

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of November 16, 2016
APPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: S. James, Chair; Tom Giffen; Ken Kustra; Scott Komisarek, BOS Representative; Mike Santa; Rudy Cartier Alt; Carleton Robie, Alt; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent

Absent: Judi Lindsey; Al Hall Vice Chair; Joyce Bedard, Alt

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

S. James asked Alternate Rudy Cartier to sit in for Al Hall, Vice Chair and C. Robie to sit in for J. Lindsey.

Minutes November 2nd: Chair, S. James was absent. S. Komisarek BOS Representative was absent:

T. Giffen made a **motion** to accept the minutes of November 2, 2016 as presented. K. Kustra **seconded**. M. Santa; C. Robie, Alt; and R. Cartier, Alt; **were in favor**. S. James, Chair and S. Komisarek; **abstained**. **Motion passed (5-0-2)**.

Guests Present: Ricia Velasco, Master Plan Committee; B. Chivers, Board of Selectmen

Planning Board Work Session Regarding Our Third Party Review Process: Review RSA 676:4 B Third Party Review and Inspection

S. James started with the Planning Board Work Session regarding the third party review process. This was discussed at the last meeting. RSA 676:4 B. It has always said the Planning Board can have a third party review plans but the new part is that the applicant may request that the Planning Board choose a different third party consultant and the request may include the name of preferred consultant. If that does happen, we have another 45 days to identify that. We had a firm, I think Eric Mitchell came in maybe in March, Meridian? They came in and made us aware of this. We generally have Stantec do our reviews, however this is the law, so we can just stay the course with what we have or do something different. If we were going to do something different, we would have to go through a review process, request for proposals, from qualified firms, get the proposals in, review them, probably interview them, and then we could have another two or three if someone objects to Stantec and then we could decide. That would be an option so let's open it up to discussion.

K. Kustra asked we do the choosing of the third party right. S. James responded we do it or the applicant can suggest somebody but we don't have to accept it. K. Kustra said we ought to have two besides Stantec on the side, do our preliminary check of who they are, if they are licensed and so on. Have two of them. If they want a third party or we want a third party, we're limited to how many they can look at.

T. Giffen commented the issue is that the law doesn't stipulate that there is any limitation on who the applicant can select as a preferred consultant. How many engineering firms are there in the immediate area that could possibly serve the Town? I'm guessing it's more than 2 or 3. S. James said for this type of work, if we put out a proposal, we'd get 10, 15 maybe 20. T. Giffen continued, maybe a dozen anyway. We don't know if we'll even have a request for this. To save time and effort, we wait until the request comes in. At that time we can do a vendor qualification for the particular firm that was preferred by the applicant, we have 45 days to do it. It shouldn't be an obstacle time wise. If we get a request for an additional one, if we incur expenses for the vendor qualification process, we can request that the applicant pay for that under the law. Take it on an as needed basis. We're discussing this because the current process, although it's thorough, is somewhat inefficient and causes angst among the applicants because of the timing of events and also the degree to which things are picked apart, things that may be immaterial, that second comment could be helped if the timing was better. If they had meetings between the applicant and the engineering firm prior to the

meeting, at least a couple of weeks. To have someone write “War and Peace”, with 60 items on a punch list for something that’s relatively simple which doesn’t even involve putting up a building. The length of the meetings, these are times we’ll never get back in our lives and it’s egregious when it takes place. I think it can be fixed with timing if they’d smarten up. In the meantime, I can understand someone who’s on a schedule and wants to get business done would wish to avoid dealing with that well known process. It’s a trade off; you get an extra 45 days. As the applicant, I’d have to weight that carefully. I can understand the pain the applicants have and I don’t think it’s reasonable and fair and the current process has been efficient and we need to do something to address it. If somebody comes in and says they want another engineering firm, it’s the law; they’re going to do it.

M. Santa replied but you have to be careful it doesn’t say engineering, it says consultant. So you’re assuming it’s an engineer but someone could bring in anybody and call them a consultant so I think one thing we could do is look into this and see what other communities are doing but stipulate that we only accept registered engineering firms. T. Giffen agreed.

