

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF
November 20, 2019
APPROVED**

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

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

Audience Present: Nate Miller (SNHPC), Dennis Lewis (Road Agent), Jason Lopez (applicant engineer), Armand Hebert (applicant), Rob Degan (applicant surveyor), Attorney John Bisson (applicant attorney) and many town residents.

*Rudy Cartier, Chair called the PB meeting to order at 7:04pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

The 4 Corners Village District:

R. Cartier starts the presentation by reading the DRAFT Zoning Amendment for the 4 Corners District (posted on the Town website for review). This document outlines how the district will be zoned, the Table of Use Regulations and Dimensional Requirements and the criteria for building development. R. Cartier notes that the purpose of this is to allow flexibility in the 4 Corners District and for future development in this area. The PB is looking to get this information out to the voters based on the Master Plan and go over what could happen in the area. R. Cartier thanks R. Jones, M. Chalbeck and J. Pouliot for working as a sub-committee with N. Miller. He then turns the presentation over to N. Miller (SNHPC).

N. Miller starts by introducing himself to the audience and letting them know he will be presenting the 4 Corners Village District to them. He notes that this has been in the revision stages for many months with the PB and the sub-committee to refine this proposal and analyze what the development potential of this area really is. He notes that the presentation was all based on the initial report prepared by Carol Ogilvie in January 2018. He notes that the PB has taken this initial report and worked with SNHPC to bring it where it is today. During the 2018 time, there were many meetings with comments from the audience that he attended and noted there were 2 main themes that kept arising, which were: there was too much space (too many acres) and the development that would result would not reflect a traditional, rural New England community like Candia. These have been the guiding principals that the Board has used to revise this proposal and focus on addressing these issues.

N. Miller notes the 3 purposes of the District: 1. 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 4 Corners area; 3. Allow for a range of housing types and sizes that can accommodate the current future needs of residents at all life stages and income levels. These have not changed since the 2018 meetings from the original report. He goes on to state what has changed is the boundaries and size of the District. The original size was proposed at approx. 822 acres and currently is only approx. 239 acres. This is how the Board took those concerns from the residents and revised the plan based on those. In addition, the District was revised to ensure that non-residential and mixed-use development occurs in the immediate 4 Corners area. He continues by stating that the proposal will be consistent with a rural village feel by revising the building setbacks to have a maximum front setback of 25ft w/in the 500ft buffer area. This ensures the buildings are closer to the road as with a more village setting. The maximum square feet for the district will be 10,000sq. ft. This is also consistent with surrounding areas and their scope and scale of rural village centers. The Board worked on revising the building styles in the 4 Corners as well by proposing requirements of pitched roofs, unless not feasible or aesthetically desirable in the spot deemed for development. The window coverage or fenestration of the structures will also be required to have a minimum of 30% on the ground floor and 20% on the upper floors to provide for a village like feel.

N. Miller moves forward by providing the audience with information on the property within the District. Though there are approx. 239 acres of land, there are many constraints as well. Some of the parcels are already owned by public and private individuals (ex: cemetery, Town offices, CYAA, courthouse, historical society, schools, etc.) and thus, will not have further development. Another constraint on these properties is environmental. Wetland and soil constraint, steep slopes and floodplains are all issues that arise in the District

and limit the development potential. Of the 239 total acres that are proposed for the 4 Corners Village District, just over 134 acres have some type of constraint and that only leaves approx. 104 acres of unconstrained developable land. That is a drastic reduction from the original 822 acres in 2018 and even now with the overall 239 acres.

He goes into the floor area ratio (FAR) of the buildings which is the ration between the total amount of usable floor area of the building and the total area of the building's lot. This is the basis for quantifying non-residential development potential. The higher the FAR, the higher density and the lower the FAR the lower density of land use. The average FAR for existing non-residential development in the District is 0.06, which is low utilization of space. That means on average in the 4 Corners District, developers would use 100 sq. ft of land to produce 6 sq ft of non-residential space. He shows a couple examples of building from other surrounding town and also uses Charmingfare Place in Candia, to show a current building that is and would be a good fit into the 4 Corners Village District. This building lot size is 0.64 acres (27,878 sq ft) and has 3,734 usable sq ft. The ratio for the floor area of $3,734/27,878=0.134$. This shows the utilization is not going to be extensive in any way. The development idea is to have businesses on the lower half and the upper half of the building may house up to 4 residential units.

