

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of August 17, 2016
APPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: Sean James, Chair; Al Hall, Vice Chair; Ken Kustra; Tom Giffen; Scott Komisarek BOS Representative; Mike Santa; Rudy Cartier Alt; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent

Absent: Judi Lindsey; Joyce Bedard Alt; Carleton Robie Alt

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

Chair James asked Alternate Rudy Cartier to sit in for Judi Lindsey.

Minutes August 17, 2016

T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the minutes of July 20 2016 as presented. A. Hall **seconded**. S. James, Chair; A. Hall, Vice Chair; K. Kustra; T. Giffen; S.Komisarek BOS Representative; R. Cartier Alt; **were in favor**. M. Santa **abstained**. **Motion passed (6-0-1)**.

16-008 Final 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. Bryan Ruoff from Stantec the town's engineers were present. Paul & Karen Frasier and Tyler Frasier 63 Currier Road abutters were present. Abutter Russ Dann, 1 Tower Hill Road was present. Resident Richard Snow was present.

S. James read letters from both the Candia Volunteer Fire Department and the Police Department.

Volunteer Fire Dept. Letter dated July 18, 2016: "Dear MDGF LLC, Per Major Subdivision Regulations Section 11.06, the following option for Fire Protection has been implemented for the Major Subdivision 16-008 Currier Road: Sprinkler Deed restrictions for the 3 proposed lots. *"11.06 Fire Protection and Fire Suppression Water Source Requirements: All Major subdivisions shall meet the approval of the Candia Fire Department regarding fire prevention, protection, emergency access and fire suppression water source requirements and shall conform to the specifications in Section IV, article 19.14. Minor subdivision of less than 3 lots may receive a waiver from fire suppression if safety is not a concern."* Dean Young, Candia Volunteer Fire Department.

Police Dept. Letter dated July 6, 2016 this was from the preliminary subdivision hearing *"After reviewing the above plan and visiting the site, I find no concerns regarding site distance. I am concerned, however, in regard to mud season and the likelihood that emergency vehicles may find that section of road impassable."* Mike McGillen, Chief of Police. S. James asked D. Lewis, Road Agent if he had a letter. "No but my concern is the same as the police chief. I am concerned that you may not get emergency vehicles in there. It is tough to maintain this road in the springtime. We have tried to upgrade the road but it got voted down. There are significant mud issues."

S. James suggested that the Board review the Town Engineers comments and then open it up to comments.

B. Ruoff read from the General Comments portion of the Stantec letter dated July 26, 2016:
#5 Applicant required to provide a letter from Fire Chief and the Police Chief regarding safety issues related to this project, as specified in Regulations Section 10.06N. – This was just addressed.
#7 Lot 402-105 shows a proposed driveway roughly 8' from the proposed property line. We recommend that additional contour information, driveway designs and sight distractions be provided for review and approval to confirm a driveway can be provided within the associate lot with adequate all season safe sight distance.

This comment we defer to the road agent for final driveway approval. R. Blaisdell stated that the driveway was 8 feet and now is 22 feet and is perfectly flat there.

B. Ruoff *Comment #8 Should the Applicant propose paved driveways, the Applicant would be required to provide a SWPPP for the development of all proposed lots, as specified in Regulations Section 11.06.* This comment was intended to be addressed by showing silt fence on the subdivision plan but the extent of the silt fence on the plan insufficient. Comment not addressed. Silt fence is shown on Tax Map Lot 402-105 at Currier Road but is required to be extended along the Easterly limits of the wetlands along the length of the property given the existing topography. Similarly, silt fence should be shown along the Westerly limits of the wetlands on Tax Map Lot 402-105-3.

B. Ruoff said that based on discussions from the last meeting, where the driveway locations aren't set in stone and could move, my opinion would be need silt fence all way around. Depending on where final driveway location will be, that can change. We can mark up a plan for you as to where we think silt fence could be. With the requirements of the SWPPP we suggest that an additional silt fence is required on this plan. R. Blaisdell said that "we are 150' from wetland, land is perfectly flat but we can comply." B. Ruoff said "I would like to see additional silt fence. If you don't think it won't be necessary, submit a SWPPP to the town once you decide what the final lot plan will be.

R. Blaisdell – We can build a silt fence. I can show silt fence on the plan.

T. Giffen raised concerns that there seems to be a lot of excessive work on the applicant. Can we provide flexibility based on the future plan in regards to where driveways will be located? S. James suggested that if there is a requirement on the plan that there is a SWPPP for every lot, you wouldn't have to show silt fence. "That makes more sense, to me as things are going to change," he said. R. Blaisdell is concerned with hiring an engineer and the cost for SWPPP vs. putting in a silt fence. T. Giffen asked B. Ruoff from Stantec – is there an advisable distance from the wetland where a silt fence would not be required? B. Ruoff commented that it would depend on the soil type, ground conditions, slope, good vegetation, trees etc. G. Kelly commented on would 100 feet from the wetland be reasonable if it was cleared out? B. Ruoff suggested that DES may call for 150 feet. T. Giffen suggested that a silt fence to be placed within so many feet of wetlands in accordance with DES regulations be put on the plan subject to additional review pending driveway location and soil disturbance. S. James said he felt that it was a reasonable request. B. Ruoff continued.

Comment #20 Additional approval from the Town of Candia is required for a driveway permit for each new lot created. Comment partially addressed, notes have been added to the plan regarding final driveway permit approvals but no driveways permits have been received to date.

D. Lewis, Road Agent remarked that every lot has a site distance. The lot is sold and whoever buys it, can put a driveway wherever they want. Usually when it is on the plan, it changes. I understand the SWPPP issue which probably should be mandatory just because driveways rarely go where the plan shows. If they are located on the plan, then they should be put in that way. Nobody applies for the permit until they purchase the lot.