C. Robie commented I think everybody knows anyone coming in if they have a third party; they will bring in a third party who is an engineer. They know a consultant isn’t going to cut it. And if you read the line that says *the applicant may request the planning board choose a different third party consultant*, which should say engineering firm, *and the request may include the name of a preferred consultant. The planning board shall exercise reasonable discretion to determine whether the request is warranted.* So if the applicant has a request that the Planning Board feels is warranted, then he has three choices and then the Planning Board decides which one of the three choices is acceptable.

T. Giffen replied reasonable discretion. With experience in that type of work and any other qualification we feel relevant and do it that way. I don’t think it makes sense for the Board to solicit RFP’s at this stage of the game. Who knows what some applicant might prefer, I wouldn’t want to limit it.

S. James commented and if we had a list of two or three firms and they want to pick someone else, they can do that to. We could have ten and they could pick someone else.

T. Giffen agreed. We have one now, after the first request if we deem it reasonable and warranted, then we can go for a second one. And if somebody doesn’t like that one, they can pick a third. The list could be quite long but in the meantime, I wouldn’t want to put it out there just in general. Although if we did put it out there, it would be a huge wake up call for a certain engineering firm that we have now and certainly rattle their cage, I don’t know if that’s productive either.

S. James commented I’d like to add to that, I think the ones we get tripped up on and get the 60 comments that you’re talking about, are the ones that don’t fit neatly into our regs and our regs aren’t really...there’s room for improvement. A different example, next meeting we have High Street subdivision coming back in. They were given an estimate to review the preliminary, Stantec did, and they did that. Now they’re coming back for the final. They didn’t ask for any extra money, they said those were good plans; we have plenty of money left with what we gave you in the preliminary to do the final. T. Giffen replied it’s not that Stantec is necessarily bad it’s just that things occasionally get inefficient. If the timing could improve, that would alleviate a lot of that. So having a heart to heart with them could help things out hugely. It’s not like it’s terminally broken and they are horrible. It’s not. They do a quality job, they look out for us and I respect that and I like them for it.

R. Cartier asked how did we choose Stantec? Was there any criteria they had to meet to have them review plans for us.

D. Lewis replied part of the reason we chose Stantec is that they don’t do private work so there were no conflicts that could arise. So say we have a developer come in and wants to choose his own, we’ll have to do our homework to make sure that engineering firm isn’t employed by the developer in another town to design his subdivision or site plan or whatever it may be. You have to take that into consideration but we didn’t have that problem with Stantec because they don’t do that. And they have a lot of resources so they didn’t need to say sub things out, like natural resource inventory or things like that, they can do it all in house. Part of the trouble with Stantec is that they’ve been slow with getting plans reviewed and back to everybody.

Part of the reason is that a lot of times, plans come in that aren't complete or they don't say the whole picture of what's going to happen so they have to read into it as to what it could possibly be and plan for the worst case because they are here to protect the Town of Candia, not the applicant or themselves. They cover all contingencies that could arise from that project. They have done a good job. Prior to them, we had a subdivision that was reviewed by our former engineering firm and it had encroachments on people's property, they didn't take into consideration the slopes, some drainage didn't work, and doing sub-grade inspections over the telephone, we had all those issues. You have to be careful. The biggest gripe with Stantec has been the cost and the delay. And maybe we work those issues out with them, it might help it along. If an applicant comes in and wants it reviewed by someone else, if they haven't been pre-screened by the Planning Board, 45 days doesn't give you much time to do all that homework and get their plans back to them.

R. Cartier replied that addressed what I was looking for is the fact that if there is going to be another consultant coming in here, what criteria are they going to have to meet to be acceptable to the Planning Board. Right now there's nothing written, we should have some written guidelines. Based on what you just said, I see those as reasonable guidelines. If the Planning Board is going to recognize or authorize another firm to do this, this is what the Board's going to be looking at, what you just said. Put that in a one page qualification, this is what we're looking for so you avoid the potential conflict of interest.

D. Lewis commented I'll add to that. If you have an engineering firm that comes into Town, does one project and leaves, you don't have that continuity of things that go on in town, a discussion here; something went wrong with the subdivision, who do you fall back on. Yeah they may be there to help you out but Stantec's going to be there for the next one and the four last one's too. R. Cartier agreed. But State law says you can't discriminate against an engineering firm.

C. Robie commented that you just need to make sure there's not conflict of interest. If it's an engineering firm and they are qualified to do the work, you can't discriminate.