As N. Miller moves into the last piece of his presentation, he notes that this information is based on a mathematical exercise to determine the theoretical maximum amount that could occur under the proposed District regulations. The actual scope or timing of development is largely driven by market forces and makes it possible that the proposed District will never be developed to the theoretical potential un the proposal. In the results of the potential analysis, it shows that the existing development in the 4 Corners is 23 residential units, the max long-term potential is 417, so 394 would be the additional long-term development potential in the District. The non-residential sq ft. shows 52,445 sq. ft existing, 424,937 potential max long-term and therefore 372,492 sq ft additional long-term development potential in the District. He goes on to talk about the impacts that could have on the community; 394 additional residential units translates to approx. 900 additional residents and of those, 88 would be school age children. He notes that the current enrollment is only at approx. 57% capacity. The 372,492 sq. ft of additional non-residential floor space translates to approx. 372 additional jobs. This is almost an equal job to residential unit balance for the Town and indicates this could be a place where the people both work and live. As he continues with the valuation of potential development, he states that a conservative valuation would be \$70.66 million for the additional residential units and \$23.16 million for the additional non-residential floor space for a total value of all the additional development potential in the proposed District to be estimated at \$93.82 million in today's dollars. Potential revenue from the District is based on Candia's 2018 tax rate of \$24.08. The potential revenue from \$93.82 million would be \$2.26 million. Town services are also costs associated with new development and based on the studies from 13 surrounding towns including, Deerfield, Hooksett, Enfield, Lee, Brentwood, etc., expenditures were higher than revenues received for residential land uses only compared to lower expenditures than revenues received for Commercial/Industrial or Agricultural/Open Space land uses. This means that with only residential land use, the 4 Corners Village District is not viable. It needs the other categories to survive. If fully build out, the addition development of the proposed District could generate an estimated \$2.26 million in revenue versus \$2.08 million in expenses for community services to serve the new District. Though the difference is only \$180k at this time, this is only an estimate of the potential.

N. Miller states that the DOT 10yr Transportation Improvement Plan includes a project for "Safety and Operational Improvements on NH Rte. 27, NH Rte. 43 and Raymond Rd." in Candia's 4 Corners area. This project is programmed for \$5.9 million with construction in fiscal year 2028 and engineering work to begin in fiscal year 2022. No design has been developed yet, but the Town of Candia will have input in the development of design alternatives. N. Miller suggests that the Town consider advocating for the installation of a closed drainage system and sidewalks for this area. This will assist with storm water runoff and promote the walkability that rural village centers normally have. The Town will have to maintain these sidewalks, the State will not do this once they are built. N. Miller ends the presentation and the Board thanks him.

R. Cartier asks if the Board has any questions and there are none. He then asks if there are any questions from the audience.

R. Cartier opens the public meeting at 8:45pm.

Susan Cady (resident) has concerns w/traffic on Rte. 43 & Rte. 27, and asks if the Board has any thoughts about that? N. Miller states that significant investment will take place to work w/DOT for the future concern

of any traffic issues. R. Cartier notes that the current traffic on these roads is not mainly from Candia but through traffic. There won't be much added impact because they are already major throughways.

Patricia Velasco (resident) says the financially feasible piece looks like its marginal development stays in pace w/residential or it's not feasible. Schools are not a big hit and non-residential is subject to market forces and interest in development. Is there any way to balance this? R. Cartier states that this was taken into consideration in the 500ft buffer area where there is no residential only. It will have to have mixed use and residential. As a Board, we cannot limit building permits.

