

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of July 6, 2016
UNAPPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: Al Hall Vice Chair; Tom Giffen; Mike Santa, Judi Lindsey; Scott Komisarek BOS Representative; Rudy Cartier Alt; Joyce Bedard Alt; Dave Murray, Building Inspector; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent

Absent: Sean James Chairman; K. Kustra; Carleton Robie Alt

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

Vice Chair Hall asked Alternate Joyce Bedard to sit for Ken Kustra and Alternate Rudy Cartier to sit for J. Szot.

Minutes June 15, 2016

T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the minutes of June 15, 2016 as amended. M. Santa **seconded**. T. Giffen, M. Santa, S. Komisarek, A. Hall **were in favor**. J. Bedard & R. Cartier **abstained**. **Motion passed (4-0-2)**.

16-008 Preliminary Major Subdivision Application: Applicant: MDGF LLC 170 Bridge Street Manchester NH 03104; Owner: same; Property location: Currier Road, Candia NH 03034; Map 402 Lot 105; Intent: To create 3 new lots in the Residential District.

Roscoe Blaisdell, land surveyor, wetland scientist and George (Skip) Kelly were present for the applicant. Rene LaBranche and Bryan Ruoff from Stantec the town's engineers were present. Sharon & Edward Larpenter 104 Currier Road, Paul & Karen Frasier 63 Currier Road abutters were present. T. Giffen said he did the technical review and took detailed notes where some items are still pending and or where waivers were requested. R. Blaisdell said there are approximately 30 acres of vacant land and they are asking to subdivide into 4 lots, one 10 acre, with two 5 acre lots and the last one approximately 9 acres. He said it is rolling land and not steep with a few wetlands and they were able to maintain all the town requirements for lot size upland, etc. He said they got good test pit results.

Vice Chair Hall asked if they should vote as complete. T. Giffen said they may wish to discuss before excepting as complete as he had performed the technical review earlier tonight and there are few areas of concern that need to be addressed and a couple of minor items on the checklist that do bear discussion. He said if there are any questions he would be happy to explain. He said the first page of Stantec's review letter dated June 29, 2016, is largely complete. #1 question on 10.06f that reads, "*The subdivision plan shall provide soil maps and information in accordance with Site Specific Soil Maps for New Hampshire Special Publication No 3, June 1997, and as amended. Maps prepared by field examination shall be prepared and stamped by a Certified Soil Scientist and include the date of the field examination. All costs of preparing soil data shall be borne by the applicant.*" He said the work has been completed but not completed in sufficient time to be put on the plan. R. Blaisdell said they have flagged and noted all the wetlands. He said the westerly side is very poorly drained and the easterly side is poorly drained wetland and the lot is nice rolling terrain.

T. Giffen said the next item the applicant will be requesting a waiver for is 10.06g which requires buildings within 200' be noted on the plan. He said apparently most of the towns that the applicant has worked in only require 100' noted and that was how the plan was prepared. Then next item is on page two of the checklist 0.06h item regarding watercourses and flood prone areas. R. Blaisdell said he made the statement it is not in the flood plan saying down the road a large swamp that is in the floodplain. R. LaBranche asked if the determination it wasn't in the floodplain done with FEMA mapping and R. Blaisdell said yes. T. Giffen said on item #3 10.06i Deed Restrictions is non-applicable as well as #4 Deed Covenants and #5 All buildings and accessory buildings. T. Giffen read "*10.06k Preliminary road profiles showing grades, existing and proposed street r.o.w. lines, (Including side slopes), width of streets.*" He said there are no streets or roads proposed. T.

Giffen asked R. LaBranche about “10.06k #4 Fire Protection facilities” if a water cistern was required. R. LaBranche said according to the regulations a cistern is required. T. Giffen asked the applicant if they would be asking for a waiver. He continued with “10.06 3. Existing and proposed telephone, electricity, water and sewer lines”, saying it is not applicable as nothing else is proposed. He said the applicant is asking for a waiver for “10.06L #1 Preliminary drainage analysis #2 Watershed areas.” He said the last item in his review was concerning “12.04 Requires that all new lot corners be marked with granite blocks and adjacent iron detection pins unless a written waiver is granted by the Board.” He said the applicant does not have a problem getting it done but has not been done yet and he believes in past they have set conditions with a time limit to have this done. R. Blaisdell said he will set a granite bound drill hole in it which is magnetic so if buried a metal detector would be able to pick it up. He said he was not planning to set a granite bound and pipe next to everyone. T. Giffen suggested reiterating and discussing all these items as a Board. Vice Chair Hall asked if the Board had any comments. He asked R. LaBranche to speak.