B. Ruoff – These last two comments were added based on last submittal. *Comments #21 and #22.*
#21 There was much discussion at the July 6th Planning Board meeting regarding the existing safety concerns and traffic loading on Currier Road, specifically emergency vehicle access in the Spring. We recommend that the board discuss the merit and need for offsite road improvements or financial contributions to offsite improvements to Currier Rd. T. Giffen commented. Mud Season. Other issue is that the residents of that road that are there presently by and large from what I understand are not in favor of improving that road and like it the way it is. The likelihood of getting a vote through to rebuild that road and pave it is somewhat slim. It has been tried once. D. Lewis stated that it was defeated by a large margin. T. Giffen commented that it is already overloaded with mud season problems. So for discussion, how much more issues would 4 more houses cause? S. James referred to D. Lewis stating that as far as upgrading the road that probably is not an option but is there anything you can do drainage wise? D. Lewis replied that there are some things we can do but it is expensive and we don't have the money in the budget to do those things. It varies from year to year. The mud this year wasn't bad at all, some years it's horrendous. As far as improving the drainage, there is very little

place to take the water. The water table is very high there. Spring high water table can't be 12 inches down there I wouldn't think. A. Hall commented that if the towns people refuse to do what you are suggesting then the Applicant is going to have to step up to the plate and do it if he wants this. D. Lewis said they (town's people) don't want it done. R. Blaisdell said they won't allow him (Applicant) to do it either. G. Kelly, granted I have my own agenda here, clearly, however, certainly from my perspective it would be unreasonable to say to someone, no you're not going to sub divide that property, even though it meets all the requirements, otherwise because everyone likes the road the way it is and they don't want to pay to upgrade it even though they complain about it. Effectively it allows someone to control someone else's property in an unreasonable way. If you don't want a house built there, buy the land. But to allow people to vote in such a way that precludes them from using the same equitable enjoyment for their property that everyone else has had doesn't seem reasonable from that line of logic. By voting out improving the road, which was already provided for at one point, you're going to try to maintain what your neighbor does on his land, does not seem equitable to me. S. Komisarek responded that it seems to me that a municipality has an obligation to make a road passable and safe for all residents so we put out a warrant article but the people voted it down. Is there another way that this could be approached, is this something where if the select board looked at this and said you know what, we respect your opinions but we have to make the road safe. Is that another option we would have to resolve the issue out there on Currier Road? T. Giffen said to S. Komisarek you are talking about elevating it to a life safety issue? S. K responded that seems to be issue. Police and Fire in the spring someone could die out here. We have this responsibility as a municipality to have safe and passable roads for emergency vehicles do we not? S. James responded that there are subdivision regulations for offsite improvements and if this was fifty houses, it's not, if it was fifty houses I think you would argue that it isn't reasonable to put fifty houses on this road because it can't handle it, but we are talking three additional lots. The problem is that is three here, two here, two here, keep in mind but a portion of the road in Deerfield too. There is a lot of land in Deerfield and a subdivision off of this road in Deerfield too, which have little control over. The question to this Planning Board and it was discussed last meeting is the addition of these three homes does it rise to a level... T. Giffen interjected that it's a 6% increase, it's incremental. The applicant's point of view is certainly one that is understandable. It's completely unreasonable perspective to have. Only putting up four houses, from an economic perspective, I don't think there is enough money in the job to hold somebody's feet to the fire and have them redo the road, even if anybody wanted it who lives there. Once you start looking at all those things at that point, let it go, maybe. Death by 1,000 slices. A house here, a house there and sooner or later. R. Cartier raised concerns that we are making a bad situation worse. And that's the bottom line. I've driven by in the winter and it's not fine. It's tough because I hear what you are saying that you should be able to use land that you own, that's a common thing to do. The problem is it's a matter of timing. This road is a substandard road according to Dennis at this particular point in time. We've gone back to the town once to see if they wanted to improve the road, maybe improve sections of it. He asked Dennis if it was to do all the way to the Deerfield line. D. Lewis responded yes, this end of the road. Whether incrementally we can start improving the road so we don't have those problems, we ran into that same situation on Crowley road. Chester was going to do a big subdivision and came to Candia. D. Lewis subdivision requirements to upgrade the road as we had the same situation occurring there, it hadn't gotten as bad as Currier Road because there weren't as many homes on it but when they added twenty more it was going to be another Currier Road so we had the option then of having the developer upgrade the road to avoid what we are dealing with on Currier Road right now. Every town has this mud issue and has a road or two with mud issues. I've brought this up every time there has been a subdivision on Currier Road for the twenty years that I've had the job where we are getting to the point where this road is overloaded. All engineering studies show that a gravel road has a maximum limit of around 90 trips a day. Once you get over that, it becomes next to impossible to maintain the road. Whether it's for wash boarding, whether it's for dust, mud, that's basically the limit for a gravel road. We have over 300 a day up there now; we are way beyond the point of a normal functioning gravel road. Those days are long gone. Just bringing up the point as you are going to sell three, four homes up there, those people are immediately going to start calling late February, early March I can't get into my house or I can't get out, how is the school bus

going to pick up my children, I'm going to get all the complaints. It's not a good welcome to Candia. We do our best to late night, early morning. As residents here know I sometimes leave the equipment there for a week, as it's a repeat performance day and night up there, for who knows how long. It gets very expensive.

S. James replied that it is a valid comment we have discussed, we'll get some public input. I'm not hearing strong sentiment from the board that we need to actively do something about it.

G. Kelly responded that my comment is even before this conversation, according to the way I do business anyway, I'm aware of the comments obviously from the last meeting, I already decided that I would make a written disclosure to anyone buying one of these lots that they will see the letter from Planning and I'll have signed copy in my file. Because the kind of society we are in I don't want someone coming back to me saying you didn't tell me. I will have a written letter acknowledging that anyone who buys one of these lots has seen the comments from the Fire Dept, Police Dept and Road Agent.

B. Ruoff continued with the Town Engineer letter:

#22 The Applicant is required to submit the following in conjunction with a final plat approval for a major subdivision: a. Copy of the deed restrictions submitted by the sub-divider and accepted by the Board. b. A description of any relaxation of the requirements granted to the sub-divider. Basically the bulk of last meeting. Six or seven waivers. R. Blaisdell asked if he needs to list the waivers on the plan and S. James confirmed to yes, list waivers on plan. R. Blaisdell then asked if there was a list of waivers that was granted in your notes. I will be getting that tonight. It says four waivers, so I can just list the waivers like the way they are listed right here.

S. James asked what about the deed restrictions. Are there any deed restrictions? B. Ruoff responded that it's on the plan but in deeds. Because the plans really don't carry much weight but if it's in the deeds. R. Blaisdell asked so you want them to show you a sample deed with that restriction on it or have a note on it that the sprinkler, that we need the sprinklers on the deed. G. Kelly replied you want a sample deed. I've done those.

