

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of December 20, 2017
APPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: Al Hall III, Vice Chair; Judi Lindsey; Rudy Cartier; Ken Kustra; Joyce Bedard; Carleton Robie, BOS Representative.
Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dean Young, Fire Chief.

Absent: Tom Giffen, Chair; Mike Santa, Alt.

Location of the meeting was in the Henry Moore School Gymnasium. Chair Tom Giffen has recused himself from the 17-012 case and will not be attending any of the proceedings related to it. Vice Chair asked the moderator, Clark Thyng, to call the meeting to order at 7:00 pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Moderator: Clark Thyng

C. Thyng stated I wanted to give you all an understanding of what's going to happen this evening in the interest of clarity and transparency. First the Planning Board will vote to approve minutes from the December 6, 2017 meeting. They will then review their other business items. Once completed, the Board will review case 17-012 the Preliminary Major Subdivision Application to determine if the submitted application is complete according to Candia's Major Subdivision Regulations. Once the Planning Board has had a chance to review, they will vote as to whether or not the application is complete or incomplete. The applicant, developer will lay out their presentation and address the letter of incomplete items required for the Planning Board application. The Board has a chance to ask questions, no argument, no deliberation, just asking questions. Any additional input regarding the review of the application from the Board will be used to determine the completeness of the application in order to vote on it. At that time the Planning Board will take their vote. If they vote it's incomplete, the meeting will end at that point. If they vote that it is complete, the meeting will continue. The Board will continue to have conversations with the developer. This evening however, there will be no public comment taken. The Planning Board is very happy that you are here this evening and encourage you to be here to understand what's happening and how this is developing. But it's the decision of the Planning Board that at this time, the information is not fully developed and would be difficult for people who attended tonight to ask informed questions. There will be several other opportunities for the public to ask questions that they would like about this subdivision.

Minutes December 6, 2017:

R. Cartier made a **motion** to accept the minutes of December 6, 2017 as presented. J. Bedard **seconded**. C. Robie; K. Kustra; and A. Hall **were in favor**. J. Lindsey **abstained**. **Motion passed (5-0-1)**.

Continuation of 17-012 Preliminary Major Subdivision Application: Applicant: Eric Mitchell and Associates, Inc., PO Box 10298, Bedford, NH 03110; Owner: DAR Builders, LLC, 305 Massabesic Street, Manchester, NH 03103; Property location: Crowley Road, Candia NH 03034; Map 414 Lot 152 & 152-10 Intent: To create a right of way to a 60 lot subdivision in Chester (lot 152-10; 1.03 acres) and leave a 3 acre buildable lot in Candia; (lot 152; 4.13 acres). The roadways in Candia will be deeded to the Town of Chester.

Present: Applicant Eric Mitchell of Mitchell and Associates; Andy Sullivan, legal counsel for DAR Builders; Reggie Moreau of DAR Builders, LLC; Michael Courtney of Upton-Hatfield, legal counsel for the Town of Candia; Sylvia von Aulock from SNHPC; Cass Buckley from Chester Planning Board; See full list of abutters, residents and audience members who signed in at the end of these minutes.

C. Robie said for the record, for the Planning Board's knowledge, Bryan Ruoff from Stantec is not with us this evening. He sent a letter this afternoon at 2:59 pm. C. Robie read: *As discussed we have reviewed the additional submitted information by Eric Mitchell for the subject subdivision and it appears that they have addressed all the outstanding checklist items for a Preliminary Subdivision Application.*

R. Cartier commented I looked over the response from Eric Mitchell and Associates on the comments that we had as to whether the application was complete. From the information provided late this morning, the application deficiencies seem to be addressed. I would make a motion to accept the application as complete. A. Hall asked for a second. C. Robie said I would we like to go over the checklist one by one. I don't want to accept the application until we discuss the checklist. R. Cartier commented I rescind that motion at this time.

R. Cartier continued:

1) The first one was in reference to the new road not being shown on the Candia portion of the plans. That was addressed. *The proposed road has been shown on the Candia side on sheet 3 as requested. Please note that the Town of Chester Road Naming Committee has requested that the road name of Tanglewood be changed to Shannon.*

2) The item we found deficient was *location of open spaces, watercourses, natural and manmade features.* The question was there *wasn't any confirmation that there were not streams, either intermittent or steady streams on the property going through Candia. There appear to be culverts but I'm not sure when I looked at the map if they were streams or for drainage. They've addressed that. Sheet 2 and 3 shows the limits of wetlands, existing culverts, lot lines, stone walls and any other manmade or natural features in Candia.*

3) The next one had to do with the deed restrictions on the proposed building lot in Candia. That we would need deed language entered into any purchase and sales agreement for that property. And that has been noted on the plans and it will be noted as a deed restriction at such time that the lot is accepted as a building lot.

4) There were questions on the preliminary road profiles. The road sections in Candia were not provided with *road profiles showing grades, existing and proposed street right of way lines (including slopes), width of streets, proposed names of streets.* That information has been added to sheets 4 and 5 of the plans submitted.

5) Had to do with the fire protection items. There were notes that there were going to be cisterns in the Town of Chester property. *Existing utility poles and proposed underground utilities have been provided on the plan profile sheets 4 and 5. The location of the proposed cistern is shown on sheet 3 between lots 111 and 112.*

R. Cartier continued those are the five items that were needed; were incomplete at the time. They have been addressed by the applicant and as I said before, I feel that they have addressed those items and the application can be deemed complete if the Board so determines.