R. LaBranche said he will go through the list that T. Giffen just went through and discuss each item and give suggestions following along with their review letter dated June 29, 2016.

#1 comment. This is pending so that is a nonissue.

#2 comment. R. Blaisdell said he feels it is a reasonable request to only show 100’ on the plan.

#3 comment. R. Blaisdell item number 3 said the entire lot is wood and if he put a foliage line along the road it would obstruct all his text so he would like to request a waiver on this. He said the regulations ask him to show the lot wooded and the clearing line. R. LaBranche said the regulations are asking for existing and proposed foliage lines. R. Blaisdell said he doesn’t know exactly where the houses will be placed so it would be impossible to show the proposed clearing limits. The question was brought up why show a placement for a home if it may not be built there and it was discussed that they had to show a possible buildable location within the building envelope with septic and water. S. Kelley said once a septic design is approved by the state they will bring the proposed house and location meeting all the setback criteria to the building inspector.

#4 comment. R. LaBranche said he likes to see the water courses on the plan to see where the water is going as they were trying to figure it out when they did their review. He asked have the water course explained as there is a culvert in the road involved. He also asked for clarification and water course on the large wetland. R. Blaisdell said he will add directional arrows. R. LaBranche said the last thing you want to have happen is to have a subdivision go in and the water starts going to places you do not want it to go which could adversely affect the new lots or adjacent lots. R. Blaisdell said item number 4 is to provide preliminary drainage analysis and computations. He said he could see doing this if you were putting in a subdivision road but it would a minuscule amount of water from each house and they do not know the size of house that will be constructed. R. LaBranche said most likely they will build far off the road.

#5 comment. R. LaBranche said the Fire Chief’s preference if he wants a cistern or sprinklers and suggested getting a letter from the Fire Chief. The project location is approximately 2.7 miles from an arterial road which triggers this criteria. The definition of an arterial road is 101, Rt 27, Rt 43. R. LaBranche suggested talking with the Fire Chief about this. R. Blaisdell said they would not want to build a cistern maybe sprinkler systems. R. LaBranche said he agrees but the reality is the regulations criteria is clear. R. Cartier said in that part of the regulations there are 3 options, one is 10,000 cistern, second is to put a restriction in the deeds for a sprinkler systems third contribute an equivalent amount of money in the water supply fund. E. Larpenier asked where they are getting the water ¾ mile away. R. Carter said the closest water would be camp Thomas on North Road, So Haws Pond which the Fire Department has access to and he said there is also a cistern on Halls Mill Road. T. Giffen said as a member of the Planning Board he would feel more comfortable if they had the Fire Chief weigh in on that and suggested the applicant reach out to the Fire Chief. E. Larpenier asked about the test pits data and asked if they could get information to see what they found. S. Kelley said all that information has been submitted to the town. T. Giffen said that information is in the folder and is public and to come into the town office to get copies. Letters from the police department and fire department and that was done.

#6 comment. This is a note and they will comply with that.

#7 comment. R. Blaisdell said the last lot to the left has a driveway 8 feet from property line which they will move another 20 feet so it will not be an issue. R. LaBranche said the concern with building the driveway close to an abutters property in this case is it drops off quite a bit and may take significant fill and a slope will go on the neighbors property who will have the right to dig the slope up and destabilize the driveway which would also could require an easement so it would be best to move the driveway.

#8 comment. R. Blaisdell said they are asked to show a Storm Water Protection Plan (SWPP) on all lots and asked how can you show a SWPP when you do not know where and how big the house is going to be and how long a driveway. He said all the houses will be 200 feet apart. R. LaBranche said SWPP is actually for storm water erosion control during construction and with this subdivision his concern is with the two end lots with substantial wetlands. He said the intent is to show erosion control measures to protect the wetlands such as silt fences, silk sock something. R. Blaisdell said he can show some silt fences.

#9 comment. R. Blaisdell said they are asked to provide a drainage analysis to identify any potential increase in water runoff and if any culverts would be required. He said all the contours are going towards the wetlands and the proposed houses are way out back on the lots. R. LaBranche said these lots will increase the impervious area but whether they are going to adversely affect the abutting property probably not because those wetlands are fairly significant so the little bit of extra water that is going to come off these lots and go into these wetlands is so negligible relative to the overall amount of storm water it might end up being .001 or something like that. He said it is nothing that he believes would affect the runoff. T. Giffen reiterated that it is Rene LaBranche opinion that the water is going to dissipate into the wetlands with no possibility of significant impact. R. LaBranche said his recommendation would be to not require a full SWPP and dredge plan.