S. James mentioned a couple of minor comments on the plan. He addressed R. Blaisdell, so on note #4 there, you have residential agricultural zone. Change to just residential. We don't have an agricultural zone. At bottom, get rid of preliminary. Get rid of that. The note on right subdivision note. Middle of the page. You had it but the text is verbatim out of the regs except for the within 90 days is not in the regs. Take out 90 days. R. Blaisdell replied, "So take out 90 days?" S. James responded within 90 days is not needed in there. It's not written that way in our regs. You have the rest. R. Blaisdell so the word action, R. Ok. S. James last thing bottom corner you have it saying certified by. We don't certify the plans. We sign them but we don't certify them. A. Hall said just scratch that off. R. Blaisdell responded so I should put approve by. S. James said approve by is fine.

S. James asked if there were any other comments from anyone on the board or Stantec? Abutters in the back, can we get your names for the record and any comments, questions you have. Paul Frasier, 63 Currier Road. About the lot, current value. Mr. Kelly, I have to agree with you. You purchased the land, what does the Town and the Board have to say that you have to maintain the road. That is back on the Town. The townspeople voted not to pave the road. The road agent helps make it passable but how so you make everybody happy on both ends of the table. It's just a bad section of road, like Dennis said. It's poorly drained, just the way it is. Walnut Hill road down through. My opinion would be dry ditching to try getting water to where we want it to go. Just cross that bridge at that point. On one of the comments, is there already a driveway there?

R. Blaisdell responded, no, we already have a property which we have a right to put one house on. So we are only creating three new houses. P. Frasier said that the Larpeners weren't able to be here tonight due to health issues within the family, and speaking for them in a way, the driveways across from their property. Sharon Larpenner had mentioned that where they would be coming out, there would be possibly lights shining in their living room window. I'm not exactly sure where these are actually located of where her house is. Are driveways set in stone here, will they be able to shift it. R. Blaisdell said that on the plan, he randomly picked spots. Driveways opposite driveways, lining them up. He addressed G. Kelly and said that when you do them,

just talk to the neighbor and see what works. G. Kelly responded that again D. Lewis is going to approve any location anyway so someone is at least going to know before a driveway goes in. D. Lewis asked G. Kelly if he was selling the lots or going to build on them? G. Kelly said he was unsure at this point, it could be a combination. P. Frasier asked about purple line (soil type), and talking about silt fences within 150 feet of building site? R. Blaisdell said probably unless state rules 50 feet is adequate. 150 feet seems like an awful long ways. If state says 200 we'll do 200. I've been doing these for a long time. S. James reiterated that if there is any ground disturbance within 150 feet of the wet area, they will have to put silt fence in to protect the wet areas. R. Blaisdell said he would keep the driveways as far as he can to avoid silt fence. S. James said silt fence is cheap. S. James asked if there were any other comments?

R. Snow mentioned that we have had extensive discussion about the road and whether the people that are putting in the subdivision should upgrade the road and it seems to be an all or none discussion. But I'm of the impression that we have passed impact fees and that would be in the zoning ordinance. Isn't there an impact fee for highways or if there is an impact based on a subdivision even if it's only four, that you can charge an impact fee, the impact fee then goes into an escrow account that requires it to be used within some period of time otherwise it goes back to the people...S. James and R. Blaisdell both said 6 years. R. Snow said isn't this something the Board could consider? Because the Town at one point in time said they don't want to fix the road but if they had some money there to help fix it and the imposition of these four house lots or three if you want to say it's that, has had an impact on that road or would have an impact on the road and I think it would be reasonable to presume that they should kick in something for the future upgrade of the road other than the fact that they will be paying property taxes and that kind of stuff. Isn't it possible to have impact fees for the roads? S. James said we do have impact fees so there are impact fees associated with the lots when they go to build. When they do the building permit the impact fees kick in. Then you are right. They are held in escrow for six years. The issue with becomes you need to use it on a project in that general area. So they build four houses, impact fees go in, everyone changes their mind they want to pave Currier Rd. that money could go to it. R. Snow responded that the impact fees I've seen so far are for water. Are they specific to that or is there an impact fee that has to be paid no matter what? What is that impact fee? What is the expectation for these guys that they are going to have to pay when they put in for a building permit?

D. Lewis the problem with impact fees it can only be used for capital improvement. Can't be used for maintenance, can't be used for anything else. It has to be used in the section of the town where it was generated. The town is broken up into sections. We just returned a lot of impact fee money cause what capital improvement can you do with say \$1,600 dollars. It can't be a culvert, it can't be stone for the road, it can't be ditching. Those are all considered maintenance. It has to be a capital improvement. And we've never accumulated enough money to do any capital improvements so we have to return the money. The Town's great when you say that but we never accumulate enough to use. And I've researched it extensively, it has to be a major improvement say like the upgrade of Currier Road. So if Mr. Kelly was to put \$1,800 dollars into his impact fees, we would have \$1,800 to go towards a \$200,000 project it doesn't help us significantly. R. Snow asked how do they determine the impact fees? S. James said yes they will be charged an impact fee when they build a house on them. If they build a house, there is an impact fee. If they subdivide and never build a house, there is no impact fee.

G. Kelly commented I understand what you are saying, however, I know that the issue I believe, correct me if I'm wrong Dennis, it wasn't that the Town didn't have the money, the money had been essentially figured out and it cost more to maintain that road than it was to fix it. I think the problem is one of education. The people that are voting against it, it's costing more to keep the road the way it is in a poor condition than it would to upgrade it. D. Lewis, yes but they like the road the way it is. It's not a matter of we were going to appropriate the money, if the vote went the right way. The vote went to keep it the same. So that's the will of the people. G. Kelly said my point was it wasn't a function of we don't have the money; we don't want to make the change. D. Lewis yes, we don't need to educate people that live on that road; they drive it every day and know exactly what it is. Abutter, T. Frasier, 63 Currier Road spoke up and said that just because we are sitting back here, doesn't mean we are the only ones who voted against it. Don't make us out

to be the bad guys. Lots of issues. There is Deerfield on other side, more of Currier Road in Deerfield than Candia. Lot of traffic comes out of Deerfield but there is a big issue there. S. James replied “I am on the other end, it’s terrible and I voted to fix the road and I’m probably the only one on the road.” Are there any other comments from the public?