J. Bedard asked I'm looking at the one through five that you went through Rudy, but on the application it looks like there was more than five, am I missing something. From this list here, is that what you were going from? R. Cartier replied no, I was going from the list that I had given to DAR builders based on the last meetings discussions, the one that Andrea sent. J. Bedard ok, I thought there were more than five. R. Cartier replied Joyce to address your concerns on the full list; some of those items were addressed between the time that I had reviewed it and the time that we actually had that second meeting.

MOTION:

R. Cartier **motioned** to accept the application (*preliminary major subdivision*) as complete at this time. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (6-0-0).**

E. Mitchell introduced himself and said my company prepared the plans for DAR Builders. I'm here tonight, Reggie Moreau, Principal of DAR is here as well as his attorney, Andrew Sullivan. The plans that we had were revised for the acceptance, there were some things that were noted that we need to discuss at some point, whether it's tonight or not, relative to the frontage on the proposed lot. The conditional approval on lot 152 originally in 2005, said that it was unbuildable. That's the way it was approved. Acknowledging that the improvements need to be done on Crowley Road. We have met with Stantec. We did not go down through their entire letter item per item because a lot of those items dealt with the final review, the plan, the roadway design and drainage. One comment that was made that the roads are to be deeded to the Town of Chester and maintained by Chester, then they would be designed to Chester regulations, which we had done. That's what they're designed to. We'll continue to have meetings with Chester, we had a meeting last month and we're meeting them again the second Wednesday of January. At the last meeting we asked for confirmation that they would take over the road, that is in Candia and they agreed. They would also be taking over the drainage, retention ponds and the maintenance of those. So that part is done, that was some of the questions of Stantec. The things we discussed with Stantec primarily dealt with the traffic study, traffic itself that was there. We gave an introduction to what we had done and why we had come up with what we did. We also talked about the intersection at lot 52 (*should be 152*) of Crowley Road and our proposed road which has now been changed to Shannon as opposed to Tanglewood. They looked at the, we modified that slightly from the angle that we had it, so it will bending (*or bend in*) just a little bit different, which we intend to do on the final plans. In addition to that there were questions about Crowley Road and the fact that in some instances it's very narrow, which we all understand. The plans that were done across the street that Bear Paw has a lot of the easements on some of the land, other than the house lots there, when those plans were approved in 2008, there was an additional right of way granted to the Town and there is also a Deed for that. So although originally the right of way from our three way corner heading towards Lane Road, north south section, that was put in 49 ½ rods, the way it was lined out; I'm sorry, 3 rods; 49 ½ feet, in some places is much narrower than that between the stone walls. When the plan was done in 2008, across the street, they had given an additional right of way, which I know was 60 feet from the right of way on the frontage lots that were created. Where we did not have common frontage, they did set back and I believe it's probably 30 feet off the center (*unintelligible*) of the road. Although going out there today and driving out there, the stone walls are still there and the trees are still close to the road, the actual right of way is wider than the 49 ½ feet that was what the road was laid out for. And certainly improvement will be easier to do because even in sections where there is a stone wall, that's already been deeded to the Town. The Town has a Deed to that. Move some of the walls apart to try to get at least 20 feet of pavement down through that section north south is something we would plan to do to prepare the plans. On the section that goes east and west, from our corner of Shannon, our 3-way intersection out towards Chester Road. We do have to; some of that area is 60 feet of right of way because of what has been granted from the original 12 lot subdivision here and the piece across the street, but we do have to come up with plans and details as to where that would be widened and maintained at 20. Currently the road is at 18 ½ to 20 feet of pavement and our proposal is to make it at least 20 feet of pavement. Those details we plan to work out first with Stantec, to make sure we have a design that we can do and we would plan to submit those with the final plans when we come back to the Planning Board for that. Based on an understanding of the process, if there are additional questions or comments the Board has for me to address when we come back for the final, I'd be glad to take any input.

C. Robie asked Mr. Mitchell do you plan to submit some plans and some information about what you just told us about Crowley Road to Stantec for review. E. Mitchell replied yes, those would be submitted with our final application. C. Robie replied that's what Bryan's letter refers to, he read: *We met with Eric Mitchell on Monday December 18, 2017 to discuss potential future offsite improvements to upgrade Crowley Road for the concerns raised by Stantec, (Road Agent, Mr. Lewis) Dennis and the police chief for the proposed additional traffic due to the subdivision.*

At this time, there is no additional information that warrants a formal review or review letter to be issued by Stantec. Once Eric Mitchell has submitted a Final Subdivision Application that includes additional details on the proposed roadway improvement(s) design(s) for Crowley Road we will perform our second peer review of the proposed plans/design. Was there anything that you addressed that the Police Chief had concerns about? I think they were pretty much the same concerns that the highway department had also.