#10 comment. Recommends drainage analysis at existing culvert crossing at New Boston Road. R. Blaisdell said he does not feel the houses will impact New Boston Road a half a mile away. R. LaBranche said they had not seen the sight until tonight and noticed the culverts were coming from the other side of the road onto this property. He said usually you are more concerned when it is coming from the property onto other properties. He said this would not be necessary. T. Giffen said based on your physical inspection of the site your recommendation would be no concerns and R. LaBranche said yes.

#11 Drainage analysis of existing 18" CMP culvert under Currier Road. R. Blaisdell said the culvert is coming from across the road onto their property into the very poorly wetland. R. LaBranche said the only issue he would point out relative to the culverts and roads they are adding 4 new homes on Currier Road and talking to the road agent understand Currier Road has its own issues of rutting up significantly in the winter time and spring time when it is wet. He said the road agent's concern is valid is by adding additional homes you are adding more people that will be inconvenienced by this. In addition there is always that potential that a fire truck or ambulance cannot get affectively through and is an issue relative to Currier Road. Relative to infrastructure the culverts are passing storm water from the other side of the road into the wetlands and you are again these 4 new homes are going to be dependent on these culverts working and being in good condition as he doesn't know if they are in good condition. D. Lewis said the culvert is in good condition and have only seen it go over the top once, however when it goes over the top it means the wetland has reached its capacity when that happens it takes the course down the road to the next culvert down towards New Boston Road before it washes across the road because everything has reached capacity including lower large swamp before New Boston Road so that culvert won't outlet either so the road essentially becomes a dam and it crosses the low point where the culvert so even enlarging the culvert the next one wouldn't alleviate the problem. That whole area has water issues when flooding time happens. Vice Chair Hall said beyond this project. D. Lewis said way beyond this project. If anyone from the board visited at flood stage would be in awe at the amount of water that travels through there. R. LaBranche said what he was describing is there are some issues on the road and they are adding homes on the road that are depended upon emergency services to access the homes. Existing issues that are not going to be addressed by anything you are proposing here. D. Lewis said he would agree there as the 4 new houses will not impact the water issue as that is an existing situation that really has not remedy. The water physically has not place to go in the springtime or flood stage. P. Frasier said the driveways proposed they will have to ditch that side of the road will they need culverts. D. Lewis some may

need culverts some may not. The question was asked if the town has certain specifications for the long driveways 900 to 1000 feet that are proposed. D. Lewis that have to be a certain width and grade they have to follow, pull offs for emergency vehicles and room to turn around once in. R. Cartier said the requirements are in the Zoning Regulations. P. Frasier said he had pictures of what the area looked like in the spring, wetlands and runoffs after R. Blaisdell had been there surveying in the winter with snow on the ground. He said near their property there is a spring on the property up on the ledge upper right that runs down through the middle of the property every year and it is where there are two test pits marked and not marked on the plan. If you were to run the driveways all the way up they would work like a beaver dam and stop the water and the water would run down driveways. R. Blaisdell said all the wetlands have been flagged. R. LaBranche said his recommendation on a drainage analysis is probably not necessary.

#12 comment. Fire suppression water source. R. Blaisdell said they will probably end up putting in sprinklers.

#13 comment. Drive way grading plan. R. Blaisdell said they are simple driveways, flat maybe a 2' rise with some needed culverts some not. R. Cartier may be appropriate to put that on the plan. R. Blaisdell said he can put a note on the plan that driveways would not exceed 10%. R. LaBranche said it may be good to include specifications on the driveway as well.

#14 comment. Type of wetlands. R. Blaisdell on the left hand side very poorly drained on the right side poorly drained and will show that. He said he is a wetland scientist and septic designer.

#15 comment. Add a legend with more addition information for clarity. R. Blaisdell asked what was unclear on the legend. B. Ruoff said setback typical should be shown and call out as typical would be fine.

#16 comment. Regarding 20% slope. R. Blaisdell said he scaled it and it is 10%. R. LaBranche said if it is 10% then this comment doesn't apply.

#17 comment. R. LaBranche his misinterpretation of the regulations.

#18 comment. R. Blaisdell said he will have an engineer to show that all these lots are buildable. R. LaBranche said the regulations state that they plan has to be stamped by an engineer saying they did it. The town engineer does not put any comments on their plans. T. Giffen said his own point of view if he was in your shoes would want some kind of insurance from someone that said yes we can forward and have it to make sure my investment was protected and from the strongly advise to do for your own protect. S. Kelley said he has and trusts R. Blaisdell. T. Giffen said it is a requirement of the regulations. R. Blaisdell said he is a wetland scientist and septic designer and the state looks for these things not a PE stamp. He asked if he could get a straw poll seeing if he is wasting his time coming to the next meeting asking for a waiver. T. Giffen said this isn't the first time for S. Kelley and he wouldn't be wasting his time or our time if didn't have some reasonable amount of faith in R. Blaisdell that this wouldn't go forward because ultimately this has to get a septic system in place you would be done. S. Kelley said he has built somewhere between 200-300 houses since the late 1980's. R. Blaisdell said he has been doing septic designs for 35 years. M. Santa said when they come in to get their building permit they will have to show a state approval septic system to build. T. Giffen. Petrin said personally he wouldn't have a problem waiving this. S. Komisarek said he agrees.