So as far as moving to approval with conditions, the ones I had were:

#1 Note for Silt Fence to be placed within any disturbed area in accordance with DES Storm water regulations. We’ll have to put this in the Notice of Decision.

#2 Added Deed restrictions to the plans. Granite bounds, we didn’t talk about that but usually it’s 60 or 90 days. R. Blaisdell said give me 90 days.

#3 List the waivers on the plan.

#4 Copy of the sample deed with restrictions. R. Blaisdell said putting a deed restriction on the plan, it’s already there.

P. Frasier asked about Dean Young, the Fire Chief. Width of driveways and back as far as they are going to be? What were his requirements or town’s requirements for that? 12 ft? R. Cartier said that every 1,000 feet you need a pull off. In regulations. R. Blaisdell said whatever rules there are, we’ll follow.

S. James move to accept? T. Giffen moves to accept. A. Hall seconded.

R. Cartier addressed his concerns; I’d like to see more houses in Candia, my concern is from a safety standpoint is that that road as of this point in time, we shouldn’t be putting more houses on it. IT’s just a matter of timing. Everything else if fine.

M. Santa said that Stantec said in their memo here that the board discuss the merit and need for offsite road improvements or financial contributions. I know we touched on this issue but did we really fully discuss it. In other words, many times development is in advance of the infrastructure that the town or city has, the developer will be asked for a contribution or to come up with some way of mitigating the issue whether the city or town believes it needs a stop sign or a new fire station or what have you. It seems like we have a problem here but we haven’t fully discussed what options we have as far as contributions from the developer. That is my comment. A. Hall asked for his suggestion. M. Santa replied that I can’t support the motion without some effort made to discuss this further.

S. James I see the issue as the Town went ahead and put in a warrant to improve the road, pave it. And it was voted down handedly. I don’t think it’s reasonable to go to that level you need to pave the road out to that level because it’s something the town wouldn’t do on their own. The next level would be to do some improvements and after talking to Dennis, it’s very limited. There was an idea of ditching brought up but the water table is so high that that really doesn’t work. If there was a suggestion x amount of \$ we can do this, it would do something. Do you have a suggestion for something specific or where are you headed with it? M. Santa I see the town’s vote on the road as a non-issue. We are going to have four more houses on the road and individuals that are new to the town never had a chance to vote. And yet we are not doing anything, developer is not doing anything to improve the situation. I don’t think that’s right. I would ask for a response on their part. We’ve brought up the issues but I don’t think they have been addressed to my satisfaction. A. Hall asked are you suggesting that the developer ought to provide Town Road Agent road agent a piece of equipment specific to maintenance of that road. Something like that? M. Santa said it is not uncommon for a developer to contribute to offsite improvements when the infrastructure that is in place is not going to support additional development adequately, I don’t think we’ve really talked too much about what possibilities are. I’ve heard conversation about some improvements could be made. Not our job to get into specifics, I’d like to hear that from the other side of the table.

G. Kelly responded so not having any specific knowledge of what might be done, what I’ve heard is that there’s not a whole lot we can do. D. Lewis said there is not a whole lot we can do without a whole lot of money. AT this point follow up with this, I would get together with Stantec and see what recommendations we can come up with for trying to make the road somewhat better. Is it going to be 100% good without rebuild, no. Maybe some under drain might help, if we can find an adequate place to take it. I’m not sure. G. Kelly then of course comes the issue of what does it cost, what are we talking about, how do you quantify that? R.

Blaisdell said I thought his money had to go towards capital improvement. D. Lewis if it's off site improvement it doesn't. Off site improvement and other money we are talking about (impact fees) are two different things.

T. Giffen to Chair I'm somewhat in agreement with Mr. Santa's point of view. The thought that went through my head is that we are kicking the can down the road. We have to have some sort of practical plan that could be implemented for them to contribute to a percentage of some kind. Say for example, there is roughly 3% more traffic on the road. Say plan cost \$50,000 dollars to do extensive ditching and under drainage, maybe 3% of that could fall upon a perspective developer who wants to increase the road traffic to that extent. But I stopped that line of reasoning as I don't see that we have a plan that can be implemented. And that's based on what I've heard from Dennis. We simply don't have plan. If we had a realistic plan that had a number on it that had a number on it, or an idea of a plan, then it bears further investigation. But from what I understand, short of a substantial overhaul, rebuild, repaving, we aren't going to get there. There was a recent vote from the Town as a whole that indicates their preference, irrespective of cost, I'm saying to myself, nothing is going to happen so why hold their feet to the fire and ask them for money that will never be in the reasonable foreseeable future. It's making a bad situation worse.

a. I'd like to see something concrete in way of a plan and if there were, have these folks pay a reasonable amount towards it based on some sort of reasonable calculation. If there isn't a practical plan we can implement, what are we asking for the money for? That is my thought process.

S. Komisarek raised concerns. How much more sub-dividable road is there on Currier Rd? Lots of traffic, Dennis is saying 90 trips a day and we are over 300 now, adding 4 more houses, how much more sub-dividable land is out there? What's the potential, are we going go through this 2 3 6 more times at some point we really have to get to the crux of the issue in the long term. Tricky thing. The people on that road overwhelming support keeping it the same, keeping that road character and yet, I feel as a municipality Fire and Police Chief are saying we have a real issue here, then as a municipality we have a responsibility to provide safety. That's the crux of it, those two opposing issues. I agree with Tom, if there was some plan, as Mike said and someone comes in infrastructure isn't quite there and there is reasonable approach and someone has to pay their fair share toward a plan. But what is the plan and how many more homes could end up there. At what point, get up to 400 trips a day, at what point...at one point every road in Manchester was gravel and a lot of people liked it but, and I know people on Currier Rd probably don't want to hear that but over time things do change. That what's we are facing here. T. Giffen said that is what happened on Crowley. Someone was bringing in twenty new homes there is enough money in that project to cover ancillary costs, this guy adding 4 homes is not economically practical thing for him to do a big contribution to something that has already been disapproved. If there were a modest plan that could be implemented that would make a big difference, ditching or whatever...What would we do short of paving that road? D. Lewis responded you have to excavate all the material out, good material, down to 3 ft, under drain it. Problem is even if leave it at dirt, the problem becomes when that dirt is frozen and is thawing, the water can't get to the under drain anymore. It's trapped between the frost layer and the top. No matter how good the material is, water is trapped in and it gets soft. As soon as the frost goes, it's dried up in two days. You can see the spots, frost comes out, dries up and there is a sink hole of mud. I've put 200 ten wheeler tri axle loads of inch and half stone on that road in last 20 years, at least 200 loads. March, when it's soft, it doesn't look like I did a thing. Under draining might help, ditching yes but is it going to be a solution that cures that problem? No.