R. Cartier said when it says consultant, you talk about it being an engineering firm, I don't know if there's a definition of consultant in the State law but it doesn't say it has to be a registered professional engineering firm to be a consultant. You could have a land planner come in here, you could have lawyer come in here and what we had said before, they're supposed to be looking out for the Town's best interest, well the Town's best interest they're looking at what our zoning regulations say and does the plan meet the zoning regulations. I can see a potential conflict with something missing on an engineering plan. And in theory, that's not the Planning Board's problem per se because we're supposed to be making sure they are meeting the zoning regulations not whether they are doing their engineering properly. Professional engineers are responsible for it and the liability is on them if it's not.

C. Robie commented that's why the applicant has to have an engineer's stamp on his plan. The engineer is expected to do the job correctly. If you have a regulation, you follow the regulation, you go to that spec, and it's engineered.

T. Giffen replied this is third party review. The review is of the plan which is the work of a professional engineer by law. I don't think there is anything in the RSA's as to who is qualified to review the work of a PE. I don't think there is anything that restricts us from coming up with a set of standards that would apply to an acceptable third party reviewer. If those two circumstances are correct, I don't know, then what we can do is come up with a specification for an approved third party reviewer and that would include they are a PE, they have experience with this type of work, no conflict of interest by doing any work within the past X number of months or scheduled within the next X number of months for the same client elsewhere. We could come up with a pretty good list, that's just a start. I'd also want references from other municipalities, at least three. So we could call the Planning Board in Town X, Y or Z and say did these guys do a good job or did they drop the ball, what's your impression of them. And if we had a preset standard, at that point, all we have to do is request from the preferred third party reviewer, that they provide us with the documentation that they are currently licensed, a legal affidavit that they don't have a conflict of interest based on these criteria, a list of references and contact the references. I think we could get that done in 45 days. If we had a list in advance so people would know what we're expecting.

R. Cartier said I think we'd have to ask Stantec to do the same thing. Were they ever approved?

D. Lewis replied we'd have to go back and figure out the particulars of that process. It was with the Board of Selectmen and the Planning Board and it was probably 15 years ago. R. Cartier replied it should be a level playing field. You can't make a third party one sided, how come I have to do all of this stuff and Stantec, who is not the Town engineer doesn't have to go through this. I don't think Stantec would have a problem doing it at all, but if it's for one is should be all. D. Lewis commented I think it would speed up the process a lot to have a list on these if the RSA allows that. T. Giffen said we can run it by Bart.

S. James said so it sounds like the consensus is to move ahead with a policy guideline or minimal qualifications for third party review. So I can take a shot of drafting something up. I'll bring it back for the next meeting, talk about it, get something that everybody likes and then we can send it to Bart.

S. Komisarek mentioned I'd like to bring up when Joe Sobol and Craig were here from the Irving and we had Bryan Ruoff from Stantec, in all honesty, I was embarrassed to have Bryan as the Town's engineer because he went down point after point after point with those engineers and said oh I guess I was mistaken, that to me, after that, there should have been some communication with Stantec. We've always had a good relationship with Rene but it was embarrassing. You get these developers that come in, they know they have to pay it, but he wanted them to do things that just didn't even make sense. So you see that argument from the developer's side. Of course you want someone who will take care of the Town. And I know Stantec's always been good to the Town but we have a responsibility to make sure they are not going too far, in excess. At times they do. That's what the look for. They've had some problems in the past, lawsuits, but we have to find the right balance. We have a good relationship with Rene and we should have a dialogue with these guys, we love you guys but.

T. Giffen commented that the novel could have been cut to a reader's digest version and we wouldn't have had to see that list had they got the work done prior to two to three days before the meeting. If they had met with the applicant to have a pre-planning board conference and work out the nonsense.

K. Kustra asked are we going to set a timeline for this if someone comes in between now and the next 2 months should we set a timeline for ourselves?

S. James replied I offered to do some minimal qualifications, I can do that for the next meeting, and we'll talk about it, get it to Bart and have it in a meeting or two after that. By end of January we should have it squared away.

T. Giffen commented that if someone comes in earlier and makes the request that will force the timing of the development of those regulations and we'd have to get an opinion from Bart right away for what we can and can't do.

