

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF May 15th, 2024
APPROVED MINUTES**

PB Members Present: Tim D’Arcy, Chair; Mark Chalbeck, V-Chair; Brien Brock, BOS Representative; Kevin Coughlin; Scott Komisarek; Mike Guay, Alt.
Linda Carroll, Alt.

PB Members Absent:
Rudy Cartier (excused)
Judi Lindsey (excused)
M. Santa, Alt.

* Tim D’Arcy, Chair; called the PB meeting to order at approximately 6:30PM, followed immediately by the Pledge of Allegiance

New Business:

- **Scenic Roads -Tree Trimming/Removal:** N.H. Electric Co—Operative, Inc. and Consolidated Communications to remove trees on roads that have been designated by town meeting vote to be scenic roads (Crowley Road), within the proposed work area, pursuant to RSA 231:158. *Note:* Upon a finding by the Board that the information meets the submission requirements of the **Candia Regulations**, the Board will vote to approve. Should a decision not be reached at the public hearing, this will stay on the Planning Board agenda until such time as it is either approved or disapproved.

Keith Martel – Property Owner: Unfortunately, the NH Coop was not able to make it tonight. The request is fairly straightforward. We are building a house at 101 Crowley Road. We are in a dead area between Eversource Coverage and Coop Coverage. The power line stops a couple of hundred feet up the road and a line extension is necessary to come down. They have provided you with a list of the trees that they are looking to remove. Pretty straightforward. Especially after the last storm.

T. D’Arcy: So, you are doing 101 Crowley? You’ve got two other lots?

Keith Martel – Property Owner: Yes. I also own 113 Crowley, which is a separate lot. Those are the only two properties that would be directly affected.

T. D’Arcy: And this is just for clearing for the powerline?

K. Martel: Correct.

B. Brock: Whatever they take out, I am sure is going to be a benefit to us. That’s a narrow strip of road.

M. Chalbeck: I understand it, being in the industry.

M. Chalbeck: **Motion** to accept the proposal for the tree trimming as presented. B. Brock: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

Old Business:

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

Joseph Coronati – Jones&Beach Engineers - Engineer for Applicant and Bob Carr – Property Owner and applicant.

J. Coronati: Since the last meeting we have been going mainly through the Stantec review comments. A couple of those things I will just briefly touch on. One of the concerns from Stantec was the amount of disturbance in the front. We were starting to get close to the threshold requiring another state permit, Alteration of Terrain Permit. We were right at the threshold but slightly below it. We pulled these units in closer to the road, which removed some of our disturbance areas in the back. He wanted us to allocate space for stockpile. We had some small tree buffer areas that we were showing as to remain; we added those areas into the disturbance. Added a stockpile area on the plan. Pulled these in, tightened up the grading. We officially designed the stormwater. We had to create stormwater calculations, provide retention ponds.

T. D'Arcy: If I remember correctly, there was a grey issue that Bryan felt was going to be graded the wrong way and causing water retention problems in the cul-de-sac or something to that effect.

J. Coronati: A little bit. I think we had previously planned to use the cul-de-sac as our detention area because it's an area that is going to be disturbed. Now we are officially doing that. We have designed the grading; we have pipes coming in and out. We've kind of always had the same drainage pattern. None of the pattern of drainage really has changed. It's just a little more detailed.

B. Brock: That's basically what Bryan was asking for was more detail.

J. Coronati: Which makes sense given the fact that we were proposing pipes, but we had sized them in our office, we hadn't done stormwater retention calcs. Our problem is that we had so much land that we didn't necessarily need to do all of that detailed work but around the cul-de-sac, it is important you get the culverts the right size in and out to make sure we are not flooding.

We have a pretty sizeable wetland. We are taking that water into our cul-de-sac. We are certainly not putting any additional.

T. D'Arcy: We don't have the detailed topography of the backland. Do we have enough?

B. Ruoff: Yes. They have accounted for what they need to in the proposed design.

J. Coronati: I know your site plan regulations are set up for commercial developments. We have been reissuing all of the waivers in one letter so that you didn't have piecemeal. In the back of that letter is a

large amount of waivers. Most of which we have talked through. There are two new waivers. One is related to drainage. The other is about requirement for guardrail around the inside of the cul-de-sac and we still envision that as a...the town has a regulation; they want a certain slope off the side of the road or a parking lot. If it's steeper than that, you have a requirement for guardrail, but this is a 3 to 1 slope. It's kind of a typical side road slope and doesn't warrant the guardrail according to the DOT's warrants. Your regulation is a little stricter, so we asked for a waiver on that. Mainly because we still envision this as like a little common driveway not a road. It's just sort of an issue...not an issue but a result of the regulations not really speaking to private driveways, private common driveways. It speaks to bigger projects that you are more used to getting for commercial.

