

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF July 17th, 2024
APPROVED MINUTES**

PB Members Present: Tim D’Arcy, Chair (via Zoom); Brien Brock, BOS Representative; Rudy Cartier; Scott Komisarek; Linda Carroll (sitting in for Judi Lindsey)

PB Members Absent:

Judi Lindsey (excused)
Mark Chalbeck, V-Chair (excused)
Kevin Coughlin (excused)
Mike Guay, Alt. (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

T. D’Arcy moved Dick Snow’s Lot Consolidation Request to the top of the agenda.

Dick Snow: It’s a lot consolidation documentation in accordance with statute. Everybody else has signed off on it and according to the statute, you can’t deny the application and all you are doing is letting the tax mappers that something is happening.

T. D’Arcy: He acknowledges ownership of two lots. Map 409 Lot 147 and Map 409 Lot 148. Acquired by deed in Rockingham County Deeds Book 1738 Page 487 and Book 2749 Page 0661. This is Richard and Joyce F. Snow, 127 Depot Road in East Candia. Joining these two lots into one lot.

Dick Snow: That’s correct. For the purposes of taxation and planning and zoning.

B. Brock: **Motion** to approve Dick Snow’s Lot Consolidation Request. L. Carroll: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion Passed**.

New Business:

- **Case #24-003 (Lot Line Adjustment):**

Applicant: Thomas Severino, 92 Adams Road, Candia, NH 03034; Owner(s): Thomas Severino, 92 Adams Road, Candia, NH 03034; Property Location: 80 Diamond Hill Road, Candia, NH 03034; Map 409 Lots 141 **Intent:** *To adjust lot line of Map 409 Lot 141 to then merge with Map 409 Lot 132. Adjustment would remove 4.7 Acres from Map 409 Lot 141 and transfer those 4.7 Acres to Map 409 Lot 132.*

T. Severino – 92 Adams Road: My brother and I own the old Sanborn piece along 27. Map 409 Lot 41. This is the parcel that we own next to Contel. It's really just a matter of squaring up that parcel that we own. It squares that back up to the commercial line. I am just here to request approval of that.

R. Cartier: 600 Feet of commercial?

T. Severino: 800

Jannette Miller - 74 Diamond Hill Road – How does that affect my land? Is it anything that's doing behind my property?

T. Severino: All we are doing is taking that line that is already there. We are really just squaring that parcel off.

*R. Cartier: **Motion** that we accept the application as submitted. B. Brock: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.*

*R. Cartier: **Motion** to accept the plan for the Lot Line Adjustment as submitted. B. Brock: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.*

- **Case #24-004 (Minor Subdivision):**

Applicant: Thomas Severino, 92 Adams Road, Candia, NH 03034; Owner(s): Thomas Severino, 92 Adams Road, Candia, NH 03034; Property Location: 80 Diamond Hill Road, Candia, NH 03034; Map 409 Lots 141 **Intent:** To subdivide Map 409 Lot 141 into two residential lots. Intent will be to sell both lots.

L. Carroll recused herself as an abutter.

Thomas Severino: 92 Adams Rd.

R. Cartier: We just have to go through a quick checklist to make sure everything is there.

T. D'Arcy: Reviewed the checklist items with the applicant.

There was a question about a specific lot/parcel and owner/abutter notification. Jim Franklin confirmed that the abutter was notified as one of the abutters.

R. Cartier: If it does get approved, probably one of the conditions is to revise.

R. Cartier: In relation to 5.06D, I think that is something we should look at to make sure that it was covered that the Board agreed that it would be okay to waive that particular item.

- 5.06d _____ 1. General site location map locating the proposed Minor Subdivision boundaries in relation to major roads.
 _____ 2. A vicinity map showing the location of the proposed subdivision in relation to abutting properties and existing streets, highways, or municipal facilities.

R. Cartier: **Motion** to waive that requirement based on geographical information. S. Komisarek: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

T. D'Arcy :

- 5.06e _____ 1. *Boundaries and areas of the entire parcel referenced to a public street intersection or USGS benchmark, north point, bar scale, date and dates of any revisions. (The Board may waive the requirement of a perimeter survey for the entire parcel and may require specific data only for lots for which sale or lease is contemplated, in such instances, the Final Plat shall include a general map insert which indicates approximately the size and shape of the entire parcel to be subdivided.)*

S. Komisarek: **Motion** to waive the requirements in 5.06g. R. Cartier: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

T. D'Arcy:

- 5.06h _____ 1. *Existing and proposed easements*
 _____ 2. *Deed restrictions or covenants*
 _____ 3. *Building set-back lines*
 _____ 4. *Parks and other open space*
 _____ 5. *Water courses, stone walls and significant natural and manmade features. This includes culverts, and the direction of flow indicated by arrows through those culverts.*

What you are proposing for 401-1 is an existing home and you're not proposing any building in Lot 401 at present. I think setbacks are not germane to this particular application.

L. Carroll: What about wetlands and the pond that are on the second lot, 141?

B. Brock: That would come up when somebody decides to build on it.

L. Carroll: Okay, but we talked about frontage at the informational meeting. If there was a house lot, the driveway would have to be on the other side, which is really dangerous. It's really very narrow and it's a blind spot.

T. Severino: If we went in for that driveway permit, which again, separate issue but if we went in for that driveway permit, we were going to clear this area. We were going to clean that up so that when you pull up to there, you can see across that corner. So that would be something that would be part of that driveway permit. There is a good fifty feet or so if not sixty feet from this line to the edge of the way so there is plenty of upland to get that driveway in there. It needs to be cleaned up anyway.