S. James responded and I hear your comments and I'll talk to Rene. T. Giffen stated that if they had a standard practice to have a meeting between the two engineering firms, whoever drew up the plans and Stantec, they could sit down and go through and all of the weeding could be done in advance. That would be huge. If the timing issue is fixed and they have pre-planning board conferences that iron out minor misunderstanding, everyone will be happier and we're far less likely to get requests for a different third party. It will make things more efficient for all concerned, applicant and the Town. Stantec's quite capable of doing the work we want done and capable of developing a professional relationship with the applicants, it's just a matter of getting the timing right so they can do it.

S. Komisarek asked S. James to talk to Rene and mention what transpired when Craig and Joe came before us with regard to Bryan.

C. Robie commented I think this can be resolved. The applicant gets their plans in on time, getting them over there; get them a check, all before the next meeting. So when someone comes in with a plan for the review process, they might be able to get accepted and approved at the same time. There's no reason why that can't happen. Three, four, five months to get something approved is way too long.

R. Cartier responded we're supposed to act on an application within 65 days, one way or the other, the applicant decides that they want to have a third party review, then it extends it another 45 days. That's 110 days that the Planning Board can take their time doing stuff. The applicant needs to realize that you may not

get your plan reviewed in 65 days; it could take up to 110 days. Setting some guidelines, we should still be reasonable. Dependent upon the size of the project, a small project it shouldn't take 110 days.

Other Business

Mylar: S. James commented that the Mylar for Chester Turnpike case is here to sign. Those were signed tonight. S. James continued with other business:

Website: We got a request from the Town's webmaster to set up a different web page, one for the ZBA and a separate page for the ZRRC committee. Andrea came up with the language so take a look at it and see if you want to add anything when it goes up.

Budget: Through Oct. 13th, we are \$601 under budget. Time for meeting minutes for Master Plan Steering Committee will be added in here. Question I got was if we wanted to encumber the money. I didn't see any reason too but wanted to bring it up to the Board. For example we have some money left; about \$150 dollars between law lectures and conferences; a little bit in books. I'm not looking to spend the money but if someone wanted to go to a conference in January, they could do that. I can't think of anything.

S. Komisarek suggested encumbering it. If you look at our budget, we just got shot down from the Budget Committee after it got approved from the Select Board so it will go to the December 14th meeting deliberative and then we can still do a warrant article on that. If we are going to create a culture for planning, we might need some money.

T. Giffen said unless we have a specific purpose in mind, an invoice that we know is coming in for activity that occurred during this year, that we shouldn't be encumbering anything. If we know that we're going to book two people to go to a seminar in the 3rd week of December, but we won't get billed until January, then we encumber that, but other than a circumstance like that, no. It has to be for an Invoice of this period but that we know will be coming in but it can't be paid because the vendor won't be issuing an Invoice until January, or something of that nature. It has to be a specific vendor invoice. S. James said we did talk about putting funds aside for planning. We put that in a proposed budget of \$10,000 and that was rejected by the Budget Committee.

S. Komisarek commented that I went to that meeting, answered their questions, they seemed satisfied and then we all left and I wish I had stuck around. We can go on the 14th of December, which I plan to do and talk to the Budget Committee and then we have the deliberative session but I think we need the backup plan of the warrant article. I worked on that today.

T. Giffen suggested that we argue to the Budget Committee in support of our request that it's a revenue producing activity and the goal is to improve and expand the tax base that meets the Town's needs and in by doing so we enhance revenue, helping to reduce the rate.

C. Robie suggested we need to go to the budget hearing on the 14th and lobby the case. A little bit of history, two years ago, we put forth a warrant article by the Selectmen for \$5,000, the first phase of master plan, it was approved. Last year we put \$10,000 in the operating budget and it was approved. The Selectmen backed a \$10K budget this year and it was approved by the Selectmen and the Budget Committee rejected it. So either a warrant article or at deliberative session, if the Selectmen back an increase of \$10,000 for planning that the room will vote in favor of that. They understand what we're talking about. Good planning will create good revenue which will help with the tax base. \$10,000 for planning is minimal. It might not be for this year or 10 years from now, but it has to happen.

S. James asked C. Robie to review the process. C. Robie said the Select Board asks all the departments to put together a budget. The Select Board discusses the budget and they present that to the Budget Committee. The budget would go to deliberative session with Budget Committee's recommended budget. The Budget Committee recommends the budget to the community. Selectmen recommend the budget to the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee reviews it and recommends the budget to the community.