E. Mitchell replied they were. Some of the things that still have not been...obviously the Crowley Road improvements whatever they are to be and what's being proposed still have to be put on paper and presented. The question about; any questions about ownership of the road, who would own the road, Chester's agreed to do that so that part has been done. We've also taken a look at the intersection of Crowley Road and Chester Road and we've obtained sight distance easements for cutting that back so that will be an improvement looking out through there. We did talk to NH DOT about S. Main St. and Crowley Road as well as S. Main St. and Route 43 and they had indicated to us that if there are concerns out there, I think everyone knows that some sight distances are not good, it's not in their purview on this particular project to step in. This project as proposed is not something that they would review, get involved in relative to the intersections on S. Main St.

C. Robie asked and that was in response to our highway agent's letter that was number 3? E. Mitchell said it was commented in several letters from highway as well as the police. A lot of people have indicated that the sight distance is not good at Route 43 and S. Main St.; I mean S. Main St. and Crowley Road. An additional thing that is on the Road Agent's letter is that the requirement for an overlay and an inch and a half shim on Crowley Road. That is something that was talked about and presented to the owner early in the spring when he was looking into the project; something he knows he's agreed to and he would have to do that. So the question comes down to is not whether the shim and wear course is going down, it's going down, the question is can it be made any wider in any spots and any other improvements that need to be done on the road and that's what we'd be looking to submit with our final plans.

C. Robie asked so to construct a plan of what you plan to do, do you need to do some engineering out there? E. Mitchell replied yes, it's not necessarily engineering from the standpoint of re-grading the road and doing that it's the widening the areas that we can widen. It may not be a *planit, plan of or planned (unintelligible)* profile that you would see for a brand new road, all the grades and all of that it would be more or less a plan view of where the road is to be widened, where the pavement can be made a little bit wider. We do realize that we have to go through Scenic Road Hearing process to cut any trees. Stantec had counted themselves, with the Road Agent, about 29 trees that are along the street. We had counted trees as well. It was more than 20, just driving up and down the street. In our count, at least half of those are either dead or diseased. Even without this development there are concerns about trees that may be falling down. But that's another process we have to go through, the Planning Board and that's also something we'd be looking at for the design, any design improvements to Crowley Road. We'd also be looking at what trees may or may not have to come down and go through a Scenic Road Hearing process.

C. Robie asked once again for the traffic increase I think the study showed the road did not meet the standard, is that correct? E. Mitchell replied I think one of the first responses in the Stantec letter about that did talk about I believe that the existing road with the traffic that's there is a low low volume road according to ASHTO, which is the National Association for Highways, and then they said with the proposed traffic an addition of somewhere around 600 vehicles a day, that it would be an arterial road based on your subdivision regulations. However, our traffic study when we had done that, we started out with ASHTO and so we used ASHTO requirements. The ASHTO requirements for the type of traffic for the increase we have is for between 18 and 20 feet of pavement so if you compare apples for apples with the National Standard, 18-20 feet of pavement, obviously with 20 preferred, is still the ASHTO requirement. I think it's obvious, if this was a brand new road, we'd be meeting the 24 feet of pavement but where it's an improvement to an existing road, we're using the ASHTO requirements, trying to get it to 20 feet and possibly a little bit more shoulder work if we can. C. Robie responded so you're going to put all that down and present that to Stantec for their review is that correct? E. Mitchell replied yes and the Road

Agent, work with them and then submit it to the Planning Board for the final plans. J. Bedard replied this is exactly what I was going to bring up, one of the main concerns I have is what the Road Agent described as the road not being able to support that kind of traffic. So I'm very curious and I definitely want to see what those solutions are going to be. E. Mitchell responded I understand.

R. Cartier asked Mr. Mitchell on the Planning Board official Notice of Action back in March 30, 2005 as part of the approval for the original subdivision, lot 152 was supposed to be marked as a non-buildable lot and again that was part of the original application process that was in here. How are you going to address the fact that that was part of the conditions of approval for the original subdivision in Candia? E. Mitchell replied the plan set recorded and signed by the Board talk about lot 52 (152) being unbuildable and then it says subject to further review by the Town or the state. In my review of the minutes, a lot of what the intersection that was proposed at the time is a different look than what we have and the proposed road to get out back to get into Chester would have bisected lot 52 (152) and not have 3 acres on either side so it wasn't sufficient enough to be there. I think part of the concern also was if it was a buildable lot back in 05' someone may not had the ability to go ahead and put a road to get out back so they wanted to make sure that access was left to out back and that's something we have to address to the Board here now. So is there sufficient land and acreage and all that kind of stuff to satisfy Candia so the lot that we proposed is. I know it's 3 acres, we do have State Subdivision Approval, it does not have existing 200 feet of frontage on Crowley Road but it would once the road is built, it would be our position that once the project in Chester is bonded and even if the road has to be built or constructed to go into the project before lot 152 would be buildable then so it's physically is more than 200' of frontage, it meets the other requirements, then that would just have to wait. It's not something that's proposed to be built on at the beginning of the project. It would have to wait until the road is actually constructed past it. R. Cartier replied so the way that it stands now you'd have to come in for a waiver to the original conditions of approval for the project as it stood before. Because it's part of the decision that was made that it would be a non-buildable lot. It still only has 152 feet of frontage on Candia roads. As you noted before, it's going to be on Shannon drive, it would also have frontage but that's not going to be Town of Candia land, it will be deeded to the Town of Chester. So I think that's going to be something that is definitely going to have to be addressed before the final application is submitted to make sure that that's covered to see if the Board is amenable to changing that. E. Mitchell replied we will look into that very closely. R. Cartier commented one comment that I wanted to make is that I just got noticed that, the response for a lot of the information came in this morning about 10:00 to Andrea. A. Hall said it was this afternoon, 12:05 pm. R. Cartier continued I happened to be available this afternoon to take a look at it and go through it to see if the conditions that we had were met and it was fortunate that I was able to otherwise the Board would not have had any kind of time to actually review this. I would hope that any information that we request from you or the owner be submitted in a more timely manner so we do have time to be able review the responses to many of the questions that are still out here right now and I know there will be other questions that will come up as we start to review things a little bit more in depth. It is going to take awhile to get through some of these. I know there are comments from the Road Agent, Chief of Police, some of them have been addressed, I don't know if they're satisfactorily addressed. We have not had any conversations with any of the people, the Road Agent or the Police Chief or the Fire Chief on these issues. There are also comments from the Conservation Commission, from Southern NH Planning and a lot of other places. I'm hoping that as we can get this information to you and these questions to you that it would be timely in the response so we do as a Board have time to read through this material before we come to a meeting. E. Mitchell replied I understand that and I know that you need more time. With the final application submittal, all the information we expect to be submitted with that completely. If it turns out that there is additional things that need to be looked at before we actually finish the final plans, then we would also still ask for a hearing from the Board to go over those two or three items. But our intention is to address all the comments before we submit the final plans. So with the final plans, which may be 15 to 21 days prior to the next hearing, all information would be submitted with those. R. Cartier replied okay good, I appreciate that. As part of the discussion in here we