#19 comment. R. Blaisdell said he will be adding the wetland notes.

#20 comment. R. Blaisdell said when should they ask for driveway permits? D. Lewis said they have to have the lot created. He said he did not see any issues but any of the driveway locations you may find out you need a wetlands permit. D. Lewis said Currier Road is very hard to maintain and the current traffic volume has exceeded the capacity of a gravel road prior efforts to upgrade the road have failed at town meetings. He said in his opinion 4 more lots won't make the existing conditions worse his main concerns are public safety fire apparatus police as well as school buses and deliveries how they are going to address this in the long run. It's okay to sit here and say 4 more lots are not a big impact but on a road like Currier Road it is a huge impact and need to take that into consideration. He said he does the best he can to maintain it and the spend a lot money every year up there and the residents present can vouch for all the effort that goes into that road February, March, April and sometimes it is literally impassible and worst section is right where these 4 new lots are proposed. He is not sure how the Board of Selectmen or Planning Board want to address this issue. He said he has worked on this road for 20 years and conditions have not gotten any better and more houses keep getting

built. S. Komisarek said when the upgrade for Currier Road went before the town and got voted down, trying to figure out the logic of why keep it gravel, keep rural character? S. Larpenter said they have spent their entire life on that road and want to keep it that way. She said the cars speed already and would be worse if paved. S. Komisarek said in the spring are you concerned for fire apparatus to access the road? S. Larpenter said yes at it does get bad. R. Blaisdell said he was on Currier during the worst condition and he saw a lot of fresh rock up there but it did not stop him from getting through. D. Lewis said it was not a bad spring he said a couple of years ago he spent \$20,000 to make it passable for 6 weeks and someone buying a new home up there is not going to be happy when they cannot get out of their driveway. He said this needs to be addressed point. He is there 3am - 4am in the morning bringing in hauled stone at night and grading it out and to do it all over again at 2pm so people can get home at night and this goes on for weeks. R. Cartier asked if had done an analysis on how much traffic has increased. D. Lewis said the last traffic count it was over 300 cars a day and the average of 90 cars a day, is maximum for a dirt road. He said you just can't do one section it would have to be upgraded completely. Maybe perhaps upgrade it to a gravel with a box out road 3 feet down and do an under drain and still keep it as a dirt road it won't be perfect and will require maintenance but would be one step short of paving and just as big an expense or more then paving because you do not have the pavement on the road to absorb the load. R. Cartier confirmed with the road agent that the road currently cannot handle the traffic. D. Lewis said it cannot and anyone resent tonight who lives on the road can vouch for that. He said all the other dirt roads are low volume traffic. P. Frasier said when it was proposed to pave Currier Road he said he fought not to have it paved as he likes the dirt road and the road was only benefiting 5 houses at that time and when you turn the corner it was Deerfield's Road. He said it is not all Candia Traffic it is also Deerfield Traffic all on the right hand side. He said ditching areas of the road would be helpful when putting in driveways ditching would help that is why he was asking about the culverts and where they were going to dump into. A. Hall said for the record the Police Chief has concerns regarding to mud seasons emergency vehicles may find that section of road impassible and on the Building Inspector's comment #9 waiting for the results of the wetlands delineation before he goes any further with his review comments. He said the wetlands report in his opinion is major key to the completion of this proposal. R. Blaisdell said the wetland report is just going to discuss the soil types and wetlands will be marked. It was asked if the road was designated scenic and it is not. K. Larpenter said would you be able to pave if a scenic road and D. Lewis said designated scenic roads you can improve them it refers to tree cutting/clearing. S. Komisarek said he is a little confused if someone purchases a property and meets all the requirements almost seems it's the towns responsibility to make the road passable and the road is not passable in the spring for small cars yet when the town voted to pave the road recommended by the road agent, it gets voted down. He said it is a tough situation. T. Giffen said philosophically said you hold these peoples feet to the fire for a preexisting condition with a dirt road that is running 3 times the capacity on the road. D. Lewis said on Crowley road it was built up in two large divisions and they were able to have these subdivisions contribute to upgrading the road because it was a dramatic impact but with Currier Road evolved 1,2 3 houses at a time then there were 60 to 70 homes now. So the impact was gradual no one you can put the offsite improvements on like Crowley Road. D. Lewis said we all like dirt roads, its fire protection, ambulance emergency services and he does keep in contact with the Fire Department on a daily basis on going monitoring when it is muddy in case there is a structure fire the fire department would have to enter Currier Road on the Podunk end. He said it is a public road and it ends up being treated like a back road. S. Kelley said people who buy these lots are going to know upfront they are on a dirt road.