S. James asked if adding geo textiles would help? D. Lewis responded that it would help to a certain point but not going to cure it. P. Frasier said that he believes ditching would help. Road higher in some spots, lower in others. Several culverts on left hand side and across. D. Lewis the road is ditched, you get too high with the ditches and the road pushes itself into the ditches. Ditching helps some but not a cure. M. Santa stated that he is not a civil engineer and I don't want to speculate about what may or may not work. Stantec brought up the issue, I'd like to hear from the developers engineer or Stantec or combination of the two that we have exhausted all the options we have for further development out there. I really can't support what we have right

now. R. Blaisdell said he can't add anymore to what has already been said and that he is not an engineer. I think everything has been said that can be said.

S. James recapped that the solution to fixing the road is to pave it. That is the simple solutions. Short of that, it's a band-aid. D. Lewis responded that it isn't just paving its rebuilding. S. James commented that you get to the end of the road and then you are in Deerfield and that part is still awful. I understand the point. Hypothetically, we go out and Stantec says to fix it, its \$100,000 dollars. We aren't going to make them pay \$100,000, maybe its \$5,000 or \$10,000 but it the Town doesn't have the other \$90,000 then what we would do? Keep any money in escrow for three years until the Town decides to do it. You could put it in the budget but it may not pass. The idea of impact fees is a developer comes in and puts in 30 houses that have an impact on the school, but they are not going to pay a million dollars to expand the school but they proportionately have some impact and that is the idea of it. We don't want to stifle people creating lots. Need more buildable lots and homes in Town.

G. Kelly said that on your comment on impact fees, I have a large subdivision in Laconia that I started 9 years ago, its 85 lots. When I started the subdivision, I was required to give them a sample deed and in the deed I had to give them a bedroom count. We are on City water and sewer there. So it wasn't about septic systems, planning board said it's about impacting the school system. Went back to Laconia recently, year and half, two years ago to get approval to put a different style house in I said by the way I want the board to know that to date, I've sold 38 houses and the impact on the school system is zero. Planning said we don't want students now. The point is, you plan and try to give people what they want and I couldn't believe I heard that comment but it is part of the public record, it is what they said to me.

S. James so let's recap where we are at. We have a motion and a second. And then we have some further discussion at potentially having the engineers look at some other options. We have two potential options. We can continue the hearing and have them come back and see what Stantec and Dennis come up with or we could move ahead on the vote. What is the general consensus of the board to postpone or continue?

R. Cartier suggested a possibility of Trust Funds. He asked Dennis "do you have trust funds for highway maintenance?" D. Lewis responded we have the highway fund and allowed to use the interest every year, about \$12,000. R. Cartier asked if contributions can be made to that or is it a closed fund. T. Giffen but it would become part of the corpus of the fund and limited to the terms of the original request, that only the income could be spend. R. Snow said it would be easier to do it as a new trust and then the new trust you have the terms and conditions. Principal only fund, you put that in. You can put to use for maintenance of Currier Rd only. The Town management selectmen can vote to accept the trust. S. James to R. Cartier "you were talking about putting it in a general trust fund not a specific one for the road correct?" R. Cartier, yes. R. Snow continued that the lots you are creating are now funding the rest of the town. I'm looking at these plans trying to think of it as a local developer and a tax payer. These guys are putting in a half a mile of driveway. Now if they put them in as gravel it's less expensive, but if pave it, it's more expensive. Cost them then they put in more expensive houses. The more cost they put into it, the more profit/revenue, they have to get to make a profit that means the higher the price for the houses. Four houses at a quarter million is only a million. Four houses at \$500,000 then you have two million, which becomes part of the tax base. So the better that road is the higher the price the houses can be and the developer can maintain a profit margin but he has to charge more for the houses but he can't charge more if the houses aren't worth more. With a dirt road in front of it, they are worth less than they are with a paved road. That's just common sense. T. Giffen commented that if you look at the valuation in this town, valuation index used to identify the route of where the parcels are on specific roads. There are two roads in town that have the highest valuation index, one of is Jane Drive, I suspect that the reason there is things were built on one acre there back then so you have a house lot capable of holding a house in a certain minimum there and the rate per acre there is relatively high. The other road interestingly enough that occupies that top valuation level is Tower Hill and if you want to talk about a road that's horrible to drive in bad weather, it's a dirt road. Could be the views. Horrible dirt road and has highest index in town.

A. Hall suggested that the motion be to continue this. S. James asked if the consensus would be to continue it. T. Giffen addressed Stantec and D. Lewis and asked if they could come up with a plan that would make any sense at all in the next two weeks that could be implemented or are we putting it off and just spinning our wheels. D. Lewis responded that he would have to talk to Stantec on that. B. Ruoff of Stantec said they could make time for that, sure.

A. Hall said he **withdraws his second**. T. Giffen **withdraws the motion**. A. Hall made a **motion “move to continue”**. T. Giffen **seconded**. S. James suggested that Currier Rd. come back on September 7th and will be heard first. We will see what the Road Agent and Stantec have for ideas for the road and we can discuss them further. R. Blaisdell stated that will be the only issue to be talked about at the next meeting.

S. James **motion** to accept continuation to September 7th. **All were in favor. Motion passed. (7-0-0)** Abutters of Currier Rd. will not be notified.

S. James 5 minute recess and we will continue at 8:25 pm.

16-009 Final 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, Dino Minuti were present for the applicant. Bryan Ruoff from Stantec the town’s engineers were present. Resident Richard Snow was present. No abutters present.

S. James opens up the public hearing and reads the letters from the Police and Fire Departments. Letter from Police Department, Chief McGillen dated July 6, 2016; *after reviewing the above plan and visiting the site, I find no safety concerns. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.*

Letter dated July 18, 2016 from the Candia Volunteer Fire Department; *“Per Major Subdivision Regulations Section 11.06, the following option for Fire Protection has been implemented for the Major Subdivision 16-009 Chester Turnpike Realty. Sprinkler Deed restrictions for the 4 proposed lots. 11.06 Fire Protection and Fire Suppression Water Source Requirements: All Major subdivisions shall meet the approval of the Candia Fire Department regarding fire prevention, protection, emergency access and fire suppression water source requirements and shall conform to the specifications in Section IV, article 19.14. Minor subdivision of less than 4 lots may receive a waiver from fire suppression if safety is not a concern.”* Dean Young, Candia Volunteer Fire Department Fire Chief.

