

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES of April 18, 2018
UNAPPROVED
Public Hearing

Present: Rudy Cartier, Chair; Al Hall III, Vice Chair; Judi Lindsey; Mark Chalbeck; Ken Kustra; Joyce Bedard; Mark Laliberte, BOS Representative.

Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dave Murray, Building Inspector, Dean Young, Fire Chief

Absent: Mike Santa, Alt

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

Minutes from April 4th, 2018:

A. Hall made a **motion** to accept the minutes of April 4th, 2018 as presented. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor**. Mark Laliberte abstained. **Motion passed (6-0-1)**.

Continuation of 18-001 Minor Site Plan Review Application: Applicant: 304 Raymond, LLC 679 1st NH Turnpike, Northwood, NH 03261; Owner: same; Property location: 304 Raymond Road, Candia NH 03034; Map 409 Lot 116.1; Intent: To add traditional drive up self storage units to existing building utilizing “relocatable” storage structures in the L1 District.

Present: Applicant Mark Murphy of 304 Raymond LLC.

Abutters Present: None

M. Murphy handed out new site plans and introduced himself, I’m Mark Murphy, one of the owners of 304 Raymond LLC.

R. Cartier said you were in here 2 months ago and there were some things in the notice of application that it was incomplete and we can go over those. R. Cartier read:

1) The name and address of the property owner and the address of the authorization is not on the plan. The plan does not say prepared by, it says owner. It needs to be put on the plan. It says manager. Changing the name on there to make sure it reflects the property owner. Make it clear that you are the property owner or the owner of the LLC. Add manager/owner to the plan.

So that was added to the plan it was taken care of. R. Cartier continued:

2) Note if there will be additional lighting on the plan and note location. It needs to be dark sky compliant. M. Murphy said I have little x’s and I’m sorry they’re hard to see, it didn’t print out quite the way I thought it would. Around the buildings it’s showing lights and they will all be dark sky compliant, down light, wall pack units. Probably solar charged LED’s. K. Kustra asked if the abutters on the plan were current. M. Murphy replied it was as of the last meeting, I didn’t update it I guess because I didn’t think it had changed. K. Kustra replied Jeff Kantor is no longer with us, he passed away. M. Murphy replied ok, it was held in a revocable trust; it still could be in that trust depending on his estate documents. K. Kustra asked could we get that clarified. R. Cartier replied sure, I believe that is correct, Jeff had a trust before he passed away. M. Murphy said it definitely was a revocable trust because I have that noted. I apologize for not following up on that. R. Cartier said so you have the lighting, if you could at some point in time, it is dark sky compliant, if you can send in a cut sheet to the Building Inspector of what that’s going to be so he can confirm that.

3) *Signage* – Note any new signage on the plan (location and approximate size of the sign) which will go through the Building Department for a sign permit. M. Murphy replied I wasn't sure how to fix that because it did say on there that the sign is on here, it's an existing sign; I put on there any changes to be submitted via separate permit. I did talk to Andrea, I think that didn't have to be done right now. We're proposing to use the existing sign and change the copy on it. A. Hall said you have a temporary sign out there now. M. Murphy said we have a permanent sign on two telephone poles that says Transmission Man, which is one of the tenants down here. Right now I have a box, one of our boxes. I don't intend for that to be a sign; that was put there because this guy was parking up here where he was not supposed to be and I had to physically stop him from doing that so I physically put something in his way. I thought I made it clear the first time and then he did it again so I physically had to block it. It's not intended to be a sign and I can swap it out for one of my covers that doesn't have any writing on it. My intent is that that sign will eventually become ours. I didn't want to do that before I get through this process. R. Cartier summarized bottom line you're not going to add any signs, you're going to re-use the existing sign that's there. M. Murphy replied yes, if the face of the sign, I think it's smaller than what's allowed so we might bring it up to the allowed size of the sign on that pole but we'll just re-use that pole sign. R. Cartier said so that covers it, there's no new signage on there and you will be sending the application in to the Building Inspector. M. Murphy replied I'll definitely do that.