as a Board don't have all of the questions per say, we do have a number of comments from SNHPC, from the Road Agent, from the Police Chief and the Fire Chief and a few other comments, not comments but requests from DES, we should probably have those comments, now that we've accepted the application, have those comments entered into the record. If we do have representatives from the above named entities to present if they could, or if they don't we could read the letters into the minutes. C. Robie asked Rudy don't you think we should give the applicant the chance to come back with a response to what we already have here. I think it would be in the best interest of the applicant and everyone involved? He's already seen these; he's talked to Stantec about them. He just discussed with us in length about the road. When they submit a final plan, I think that's the time everybody looks at it. R. Cartier replied seeing we have the letters from the various entities, from my standpoint, I'd like to get the information right from them and what their concerns were. Yes we do have some responses from Eric Mitchell too on those letters but the public doesn't have knowledge of them and I'm not comfortable just reading here, I'd rather hear from the entities. C. Robie said the Fire Chief is here and Mr. Lewis read his letter at our last meeting, am I correct? R. Cartier replied I think we have SNHPC, we have Conservation Commission. A. Hall said we have comments, questions and response from SNHPC and here tonight is their executive director Sylvia von Aulock if you would address the comments and thoughts.

S. Von Aulock handed out an 11 x 17 document with photo images of various areas on Crowley Road. I'm Sylvia von Aulock, Executive Director from Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission (SNHPC). We were asked because this was recognized as a development of regional impact to review the plans presented. What I gave you is something I asked our GIS expert today to generate really quickly, so when I went to the site, I took some photos, this is just with my cell phone. If you look at the plan over to the left, you'll see a number one and I tried to draw in my car, at the intersection of Chester and Crowley Road. The top picture is looking southbound, looking to the left. The bottom picture is looking to the right. You can see, we've been talking about difficulty of visibility and you will see that in the bottom most picture here. The middle picture, the middle of Crowley Road that was taken along the way. We've talked about the condition of the road and that just proves that out. Over at Lane Road, I'm showing again...the top picture is looking south and the bottom picture is looking to the north. That's just so everyone has a visual. SNHPC has submitted two letters; the first one submitted was July 12th, (2017) this was when it was first sent to Chester. Is that appropriate that I review this now? Ok first letter. I'm going to try to not word for word but basically cover everything. The plan set overview. When you review a set of plans, looking at the scale of the plan is very important. *The cover sheet depicts the site at 400 scale, two sheets at 200 scale and the remaining at 1" = 50' scale. We would request that additional information be provided on both the 400 and 200 ft. scale (sheets 1 and 2) so as to better understand the site as a whole.* For example tonight Mr. Mitchell was talking about widening the road. We don't have an aerial view, we don't have anything that depicts where the abutters are, where anyone lives along that view. Aerial view would provide information similar but a lot more information than what I've provided and then you could locate where is this road being proposed to be widened? Where are the trees coming down, where are the dead trees, the trees that are not doing well, where are they coming down so that everyone involved, all stakeholders, everyone can see exactly what's happening and where? That's really important to be able to visualize. That's something for example, even in our own review, would like to see that.

Drainage information is difficult to find. It's a little different talking to this community and Chester. You're really I think looking at the road. Chester is looking at more because of where things are but drainage within the subdivision has an issue that I brought up. But let's go back to traffic impacts.

At build-out, the proposed Crowley Woods subdivision would result in 60 new single-family dwelling units. We talked about that. Our reviewers looked at what the traffic impact would be there. I've heard at the last meeting, your own reviewer said 666 new cars a day. Our estimate was closer to the high 500's but regardless, it's a lot of increase in the number of cars. We suggested a number of intersections in our, this is where things get complicated. The first letter was written before the traffic impact analysis; the second letter was after we received the study. In that second letter we talk about what intersections were

reviewed and two intersections were not reviewed. October 11th is the date of the second letter and you should have a copy of that. Because we're talking about road impacts, that's where I wanted to stay with this group.