Mike Schmidt (resident) asks the Board to define 'all affordable income levels'. R. Cartier states that a building lot in Candia is approx. \$150k and new construction is approx. \$340k each. The 4 Corners Village District proposes apartments above businesses and are more affordable for younger people starting out.

Max Nacosia (resident) says that there are very few apartments in Candia and the rents are already \$1200-\$1600/mth and we have good schools as well. How do you restrict rental amounts? R. Cartier states that the shortage even in Manchester is exorbitant, but it's supply and demand.

R. Cartier reminds the audience that this is only an idea at this point and there are no designs yet. The Board is being pro-active and implementing the Master Plan and the 4 Corners is a good place to focus.

John Richter (resident) begins by requesting that the presentation be put on the website and the Board confirms that will be done. He goes on and asks if these roads are going to change on who has to maintain them (State vs. Town)? R. Cartier states that there is a process for that, and the Town would have to approach the BOS and ask if the Town would accept this road? J. Richter notes that there has been adult grumble on the district and some of the guys really don't like this stretch of road and want to get rid of it and dump it on the Town. He wants it on record that we don't want that. B. Brock states that there has been no talk about the Town even considering taking that road.

P. Velasco states that she doesn't see any provisions for parking. If you're not going to have parking in front of the store, what about a municipal lot where the community kicks in towards that, so it becomes a more walkable place, or parking behind the stores? B. Brock states that whole process would happen once somebody comes before the PB to develop a piece of property. It would be based on the structure they are putting up, what the impact is and how many parking lots are required or needed? The thought was to get the parking in the back of these structures. That would all be the start of the process before anybody started to put up a building.

Ralph Darrah (resident) asks if someone came from out of town and wanted to visit, they could park at one business and visit all the others and leave their car there? B. Brock notes that is what people do in the city now if you park. Not everybody moves their vehicle to go to another store. R. Darrah says in the city you pay a meter where you park in a municipal place. You don't park at one business just to walk a ½ mile to another business. R. Cartier states that in many smaller areas such as New London, they don't have any parking meters and you can park in one person's lot and walk around to other areas. We're looking at the village concept without parking meters, w/parking in the back being free. That's one on the village district concepts, to be walkable. R. Darrah states that as an owner of a business they may not want people parking for extended amounts of time if they aren't at their business to shop. He suggests the Board look at this issue closer. R. Cartier refers to N. Miller and says he believes the Board looked into having front parking on the street and within the setbacks. N. Miller confirms that and states that would have to be a discussion with the DOT if there was an interest to have on street parking.

J. Richter asks when the last traffic count done through the 4 Corners from Rte. 43 and Rte. 27? R. Cartier states that he doesn't know that answer right now. J. Richter states that it's a lot and he doesn't think there will be any on street parking due to the amount of traffic flow. It's a main throughway and there probably going to have a hard time with that. R. Cartier states that with the discussions with the DOT and also when someone comes to the Board with a proposal, then yes, they would address it at that time. The Board will also note that concern when giving information/feedback to DOT for safety improvements in the area. J. Richter then notes that he has a 100'x100' lot, and wants to know how much of his land is he going to lose to sidewalks and parking? R. Cartier says none of your unless you want to do it for parking on your property. The Town won't go to eminent domain and try to take any of your property for parking or sidewalks. They will stay within the right of way. If they need land, it would be the same as any time before, and they'd have to negotiate with you. We're not anticipating at this point in time, that's really going to happen.

Ron Laverdure (resident) follows up on sidewalks and the width of the roads and how that will be impacted for winter travel? B. Brock says the State has a right of way for highways. Sidewalks will be discussed with the DOT in design stages. What the sidewalk right of ways and width of the roads required will be part of

that discussion. This is a long process and it's possible sidewalks won't be a part of the design at all. M. Chalbeck states that these roads are 3 rod roads and there are still another 11 feet beyond the fog line on each side that is State property. N. Miller notes that the engineering phase with the DOT will start in 2022 and construction won't start until 2028.