R. Velasco asked that on the transportation for the master plan we talked about drawing up a new impact fee would that be included in what the Planning Board uses its money for? Can it be one of the items? S. James said it could be one of the items. What we talked about, putting money aside in the budget for planning. It could be impact fees, it could be for zoning, let's get someone to help us with it, SNH etc.

R. Velasco said that the impact fees could be seen as a way to protect Candia when outside towns are proposing developments or business that impact Candia and create costs to the Town the impact fee is a way to help make Candia whole, improve the roads. The old version really didn't do that effectively. Having planning do that would be helpful.

S. Komisarek said Exit 3 was what we talked about when we came up with that money, sound concept for areas to generate revenue.

C. Robie said let's go to the Budget Committee on December 14th, they will make their final recommendation on budget. There's the public hearing and soon after will be a final decision. So if the public goes and lobbies, which you'll go as a member of the public or member of the Planning Board or Selectmen, whoever goes, that they are in favor of that, and if that doesn't work, draft the warrant article and see if you can get that approved and then go to the deliberative session. The best place to have the money is in the operating budget, and then you have it. And if that passes on the floor at the deliberative session, when the warrant article comes up, just delete it; you don't need it any longer. And if it doesn't pass on the floor, then go to Article 27 which reads your warrant article and see if you can get that passed and then it will go to the ballot as a warrant article. Get the Budget Committee to put it back on.

S. James said I like that approach. We have a meeting on the 7th, the Budget Committee meeting is on the 14th and we have another meeting on the 21st, we can talk about it then. I'll check on the dates for the warrant articles. C. Robie said warrant articles go the Selectmen first then to the Budget Committee.

B. Chivers said the date is December 5th, deadline for warrant articles to be in. D. Lewis suggested put in the warrant article and then withdraw it after the 14th. S. James said Scott can you wrap up the language and send it to me.

C. Robie suggested going back 2-3 years for first phase of the Master Plan that was a warrant article written. Change the wording and that will be the article. 2014 warrant article.

MOTION:

S. James said let's make a **motion** we submit a warrant article requesting the amount of \$10,000 for continued planning and implementation of the master plan recommendations. For discussion, I like Carleton's proposal that as many of us that can attend go to the Budget Committee on the 14th and try to get that back and if so, we'll withdraw it. We had a motion and a second. **All in favor. (7-0-0) Unanimous.**

Mini Grant:

S. James commented that the NH Housing Mini Grant was submitted. Late October so we should hear on that within the next month. That has been applied for.

Next Meeting Dec. 7th:

S. James informed the Planning Board our next meeting is 608 High Street, they were in for the preliminary major subdivision and now are back for the final. Also, Candia South Branch is in for the gravel lot adjacent to CoPart. Those two are at the next meeting.

SNH Planning Transportation Draft:

S. James stated that the SNH Planning helped us update the transportation plan and they have a draft, they submitted, received comments and would like to hold a public hearing. I don't think it makes sense to do that on the 7th. I was thinking the 21st.

S. James said last time Boyd mentioned about maybe not having it. That group has come up with one proposed warrant article for accessory dwellings. The law has changed effective next June, it allows a large

size than we allow. We allow 600 sq. ft. maximum. The law is now 750 sq. ft. and we need to change it to get into compliance. We have a draft of that. We need to hold a public hearing on that. I will check on that.

It should be reviewed and accepted and voted on by the Planning Board or the Revision Committee and it's good to go. We'll have the public hearing on that, I'll check the dates. Planning Board has to have a public hearing on it and a vote.

Zoning Review and Revision Committee:

S. James asked does anyone have anything in particular they wanted to talk about for the Zoning Review and Revision Committee. If no one has anything, we won't plan to have it.

R. Velasco asked if the ZRRC was separate from the Planning Board.

S. James explained that we started a separate committee, it's not a formal committee in terms of membership, and it's an open committee. We hold it after the Planning Board meeting on the 2nd Wednesday of the month. That's why it's on the agenda. We meet and it's really whoever shows up if there are things to discuss. I don't think we have any.

Work Force Housing, Master Plan, Transportation, Warrant Articles:

R. Velasco said I was curious about work force housing which has been an issue with master plan, looking at how towns achieve the required amount of work force housing given that you have to put something in place in your zoning regulations for it. I don't have any particular ideas or plans I was more curious about what was out there and is that questions being tackled at all.