T. D'Arcy: I agree. After your first application and looking at your waiver requests and looking at the regulation, I think probably everybody on this Board agrees that.

J. Coronati: Not every project will fit into a set of regulations, and this is one of those cases.

B. Brock: That's why we still have the ability for a waiver.

J. Coronati: You don't have to necessarily change all of your regulations because of something like this.

B. Brock: Case by case.

J. Coronati: I think maybe the only other aspect that's been discussed. We have gone around and around with Bryan and the fire chief on whether the path / driveway out back had to be widened. Could it be the same size? We did not prefer to widen it. It's kind of a little, almost an old country trail.

M. Chalbeck: It's an old logging road.

J. Coronati: Our preference was not to widen it. If we did widen it, we would need wetland permits.

B. Brock: My only concern was if the Chief thought he could get back there.

J. Coronati: And I think he states, if he can't, he won't. It's not like it's a house. There are no inhabitants. It's a barn. If it goes up, it goes up.

T. D'Arcy: My plan for tonight was to have you present and then we go through Stantec's list and your list. We get the both of you on the same page and we get it all in the record, right? And then we can start looking at the waivers.

B. Brock: We should be able to get through the waivers. The waivers will then give them better direction.

T. D'Arcy: I am just going to go through the points on Bryan's letter (see attached). The plan specifies 99,000 square feet and he was concerned that it was over 100,000 and his latest is partially addressed. The applicant's engineer has responded that if you are going to be running underground power out to the barn, he felt it would take you over the 100,000 level. The applicant's engineer has responded that overhead electric wires or onsite solar will provide electricity to the proposed barn. However, overhead electric wires are not shown on the plans and are not permitted as per regulation 4.03-L.

B. Ruoff: To make sure the direction going forward is clear. Some kind of solar system for the barn would make sense and work and would keep the project under that 100,000 square foot threshold which would not require additional permitting. The solution is amicable except, I just want to make it clear that overhead electric, if it is ultimately requested by the applicant, it is something that they would essentially need a waiver for as well.

J. Coronati: We would be proposing that the six units would all be fed by underground.

M. Chalbeck: It would have less impact if he went overhead.

T. D'Arcy: Keeping the intent of the regulation in mind, I would be more amicable to an underground to the wood line and then come up.

B. Brock: So, you are going to make that official request in the near future?

J. Coronati: Yes.

T. D'Arcy: It's more palatable to get it to the wood line because then we are keeping with the intent of the regulation. Right? We are not going against the intent.

Number 9 is that the plan specifies a scale of one-inch equals fifty feet, but the regulations require one-inch equals 20 feet as specified in 4.3-E. Which you have requested a waiver for. Your point on this is that the regulations were not meant to be used on such a small development on such a large lot. Which is a fair point. Bryan, you got enough detail in the maps they provided when they get into the stuff specific to the developed area, correct?

B. Ruoff: Yes, agreed. The level of detail is sufficient. I feel like this is a waiver that has been granted maybe half a dozen times in the last five years so for this size site it's not uncommon for that type of a waiver.

T. D'Arcy: The next one down is similar. The plan only provides partial boundary and physical conditions in topography survey and the regulations require it to be the entire parcel. It should be noted that the applicant requested a waiver. There is a partial survey in the proximity to the proposed improvements. So once again, that particular line item is basically because the development is in such a small part

T. D'Arcy: The proposed improvements require the submittal to an approval by the zoning board and NHDOT Driveway Permits, NHDES Surface Disposal Permits, AOT, Drainage and Fill Permits, and USCOE Permits based on the proposed improvements. It is required that a copy of the necessary permits for the project be submitted with the application to the town in conjunction with the application. The crux of this is that the required permits for the project are currently pending and that is normally all we require. That puts you in compliance.

