

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF March 6th, 2024
APPROVED MINUTES**

PB Members Present: Rudy Cartier, Chair; Brien Brock, BOS Representative; Judi Lindsey; Kevin Coughlin; Tim D’Arcy; Mike Guay, Alt. (sitting in for Mark Chalbeck); Scott Komisarek (via Zoom)

PB Members Absent:

Linda Carroll, Alt. (excused)
Mark Chalbeck, V-Chair (excused)
M. Santa, Alt.

* R. Cartier, Chair; called the PB meeting to order at approximately 6:30PM, followed immediately by the Pledge of Allegiance

New Business:

Case #24-001: Applicant: Applicant/Owner – Bob & Claudia Carr — 17 Vassar Street, Manchester, NH 03104. Property Location: 669 High Street, Candia, NH 03034 Map 405, Lot 48 ***Intent: MAJOR Site Plan consisting of three duplexes and a barn.***

R. Cartier: The first thing we need to do is to accept the application. Judi and I met with the engineer and the applicant on February 22nd, and we did come up with some items that need to be addressed. Judi, do you want to handle bringing those up, we will go over each one.

J. Lindsey: Reviews the Pre-Application Checklist Meeting Items (See Attachment). The Board, the engineer, and the applicant review

Joe Coronati, Jones, and Beach Engineers: With me, I have Bob Carr, the owner and applicant. Yes, we requested a waiver for the scale of the plans. January 10th, you’ll see in your application packet, we had a waiver request that has five or six waivers.

J. Coronati: We discussed that in the plan set we would be adding an aerial photo behind one of our plans to show you proximity of the abutting buildings, relative to this development. Because we obviously did not go on their properties and locate their homes or structures but we can do it with an aerial but that is not in this plan set yet.

R. Cartier: So, we don’t have that yet. Let’s leave that as an open item.

K. Coughlin: Is that aerial view acceptable?

R. Cartier: As long as it’s shown on the plans, it can be but at this point in time we’ll come back and discuss that one.

J. Coronati: I brought with me tonight a sidewalk waiver and a curbing waiver.

J. Coronati: We do show a well on the property. We show water lines to each of the units. We can provide more detail on that.

J. Coronati: We do not have that tonight, but we will have truck turning plans. We will provide a firetruck turning template around the site and your site plan regulations require...one of the nuances with this development is that this falls under your site plan regulations. A lot of your site plan regulations are really set up for commercial / industrial uses. So, one of the requirements of your site plan regs is we provide a truck turning template for WB67 Truck which is the largest tractor trailer out there. So, we will actually be requesting a waiver from a WB67, but we know you will want to see proof that you can get at least a firetruck around this turnaround. So, we are planning on providing a fire truck turning template plan, but we don't have that tonight as well.

R. Cartier: I think we will leave that as an open item to discuss but I think that also it's related to what the final determination is going to be on what the road is because it will make a big difference.

J. Coronati: That's another one that might be up for discussion. Currently, there are two driveways to this property. This is shown as a proposed road but there is an existing house out here, located roughly about here, it has its own curb cut that lines up with Donovan Road. There is another curb cut, I don't want to call it a trail, because you can drive a truck down it. A logging road type thing. When me and Bob did the test pits, he was driving his backhoe down this and there was no rutting or anything. This logging road has been there a long time, it's had heavy equipment on it. His goal would be to just keep this...currently it comes in off of 27. We are proposing to have a new connection from the proposed road to just meet up with the existing logging road and then we are really hoping to not have to make many changes to that logging road. Bob is not envisioning that to be a road at all. He wants it to be kind of a rural little trail / logging road type thing that he can occasionally use to go down to the back barn. We were certainly not thinking we would provide a profile of that. It's certainly not anything he expects to have any real traffic on, other than himself and buddies type of thing. So, I don't know how that weighs in or falls into this requirement. We also weren't planning to widen it. I know as we get further in, Stantec wanted to see it widened to twelve feet. I don't think that's our goal. We would really like to just keep it the width it is. He drives it now; he can easily drive a backhoe. I guess the key to that though is that we are not planning on providing any specifications for the existing logging road because we weren't planning on changing it.

R. Cartier: From an application standpoint, we will put that down as one of those questionable ones at this point in time.