C. Robie said wasn't that what the last grant was for to do a feasibility study around the center of Candia. To see what would be acceptable and what comes back, we're not going to get it done this year, but next year, it would come to Zoning Revision and the information that was gathered, there was a place to change the zoning but we need the information. Grant was NH Housing.

S. Komisarek said the issue of water always comes up. We need to look at what makes sense for Candia and we have the aquifer on 101; the whole essence the master plan committee, Ben Frost came in and gave a presentation. He reviewed our regulations and he feels that we are not in compliance and that if a developer came in tomorrow and wanted to do particularly multi-unit buildings, that they would have a very strong case and could get a builder's remedy. At which point the Planning Board would lose all control so he's encouraging us to plan to look at it, to figure out, where it makes sense, architectural controls, but at the end of the day we can't build a moat around Candia, every community in NH has to do its fair share with regard to multi's and we are clearly not doing that. My position for the last 5 years, let's wait and let somebody sue us. But after Ben Frost gave his presentation, we should think about doing something here at some point.

S. James said it's something we've been talking about for a number of years, and part of the funding, it's an all volunteer committee, and we show up and if someone shows up and says this is important, and they take the lead on it and do it, it can happen. Absent that it, isn't going to happen. We don't have any funding to hire anyone and we need people to step up and do it. We do have a \$5,000 study to look at some zoning.

R. Cartier recapped Ricia we want to be proactive. Part of the Master Plan Committee work was for a village district to see if that was going to work. Scott and I talked to Jack Munn at SNH Planning we said we want to see what kind of infrastructure do we have in place to see what this land will actually handle. We'd like to do it for the whole town but \$5,000 isn't going to do it. So Jack suggested we do as much as we can in that village area to get a feel for what you want to do. It will look at soil types, water availability; things like that to see what can be sustained in that area. Then if we have that example of how we can do things, we're in a much better position we're looking at what the Town can handle from an environmental standpoint, water, sewer and everything else. This will be a good starting point. If we get more money for planning \$10,000, \$15,000 or whatever, we can just grow that circle out to different parts of the Town.

R. Velasco commented how you build that work force housing affordability and what do regulations require. Do you reduce the size of the lot? It's hard to see how it would really happen and I'm curious to see

what other towns have done. R. Cartier commented we can say what the land can handle but we have no control over what someone does with their land, we can make recommendations and allow for it.

C. Robie addressed Ricia you said lot size, you go to the voters with a zoning lot size revision it's not going to get voted in, it will fail. But if you go to the voters with a plan for certain areas that have been studied, and their feasible to reduce the lot size, you'll get that passed. Feasibility study with a plan, it would pass.

R. Velasco said I just want to make sure we're in compliance and a developer can't come in and bulldoze over everything that's here. C. Robie replied there aren't enough pieces of land that a developer could buy and make a huge impact because it's not for sale. You can't string together enough pieces of land.

B. Chivers said regarding one more warrant article Scott, Dennis and I and Ricia served on the Transportation Sub-Committee of Master Plan and one of the recommendations we've put forth is re-aligning this intersection over here. Route 27 and 43 and our committee agreed that a traffic circle over there and re-route the North and South bound traffic come out behind the fire station. \$15,000 warrant article to study the feasibility and do some preliminary engineering on that. So the transportation specialist at SNH Planning is providing us with a draft warrant article and he feels that if it's passed, will provide enough money to study this concept and be a down payment towards DOT's matching grant if we ever build it. So that's one more warrant article that will be presented to the Board of Selectmen on Monday the 28th. \$15,000 warrant article for that and then the \$10,000 warrant article for the master plan.

C. Robie reiterated all the more reason \$10,000 needs to be in the operating budget.

B. Chivers asked when the Master Plan would be ready to be presented in public hearings. S. James replied the Steering Committee has a meeting on the 13th and we were supposed to have the draft from SNH prior to that. We'll review the draft on the 13th, comments back to Planning Board in January or February.

B. Chivers commented I'm wondering if the public wants to see the master plan before they approve a \$10,000 study on how to implement this thing. What comes first here, the master plan or the \$10,000 appropriation to implement.