Some of our comments about the traffic impact study: One thing we found, the trip distribution methodology, the Impact Study used 2000 census, that's on our page two of that second letter. We provided more updated information based on 2015 census data. It's important to be as updated as possible because things change between 2000 and 2015. Some of these comments may have already been addressed by the developer, their engineer and their traffic expert but we haven't received anything since these letters were submitted and the initial analysis. We haven't received any additional information, an update to the traffic analysis for example. The Traffic Study, we're expecting new information to be provided. We haven't heard back. One thing that we did also find that was not addressed, typically in a traffic analysis you want to make sure it includes any pending or expected future development. We did not find that this was presented in the analysis. Evidently there is a proposed Meadows project of 172 Townhouses on Chester Road in the Town of Raymond and we suggested that that be included because again, this is a development of regional impact. But there may be additional pending development in both Candia and/or Chester so that pending, or something that was approved maybe a couple of years ago that's still being built out, all of that needs to be provided. Back to the original letter, we've heard a lot about geometry. And again we were one of those who did recognize that Crowley Road is 18-19 feet in width and that's very narrow for a road that would have this much pending traffic. So we also recommended a width of 20' with 2' wide graded shoulders on each side of the road. But not only are you looking at just the road widening, whenever you widen a road you add additional impervious surface, you have to also think about grading. We know this is a scenic road and we heard about walls being removed but are they being moved and put a little further back, so that's also an important thing to know for scenic road.

R. Cartier asked on the sight distances you were talking about in this area, what do you recommend for sight distances and what's the basis for that recommendation, standards. S. Von Aulock replied again I would go to ASHTO; I don't have those recommended sight distances in front of me but certainly the traffic engineer and Mr. Mitchell I'm sure probably know those better than I do. All I know is from our review that we measured on the Chester Crowley intersection looking southbound 250'. That was considered pretty good, considering. I know that Mr. Mitchell's been talking to the DOT district, I'm sure they can also provide those details. We review, we don't provide *answers (unintelligible)*, and we can only review what's put in front, so we can't really provide the recommendations. I know it's not the best way to go but we can only provide recommendations in this way. When looking northbound at that same intersection we noticed and the picture shows zero sight distance, so definitely plans have to show an improvement there and we highly recommend that plans be included that's likely again to look at grading, drainage, what happens to the vegetation. Sight distance at Lane Road, the staff measured approximately 165' and it was recommended that some trees need to be removed. Again the photos there show that. After the last meeting, which I also attended, I did in listening to the conversation here and talking to your Road Agent, also talked about construction sequence. It's really important for the Boards of Chester and this one to know that as you're reviewing these plans that construction sequence is well detailed in that what happens first second and third etc. will the subdivision go in and then off-site improvements be made or will off-site improvements be made in anticipation of the new development. So those things must be spelled out.

A. Hall asked in layman's curiosity how can you go through the construction process of a 60 unit development without improving the road that construction vehicles are going to go over. It would seem in common sense seems like you'd have to spend literally millions of dollars to upgrade Crowley Road in order to service the construction trucks etc. of the development. S. Von Aulock replied again I'm not an expert here but my intuition would say that as the road is right now it varies in its condition. Some sections look pretty good, others not good. The photo I included on the map is a section that didn't look as good as others. It's always our recommendation that an entire inventory of road condition be made before

construction. And that an agreement be set between the developer and the community that all improvements; that it can't get any worse. It has to be at least as good as what the condition is after the entire construction. So you can well imagine that construction vehicles, moving vans, mostly construction vehicles to trucks, especially if material is leaving the site. It's really hard on the road. I wouldn't make any, I personally but again but this is where you're Road Agent has the expertise. I imagine that he can certainly come up and talk but that I wouldn't make any improvement until everything is completed and then you would improve the road so it lasts much longer.

R. Cartier asked was SNHPC involved with the development in Hooksett on Berry Hill Road in that residential area. S. Von Aulock replied not during my time. R. Cartier continued I'm just wondering because that involved a lot of residential roads, and recently just making improvements to Whitehall Road which is a state road, which required the developer in that area to....S. Von Aulock if it is declared a development of regional impact then I would venture to say yes.

S. Von Aulock continued the other aspect that I want to bring up is water and water availability. This is from our first letter page 4 *Regarding Water Resources In 2009, SNHPC prepared a Source Water Protection Plan for the Town of Chester. The overall goal of this Source Water Protection Plan is to protect the drinking water supply.* We know that this will require 60 additional wells so we suggested a study be conducted to better understand how the development will impact well yield. Also if there's blasting, it's always important to do testing of wells prior and after any blasting to ensure existing homeowners aren't impacted in any way. But certainly groundwater is a tricky science on its own and we want to ensure, I'm sure the developer equally wants to ensure not only the future residents have water but existing residents along Crowley Road still have good water and that it's not impacted in any way.

