

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF
May 22, 2019
APPROVED -Work Session**

PB Members Present: Rudy Cartier, Chair; Brien Brock, BOS Rep.; Josh Pouliot; Mark Chalbeck, V-Chair; Joyce Bedard; Scott Komisarek

PB Members Absent: Mike Santa, Alt.; Robert Jones, Alt; Judi Lindsey

Audience Present: town residents: Amy Komisarek; Dick Snow; Dr. Matthew Cobb; Bob Petrin

Presenter: Nate Miller (SNHPC)

Chair Rudy Cartier called the meeting to order at 6:00pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

R. Cartier began the meeting by proposing a motion to seal the minutes from the training on May 15, 2019, with Attorney Buckley, so as not to render a proposed action ineffective.

M. Chalbeck **motioned** to seal the minutes of the May 15, 2019 meeting. B. Brock **seconded**. J. Bedard **abstained**. **All others were in favor. Motion passed.**

In addition to sealing the minutes, the Board also officially closed out the last meeting date of May 15, 2019.

B. Brock **motioned** to adjourn the May 15, 2019 meeting. J. Pouliot **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

The Village District (Four Corners):

R. Cartier states that the intent for these meetings is to work with SNHPC on the Village District proposal. The Board will cover some basic groundwork this evening and will touch on a few key points in order to move forward with the plan.

N. Miller notes that he has a copy of the draft contract that he provided to R. Cartier and will be reviewed by the Board members. He also has a few handouts for the Board members and audience to follow along with and participate in as he presents the information on the project. One of the handouts he starts with is the MTAG Report that Carol Ogilvie provided to the Town in January 2018. The idea is to use the information that C. Ogilvie provided as a starting point and then refine it by input from the Board members and settle on a basis to use for the build-out analysis.

N. Miller reference the Four Corners Village Draft Zoning District map, which provides an outline of the 239.02 acres that will be the proposed Village District, and requests confirmation from the PB members that they all agree to these boundaries.

J. Bedard confirms the acreage of the proposal with N. Miller and then J. Pouliot inquires as to why the overall area is so large. N. Miller states that this was the plan provided from the Board. M. Chalbeck notes that at one point it was an area of approximately 800+ acres and the Town residents were not happy with that. The other members state that it was a much larger area when the plan was originally proposed and has been significantly reduced. The shape of the proposal is based on the individual lots within the space and their property lines.

B. Brock asks the other members of the Board what the original opposition was to the project and R. Cartier and J. Bedard both confirm the size was the main problem. J. Pouliot states that many people may have had misinformation and were not clear that no one was having their land taken to be developed upon. There would be potential zoning changes in certain areas only.

N. Miller again requests the PB decision as to the agreed upon space. B. Brock questions N. Miller that if the situation arises, the Board can change it at a later date and N. Miller confirms that is correct, but this will at least be a starting point. R. Cartier also notes that it can be expanded to include additional space and zoning changes in the future as well if the Town goes in that direction.

N. Miller continues with the C. Ogilvie report and states that the Four Corners District has 3 purposes:

1. to allow mixed moderate density residential and small-scale commercial uses compatible with a village setting;
2. permit new development, redevelopment and infill construction that increases the economic viability of the Four Corners are;

- allow for a range of housing types and sizes that can accommodate the current and future needs of residents at all life stages and income levels.

N. Miller confirms with the Board that each of these purposes/goals are agreed upon for this project.

He notes a concern that the Board has with ensuring that the mixed-use occurs within the Four Corners District. Referring to the map again, he shows an outlined area that will be considered a buffer of 500 feet around the center of the Four Corners District. A way to address that concern is to require that any building or lots developed solely for residential uses, be located a certain distance away from Rte. 27 and Rte. 43 (ie: the 500ft buffer area). Everything else within that buffer area would be required to be mixed-use or non-residential. J. Pouliot asks about commercial use and N. Miller says the Board can require the area to be only mixed-use if that's what is agreed upon since this is just a recommendation to see the potential options of the project. These ideas are a way to ensure the area is used the way it is agreed upon.

B. Brock asks if it will impact anything that previously exists and N. Miller states that as C. Ogilvie has written it, anything that already exists shall be allowed to continue as a permitted use. B. Brock states that the buffer will help with restricting only residential within the area and encourage the mixed-use development. R. Cartier questions if the 500 feet is to large. B. Brock and M. Chalbeck give him a visualization of space to include the buildings, septic, well and possible parking areas could use up that space very quickly. This helps all of us to see the buffer is adequately sized. M. Chalbeck notes that having this type of use confined to a specific area also helps with the workforce housing idea and will be more centralized within the town. J. Pouliot asks about wetlands in the area and R. Cartier also notes the CYAA owned land, the cemetery, school, church and the Town Hall. N. Miller states that with the environmental constraints added to these already owned lands, there ends up being a reduced area for development as a whole.

N. Miller confirms with the Board that this buffer area of 500 feet is agreed upon for this project and anything already existing will continue as a special exception.

N. Miller goes on to talk about the setbacks for the Village District. A minimum as well as a maximum setback to ensure the buildings will be closer to the road and make a more village setting. R. Cartier notes that it needs to be pedestrian friendly to include a sidewalk and possibly parking in front of the building. R. Cartier questions if there are any state issues regarding restricting parking in the front. N. Miller confirms that the businesses would adjust to park on the side or in back of the building, to include accessible handicap parking.

A. Komisarek mentions the idea of angular parking and N. Miller states that it would have to be determined by DOT at a later date when they start the engineering planning part of the project.

N. Miller confirms with the Board that the front setback would likely come right to the sidewalk and parking would be all on street. The minimum setback would be approximately 20 feet and the maximum setback would be approximately 30 feet.

N. Miller states that the building height maximum is already at 35 feet and confirms with the Board that the actual building footprint will have a maximum of 10,000 square feet.

N. Miller continues with a minimum frontage for cul-de-sacs in the District but are not typical in rural New England settings. Village area connectivity can be limited using cul-de-sacs. R. Cartier notes that the cul-de-sacs can be helpful in accessing the back lands and optional parking in back of developments. N. Miller gives the option of "paper streets" and create a layout within the District. A. Komisarek states that we are dealing with state roads and they only allow so much access per piece of land so cul-de-sac could be used to access the land. N. Miller states that by implementing paper street, as time goes, the paper streets become town roads and then there is new access to the land. R. Cartier thinks paper streets may be a tough sell with the residents because, they may not understand what they are being used for and that perception of someone taking their land and using it as they see fit will not be acceptable. **The Board agrees to keep the cul-de-sac language in and J. Pouliot notes it would be best to keep them outside the 500 foot buffer.**

The next area covered is the resemblance to traditional New England village centers. **The Board agrees that fenestration or window coverage for the front façade of the buildings have some set percentage required.** Dr. Cobb notes that the façade would be acceptable but and roof requirements may exceed the height requirements. R. Cartier notes that the language can state some façade is acceptable for that.

N. Miller confirms with the Board that the minimum lot size will be ½ acre with a maximum residential density of 4 units per acre.

N. Miller confirms the next work session is scheduled for 6/5/19 at 6pm – 7pm. He will look more into maximum setbacks and fenestration and bring that information to that meeting.

MOTION:

J. Bedard **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 7:42pm. J. Pouliot **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

Other Business

- Any other matter to come before the Board

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Galica
Land Use Secretary
cc file