The site is required to be provided with a designated striped space for delivery vehicles as specified in Section 8.3-A-2. There is another waiver request, and this is to your point that this is not a commercial development.

Proposed access to the barn, parking spaces are provided no less than .2 horizontal candle feet of lighting is required to be provided the minimum of .2 horizontal candle feet with an average uniform of 4-1 in a minimum color ration of 50 for commons spaces shared and parking spaces as required by regulation 8.03-D. Again, you have requested a waiver on that and I think we all kind of agree that that type of

lighting doesn't fit in with the character of the neighborhood and I don't think we need to go any further than that.

This one we do need to talk about. I believe number 28 here:

"The proposed access drive culverts are specified as twelve-inch HDPE culverts, but are required to be a minimum of fifteen-inch RCP for open drainage systems, as specified in Regulation section 8.06-K and 8.06-Q." My question to you Bryan is what they are proposing adequate for the water drainage that is calculated?

B. Ruoff: It is. In recent history, this regulation is probably worth being revisited and potentially updated. In recent history, the town has required culverts installed within the public right-of-way to be RCP and any culverts on site, it could be flexible. It could be HDPE or RCP, whatever is proposed. In a lot of instances, most developers prefer HDPE. Truthfully at this point, the advancements have been made and that material they have similar or as good load ratings as RCP. It's perfectly suitable for what they are proposing, yes.

J. Coronati: The pipes are all 15-inch also. So, it's really just the type of pipe.

B. Ruoff: The original design was 12-inch pipes. It's since been updated.

T. D'Arcy: *"Additional details and/or deed occupancy restrictions are required to ensure that the proposed well is not being proposed as or could potentially serve a small community system; for a water supply of 25, or more, people the well would be considered a small community system and would be subject to the requirements of NHDES Env Dw 305. If deed restrictions are not put on the property maximizing the number of occupants, then we recommend that the proposed community well be submitted to NHDES for review and approval as a small community well system."* To sum it up, NH state requires that any well that serves 25 people or more is a public well system. So, in that case, since you're not requesting a well system, I just propose that we would probably as a Board limit it to two people per bedroom for a total occupancy of 24.

L. Carroll: Yes, four for each building.

J. Coronati: We do have a note to that effect on sheet C-4 Note 22, we noted on there that the maximum occupancy is 4 per unit, total of 24.

T. D'Arcy: We are going to want to put that in as well.

It is recommended that the Board discuss whether the proposed cul-de-sac road should be designated as a private road with an associated street sign or a property address to minimize confusion from first responders. So, do we want to specify this as a private road or as a driveway.?

B. Brock: I would think it's a private road because it is going to access three units with a cul-de-sac. So, it is more than just a driveway and for the future, it would probably be good if it did have a street sign.

T. D'Arcy: I'll play devils advocate here, just cuz that's what I do. If it's a driveway and not a private road then in the future, people can't necessarily as easily ask the town to take it over.

B. Brock: Well, they can't. It would be on the plan that it's a private road. It's not even going to be built to town specs so we wouldn't take it over. That will be on the recorded plan.

B. Carr: The postmaster did send a letter where he just assume that it be...that the addresses be 669-1, 669-2, and so on.

B. Brock: Oh really?

B. Carr: Yes.

B Brock: So, no street sign.

J. Coronati: One way to deal with this is not to deal with it also. If the postmaster and the fire department prefer to have it be a private, if they don't agree, and then they come to terms. It would be best for us to just leave it open. We'll do whatever the town wants.

B. Carr: Certainly.

T. D'Arcy: My take on this for right now. The waivers are just to not have to put the driveway up to road spec. This is something that we'll have to discuss and determine more when we get to the actual site plan review.

I'm moving on to the next one, the second part of 58. *"The proposed cul-de-sac storm water detention pond creates a stormwater impoundment adjacent to the roadway; the 100-year detention pond water level is required to be a minimum of 25-feet from the edge of pavement, as specified in Regulation Section 8.06L."*

Is this just that the retention pond is close to the driveway?