Then we have a letter from Stantec dated July 26, 2016. B. Ruoff read Stantec review letter dated July 26, 2016 addressed to the Town of Candia, General Comments:

#3 The Applicant is required to provide preliminary drainage analysis and computations, as specified in Regulations Section 10.06L. Comment not addressed. The applicant shows a proposed 24” culvert for the wetland crossing at Tax Map Lot 41-42-2 but no drainage calculations have been provided as agreed at the July 6th Planning Board Meeting. We recommend that drainage calculations be provided to *identify (that’s a typo, I’m sorry)* to confirm the sized culvert is appropriate and to confirm that there are no impacts to abutting properties. Additionally, we recommend that the Board discuss making any approvals conditional of wetlands permitting approval in the event that there are conditions relative to the wetlands permit. B. Ruoff asked R. Blaisdell if he had received a copy, and R. Blaisdell said no.

R. Blaisdell stated that this is my calculation. This is from a book on size and culverts. We have 4 acres of drainage going in here and this book says that a 15 inch culvert is big enough. I’m building a 24 inch culvert, that’s my calculation. It’s way oversized.

B. Ruoff commented that he wasn’t sure what this is based on so I can’t make a determination on that. R. Blaisdell retorted that “all the engineering you’ve done in your life 4 acres of drainage, you don’t think a 24 inch culvert would handle it?” R. Blaisdell responded it would depend on soils, tail water conditions, grades, depend on a lot of things. R. Blaisdell responded that he can guarantee that a 24 inch culvert will handle all this. All the culverts on the road are all 15 inch except for one 24 inch. This is straight from a book on Engineering on culvert sizing. This is a 15 inch culvert vs. a 24 inch culvert. A 24 inch probably handles four

times as much water than a 15 inch. This is way, way over designed. This is just one little pocket. Everything else goes the other way. This is my drainage analysis. I'm not going to hire an Engineer for \$500 to tell me that we really only going to need a 12 inch culvert. This is way over designed. I've been surveying for 35 years this is my drainage analysis. The other part of the drainage analysis was to show the direction of the water, which I've done with arrows and that was deemed to be adequate.

S. James asked R. Blaisdell what book was this from? R. Blaisdell responded that the actual title of the book he doesn't recall but it's a book on designing forest roads, and all the stuff that has to do with this.

R. Cartier looking at plan. Flows going away? Culverts existing on plan, one in place for driveway. R. Blaisdell only concerned with upstream, the one for the wetland crossing. R. Blaisdell asked D. Lewis, Road Agent if he thought a 24 inch culvert would handle 3.5 acres of land. D. Lewis responded that I have no idea; it would depend on what goes into it, out of it, how the flow is.

S. James commented that the issue isn't Stantec isn't saying 24 inches isn't adequate, their just saying there is no proof provided by the applicant that it is. R. Blaisdell responded that this is proof. S. James replied that a one page photocopy out of a book we don't have the title of isn't really proof. R. Blaisdell said that he thinks it is. S. James respectfully disagreed. R. Blaisdell responded that this is a culvert covering a miniscule amount of road. S. James commented that I think the culvert is fine I just think you need proof. R. Blaisdell interjected with so I'm going to hire an Engineer for \$500 to do a whole big study and they will end up telling me why are you doing 24 inches a 10 inch is big enough. This is way way way overdesigned. S. Komisarek said that Russ has been doing this for a long time. He has a lot of practical experiences. He can look at something and can say gut instinct this isn't going to work but unfortunately what we do here, we don't have the luxury of doing that and we have to have somebody come back, whether it be Stantec or your engineer. It's not that we don't trust you; we can see by your expression that your practical tells you that it is way oversized but we don't know that. We can't run our meetings like that.

R. Blaisdell replied this number came out of a book on Engineering and it says a 15 inch culvert will handle 6 acres of land a 24 inch will cover 20 acres. I've got 4.5 acres.

T. Giffen responded with the first point I have is this. I'm not an engineer. I'm a CPA and I teach at the University level. If one of my students came to me with something like that without proper citation, they would lose big points. So a citation means, tell me the ISBN, tell me the title, tell me the author, tell me the date of publication, tell me who published it, otherwise its scrap paper, I'd throw it away. That's what I do in my professional life because it's unsupportable as it is. That's fine. The other thing, my thought is that if there are multiple factors that go into it, and I'm sure there are, that a detailed calculation from an Engineer to consider all those factors would be more than a table. If it were a table as simple as acreage, we wouldn't need engineers. You have a couple of things that affect it, you have slope, soil type all these other things. So here's another question, if it specifies a 15 inch and you actually have confidence in it, then why would you go to a 24. It tells me that you aren't confident in the numbers in the table therefore why should I be? R. Blaisdell responded that I always upsize them by one. T. Giffen that's a big upsize. Used example to design a beam, found a table, I might want use that but I may want double the size just so it wouldn't break. That's the same approach I see being taken. I don't find credibility a. for the lack of citation b. for the fact that your upsizing it so much tells me that you don't trust it yourself. I don't want to be a hard person, but I can't buy what's being said, it doesn't make sense to me. I think a real calculation would be important.

R. Cartier but I think what is being asked for here is not necessarily an engineer designing the wetlands crossing, what Stantec's letter is to look for the drainage calculations. I don't know if the town or the engineer would accept the drainage calculations from someone who wasn't registered as an engineer to do that kind of work. But the comment about citations is probably the biggest thing. I wouldn't accept that only because there is no citation of where it's from, what it is, how the calculations are developed so somewhere along the line if I was looking at it from a common sense standpoint, ok done with this book, with these engineering calculations, I don't see anything other than a table there.

R. Blaisdell said I did a calculation for how many acres there was. Then you compare culvert sized for different amount of slope and how many acres it will handle. Do you want the title of the book?