T. Giffen said the applicant has done a good job but there is still work to be done and his thoughts are let them go back and then address the final waivers at that time, unless the consensus of the Board is to address those waivers now. R. Blaisdell said he would like to ask for his waivers now. R. Cartier keep in mind there is public safety that is involved that has to be addressed going through the waivers still going to have to address the fact that the road is over capacity and access is an issue, they have snow storms. R. Blaisdell said he will contact the Police Chief and the Fire Chief as well. T. Giffen said as D. Lewis has said this has been an incremental process one house here one house there and doesn't seem much at the time but then you end up

with 300 cars a day on a road that hold 90 so the question is how did we let that happen, what do we do to fix it and lastly should we put these people's feet to the fire for a preexisting circumstance when it is not economically viable for them to address as it was on Crowley Road. He said there is not enough profit in 4 houses to cover the cost of rebuilding Currier Road. D. Lewis said you are looking at \$400,000 to upgrade it.

R. Blaisdell said he will use Stantec's review letter dated June 29, 2016 to go through the waivers he is requesting.

#2 comment. R. Blaisdell said it asks to show all buildings within 200' on the plan and they have shown 100' and they want to request a waiver on this. R. Stantec said showing 200' is not necessary. M. Santa made a **motion** to accept the waiver on Section 10.06g to show buildings within 200' of the subdivision. T. Giffen **seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

#3 Comment. Section 10.06h as specified under Section 19.04 to show existing foliage line on plan and they are asking for a waiver on this as it is an entirely wooded site. T. Giffen said they do not know where exactly the houses are going to be. M. Santa made a **motion** to accept the waiver on Section 19.04 to show existing and proposed foliage lines on the plan. T. Giffen **seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

#4 Comment. Section 10.06L show a preliminary drainage analysis and computations. They are asking for a waiver. R. LaBranche said he agrees with the applicant that the amount of impervious and existing condition that it is not necessary. T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the waiver on Section 10.06L to provide a preliminary drainage analysis and computations. Komisarek **seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

#8 Comment. R. Blaisdell said is about Section 11.06 to supply a Storm Water Protection Plan (SWPP) for all the lots but they do not know the exact placement of homes. R. LaBranche said they will have a full SWPP and recommend the appropriate erosion control measurements such as silt fences to be shown on the plan and wetlands. R. Blaisdell said he does not need this waiver as he is going to do this.

#9 Comment. R. Blaisdell said Section 15.06 is to show storm water flow to adjacent properties. He continued it is minuscule same as #8 and all going downhill to large wetlands. R. LaBranche asked if he could show storm water direction arrows and full analysis has been done away with. R. Blaisdell said he will add the directional arrows.

#13 Comment. Section 19.14c full driveway grading plan. R. Blaisdell said he there will be notes on the plan on the requirements are for driveways so they are not more than 10% grade. T. Giffen said the driveways need to be approved anyway. So he is asking for a waiver to show a plan of the driveway grading. T. Giffen said this is a recommendation and a waiver is not needed.

#18 Comment. Section 5.06I to not hire a professional engineer to review all the lots.

T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the waiver on Section 5.06I to hire a professional engineer to review and stamp the plan. M. Santa **seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

M. Santa asked how they are going to address the suppression system will there be notes on the plan. R. Blaisdell said he clearly knows what he needs to know with the exception of the issue of the road. He said he will put a note on the plan that the new homes will require a sprinkler system. R. Cartier said that will be a deed restriction. T. Giffen said as far as the items on the technical review the only other thing that comes to mind is setting the bounds. He said it is typical for the Planning Board to approve with the condition of pending the installation of the bounds and work with the surveyor typically 30, 60 to 90 days whichever is mutually agreeable. R. Blaisdell said he would like 60 days. He said confirmed that the bounds need to be set to sign the Mylars.

P. Frasier asked about waiver on comment #2 and T. Giffen clarified saying it had to do with drawing the adjacent homes and structures within 200' of the subdivision. P. Frasier asked if they would be notified of the next meeting and it was confirmed that when the applicant comes forward with the Final Major Subdivision it will be 30 days prior to the meeting it will be heard and notices will be sent to all abutters. Vice Chair A. Hall said they will take a 5 minute recess before the open the next public hearing.