T. D'Arcy:

- 5.06i _____ 1. *Where individual on-lot sewage disposal systems are proposed or in existence, the subdivider shall present evidence of State approval of the suitability of each lot for on-site sewage disposal for building purposes. For lots greater than 5 acres, an opinion by a registered Professional Engineer that a suitable site for a subsurface disposal system exists may be substituted for state approval. For lots greater than 10 acres, a request for a waiver from this requirement may be made when supported by appropriate soil data. In all instances shall specifically indicate on each such lot that state approval for an on-site subsurface disposal system has not been applied for nor*

has been granted.

T. Severino: I did have Jim Gove from Gove Environmental. We did two test pits for each lot.

R. Cartier: Is the land in current use?

T. Severino: It is under current use. When that new lot goes, they will keep that backland and the area around the house as is and the remaining acres will remain in current use.

R. Cartier: You need a letter from the tax collector stating that it is in current use currently.

R. Cartier: **Motion** to accept the application with the waivers noted and approved by the Board. **Second:** B. Brock All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

T. D'Arcy: Open the public hearing for case 24-004 at 7:04PM.

Jeannette Miller - 74 Diamond Hill Road – My main question is, just to put my mind at ease, what is happening behind my property. My line is the stone wall.

T. Severino: There is a young couple that I am selling the house to. They want a homestead. I wanted to keep that wall as the property line and divide that frontage. The first lot behind you is going to be nine acres and the second lot is 25 acres and that is just going to be one lot.

Beverly Cole – 95 Diamond Hill: So, you are going to clean that up, that is great news.

T. Severino: I strategically try to position it so that if someone pulled out of their driveway it would not be directly at your house. In general it is on that edge of that lot kind of facing this lot line between these two lots.

Mark Bussiere - 103 Diamond Hill Road – I was wondering if that lot could be subdivided in the future. Will there be a stipulation in the deed that it cannot be subdivided down the road?

T. Severino: It states in the regulation that it cannot be further subdivided.

R. Cartier: There should be some kind of deed restriction that it cannot be developed.

B. Brock: Personally, I don't think it is necessary to put a deed restriction on there.

T. Severino: Hopefully it will be sold and there will be a house in the middle. There is no intent to do anything with it.

R. Cartier: The problem is we can't look thirty years ahead.

J. Franklin: I am always concerned when someone wants to put a deed restriction. Is it in the zoning or the subdivision. Subdivision regulations can be waived without a variance. Someone could come in here and request further subdivision.

T. D'Arcy: I think we are beating a dead horse here.

R. Cartier: I disagree with that.

Closed the public hearing at 7:18PM.

Motion to accept and approve: B. Brock. **Second:** - S. Komisarek. Three Yay. 1 - Nay. **Motion passed.**

B. Brock: Motion to grant the applicant 30 Days for metes, bounds, and mylars. – S. Komisarek: **Second:** All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Old Business:

- InvestNH HOP Updates – Steering Committee – Cam Prolman

C. Prolman: SNHPC: Thank you for your time. We were supposed to do further outreach at the summer concert series at the library. We are going back to the Farmers Market. I just wanted to come and provide a brief update. The HOP Committee provided, once again, really thoughtful comments. We are working on incorporating those. I know we gave the planning board until Monday of this week. Since we are still working on it, if you still need time. I spoke with Tim last week. We will work with the town on closing out the grant, the final recording.

R. Cartier: Do we need to have any extensions to the original contract deadlines?

C. Prolman: No, I don't think we do.

T. D'Arcy: As far as going forward, Amy and I had a chat with Bryan Ruoff. Partially about HOP II. Bryan is on board.

It's an interesting report with a lot of data.

R. Cartier: We got the stuffing beat out of us when we did the Village District. I think the biggest drawback is you can't build houses if you don't have land.

C. Prolman: This is not a problem Candia can solve. This is an economic problem.

Some continued discussion about the housing crisis and the direction that the Board and ultimately the Town of Candia need to move.

T. D'Arcy: One is the ADUs, we do them as conditional use, maximum of two. If the first one is detached, the second must be attached.

R. Cartier: The change to the zoning ordinance is very easy. We just take out that it has to be attached. It can be by right.

T. D'Arcy: We could mirror the state. For the detached, we need to think about, do we want it to be close to the house?

T. D'Arcy: Campgrounds.

Some discussion about zoning for campgrounds, agrotourism, etc.

- Nate Miller – Impact Fees

J. W – The state does not say that we have to have zones for impact fees. Can you vote on it to get rid of it?

R. Cartier: It's not in there.

J. W – It's in there as far as how it is accounted for.

R. Cartier: That will have to go before the Board of Selectmen.

T. D'Arcy: You gave Bryan Ruoff a number for road (re)construction.

J. W: He came back with a number and we are going to use that number. I think it makes sense to use a bid price.

- Approval of Minutes, 6.5.24 & 6.19.24

- Approval of Minutes, 6.5.24

L. Carroll: **Motion** to approve the minutes of 6.5.24, as amended. S. Komisarek **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

- Approval of Minutes, 6.19.24 –

S. Komisarek: **Motion** to approve as submitted. **Second**: L. Carroll. R. Cartier abstained. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

Other Business:

- Town Planning
- Any other matter to come before the Board.

Some continued discussion about impact fees.

Motion to Adjourn: L. Carroll. **Second:** S. Komisarek. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Meeting adjourned – 8:08 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Amy M. Spencer

Land Use Coordinator

cc: file