R. Darrah asks is there will be control if sidewalks are put in? R. Cartier notes the 25ft max setbacks and that would also be part of the DOT design. The DOT will be working with the Town so as not to wreck the economic viability for the Town.

J. Richter asks who will be in charge of the curb cutting and R. Cartier states that will be the DOT.

D. Lewis says he noticed it said 'unless otherwise permitted by Conditional Use Permit'; how much will change this? He is worried that if it doesn't end up as intended, it could be an issue in the end. R. Cartier states that this Board will need multi-use structures and public input. The Board did not want to be too rigid and have flexibility to review case by case and see if it meets the spirit of the ordinance.

M. Cobb asks about a demand analysis for commercial vs. residential? Basing residential on current land use, but talking about buildings that have the same value of them as they are all residential? R. Cartier states that the PB cannot put in the regulations to say what people can and can't do in a certain area. The demand for housing is very strong and we never really know if that will happen.

P. Velasco asks if the village extends to the Irving and R. Cartier states that it ends at the cemetery, CYAA, courthouse and post office.

R. Cartier states that if the proposal works well, citizens can expand it in the future.

Tom St. Martin (resident) asks as far as walkability, there are no provisions for the yet? B. Brock notes that will be in the planning process. T. St. Martin asks if the sidewalks are buildable items and R. Cartier says yes, but if there are any wetland, it would be reviewed by DES during the planning process

P. Velasco asks if the Board can require sidewalks for safety and R. Cartier states that it depends on what the development is and B. Brock notes that is in the planning process as well. R. Cartier states that the Board will be taking a closer look at this and the criteria but will know more in development and planning process.

J. Richter ask if there has been any traffic study done? M. Chalbeck states that within a mile, kids should walk but anyone on Rte. 43 are bussed. J. Richter notes that if this transpires, that could increase more children and overall foot traffic. M. Chalbeck states that it is restricted in this area but now it doesn't do that. R. Cartier notes that if it is approved, the safety aspect will be worked out with the DOT for this piece of the design analysis.

Art Gosselin (resident) states that he has raised his family and runs his business in Candia and his business is a part of the proposed 4 Corners Village District area and it's very successful. He believes the Town can flourish but still remain small.

T. St. Martin asks what New England Architecture is and R. Cartier notes that is in the Site Plan Regulations (on website for review).

M. Cobb asks if the Board has looked at sustainability for water and septic and R. Cartier says no. The Board will work with DES for this part of the design.

T. DiMaggio asks if the land can sustain the developments and R. Cartier states that the Board can't answer that because it would all be conjecture at this point considering it's only in the idea phase. Each site will be looked at individually and this development is unlikely to be built right away so we can not determine that at this time.

R. Cartier states that the Town will have a lot of input in the State design plan for the 4 Corners Village District. R. Cartier ends question/comment time and thanks everyone for the feedback.

R. Cartier closes the public meeting at 8:52pm.

Case #19-006 (Final):

Applicant: Armand & Susan Hebert, 2001 Cedar Street, McKenzie, TN 38201; Owner: same; Property Location: Currier Road, Candia, NH 03034; Map 402 Lots 51 & 57.

Intent: MAJOR subdivision. To consolidate the two existing lots (402-51 & 57) and then subdivide into 5 frontage lots for residential use.

Armand Hebert discusses with the PB that he was not provided enough direction at the last meeting on 10/16/19 by them and therefore had to speak with his attorney (John Cronin) as to what the next steps would be for him. The Board referred to the 10/16/19 meeting minutes and stated that the applicant was to obtain information as to the costs he would contribute to the culvert and road upgrades. After further discussion as to what the applicant was willing to contribute, they all decided to continue the case for the next scheduled

meeting. The applicant is to work with D. Lewis (Road Agent) on pricing for the upgrades noted and come back to the Board on 12/4/19 with this information as well as updated plans to review with the Board.

R. Cartier states that the case will be continued to the next hearing date of Wednesday, 12/4/19 at 7pm.

Case #19-010 – LLA:

Co-Applicant: Tatulis Family Rev. Trust, William & Edith Tatulis, Trustees, 305 Chester Turnpike, Candia, NH 03034; Owner: same; Property Location: same; Map 411 Lot 49.