B. Ruoff: Essentially the depression in the center of the cul-de-sac is sized to hold the stormwater. It's sized for the 100-year storm, which is in excess of what DES requires for detention ponds. So, it's significantly sized. By the letter of the regulations, the level of the stormwater at the peak in that storm event is required to be 25 feet from the edge of pavement. That isn't possible in that cul-de-sac, based on the configuration, it's not big enough. Technically it doesn't meet it. Is it still an acceptable system, yeah, I would say probably. It's another instance like Joe indicated earlier where the regulations don't necessarily speak to this type of development. Is it going to be the end of the world that the water backs up in the center of that cul-de-sac? Not really but it doesn't meet the regulations as they are currently designed. Essentially and they would seek a waiver for that.

J. Coronati: They are not necessarily on the plans because the plans don't show a lot of that off-site stuff. We actually added. Sheet 17 of 23. It actually has the aerial photography which shows all the buildings. We didn't trace them onto the plan, but I think this is actually better because it shows you a real-life views.

T. D'Arcy: Reads letter to be added into the record. This is from Bob Martel –

B. Carr: I can respond if you'd like to whatever degree; it might be helpful to the Board. I tried to get everybody together to come out, let's go look at this. I got people from the fish and game to come out. Nobody took me up on it. I invited the entire commission out there as well as my neighbors. Nobody

came, nobody responded. Fish and Game actually helped me put those beaver deceivers out there. The reason I did it is because these ponds were getting huge, and you could just see dead trees everywhere. These ponds got really deep. As far as diverting the water in different directions, that's not true. As far as the deeds are concerned, the quick claim deeds, I don't understand what he was actually asking. That's beyond me, I don't know but I have reached out to all my neighbors, and I have their emails and I've even stopped by their homes and knocked on doors. To now avail. I tried.

M. Chalbeck: So, the pond they are talking about is the old mill pond on the very southern edge of your property. When I was a kid and we used to hunt the property a lot, you could walk halfway down that pond. It was all marsh. And over the years the beaver dammed it up and it flooded and then beaver dam breaks. It's been through a cycle like this that I know of.

T. D'Arcy: We'll start going down through the waivers:

T. D'Arcy: The first waiver request is for: **Section II, Article 4.03.E — Plan Scale: The scale of the plan shall be at a minimum of one-inch equals twenty feet (1" = 20'), and the plan shall include a north arrow and the date.**

“We are asking for a waiver from this requirement because this site is 88 acres and most of that property is not being developed. Typically housing developments would be at a larger scale than 1"=20'. Since we are required to apply under the site plan regulations, those are more geared towards commercial sites and additions, which makes more sense for a more detailed site plan. Our plans are at 1"=50' and provide adequate detail for this spread-out housing design.”

B. Brock: **Motion** to accept their waiver request on plan scale. M. Chalbeck: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section II, Article 4.03.F - Boundary Survey: A survey of the perimeter boundaries of the proposed use subject to site plan review, including compass bearings, distances, and area in acres.

“We are asking for a waiver from this requirement because the site is 88 acres and mostly undeveloped backland. The client also agreed to no further development as part of the ZBA approval to allow the multi-family housing development. The units are not being sold off individually and therefore we are not required to survey the entire lot per the condominium law. We have surveyed approximately 17.6 acres of boundary which is well past the proposed barn in the rear of the parcel and enough to prove out density. For these reasons, we feel that this is a reasonable request given the small size of this development compared to overall parcel size.”

B. Brock: **Motion** to accept the waiver request for boundary survey. L. Carroll: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section II, Article 4.03.G — Topography Survey: Existing and proposed topography showing surface contours at intervals not in excess of 2-feet.

“We are asking for a waiver from this requirement because the site is 88 acres and mostly undeveloped backland. The client also agreed to no further development as part of the ZBA approval to allow the multi-family housing development. We have provided detailed topography on the front

15 acres, which is far more than the area needed for this small development. For these reasons, we feel that this is a reasonable request given the small size of this development compared to overall parcel size.”

T. D’Arcy: The town engineer has specified that he has enough detail and enough information including the rainwater discharge.

M. Chalbeck: **Motion** to accept waiver for the topography survey. B. Brock: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section II, Article 4.03.I — Natural Features: The location of natural features such as rivers, streams, marshes, wetlands, and any man-made feature such as existing dams, roads, stone walls, and structures. The plan shall indicate those natural and man-made features which are to be removed, retained, or altered.

“We are asking for a waiver from this requirement because the site is 88 acres and mostly undeveloped backland. The client also agreed to no further development as part of the ZBA approval to allow the multi-family housing development. We have provided detailed existing features for the front 15 acres, which is far more than the area needed for this small development. For these reasons, we feel that this is a reasonable request given the small size of this development compared to overall parcel size.”