R. Cartier asked Sylvia looking at the water resources the analysis that was done by SNH Planning, there was concern that near the site, Crowley Woods development, that it has a very low well yield capacity at this time. S. Von Aulock replied back in 2009. We haven't updated that analysis but because it was a concern back then and because it's always a concern when you have...I don't know if there will be any blasting, I don't know if the engineer can speak to that, but that's always a concern. If it was a concern back then, I would ask for a study to be done. R. Cartier replied as it stands now there seems to be an issue with water supply in that area. And then adding a higher density housing with another 60 wells being drilled in that area, would have a negative impact. S. Von Aulock responded I can't say that it would have a negative impact but certainly some studying of that I think is important. R. Cartier reiterated so an update of what was done back in 2009 would be an appropriate thing to do to see...S. Von Aulock commented I think what you want to know is how is that well yield, and also to ask about blasting and what the protocol will be. Will you be testing abutters that are nearby, will it be within a certain distance; sometimes it's within 1,000 feet or I've seen it go a variety of ways. That's an expert. I know a little bit about a lot so I'll get myself in trouble here but I know enough to say that it's something you may want to look into. R. Cartier asked doesn't the water well board also have information on yields that are drilled in the past 20, 25 years? Are you familiar with that database? That might be helpful with the concerns that you had with the existing water supply in that area. S. Von Aulock replied no. C. Robie replied Rudy all the wells drilled in the State of NH by a licensed well driller has to be recorded with NH DES.

S. Von Aulock replied I think that summarizes the comments, I'm sure there's more here but without getting too much into the weeds, I think that gives you a pretty good idea of some of our concerns.

C. Robie asked Mr. Mitchell on the wells have you planned on doing any survey on water data in that area and also the road, when you draw those plans, you'll put together a program of how it's going to be completed and the approach you take to it.

E. Mitchell replied two separate questions; the construction sequence certainly has to be worked out before between the Town and the developer. On one hand to have construction vehicles going up and down the street and the road stays just as it is, it's going to get worse. But if you go ahead and do all the repairs right now before you start your construction on site, then it still may have some problems. So maybe there's something that can be done in between. But we would work that out with the Road Agent come up

with a schedule as to when the improvements have to be made. C. Robie responded so that should probably be worked out as you apply with your final application. E. Mitchell replied yes. C. Robie continued and probably come up between Stantec, the highway agent, yourselves with a bond that would bond that issue for the Town of Candia. E. Mitchell agreed, yes we can do that. As far as the wells, generally speaking if you look at the availability of water here in New Hampshire and certainly in this part of the state, the state has a requirement, DES that the minimum lot size is about an acre with existing wells and septic systems, and historically, based on my experience and there's as well, it's usually not an issue of finding water. In some instances it's just how deep you have to go but we don't have problems. Once in a very very rare occasion do you have some *knob (unintelligible)* or some dead end street where you do three wells for a house lot and you just can't get any water. Generally, the odds are great. I don't know what the odds are per say, whether they're 95% or even more, but you're going to find water. In terms with the records of the Water Well Board we can look at those and all the wells that have been built in and around the development and come up with information as far as depth of well yields are, and we can provide. Generally speaking the density of one acre per house lot is usually not a problem finding water. In this particular case, we have almost 200 acres with 60 houses on it even though they're not spread out over the entire thing. But we feel confident and comfortable that water will be there but we can get the information from the Water Well Board for you.

C. Robie confirmed you do plan on drilling a well for each home, not a community well system? E. Mitchell replied correct, there will be a well for each home.

R. Cartier asked a question on the road improvements. If I'm looking at the project correctly, it's going to be done in 3 phases. E. Mitchell replied we expect there to be 3 phases. One phase would go in off of the 3-way intersection for a distance of about 1800 feet or thereabouts. We'd put a temporary cul-de-sac in. The 2nd phase, which could happen the next year, the road would be finished all the way back out and have a loop, so it would come back out to Crowley. The last phase would be the cul-de-sac off of that. Whether that's a year for each phase, I don't know. The first two phases have to be completed. The first phase going into the cul-de-sac can be done but the next phase has to take the road all the way back out, it won't be a second cul-de-sac so the dead end is only there for the first phase and then it would be connected all the way to Crowley Road. R. Cartier said the reason I ask is on the road improvements, obviously the road can't stay the way it is right now and have even the first phase, because as you said, heavy equipment will pretty much destroy the road. But if the road is improved and the improvements are done say next year, what happens to the roads when the other 2 developments are gonna go on if the road deteriorates, will you be offering a road bond to repair the road if it needs to be repaired because of the 2nd and 3rd phase that was fine when the 1st phase was being put in but now that we're back to having a lot of heavy equipment coming in there, how is that going to be handled. E. Mitchell reiterated that's something we will be talking to the Road Agent about, the construction sequence because that also comes into play. Same thing, if the whole road is improved right off the bat, right after phase 1, as you just said what if it deteriorates after 2 or 3 so we have to take a good look at that and come up with the best solution.

K. Kustra asked is there any thought for expansion from 60 to 100 or 120 there seems to be plenty of acreage around. E. Mitchell replied no, the amount of lots that we have here, is limited to the number that we proposed of 60. This is an open space development even though there's a lot of open space, this is the total number. As far as the houses are concerned, half of them will be 4 bedroom houses and half will be 3 bedroom houses. That's only to indicate that not everything is going to have the same amount water requirement, not all 4 bedroom houses; half will be 3 and half will be 4 but there won't be any more than what we've shown this proposal is, as the limit of what we're going to propose.