S. James said this is exactly what it says Preliminary Drainage Analysis and Computations Watershed Areas. R. Blaisdell responded which I've done. S. James said I know you did it but you can't prove you did it per se. R. Blaisdell said I can't prove I surveyed this property but my survey stamp says I did it. I spent some time looking at the contours, calculating, on my computer I digitize it and that's 4.5 acres. I did the calculation. Then I have a chart that matches acreages with different slopes, steeper, bigger, used this chart, which I've been using for 30 years which I don't have the title of but I can get that for you. This says a 15 inch culvert will handle it. 24 inches isn't just double the size. More discussion on culverts and calculations. T. Giffen suggested that R. Blaisdell just document what he did. Document exactly what you did and write it up. The acreage is x, slope is y, soil type is z, any other thing that factors into the calculation. Any factors that are missing, Stantec could tell you. R. Cartier replied that you've done all the work, you just haven't documented it. T. Giffen documentation would be helpful, otherwise its unsupported assertion.

B. Ruoff of Stantec continues with reading from their letter:

#4 The Applicant is required to provide a letter from the Fire Chief and the Police Chief regarding safety issues related to this project, as specified in Regulations Section 10.06N. Comment is addressed at this time.

#11 Should the Applicant propose paved driveways, the Applicant would be required to provide a SWPPP for the development of proposed lot 411-42-2, as specified in Regulations Section 11.06. However, given the existing wetland and potential environmental impacts we recommend that a SWPPP be provided for all lots excluding lot 411-42. Comment not addressed. It is recommended, based on the extent of the wetlands on the property, that a proposed lot plan and associated SWPPP be provided for each developed lot containing wetlands. Silt fence is shown but limits are not sufficient to mitigate potential erosion control given the grades and wetlands shown on site. I view this at this point the same way we viewed the previous. I don't see any reason why we couldn't. R. Blaisdell said so show more silt fence and make sure we meet DES requirements.

S. James raised a concern that these lots are, in my opinion, significantly more wet than the Currier Road lots. Particularly towards the right, south end of the plan. I'm not sure I agree that silt fence in this case is adequate. Particularly at this last lot, there's a lot of wetland there. There's a lot in the first three lots. R. Blaisdell responded that they would be about 100 feet or more from it. 200. T. Giffen reiterated that given the degree to which these are wet, the same approach may not be an applicable one, may not be thorough. S. James said that is my opinion yes. Discussion then ensued regarding how wet the lots on the plan are. S. James mentioned this being a connected wetland system. R. Blaisdell said we don't know where the house is going to go. We don't know how much disturbance. What would you expect to see on this plan besides silt fence?

B. Ruoff replied the generation of the original comment was based on exactly what the Chairman is speaking to but there is significant wetlands and it would more appropriate for these lots to do a SWPPP instead of waiving that requirement. The discussion in the last meeting was that if we showed silt fence on this plan or erosion control measures, that could potentially alleviate that requirement. Personally, I'm still of the opinion that there's just so much wetlands on it, other than the non wetland lot, it's probably beneficial to have the Town waive that requirement. R. Blaisdell asked so what is a SWPPP plan going to show us. Show us how much water's produced by a house in a septic. B. Ruoff replied, No that it deals more with erosion control measures and how you mitigate erosion control albeit seeding or stock pile areas, silt fence, hay bales that sort of thing. The purpose of a SWPPP, you get a proposed lot plan and you base your erosion control measures on that proposed plan on that final plan. S. James suggested that R. Blaisdell make the SWPPP plan part of the approval. R. Blaisdell commented that when someone buys the house lot, they do a Septic design and they have to do a plan that the building inspector or Stantec would have to approve. I have no idea where this will all go. I don't see an issue with us adding a condition that part of the building permit, would be to have an approved SWPPP plan. If you approve this for something that it doesn't really happen and they build over here, they are just going to do what they want.

S. James add a note to the plan that says any development or clearing on these 4 lots will require and approved SWPPP plan before the work takes place. T. Giffen that makes sense but my particular concern is not just with site of home and septic system and those design parameters, but also what's in the clearing, soil disturbance, everything else that affects drainage and flow. Come up with a drawing of where you want to put

things and then do a SWPPP plan with respect to that, then it's all consistent. R. Blaisdell asked all lots except lot 42. T. Giffen said yes, you have one dry lot.

S. James asked R. Blaisdell to add construction entrance, what you're going to do. Sound reasonable. So any development and clearing on all lots, except lot 42 will require a SWPPP plan approved by the Town.

B. Ruoff continues with letter comments:

#15 We recommend that a driveway grading plan be provided for each proposed lot to identify wetlands impacts and to demonstrate that a driveway with a maximum grade of 10% can be provided, as specified in Regulations Section 19.14C. Comment partially addressed, we defer to the Road Agent for final driveway location approval and permitting.

T. Giffen said that should be tied into SWPPP plan as it deals with drainage. We covered that with the previous point. Also the driveway plan has to be approved by Road Agent. D. Lewis replied I go by the site distance; driveways are never going to be where it's shown on the plan so we have to deal with it when they build it. I mean we can check the grade and if it doesn't meet it, keep working on it. We've had them move driveways because of that.

B. Ruoff continued with letter:

#21 The Applicant is required to present evidence of State approvals of the suitability of each lot for on-site sewage disposal building purposes for the proposed lots 411-42 and 411-42-1, as specified in Regulations Section 5.06I. Comment not addressed.

#23 Additional approval from the Town of Candia is required for a driveway permit for each new lot created. Comment partially addressed, notes have been added to the plan regarding final driveway permit approvals but no driveway permits have been received to date. Obviously there's no driveway permit at this time and would refer to Dennis again for driveway permits.

#24 The applicant is required to submit the following in conjunction with a final plat approval for a major subdivision:

a. Copy of the deed restrictions submitted by the sub-divider and accepted by the Board.

b. A description of any relaxation of the requirements granted to the sub-divider. R. Cartier commented that he would like to see a sample deed. S. Komisarek commented that you wouldn't need the sample deed; you just want the sample language. R. Blaisdell basically the note on the plan.

S. James addressed R. Blaisdell to add the waivers, adding those to the plans. R. Blaisdell said that he needs to set to corners. Need an approved dredge and fill. Expedited go to Conservation Commission which makes it go quicker. With the drainage; if I can get conditional approval on Stantec's approval of drainage study if I've oversized it, we're good and we don't have to meet again.