S. Komisarek: **Motion** to accept the waiver request for natural features. K. Coughlin: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section II, Article 4.03.K — Sidewalk: Proposed streets, driveways, parking spaces and sidewalks, with indication of direction of travel and inside radii of all curves. The width of the traveled way of all streets, driveways and sidewalks, and the total number of all parking spaces shall be shown. Loading spaces, trash disposal facilities, and facilities used in connection with any structure on the site shall be shown.

“We comply with most of this section, but we are asking for a waiver from the sidewalk requirement because we are proposing a short shared private driveway, just over 300' in length, for six (6) dwelling units. The purpose of having sidewalks is to improve pedestrian safety on roadways with high traffic volume, so that pedestrians will not be walking in the travel lane. Traffic on the shared driveway will be minimal and does not warrant the need for sidewalks. There is no sidewalk along Route 27 to connect to and the residents will be able to walk along the driveway with no safety concerns.”

M. Chalbeck: We’ve granted this before, for other developments that are private.

T. D’Arcy: Personally, I think this also keeps the development more in line with the character of the neighborhood and with something that we as a town and the town ordinances would prefer.

M. Chalbeck: **Motion** to accept the waiver request for sidewalks as presented. B. Brock: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section III, Article 8.03.A.2 — Truck Turning: Turning movements shall be provided for a WB-67 vehicle demonstrating that a delivery vehicle can access, maneuver and exit the site without impacting other motorists or pedestrians.

“We believe that this requirement is intended for industrial and major commercial sites where deliveries via a large tractor trailer such as a WB-67 are anticipated. A WB-67 is specifically intended for deliveries of materials to warehouses or superstores, and it would have no business utilizing a shared access driveway between three duplexes. The largest vehicles anticipated to use the proposed shared access driveway are fire trucks and delivery box trucks similar to a SU-30. Turning movements for these two vehicles were run on Sheets T1 and T2 of the plan set.”

M. Chalbeck: Every time we have granted a waiver, we’ve gone down to WB-40, so the SU-30, I’m not sure about.

B. Ruoff: The applicant has provided turning movements for the largest fire apparatus that will be utilized for the town and for a typical delivery truck. WB-40 is a little bigger. I think what’s necessary for the site so I think what they are proposing is reasonable. The largest vehicle that they’ve accommodated their site plan for and the radius coming out to the roadway is the fire engine anyway, which would govern. As far as their proposal, I think it’s sound for what they are proposing. The WB-40 is more for a commercial site. Where this isn’t a commercial site, this is residential, there wouldn’t need to be deliveries for that size vehicle basically.

T. D’Arcy: A WB-67 is the largest over the road tractor trailer.

B. Ruoff: Mr. Chairmen, you don’t have to rub it in that we are overdue to update those regulations. Don’t put salt in that wound for me. I think we’ve granted this waiver 40 times. I have nightmares about it.

M. Chalbeck: Based on Bryan’s recommendation, I will make the **Motion** that we accept the waiver for Article 8.03.A.2 - truck turning. M. Guay: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

Section III, Article 8.03.A.3 — Delivery Area: An area designated and striped for delivery vehicles (is required).

“Again, this requirement seems like it is intended for industrial and commercial sites. The delivery vehicles will mostly like stop in the cul-de-sac near the driveway for the unit it is delivering to and walk to the front door. Residents exiting their driveways would be able to either wait or go the other direction away from the delivery vehicle on the cul-de-sac and therefore wouldn’t pose any traffic congestion.”

T. D’Arcy: This is a point that I completely agree with you on. That having delivery vehicle marked parking in a rural / residential district is not what this town would intend with it’s zoning ordinances and with it’s rules and regulations.

B. Brock: **Motion** to grant the waiver request for delivery area. L. Carroll: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

Section III, Article 8.03.D.3.D — Lighting Design: Parking lot and sidewalk lighting shall provide a minimum 0.2 horizontal foot candles with an average uniformity ratio of 4:1 and a minimum color ratio index of 50.

“A parking lot is not proposed, and neither are sidewalks. Lighting on the units is proposed above their garage doors and at front doors like most homes. We want to avoid having too many lights in this development and we believe that is the goal of the Town as well in a rural area like this one.”