16-009 Preliminary Major Subdivision Application: Applicant: Chester Turnpike Realty LLC 404 Chester Turnpike Candia NH 03034; Owners: Same; Property location: Chester Turnpike Candia NH 03034; Map 411 Lot 42; Intent: To create four new lots in the Residential District.

Roscoe Blaisdell, land surveyor, wetland scientist and Dino Minuti of Chester Turnpike Realty LLC 404 Chester Turnpike were present for the applicant. Rene LaBranche and Bryan Ruoff from Stantec the town's engineers were present. Abutters Russ & Bernadette Dann 1 Tower Hill Road were present. R. Blaisdell said the property is on Chester Turnpike near Donovan road is just over 24 acres and they are proposing 5 lots. He said there are more wetlands on this property but are looking at only one dredge and fill permit that he plans on applying for soon as he gets a consensus on how it goes tonight. He said two lots are less than 2 acres and will require state subdivision approval and the other 3 lots are larger than 5 acres and do not require state subdivision approval.

T. Giffen said when he did the technical review section 10.06f shall provide soil maps and information. He said the stamp is not yet present but the work has been done this will be an open item. R. Blaisdell said that Bruce Gilday did the work and the plan will be stamped. T. Giffen said Section 10.06f contour lines have exceeded the 5 foot intervals and they have given 2 foot intervals with no issue there. He said Section 10.06f regarding showing buildings 200 foot they are going to request a waiver as they have done the 100 foot standard. He said Section 10.06L the preliminary drainage analysis for the watershed areas they are going to be asking for a waiver this too. Also they will have to have a time limit on the placement of lot corners.

R. Blaisdell said they will go through the comments of the review letter from Stantec dated 6/29/2016. #1 Comment. R. Blaisdell said it asks to show all buildings within 200' on the plan and they have shown 100' and they want to request a waiver on this. R. Stantec said showing 200' is not necessary. M. Santa made a **motion** to accept the waiver on Section 10.06g to not have to show buildings within 200' of the subdivision. T. Giffen **seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

#2 Comment. Section 19.04 show existing foliage line on plan and they are asking for a waiver on this as it is an entirely wooded site as specified under Section 19.04. T. Giffen said they do not know where exactly the houses are going to be. M. Santa made a **motion** to accept the waiver on Section 19.04 to show existing and proposed foliage lines on the plan. T. Giffen **seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed (6-0-0).**

#3 Comment. Section 10.06L To showing preliminary drainage analysis and computations. R. Blaisdell said depending where a house goes if left of lot go one way, if right of lot another way and will be minuscule with shorter driveways then the Currier Road Preliminary. R. LaBranche said although the comment is similar to the last Preliminary Hearing this site is different from the other site in that there is a significant amount of wetlands that are all connected from lot to lot. His question is as these wetlands fill up in the springtime or significant rain event where is the water going and what size should the culvert or culverts be that will allow water to go from one lot to another lot. He said there should be some kind of analysis. R. Blaisdell said they only have one culvert crossing the wetlands. R. Blaisdell said he water shed is 6 acres and he can look at a chart and believe it will be less than a 24" culvert. He said there is an existing culvert crossing the road and he has not determined the size and have not finished his dredge and fill yet but he said he would assume on a six acre lot the drainage would be small and a 24" culvert would easily handle that and if you do not feel it will handle it he will make it larger. The existing culvert shown is 24". The driveway that will require a culvert is lot 42-2. He said he will do an analysis of how much land is being drained over to that culvert. R. LaBranche said when they go for the dredge and fill with the state the state will want to make sure animals and amphibians can crawl through. R. Blaisdell said he will do his own analysis for size culvert to handle approximately 6 acres and drainage is going onto the property. R. LaBranche said their concern would be the connecting culvert for the driveway more so then the culvert going onto the property. He said he will show drainage flow on plan. R. Blaisdell said he will show the certain size culvert and show the analysis. T. Giffen confirmed he will be complying with comment and R. Blaisdell said yes. R. Cartier asked the road agent if there were issues of flooding on this section of Chester Turnpike and there are not any issues with flooding.

#4 Comment. Letters from the Fire Chief and Police Chief. R. Blaisdell said they will put a note on the plan for a deed restriction for a sprinkler system. D. Minuti asked about the 3rd option of contributing money to the

fire suppression fun instead of a cistern or sprinkler systems. The third option is calculated from the size of the building. T. Giffen said believes amount of money in the contribution is going to be close or equal to the sprinkler system and R. Cartier said it could be. The applicant will contact the Fire Chief.