Co-Applicant: Ranch Roller Coaster, LLC., 670 North Commercial Street, Manchester, NH 03104; Owner: same; Property Location: Chester Turnpike, Candia, NH 03034; Map 411 Lot 50.

Intent: A *lot line adjustment*. Remove the equivalent amount of .821 acres from Map 411 Lot 49 (approx. 6.183 acres) and Map 411 Lot 50 (approx. 79.127 acres), then re-distribute those acres equally within the same property locations of Map 411 Lot 49 and Map 411 Lot 50, thus creating a new lot line for each parcel of land.

Rob Degan (Surveyor) briefly reviews the presentation and intent of the case to the Board. The Board notes that they submitted the updated information to Town Counsel and after review of their comments, it was agreed upon that the Board is not creating a non-conforming lot nor contributing to it. The Board will be resolving a long-standing title/deed issue between the property owners. The Board notes that as a condition to the approval, the applicant shall provide the Land Use Office with copies of the newly recorded Deeds. Attorney Bisson and J. Lopez agree to have the Land Use Secretary record the Deeds at the same time as the mylars and insert the plan # onto the space provided in the property deeds. A copy will be provided to the Land Use office of these 2 Deeds after recording.

M. Chalbeck made a **motion** to approve the application with conditions. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

Case #19-009:

Applicant: Brien & Linda Brock, 272 Chester Turnpike, Candia, NH 03034; Owner: same; Property Location: same; Map 411 Lot 67.

Intent: MINOR Subdivision. To subdivide lot 411-67 (approx. 29.114 acres) into 2 residential lots to be approximately 13.988 acres and the remainder of 15.126 acres to never be further subdivided.

*B. Brock recuses himself as the applicant.

After review of the updated information which included the coversheet of the plans with the surveyor stamp and the recorded amendment for the dissolution of the covenant on the applicants property signed by the majority of property owners, the Board has agreed to approve the application with the condition that 4 full sets of plans, with the surveyor stamp on each sheet, will be provided to the Land Use Office along with the mylars for recording.

S. Komisarek made a **motion** to approve the application with conditions. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

Minutes -October 16, 2019:

J. Bedard made a **motion** to accept the minutes as presented. B. Brock **seconded**. J. Lindsey & J. Pouliot **abstain**. **Motion passed.**

Minutes -October 29, 2019:

The Board agrees to defer the minutes to the next scheduled meeting date.

Minutes -November 6, 2019:

J. Lindsey made a **motion** to accept the minutes as presented. S. Komisarek **seconded**. J. Bedard & J. Pouliot **abstain**. **Motion passed.**

MOTION:

J. Bedard **motioned** to adjourn the PB meeting at approximately 9:37pm. J. Pouliot **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

*Rudy Cartier, Chair called the ZRRC meeting to order at 9:38pm.

Review Zoning Ordinances for potential Warrant Articles:

The Board reads and discusses the 17 proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments that will go to the ballot. R. Cartier notes that there was a meeting on 11/18/19 where the Board met with the Ag. Comm. for clarification on the 3 Agricultural related amendments and it was noted that the 3acre minimum was changed to 2 acres. Charlane Bilodeau wanted clarification on who would be in charge of granting special exception and R. Cartier noted that would be the ZBA.

B. Brock stated that after checking with Municipal Assoc., the Ag. Comm. would not be able to be a part of the ZBA process for this in any capacity.

Paul Bilodeau notes that he has heard that the Home Service Contractor piece was negative but after getting more information, he now thinks it's positive for the Town.

M. Cobb notes that the consensus of the Ag. Comm. is to have the zoning permitted w/o limitations and R. Cartier states that there had to be a compromise because it was necessary.

MOTION:

J. Lindsey **motioned** to adjourn the ZRRC meeting at approximately 10:05pm. J. Pouliot **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Galica
Land Use Secretary
cc: file