M. Chalbeck: Motion to grant the waiver for the lighting design which is Article 8.03.D.3.D. **Second:** K. Coughlin. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section III, Article 8.03.I — Granite Curbing: Parking spaces shall be of adequate size and number in accordance with Candia's Zoning Ordinance and shall be physically delineated by granite curbing so as to protect adjacent pedestrians.

“We are providing three parking spaces per dwelling unit — two in the driveway and one in the garage. The parking requirement per zoning is only two spaces per dwelling unit and therefore we exceed the required number, and a waiver is not required for the number or dimension of parking spaces. However, no curbing is being proposed anywhere for the use. The intent of curbing typically is twofold; to stop stormwater from leaving pavement where it is not intended to, and to physically demarcate paved areas. We are proposing to allow runoff to sheet flow off of the paved surface and into several culverts and swales toward a detention pond in the center of the cul de sac, then finally to the back of the site. Therefore, curbing is not necessary for drainage design purposes. Furthermore, curbing would be contrary to the intended character of the proposed multi-family residential use. We are intending to maintain a rural feel to the site in keeping with surrounding properties and the existing use of the subject parcel. There is no curbing on High Street or any surrounding sites along High Street to the best of our knowledge. Therefore, we have no need for curbing and feel that it would be detrimental to the intended character of the property.”

L. Carroll: Motion to accept the waiver for Article 8.03.I - Granite Curbing. **K. Coughlin: Second.** All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section III, Article 8.06.K — Culvert Pipe: Acceptable pipe material for roadway drainage systems and driveway culverts is: Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP).

“RCP is typically only used for wetland crossings. ADS-N12 HDPE pipe is industry standard for culverts underneath driveways and roadways. Local contractors are more accustomed to installing ADS-N12 HDPE pipes and these are more readily available for construction. ADS-N12 is rated for H2O loading at a depth of as little as 1 foot, and we are proposing at least 3 feet of cover in all paved areas. ADS-N12 HDPE pipe is a sufficient construction material for the intended use we are proposing.”

B. Brock: Motion to accept the waiver request for culvert piping. **M. Chalbeck: Second.** All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section III, Article 8.06.L — Stormwater shall not be impounded adjacent to roadways. The 100-Year Detention Pond elevation shall be designed to be a minimum of 10-feet from the edge of the right-of-way or otherwise a minimum of 25-feet from the edge of pavement.

“Due to the clustered nature of the proposed development in the front area of the subject parcel, the center of the cul-de-sac is the only good location for a detention pond. Otherwise, it would need to be between units 4&5, which is space that we need to use for landscaping and utilities. We are keeping the 100-Year peak elevation of the pond 1 foot below the lowest grade of adjacent pavement and the remainder of the pavement is higher so it will have more freeboard than that. This will protect the road gravels more than a horizontal separation of the peak elevation of water would. The 100-year peak water surface would be about 6 feet from the edge of pavement at the closest, but this is a temporary condition and the multi-stage discharge outlet structure is designed to fully drain the pond. The water level would return to a stage at which it is 25' from the edge of pavement shortly after the storm and then the pond would fully drain.”

L. Carroll: Motion to provide a waiver for Section III, Article 8.06.L Stormwater: L. Carroll. **Second.** M. Guay. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Section III, Article 8.17 — Guardrail shall be provided for all locations where side slopes exceed 4-feet horizontal and 1-foot vertical, for a vertical drop greater than 5-feet.

“The only location where a 5' vertical drop at a slope greater than 4:1 is proposed is in the center cul-de-sac island. Guardrail is typically only required with a 5-foot vertical drop if a 2:1 side slope is proposed. In this case we are providing an 8' vertical drop 3:1 side slope. Per AASHTO, guardrail is typically not warranted on a 3:1 slope unless there is a drop of 15' or greater. (See below AASHTO guidance diagram). This Town ordinance is more stringent than the typical requirement and guardrail would not be of any benefit from a safety standpoint in this case. Vehicle traffic will naturally follow the outer lane of the cul-de-sac in a counterclockwise direction. The inner lane of the cul-de-sac would be mostly unused. Guardrail in this location would be a large expense to the applicant for no safety benefit.”