J. Coronati: We actually do have a note on the plan. It's note 22 on sheet C4 and we will be editing it. It talks about each tenant having their trash stored inside their garage, which was the first part of that note. The second part is the part we will be editing, as it says trash will be picked up by a private hauler. And we talked about that they will be bringing it to the recycling center.

J. Coronati: Bob sent that to me a couple of days ago, maybe last week, and so we will provide that. We do have, maybe not as detailed, on the last page of the whole plan set, we do have a construction sequence that goes down through all of this on the plans.

R. Cartier: Are there dates on there?

J. Coronati: No. No dates. Just kind of the order of events. We don't normally get into putting dates to it.

R. Cartier: I think for this completion review, probably because you've got the sequence on there then technically it would meet the requirements in here but like you said, it will probably have to have more detail. Usually on the plans what we need to have in there is a timeframe so that it doesn't go on for 20 years or something like that. A reasonable timeframe in there, that is what we are looking for. I would say that it meets the intent right now.

T. D'Arcy: Rudy, I think we have some abutters here, I think it might be appropriate to inform them of the process, in terms of what we are doing tonight right now isn't approval or disapproval of anything, it's whether or not the application is complete.

R. Cartier: You've summed it up very well.

You have put in the request and that covers it for now.

R. Cartier: There are two parts to this. One of them is that the Board has to go through the application to see if everything in the application checklist has been submitted. If everything is submitted, then the Board has to vote to accept the application. If there are things that are missing and the Board determines that they are critical, then the Board would vote to not accept the application as complete. If the Board determines the application is complete, we go right to the Public Hearing and open the Public Hearing the same night.

T. D'Arcy: We may or may not accept this as complete and even if we do accept it as complete, then when we open the Public Hearing, we may or may not conclude the Public Hearing. I just wanted you to know. You are hearing us cruise through this pretty quickly and that's not just a check, check, check we're good and here is your approval. It's a two-step process.

R. Cartier: This is strictly just a checklist to see if everything is there that we need to hold a Public Hearing. We have gone through that but just to check on the items to get the Board's feeling on this, first was:

- Section II, Line 17: Use of all abutting properties shown with all structures there on and access roads.
 - Structures not shown.
 - Add abutting properties existing structures.

They are not shown but the applicant has indicated that they will submit an aerial view so I will open it up to the Board to determine if they have any questions or whether that is acceptable. It's up to the Board.

T. D'Arcy: The aerial view would show whether or not it's impinging on a property line or if it's impinging on the surrounding buildings, but we wouldn't get distances, which I think we normally get.

B. Brock: They are not within an unreasonable distance.

T. D'Arcy: I don't think this is a major issue per say because of this location and where it is and the adjacent buildings, but I like the aerial view idea. I am kind of saying, if we don't have a distance between buildings, which we normally do request, are we setting a precedence.

R. Cartier: The issue that would come up, you bring up a good point, is all of our other site plans have that and it's been pretty much consistent that the Board has been requiring it, the distances. It's anything within 200 feet for structures.

J. Coronati: There is a completeness item and then there is a review item of that information, which I think is the important part. We have two side abutters basically. The abutters across the street, this first building is over 200' from Rte. 27 so there's not homes within 200'.

T. D'Arcy: And the folks behind you physically are well more than 200' as well.

J. Coronati: We have thousands of feet behind us. But the two sideline abutters, we will add those. They're residential. To the East is a residential house. Our home is 113' feet to the property line. So, I'm not saying that their house could be within 200' of our house.

R. Cartier: It would actually be the distance measured from the property line.

J. Coronati: Alright, right but I'm just saying, just to give you an idea of proximity, there is a wetland that kind of runs down this property line. There is a wooded area that we are leaving, so there is a house over here and this side has a large farm complex and there are certainly buildings over there. And this house is 77' to the property line, just to give you an idea of we are not pushing up to the property lines, we're not trying to, and I don't think they are either. They are in the middle of their lots, but we will add that information and it is clearly up to you if you want to accept it tonight but it's something I think that once you see, you can review and determine if there are any concerns at that time.

T. D'Arcy: I don't have concerns, knowing the properties. I just have concerns about the precedent because this is what we have been requiring from everybody.

R. Cartier: Tim brings up the dilemma, but we also have to remember that it's required in the site plan just because of the number of units that are being put on this site, it's not necessarily a commercial site. All of the ones that we have done with site plans have been commercial sites. This could be considered a commercial site because they are going to be rental units but still it's residential units, not commercial.

