. J. Bedard said best predictor of future behavior is past behavior. T. Giffen agreed but I'd like to see if we can modify it. D. Murray commented it's a relatively small group too, the negative; the naysayers, whatever you want to call them. It's still a small group compared to the community at large. T. Giffen replied there's only a small number that actually participate. There's like 40 or 50 people that actually help run the whole Town and the other 3,950 stay home. J. Bedard said but the group that is being negative and vocal is smaller than the group that, even though they

don't have an idea or don't participate, will come out and vote in favor of it. T. Giffen commented in favor because the Planning Board said it's a good idea and they're outside the social circle of the people that are screaming and running around with pitchforks. J. Bedard agreed, exactly. T. Giffen said in that case it may make sense to ignore them and press ahead. J. Bedard commented invite them in and then take their input. We just need to do it. We need to stop sitting around and try to please everybody and say listen here's your opportunity, come, give input and then it's going on the ballot. And now it's not going until next year now? T. Giffen said it wasn't ready. J. Bedard said now we have plenty of time to get it ready and get it to ballot. T. Giffen said the next step will be to plan the next phase and implement that. Let's get some Planning Board workshops scheduled and among ourselves talk about how we want to modify the list of permitted uses. Start focusing on the center and then the additional area and see if we can come up with something that's coherent and then hire some folks with true expertise to help us refine it and then get it on the ballot next year. In the meantime, we have a whole year. If we get an early start we can publicize it and get some hearings. We'll get all the people screaming and yelling and we can bring them in and educate them a little.

C. Robie said on that note that would be a good idea. Come June or something have something ready for a public hearing. Then you have a public hearing you listen to the people, they can come and maybe somebody might come up with something that clicks in and say gee we kind of missed that. We can go back and work on this again and now August or September, we can tweak it again. We have another public hearing and by then everybody's got it all out of their system. You get to the last public hearing nobody's there because they all have their answers and the we put it on the ballot and the Planning Board all agrees and then you have something that has some teeth. T. Giffen said okay, we've developed a plan.

N. Miller commented to your credit you've talked for more than the last hour and I think formulated some good ways forward. This whole discussion is how to be responsive to what you heard at these different meetings and you've come up with some concrete ways to improve the proposal to be responsive to what you heard but also make it a viable meaningful proposal. R. Cartier commented I haven't had a chance to read the minutes from the last meeting but I think we need to pull out from the minutes what the concerns were and what the misinformation is that we have to deal with. I'd love to find out where some of that stuff came from. T. Giffen said its imaginary, a parallel universe. C. Robie said that group isn't getting it. They missed something as growing up as young adults, they're not grasping how we grasp things; a different perspective.

T. Giffen closed the work session.

C. Robie commented maybe we should all do a little work on our Master Plan and spend a few minutes each meeting and discuss that and see if we can put something together.

T. Giffen stated the next work session, 2nd meeting of the month and then we can discuss some of the details. I suggest we start with Carol's draft and look at the uses that should be permitted in areas of highest concentration and modify Carol's draft and then we can look at the size of the area or do it in reverse and look at the limitations of use. R. Cartier asked for a Word document of the draft. N. Miller said we're available to help in any way. When you schedule you're work session and you're at the point where you want to start delineating boundaries and things like that, we can print some large format maps with parcels on them and have them available for you guys to mark up. Whatever is helpful to you in that process; we're here to help. T. Giffen said the first thing to do would be to look at the specific permitted uses we would want in the area of highest concentration. Come up with something like that and then see how much space we need to accommodate those uses in a manner that would make a meaningful impact on the tax base.

The next Planning Board work session is scheduled for February 21st following the minor site plan application review for 512 Raymond Road; Ron Severino.

MOTION:

A. Hall **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 8:16 pm. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (7-0-0).**

*******Zoning Review & Revision Committee Meeting has been cancelled until further notice.**

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary
cc file