B. Ruoff: The towns regulation is a little onerous. I will agree to that. This proposed development just barely meets the criteria. So, from that standpoint and considering that the traffic coming around this cul-de-sac, likely going between 5 or 10 miles per hour at most. I think there is really no benefit. Truthfully, there's the added hazard of someone trying to park along the cul-de-sac and impacting that guardrail. There are a lot of reasons in this specific instance, for this project, for this site, where it really poses no benefit to this site, I would say.

B. Brock: From a maintenance standpoint, they are a pain and for rural character and aesthetic, it doesn't fit. I can visualize what it is going to look like without curbing and guardrails. It's going to look like three houses that are built close to each other.

B. Brock: **Motion** to accept the waiver request for guardrails. K. Coughlin: **Second.** All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

T. D'Arcy: That is the end of the waivers at this point. Is there anything else we need to discuss at this point? I don't think going into site plan review at this point is overly prudent at. In terms of action items, you are going to decide whether or not to do solar or the above ground power waiver? There was a discussion about the heat for the building and propane tanks or whatever. Bryan, has that been worked out?

B. Ruoff: I believe so, yes.

T. D'Arcy: The applicant is requesting a waiver from that to be able to go aboveground to get to the barn.

J. Coronati: The waiver would be to have overhead utilities only to the barn and I think it was talked about that we would then add that the riser pole would be at the tree line and the utilities to all three duplexes would still be underground.

M. Chalbeck: **Motion** to accept the waiver for Section 4.03-L. as specified in the discussion, underground to the tree line. B. Brock: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

T. D'Arcy: We have now processed all the waivers. I think we have been through all of this a lot.

B. Brock: The major things that we were interested in have been pretty well discussed. There could have been some issues that didn't comply but because they had to go to the ZBA...

T. D'Arcy: I think we should put in as a condition that Stantec determine any performance bond that's required.

B. Ruoff: All site plans require reclamation surety. That's essentially to cover the town, if for whatever reason the developer goes bankrupt during the development of the project, it doesn't leave the site in disarray for it to potentially affect town infrastructure. That essentially is an amount of money that is set aside that the town can use to bid out the project to grade the site, loam, and seed to restore it to a suitable condition. I think this is a two or three-acre site. I imagine a surety estimate for this type of site would be in the neighborhood of \$50,000. It could be in a bond, and it can be reduced as the site is developed. For the inspection fee, to confirm the surety estimate by the developer's engineer is appropriate and just do conformance inspections. Typically, what we've done is just either a \$2500 or \$3000 amount. Check paid to the town, and we come out if needed, as needed, if the town is concerned about anything. Otherwise, that fee doesn't necessarily need to be used and it can just be returned to the developer at the end of construction. That is how we have proceeded in the past and how the regulations are written.

B. Carr: A \$3,000 fee just like we currently do now? What was the \$50,000?

B. Brock: That is just a reclamation bond. An insurance bond.

B. Carr: That would be a condition placed on the approval?

Collective - Yes.

J. Coronati: That is quite typical. We would add the Eversource design to the final plan as well.

T. D'Arcy: Any other conditions?

M. Chalbeck: **Motion** to accept the plans with the conditions we talked about. The surety, Stantec's inspection costs, Fire Chief and departments approval of how they want that, and all outstanding permits from the State and other organizations. **Second**. B. Brock. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

- Approval of Minutes, 5.1.24

L. Carroll: **Motion** to accept the minutes of the May 1st Planning Board Meeting as amended.
M. Chalbeck: **Second**. M. Guay abstained. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Other Business:

- Town Planning
- Southern NH Planning Commission - InvestNH HOP Updates – Steering Committee: T. D’Arcy: Reads letter / update from Carla Penfield. (see attached)
- Any other matter to come before the Board.

J. Wuebbolt – Candia Town Road Agent: They do work better in concert with trapping. I have nothing but good things to say about the areas we have trapped. Obviously, we do trapping to make maintenance more manageable. I built a little beaver box. Not a grate, an actual box. I have spoken to conservation officers. I do want to say, the beavers that get trapped by the town, they get used. A lot of people eat them. They are used as pelts.

Public Comments:

Motion to Adjourn: D’Arcy. **Second:** K. Coughlin. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Meeting adjourned - 8:50PM

Respectfully submitted,

Amy M. Spencer

Land Use Coordinator

cc: file