K. Coughlin: And that barn is not commercial right?

B. Carr: No.

R. Cartier: Correct. We would have to make sure that we are very clear on if we allow this to go through without doing what is on there, is to be very specific on the reasoning for why we are not requiring it on the application at this point in time.

T. D'Arcy: Could you create something with distances to these things even if it's just a laser range finder or taking a drone.

J. Coronati: We'll actually provide a plan that looks just like this one with the aerial photo behind it and then we can give you dimensions to it and you can get kind of an idea of what the properties look like relative to tree lines, trails, driveways, and things like that also, which I think is more kind of more important.

T. D'Arcy: Trying to make that balance between realities and legalities and I just don't want to set a precedence per say if we can find some way that doesn't require disturbing the neighbors.

K. Coughlin: How have they done it in the past? Technologies change. Things like drones and aerial photos are available, where they might not have been in the past. In the past, how did you make people meet this requirement?

R. Cartier: The surveyors did it all. If we allow this to go through, then it basically violates the completeness checklist and if we decide to do that, we just have to have very specific reasons that we allow that to not be submitted in the application, even though it's required.

M. Guay: There is stuff on here that says, it is going to be in the final. What would we be accepting tonight when we know there are certain things in here that are going to be in the final that aren't here tonight?

R. Cartier: Those are okay because they have been addressed. So, what we need to do is to find a way to address this particular one. The other ones on here, some of the ones that are going to be filed, like state permits, by law we can't stop the acceptance of an application or the processing of an application if it is being held up by a local state or a federal.

M. Guay: He said he is going to provide us with what we are asking for.

R. Cartier: But he didn't with the application. That's the key that we have to address.

J. Coronati: Can I provide the aerial photo in my OnX Account showing the homes? I will say the home to the East, the Weeks property is actually really far from the property line. Well, more than 200 feet. Then the one to the West has a barn that is much closer. (presents the Board with the view of the property with an app on his phone.) T. D'Arcy: We have a lot of heavy lifting to do with you. I hate it when rules get in the way of getting work done.

R. Cartier: If we don't do things the way the procedures say, we set a precedent. If we have a good solid backing for why we would let this go.

J. Coronati: Where this is residential with residential. Maybe that's the difference. Every application is a different application.

R. Cartier: When we approved 23 Main Street, that did have buildings around it.

K. Coughlin: Do we know for a fact that anything is close? Is that something that we could waive or not?

R. Cartier: We cannot waive things on the application. We can waive things in the regulations when we get to the site plan.

T. D'Arcy: There might be some confusion here. I think that the thing is, on the application, if the building is within 200' of the property line, it needs to be on the site plan for the application. When you get to approving the plan itself, things just need the proper setbacks. It is two different criteria when you are looking at the two different things.

J. Coronati: Took a few moments to go onto the hunting app to assist him with gathering distance data for abutting properties to the project at 669 High Street.

Old Business:

- Approval of Minutes: 2.21.24

J. Lindsey: **Motion** to approve the minutes as presented. **Second:** T. D'Arcy. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

- Nate Miller – SNHPC – CIP

R. Cartier: The Public Hearing for the CIP will be on March 20th. There is only one thing that we might be adding and, Brien, I know that this is still kind of an open discussion item. The Fire Department wants to replace the defibrillator units in the cruisers and the different areas, which is obviously a very good idea. The total is \$13,000, so it comes under the requirements that we had. I don't think the funding has been determined yet.

B. Brock: No, it has not.

R. Cartier: If the Board is okay with it, I will just ask Mike Kelly to fill out one of the request forms and I will get that over to Nate and have him add it in and as far as funding, we can kind of keep that open but at least that will be in the CIP so that it meets the whole intent of us putting in those big ticket items.

- Southern NH Planning Commission - InvestNH HOP Updates – Steering Committee

R. Cartier: I have some great news. We have our \$50,000 to do Phase 2.

Appeal Updates:

- Foster Farms, New Boston Road –

R. Cartier: In the case of James Logan vs. The Town of Candia. They have withdrawn their objection. Tim Sullivan feels as though this should be the end of it.

Returning to New Business:

Case #24-001: Applicant: Applicant/Owner – Bob & Claudia Carr — 17 Vassar Street, Manchester, NH 03104. Property Location: 669 High Street, Candia, NH 03034 Map 405, Lot 48 **Intent: MAJOR Site Plan** consisting of three duplexes and a barn.