J. Bedard said Mr. Mitchell I have a question about the letter you wrote in response to Chief McGillen's concerns. So there are seven concerns, for example on #2, it says he agrees with *upgrading Crowley Road* and so on. Your response is *this will also be addressed on the final plan*. Then on #3 it says *sight distance should be improved at the Crowley Road and Chester Road intersection* and your answer is *understood*. What is the difference between those two? Is it going to be addressed in the final plan? E.

Mitchell replied yes it will be on the final plans, there's an easement looking to the south, yes that will be part of that, we know it has to be improved. J. Bedard replied I just wanted to clarify. Understood to me was okay it's understood but is anything going to be done. So these are all going to be addressed on the final plan? E. Mitchell agreed, yes they are. R. Cartier said I think we should accept Stantec's letter as it was written seeing that Bryan's not here, we'll take it under advisement and I know the developer does have a copy of it and we can have Bryan keep us informed as to the meetings they are going to have and updates to the questions that he had.

C. Robie asked Mr. Mitchell if he had any questions. Having none, he asked how much time would you like to prepare. E. Mitchell said if we could, if you give us permission to proceed to final, we need to submit our final plans and get put on the agenda for another, new hearing with abutter's notice and all that. We would expect to try to be back here to get scheduled for the Planning Board in two months. That will give us five weeks or so to do all the things that we just talked about and to submit them. But it's my understanding that if we get permission to proceed to final, everything has to be submitted back to the Board. There's a possibility there may be more meetings back and forth with Stantec and the Road Agent relative to Crowley Road which may take a little bit more time, so we may not formally submit the final until a good time after that but we would like to at least should be here (*unintelligible*) by third Wednesday of February. We have to produce plans and submit them in advance of the meeting in order to make that meeting.

A. Hall asked the Road Agent if he had any comments. D. Lewis responded I read my letter the last time and I don't really have anything to add. I have to work with Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Morel on how we're going to proceed with the improvements to Crowley Road. Right now I have nothing else to add. A. Hall asked the Fire Chief if he had any comments. D. Young responded you have my letter. I've been in contact with Chester's Chief.

R. Cartier asked Dean Young, Chief, Mr. Mitchell put down one of the cisterns on there that would obviously help us in Candia. From your standpoint knowing that you would probably be the first due in for that property, are you comfortable with only having one cistern for 60 houses in that area at this point in time? D. Young replied well this isn't California where the fires burn through there and I think any one house will burn at a time; I think one cistern will be fine.

Cass Buckley from Chester, I'm on the Planning Board. I just wanted to reiterate something Sylvia said and as we go through this process that both Towns are aware of what each Town wants and sets up for conditions; how the conditions interact with each other. Order of operations, priorities, building sequence, all that kind of stuff so that our Chester Plans that are submitted incorporate your plans but not necessarily by reference, but fully include the conditions and the timing of those conditions so that we know and our code enforcement people can make sure that as the phases are being built that your conditions are being met also. Road conditions, intersection improvements, whatever it happens to be. I kind of encourage the Chester Planning Board and encourage you to work with us, set up joint meetings where we can actually talk about those things. Instead of having Mr. Mitchell be an intermediary or occasionally one of us showing up at a meetings, if we could all get together and hash out all the issues that we have and figure out how to make them all work together so that both are aware of each other's wants. That's all.

R. Cartier said based on what SNHPC has noted to, do we have a member of the Conservation Commission that can speak to the email that was sent concerning some of the issues from a conservation standpoint because that was one of my concerns when I looked at the plans was the wetlands area and I know the Conservation Commission does have some concerns about the wetlands area.

J. Lindsey said I'm on the Conservation Commission. The Fordway Brook Conservation Area is just across the street. *Right (unintelligible)* on Crowley Road so this proposed development abuts it and my question was, what will be the effects on the wildlife and water resources located in this area with a development of this size. Those are the same concerns that the Conservation Commission had that you have this big protected area, un-fragmented, great wildlife area and all of a sudden you're taking this road and going to make it heavily traffic it, if that's a word.

E. Mitchell responded just as a general case, and I don't have a copy of the conditions letter, I may have had it at the office, I didn't see it but we can meet with them and talk to them about what's going on. One general comment I can make is that the open space that we have here is over 100 acres I believe. Not all of it, some of it's a little fragmented, but there's great deal of it that is all contiguous and continuous and our plan for the open space is to Deed it to the Town of Chester for conservation purposes. It will not be owned by the homeowners with an easement on top, it will be owned by the Town for conservation. We're working with the Conservation Commission in Chester about the wording in the Deed and I believe...I know they are amenable to take it so we're trying to protect the open space that we have to a degree where the homeowners aren't there but public access will be allowed so citizens in Candia as well as Chester would be able to go out there. I'd be glad to set up a meeting and see the Commission, Conservation Commission in Candia, if you'd like me too.