#5 Comment. Provide statement on plan. The statement will be added to the plan.

#6 Comment. Contour lines. The applicant was add more labels to the contour lines. R. LaBranche asked about the site distances. D. Lewis said there is a location on every lot for a driveway and the second lot down from Donovan Road might not make the site distance requirements. He said you need 250' at 3 1/2' above the pavement and you just might make it and there isn't any ability to move this driveway up either maybe be able to move it down some to the right to get the site distance. He said all the other ones are fine.

#7 Comment. Revise driveways to minimize impacts to existing stonewalls whenever possible. R. Blaisdell said one of the driveways would require a dredge & fill permit.

#8 Comment. Lot 411-42-2 is show without a driveway. It was brought up that one driveway location was not clear. R. Blaisdell said he will go out and measure this driveway and confirm where the driveway is.

#9 Comment. Lot 411-42-3 requires a dredge and fill permit. He said if the Board is happy with the proposed lot lines he will figure out the culvert size and start his process of obtaining a dredge and fill permit. He said this will take about 3 months.

#10 Comment. R. Blaisdell said that Stantec does not have 1.5 acres of contiguous non-poorly drained soils and he does saying he got that with his computer. He said he has note on the plans that all lots have excess of 1.5 acres of contiguous non-poorly drained soils. This is non issue.

#11 Comment. SWPP required. R. Blaisdell said he will put direction flow arrows on the plan and silk fences from the wetlands. R. LaBranche same comment as the last Preliminary put in the appropriate erosion control measures to avoid run off.

#12 Comment. Same as #11. R. LaBranche said the intent here is once they looked at all the storm water analysis comments it all comes down to that one location they are concerned about. He said that D. Lewis said there are no issues relative to any culverts going onto the property. R. Blaisdell said then this comment is a non issue.

13 Comment. R. Blaisdell said then this comment is a non issue as well.

14 Comment. Section 19.14. R. Blaisdell said they have already talked about this and they are going to do a deed restriction for sprinklers and they are going to contact the Fire Chief.

15 Comment Section 19.14C. Maximum grade of 10% on driveways. T. Giffen said it is a recommendation and a waiver is not needed. He aid is it the sense of the Board to treat this like the previous Preliminary and add as a note to the plan.

16 Comment. Legend with additional information to be provided for clarity. This will be added.

17 Comment Additional contours for clarity.

18 Comment. Unclear right of way 50' wide.

19 Comment. Wetland boundaries soil classifications. R. Blaisdell said the work is done and Bruce Gilday is putting his soils stamp and wetlands stamp on the plan. He said he has done a revised report which he will get to the Town.

20 Comment. Reference to report soil classifications R. Blaisdell said that will be in the revised report.

21 Comment. Section 5.06I. R. Blaisdell said two of the lots 411-42 and 411-42-1 under 5 acres and they will be getting state subdivision approvals.

22 Comment. Section 5.06I to not hire a professional engineer to review all of the lots. R. Blaisdell said he would like to ask for a waiver to not have to have to hire an engineer to look at the plan and sat there is the well the test pit you are good. He said he would like to request a waiver. T. Giffen said he would assume the basis for the waiver request is based on his expertise as a septic designer and wetland soil scientist and the applicant is comfortable with that. T. Giffen said his augment would be the same for this one that if the applicant finds out at the end of this process that cannot build miscalculation on their part that would be their risk and the town would not be a risk. T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the waiver on Section 5.06I to not

have to hire a professional engineer to review and stamp the plan. M. Santa **seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed** (6-0-0).

23 Comment. R. Blaisdell said he will get the driveway permits for each newly lot created.

R. Cartier asked if any of the lots behind this parcel landlocked. R. Blaisdell said he could not tell. R. Cartier asked about Map 411 lots 39 and 37. R. Blaisdell said that there are no easements that he is aware of. M. Santa asked who collects all the data on the test pits and who has that information. R. Blaisdell said on this project Bruce Gilday did them and the information was given to the town. T. Giffen said it is in the folder. R. Dann said he remembers and heard awhile back there was an old road right of way that went through that property and came up across Chester Turnpike. T. Giffen said he did have any specific knowledge. R. Blaisdell not aware and R. Cartier said that is the reason he asked. R. Blaisdell said back in the 1700s parallel lines were drawn without walking the land marking out 100 acres parcels. Sometimes these were not practical for roads and for this particular range way that goes through this land there is a giant swamp and the road was never built. He said when he looked up research one of the lots got both sides of the range way and another one got half of the range way. Sometimes you have to go back to the King and the good records were not kept. He said he feels confident that a boundary fence has been there for well over 100 years and does not feel this is an issue and that is his opinion. It was discussed that the applicant has to come back with their final application which has to be submitted 30 days prior to the meeting. Letter per Candia Subdivision Regulations 10:08 a letter regarding recommendation for going forward or not going forward will be sent. R. Blaisdell thanked the Board.