M. Santa addressed a letter from resident who is concerned about the driveway access from Donovan Road. Would we have a driveway permit on Donovan Road? D. Lewis responded no. If the lots are created with frontage on Chester Turnpike, that is their only access. The driveway has to be created on the frontage it creates.

S. James read the letter from Amy Spooner Hebsch. August 17, 2016 To Planning Board: As a Candia resident and abutter, I, Amy Spooner Hebsch of Candia, 291 Donovan Road, cannot make the Planning Board Meeting tonight on August 17th, 2016. My only concerns with Case #16-009 Chester Turnpike, a proposed 5 lot subdivision, is that they are not planning on using Donovan Road, a Class 6 road, which cannot be used as frontage for any building lot approval. So therefore, it cannot be used for driveways or as access road. I am also concerned and would hope that there will be some type of border trees and/or privacy tree line as I am located across the street. Privacy request. Do you have any plans to clear that lot across the road?

D. Minuti responded that there are no plans to clear.

K. Kustra asked when was the lot merger done? R. Blaisdell said a few months ago. (*In reference to the Old School House Lot*). D. Lewis responded that the lot used to be owned by the Town and I believe Mr. Hardy purchased it quite awhile back. The maps aren't that accurate but I remember it being sold a long time ago. D. Minuti remarked that the lot was sold around 2001 or 2002 or so.

S. James as far as approval of conditions I have Drainage analysis calculations to be submitted and approved by the Town. Any development or clearing on all lots except for lot 42 will require an SWPPP plan approved by the Town. Submit a copy of the sample deed language for the sprinkler requirements. Add the granted waivers to the plans. Set granite bound within 90 days. R. Blaisdell said it might take more than 90 days to get the dredge and fill. I need to get the corners, ready to submit.

Historical Society Discussion re: Chester Turnpike

DHR received? - R. Blaisdell responded yes. They looked at and no issues in this area. They're good with our property. I got a letter from the State saying it was ok. S. James said we got a copy of the form which said they were requesting additional archaeological survey there. It's not our issue but they are looking for more information. R. Blaisdell replied that the dredge and fill won't be finished until they are good with that. I can get the corners set in 90 days but I might not have a dredge and fill in 90 days. S. James suggested 6 months.

A. Hall made **motion** for approval subject to conditions as outlined. T. Giffen **seconded**. **All in favor (7-0-0)**. Notice of Decision within five days.

Other Business

S. James – Candia Crossing. S. Komisarek recuses himself as he has ownership interest. Selectmen's office received a notice of credit and Boyd Chivers would like the Planning Board's recommendation before he signs off on it. It extends the date to August 12, 2017. Same amount as last year. Consensus of the Planning Board that the Select Board signs it.

Next Meeting September 7th 2016

S. James noted:

1. Currier Road Final - Currier Road coming back, that will be first.
2. Preliminary Major Subdivision on High Street, cul-de-sac in back – 9 lots, may need a waiver on length of the cul-de-sac.
3. Minor Site Plan Review: They applied for a minor site, at 304 Raymond Road. But Dave and I spoke and think it's a major site plan. D. Murray Building Inspector commented that it was 9,000 sq feet of floor space, broken up. Over 25%, I don't know, there's no ground work. Temporary buildings, metal storage self containment type of a deal. R. Cartier asked if that building changed use a number of times from its originally approved use, it was for building school houses. Then it was subdivided off and never got permits for. They have truck repair facilities in there; they have a transmission place, other things. D. Murray commented that there are 4 units in there now. R. Cartier continued that was never in the original in the original site. It's probably going to come up as it's a major change in use from what the original approval was. To my knowledge, I've never seen. D. Murray said it's definitely a change of use now, expanded use, actually. R. Cartier suggested that you might want to take a look at that when developing the plans for it. S. James issue became that there is a one page color drawing and they show the storage units there is no ground disturbance, they are going to sit on the pavement but they are adding over 50%, 9,000 sq. feet, so to me, it's a major. R. Cartier commented also take a look at the original conditions as they have one cistern but they were supposed to have another cistern and I don't think they never did. The original approval of the planning board required two cisterns. D. Murray replied that we can't go back on that now, its' changed hands and everything else. How long has it been there, 20 years? R. Cartier responded probably, the trucking company is still down there. State approval, 30,000 gallon cistern in there now but because they were high hazard occupancy with building wooden structures they were supposed to do additional work. Might need some history. D. Murray asked how did they ever get a CO if they were supposed to have two? Never did...R. Cartier said one of the biggest problems is that if you go down and find the electrical panel, it's not accessible by all tenants. It's in one of the cut off spaces. It was scary. M. Santa asked if the storage units are proposed to be put on the asphalt part of the site. T. Giffen and A. Hall said they are already there. S.

James question to the board is should we have a pre application to the minor site plan or just...to me it's pretty clear it doesn't meet that so it's a waste of time. 9,000 sq ft of buildings. D. Murray said that they won't be occupied, it's self storage. It's a strange situation, whatever you want to do. S. James asked D. Murray if he could talk to the applicant and tell them it should be a major. D. Murray said sure.

S. James commented that the last one for the 7th is the Excavation at Exit 3 Candia First Stoppe. The first and third cases will be reviewed by Stantec, we don't have their letters but we will.

Recommendation of SNHPC Representative

S. James said last thing I had, we talked about SNH Planning, Candia has two representatives to the planning commission. One is Al, thank you Al. The second we are looking for so we did advertise the position. So far we have received one letter from Dick Snow, I can read it, its' fairly brief. This is from Mr. Snow; I'd like to take this opportunity to offer my services as a representative to Candia. The SNH Planning Commission I believe that my past service in Candia as a Planning Board, Zoning Board of Adjustment, Conservation Commission and Board of Selectmen member provide me with the experience necessary to move forward with the commission.

With the current involvement of the Commission and our Master Plan update and the establishment of the upper Lamprey scenic By-way, which Dick's been involved with, among other projects effecting Candia it behooves us to leverage that capabilities of the commission with our common efforts. So for consideration. S. James asked if there term to that. A. Hall responded that it is a three year term. S. James continued that we can certainly wait for more letters; we could discuss it now, whatever the board feels like. S. Komisarek **motion** to approve Dick to the Southern NH Planning Commission. M. Santa **seconded. All were in favor. (7-0-0).**

A. Hall **motioned** to adjourn at 9:30 pm. S. James **seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried (7-0-0).**

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary
cc file