S. James replied the plan is to have the public hearing prior to the next Town meeting.

C. Robie asked about re-routing the traffic in the four corners, is that before or after the master plan. B. Chivers responded that it's a component of the master plan.

R. Velasco asked if master plan will be presented at the second meeting in December, the public hearing on the transportation part of the master plan will have the rotary and impact fee discussion in that.

B. Chivers commented our problem is timing. We're going to ask for this warrant article to be approved before anyone's even seen the plan for this.

R. Cartier said if the master plan is done in March and there's no money to do anything with it, it will be like all the other plans that happen in Candia, it will be 9 months, everyone will forget about it, and nothing will get done. It's a catch 22. I would vote to put the warrant article in to get the money and say as soon as this is ready, we can start working on it.

D. Lewis commented as soon as it loses its momentum, its dust on the shelf.

B. Chivers said how do we rectify this problem with the traffic circle, no one has seen the plan yet.

S. Komisarek replied I talked to Jack today and early next week they will have something generated, a full size plan. Put at the library, here, get it out there. They are doing an actual concept plan.

S. James suggested the transportation plan draft go on the website as well.

R. Velasco commented and DOT has done four different scenarios but it handled all the issues piece meal. No one has done a preliminary engineering for this roundabout the way we're visualizing it and it solves a lot of issues in one big plan. Some people might say well DOT should be funding it but there are monies out there to leverage this, this was Jack's suggestion also to see if there's buy in from the Town. We need to do a really good job of explaining it to the public and make it important to them to do something about it.

D. Lewis responded and this is just one part in our transportation plan. We addressed a lot of other things in town, subdivision roads, bike paths, there's a lot to this chapter that's going into the master plan, not just a roundabout at four corners. It basically covers all of Candia and its existing and future roads. S. James

commented I think the issue for DOT is that they have a report, they studied that area, they are looking at what they own and they need a pretty compelling reason to come in and take someone's land to build what you're talking about. That's the step that they aren't going to take unless the Town was on board with it. The State is not going to come in and bypass that without a real good reason because they'll have to take someone's land to do it.

R. Velasco commented DOT has no reason to do anything to improve it unless Candia pushes for it. And the number of commuters and you're talking about developing a four corners area, that's impossible with the commuting traffic going through there. Twice a day, it goes right by the school, we also have a sidewalk plan for the kids after school going down to the CYAA building. So that would be a separate project but would make that walkable.

S. James said the process for that, we have a ten year transportation plan, and it starts with MPO's, Metropolitan Planning Organization like SNH asking for projects. They ask the Town do you have any projects and the Town puts it forth. They'll do a study. I think our issue is that we don't have a focal point in Town. School, sidewalks, Road Agent, Transportation issue, Planning issue and ultimately the Select Board.

R. Velasco replied that regional planning chose Candia to put a lot more funding in to make this a more comprehensive plan. It's a long document and covers a lot of ground.

T. Giffen said if you're relying on State money to get any changes made, the State doesn't have money, not much anyway, especially for transportation. Failing infrastructure, bridges that need to be replaced, huge issues on major roads, we're small potatoes.

R. Velasco replied that regional planning was pretty optimistic about being able to get funding and there are different ways to do it. This was a way to jump start the process.

S. Komisarek on Monday night's Select Board meeting we had a gentleman from the State, Bill Lambert, was talking about the speed limit on 27 going over to Hooksett. In his presentation, he mentioned cross walks and our kids go from the school to the CYAA, there's no crosswalk. Should we talk to Bill and have him look at Candia and the State roads and see if it makes sense to do something with cross walks.

S. James commented my initial thought is you can but they will say no because how do you get to those cross walks? There's no sidewalk, they're walking in the road. No safe way to get to them.

S. Komisarek continued for the kids leaving the school.

S. James said they shouldn't be walking. S. Komisarek said okay so the crosswalks need to be part of a broader plan.

C. Robie commented that the kids are bused from the school to the CYAA. By law, they have to bus the children. S. James agreed and said I think it's an enormous waste of money.

S. James commented that there would be no zoning review meeting. If you want to work on work force housing, you can bring it in next month.

MOTION:

T. Giffen **motioned** to adjourn at 8:15 pm. C. Robie **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (7-0-0).**

*******Zoning Review & Revision Committee Meeting was not held. No business to discuss.**

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary
cc file