Other Business

Informational 31 Murray Hill Road Map 413 Lot 011 to create one new lot

John and Sandra Rollston 31 Murray Hill road Map 413 Lot 11 owners were present. James Franklin Surveyor was present. J. Franklin said on the handout on the first sheet is a copy of the town's tax map and he has highlighted the location of this property which is on the Auburn town line at Murray Hill Road. The property is 15.64 acres and has been in existence since 1976 when the Candia Planning Board approved the subdivision. He said has a copy of the original subdivision if anyone wants to see it. The second sheet is a copy of Google earth and starting at the bottom of the drawing center you will see gray and white lines that is the location of Murray Hill Road and the white line is the utility lines the black line center lower and runs to the left and is the approximate town line. First see shed then see home with driveway and they a green pond all on the left. On the last sheet you will see that they are proposing to create a 3.5 acre lot around the existing home and pond. They are keeping the pond and home together as that is what it was originally intended. By deed and prior survey plan on the right side of the property there is enough frontage to created one lot and there are wetlands over on this part. He so rather than having a wetland crossing of some unknown length they are proposing having a driveway access on the left side of the proposed lot that would be parallel with the property lines and have labeled the lines as proposed line is parallel and that is with the side lot lines that were originally approved by the Planning Board. The town regulations say that they prefer lot lines be at right angles and if they did this it would cut through the pond and make the lot difficult to access. He said it is suitable for a driveway and to build a house out back of proposed lot 11-1. His biggest concern was not having the lines be perpendicular to the road and feels in this case it is a reasonable request. T. Giffen said it sounds fairly sensible. S. Komisarek said this is a lot like the 1 lot subdivision on Tower Hill Road they just did. T. Giffen said this is more regular. S. Komisarek same idea trying to preserve something that makes sense for that lot. J. Franklin thanked the Board for their time.

Recommendation of Reappointments of SNHPC Representatives

Vice Chair Hall said they received a letter dated May 12, 2016 from SNHPC that is advising the Planning Board that the two SNHPC representatives terms were expiring Al Hall on July 11, 2016 and William Stergios, August 26, 2016. He said SNHPC is asking to see if either of them would like to continue and if so to nominate them for the Candia Selectman's office for approval. He said his understanding is that Bill is not interested in being reappointed but that he would be happy to continue to be the representative to SNHPC. He said they will need to nominate a new individual to the Candia Selectman's office for approval.

T. Giffen **motioned** to recommend Al Hall for another term as the Town's Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission (SNHPC) representative. M. Santa **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (6-0-0)**. T. Giffen asked if they need to advertise for this position. The position will be advertised. A. Hall said there is one meeting a month and you would be working with other regional planning commissions, Dred and other state agencies and provides goods and services at a reduced cost that towns individually would cost.

Master Plan Steering Committee appointments of members

S. Komisarek said they have to make the appointments for the Master Plan Steering Committee. The first meeting in July 12th. He said they were recommended to have 7 members but they received responses from 9 people prior to the deadline. He said it was recommended to have someone from the school board and CYAA and they have both, Matt Woodrow represents the school and Paul LeBlond represents the CYAA. It was also recommended to have representation from the Planning Board and Sean James, Rudy Cartier and himself S. Komisarek have volunteered. He thought since these 9 had volunteered to appoint all of them to the committee. He said two others came in after the deadline, Patricia Velasco and Sean McDaniel. Sean McDaniel had wanted to volunteer as an alternate. He suggested to have both of them as alternates. The following is the list who volunteered: 9 members Jim Argeriou, 174 Main Street; Matt Woodrow (school board), 201 Brown Road; Carmelle Druchniak 23 Merrill Road; Carla Penfield 74 Jane Drive; Colleen Bolton 186 Deerfield Road; Paul LeBlond (CYAA)27 Douglas Drive; Sean James; Rudy Cartier; Scott Komisarek; and two alternates: Patricia (Ricia) Velasco 67 Mayhew Drive and Sean McDaniel 379 Brown Road.

S. Komisarek **motioned** to accept the nine members and 2 alternates to the Master Plan Steering Committee. T. Giffen **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (6-0-0)**.

T. Giffen **motioned** to adjourn at 9:30 pm. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (6-0-0)**.

Respectfully submitted, Sharon Robichaud Land Use Secretary cc file