C. Robie asked Mr. Mitchell when you do the road engineering you will do a drainage analysis also, goes along with that. Drainage analysis on the road, what we have now and what it will be when you're complete? E. Mitchell replied we will look at it. Most of what we'd be doing is just re-surfacing what is there so there may not be much impact. Possibly it could be a couple areas where there may be culvert problems, but we would look at that. I think when the road was paved the last time, I think they did improvements. Based on what I saw on some of the plans, they were looking at either culverts or extensions so most of what we'd be doing now is just re...taking the pavement that is there now and going a little bit wider, I don't think there would be a lot of wetland impact or drainage impact, but we will look at that with the Road Agent as well, we will do that. C. Robie replied in our Road Agent's letter last month, there were some concerns about ditches and shoulders and such and widening, so I think you're going to have to look at some of those areas, certainly. E. Mitchell replied we will. C. Robie said okay. Along with that a drainage analysis of what we have now and what it will look like later to address Ms. Lindsey's.....

J. Lindsey said I wrote down some of the points that I would like you to consider with this development. Some of these have been covered already but I just want to reiterate it for the record. A subdivision of this size and potential impact raises many questions. We have nothing of this size in Candia. For a neighboring town to have a development of this magnitude empty into our Town, presents some very sobering concerns, chief of which are safety issues. If Crowley Road cannot be widened is it even possible to bring it up to the required width needed to safely accommodate 600 additional vehicle trips per day? Roads need to be maintained, repaired, resurfaced every 10-15 years or so. If this road is built to a standard that could conceivably handle 700 additional vehicles a day, is it now our responsibility to maintain it into perpetuity. So it thus becomes a tax burden forever on the Townspeople of Candia. The issue of first responders needs to be considered. If we are closest, we would be responding first the potential for a serious and substantial increase in emergency calls and situations needs to be thoroughly evaluated. The Fordway Brook Conservation Area is just across the road from this proposed development. What will be the effects on the wildlife and water resources located in this area with a development of this size? If you've ever seen how many turtles are squished on the roads. You can have 100 acres of open space back behind but once these animals have to cross and are killed you can say goodbye to the endangered Blandings turtles and things like that. Also, there's a black gum swamp I believe, it says A-23 off Candia Road in North Chester, so something to consider. And then this has been repeated, Stantec had said the amount of traffic pushes it from a rural to one that has to meet arterial road ASHTO standards so I guess the issue we really have to get that road way up to some kind of standard that's going to be able to handle all of this traffic forever and then some. Those are my concerns. (*Audience applause*)

R. Cartier commented just to build upon Judi's comments a little bit. She said the road's going to turn into an arterial road. From my understanding we only have 3 arterial roads in Candia right now, they're all state roads. Crowley Road is now going to become a Town road that we're going to have to maintain, that is a concern. The other concerns I have all relate to traffic. The sight distances that were brought up by Sylvia are a big concern. One of the other major issues I think that's going to happen is the intersection of Chester Road and Main Street with the way the traffic comes down Main Street from the

intersection out near First Stoppe. A lot of off-site improvements are going to have to be looked at closely to make sure that we're not negatively impacting Candia, I'm not sure how that can be done, that's not my area of expertise doing road construction or road design. The other concern I would have here from looking at it as being an area that has low water yield, right now, possible low water yield, I'm not going to say that it does, we don't have the information off hand, I think that would be another major concern we need to look at. If I were living in that area I wouldn't want to have my wells being impacted negatively by having much much more demand on the resources that are in that area. Looking at some of the area, I haven't looked at all the wetlands area so I'm not quite sure how many wetlands are in the area, the capabilities of having 60 houses in kind of a condensed area, being able to be handled by septic systems, individual septic systems. I know I'm going to have a lot more questions, there's a lot of good data in here you've provided a lot of good information so have a lot of the consultants, the people we've been using. It's a lot to digest to say the least. There's a lot of concerns from the people in that area, not only the people in that area but the people in general in Candia about how it would impact the feel of Candia so anything going forward would really have to take into account how that's going to possibly change the character of Candia in that area and we're not really getting a benefit out of it other than the one house lot. It could wind up being very expensive for us so I think there's a lot of research that needs to be done and a lot more questions asked and some answers hopefully being able to be developed.

A. Hall asked for public comment. We'll take comments from the abutters first. J. Bedard said to Al we aren't taking comments tonight. A. Hall replied no comments? C. Robie said we're going to ask Mr. Mitchell to complete his final plans.

A. Sullivan, legal counsel for DAR Builders, responded I think you opened up the meeting saying there would be no public comments. C. Robie said this is not a public hearing. A. Hall apologized.

C. Robie said I think our next step is to ask the applicant to complete his final plans and submit them when he's ready within 90 days of the acceptance of the application, which was this evening. I think that's the motion that this Board needs to make at this time and once Mr. Mitchell's submits his plans and we've reviewed them and Stantec reviews them, many of the questions a lot of people have, hopefully will be answered and we'll move forward from there. *Discussion ensued about whether there needed to be a motion.*

C. Robie said if we're satisfied with our preliminary meeting this evening, we will draft a letter and send it to you with our concerns as we discussed this evening, just like the last meeting, you had a letter with all of our concerns that went to your office; you will get a letter from us and move forward from there. E. Mitchell confirmed and we will proceed to submit final plans within 90 days? C. Robie replied yes.

MOTION:

J. Bedard **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 8:23 pm. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motioned carried (6-0-0).**

*****Zoning Review & Revision Committee Meeting has been cancelled until further notice.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary

cc file