J. Coronati: Rejoined the meeting and presented his findings to the Board.

R. Cartier: In my opinion, it meets the intent.

The Board agreed that the rough submittal met the requirement. All were in favor.

T. D'Arcy: **Motion** to accept the application. M. Guay: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

R. Cartier: Opened the Public Hearing for: 7:32PM

J. Coronati: (Presents a brief overview of the project. Plans and application are all available online, on the town website.) We have been here a couple of times. We came to the Board for your input. The property is 88 acres. Bob Carr and his wife want to build three duplexes and a barn in the back. We went to the Zoning Board to allow us to do multi-family on one lot. One of the conditions of that variance was that none of the rest of the property would be developed.

We perceive this as a small rental / townhouse...duplex. Three-bedroom units. Every unit will have a garage. We are not proposing a road. It's a really small development. There is a large chunk of uplands on the front of the property. There are existing trails throughout the whole piece. We asked for waivers to not have to survey the whole property. We know there is a lot going on back there, there are definitely wetlands and streams. Trying to keep as much existing vegetation as possible. We would be able to keep a lot of the wooded buffer. We are not proposing any streetlights or driveway lights.

T. D'Arcy: Requested renderings of proposed buildings/units.

R. Cartier: Have you met with Stantec?

J. Coronati: No.

R. Cartier: Usually, for the sake of expediency, we suggest that you meet with Bryan from Stantec and go over his letter so a lot of those things are taken care of.

J. Coronati: We were going to request a waiver for delivery areas and for lighting.

R. Cartier: The Board cannot act unilaterally and decide that. If you put in a formal request, the Board can consider it officially.

J. Coronati: If at all possible, we would like to know where the Board stands on the Stormwater Waiver Request.

R. Cartier: Ask the Fire Chief, Dean Young.

D. Young: I talked to Mr. Carr about it and told him if he doesn't make it so that we can get there, we can't help him, and that will be a discussion he will have to have with his insurance company.

B. Brock: How far is it from the cul-de-sac to the barn?

J. Coronati: 1,000 feet.

B. Brock: But there are other access reasons, other than fire. In your discussion there with Bryan, I know he went into a lot of detail about that and I don't necessarily agree with the requirements but it has to be accessible for their firetrucks and being 1000 feet back, you might even have to have a couple turnouts so that a truck can be parked there if Dean has to stage more than one truck to transfer the water. That's typically what we do with long driveways.

B. Ruoff: The drainage is multi-layered. I understand the applicant's engineer's argument against it. It makes some sense, but I think there are a couple of aspects at play. One, they are at 99,000 square feet disturbance for the project. That would require a full-blown drainage design. I don't even think a 99,000 square feet disturbance is constructable the way that they are showing the project. As far as I am concerned it is an AOT required project which is a big deal for drainage and permitting requirements. Anytime with the town and the 20 years that we have been the town engineer, there has been proposed drainage whether it be for a four-lot subdivision or a site plan or whatnot. At a minimum there has to be drainage calculations for the proposed improvements. We can't just accept that proposed drainage is being put in. Whenever there is proposed drainage there needs to be some sort of calculations.

J. Lindsey: What is the barn going to be used for?

B. Brock: That's not our concern.

J. Lindsey: It isn't?

B. Brock: Absolutely not.

K. Coughlin: Commercial or Non-Commercial I think is our only concern, right?

R. Cartier: I think at this point, there seems to be a lot of open questions that need to be addressed with Stantec. As well as the Fire Chief's input in regards to fire suppression and protection.

I will entertain a motion to continue the hearing to our next meeting. We will not close the hearing at this point in time, but we will continue it to our next meeting. It does not have to be re-noticed and will stay on the agenda.

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to continue the Public Hearing as discussed. T. D'Arcy: **Second**: All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Other Business:

- Town Planning
- Any other matter to come before the Board.

R. Cartier: Regional Economic Development Center of Southern NH. They are working on an Economic Development Master Plan for the Region, and they are looking for someone to represent Candia. I don't know if anyone would be interested in doing that, but Amy has offered to be involved with that if the Board would like her to do that.

Public Comments:

- Town Planning
- Any other matter to come before the Board.

Motion to Adjourn: T. D'Arcy. **Second:** J. Lindsey. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Respectfully submitted,

Amy M. Spencer

Land Use Coordinator

cc: file