K. Kustra asked about relocatable, tell me about it. M. Murphy replied what that means is that they come in on a truck and they're craned off into place. They could potentially be moved. It's a process. K. Kustra said and if they are moved, you have room to move them somewhere. M. Murphy replied I'm proposing that this is where they'll be and if I was going to move them substantially, I would come back to you and discuss it. Just to let you know we do intend to come back in the next year or so to develop permanent storage in the back which will help clean up everything in that process. So this is where they would be and would stay until we come back for approval to do something different in the back. A. Hall said what we're talking about are the four orange stripes there (*on the plan*). M. Murphy replied yes, this is where there would be storage. A. Hall said I've driven down in there and there's a lot of stuff in there. M. Murphy replied I have a lot of tenants that like their stuff. Every time I go down there, it's not supposed to be there "guys, move it". The cistern; we haven't discussed it yet but the cistern's obviously going to come up. I do show it where it is now because of the intricacies of moving it, which we're still researching; Dean and I spoke on Monday. The idea here is to set this storage and make sure everybody who's down there, all of my tenants understand that anything over there, I'm just going to haul it up on the back of my flatbed and now it's mine. A. Hall asked do you have all the units down there now, are you going to have more units. M. Murphy responded what exists right now are the two 10 x 160, the two longer yellow stripes. They're more or less there. I may move them in terms of which unit goes where because of the final layout but then there are some other white box units. But we're proposing to only have the four stripes that you see for storage units in that section of the site. A. Hall replied every time I drive down there, the units and the positions seem to change. M. Murphy replied those are the white box units, I can move those pretty easily and I have moved them in the past. They've been stable for the past 8 or 9 months as to where they are. I definitely haven't moved any since before the winter. A. Hall asked each unit is a different size is that right. M. Murphy replied we have a lot of different sizes. The one's I'm proposing here are 10 x 20 or 10 x 50 pieces depending on which supplier sell them to us and they will sit in these locations. The white boxes are basically portable storage units. Originally we bought the property and talked to Dave about doing portable storage out of Unit D. We had a change in our business model for several reasons and we're not doing the portable storage service. We have the white boxes and we do use them where we can. A. Hall asked what's the prohibition (*meant what's to prohibit?*) of somebody moving those units out in the dark of the night. I'm just concerned about security and stability. M. Murphy replied well if that happened there are three people in Town I'd call because there's only two that have the equipment to move those full. None of my equipment can actually move those full. It would be difficult. I'd know who I'd have to call around here to figure out who took them. They can physically be taken but when they're full, they weigh as much as

15,000 pounds and trying to do that would be pretty difficult. I've never had anyone attempt to steal one of those. It's an interesting thought. On this site I'm not real interested in fencing off this entire site; that may be part of the eventual plan though. Very long term we see this entire site converted to storage. A. Hall said those small units; individual units cannot be removed individually? M. Murphy replied the 5 x 8 units, the little tiny ones, they could be but again if you had the right equipment, a very large fork truck and a flat bed truck, it's humanly feasible but I don't think realistically it would happen. I guess it could happen, conceivably. Acceptable risk I'd say. A. Hall replied I was thinking if I wanted to rent a small unit or something and it disappears.

R. Cartier asked you said this is not the final location of the storage units. M. Murphy replied as far as what I'm proposing, this would be, yes. The final location, that's what we'll stick with until we come back to you guys to discuss some sort of change and when we do I see that being...we have 20 acres back here and a bunch of it is developable to my knowledge so we're planning on developing a real self storage facility; traditional, concrete etc. the whole 9 yards, back here. At that point in time, this could change. Move the tenants down to here and we'd do what we need to up here but there's also a good chance it wouldn't because again long term; I don't how long, we do have tenants in here that have leases but speaking very long term we envision this entire property becoming self storage and potentially vehicle storage or individual storage units cut up inside this building so we are going in that direction. I'm sure no one in Town likes looking at this when they drive by and long term we look forward to that change. Potentially putting in a gate up here and fencing and rent these out for vehicle storage, car storage there's a market for, inside vehicle storage there's a market for. Self storage there's a market for and I'm pretty confident that this area could handle as much as 20,000 sq. feet of self storage, drive up as we call them. There are other markets that this would handle and I think we could clean up the property and improve security substantially so that is the long term plan.

A. Hall asked about a shooting range out back. M. Murphy said there is an area out back and I've used it myself but I strongly discourage anyone I don't know to use it. There's a large sand backstop and range set up towards the sand backstop. I only let a handful of people that are personally known to me use it and I make sure these guys are watching out and we also block this access with equipment to limit access. There were a bunch of vehicles out back and those are all gone. We've cleaned up the back area. That range is there. K. Kustra asked how many units do you have there now. M. Murphy replied it's hard for me to give you unit numbers because I think in square footage so like 3,000 sq feet of these green doors traditional style storage units; that's all 10 x 10; 30 doors. Some of the white boxes as well. What we're proposing here is about 5,200 so we have a little less than that total but this would be more of the traditional storage units; organized in such a way so there is access through here. Unit numbers off the top of my head, 30 to 40, something along that line. A. Hall asked you have some in Northwood can you move them from Northwood to Candia? M. Murphy replied the white boxes can be done that way. We're somewhat capable of moving these when they're empty. The 20 footers I'm physically capable of moving them but we don't have any plans to move any of them anywhere at this point in time. We're here to ask for this and I need to live with that until such time we come back for whatever other approvals.

R. Cartier commented Mark you said there's a good possibility you'll be developing the land downstream basically from here in the next year or two years. M. Murphy replied yes, hopefully. R. Cartier continued so taking that into consideration, these here could be temporary structures. M. Murphy replied yes, the nature of these relocatables is so they can be taken out so if we build a whole bunch back here and we want to take these to another facility in another Town in another jurisdiction, we may want to try to do that. I can't imagine taking these out would be a problem to you guys. R. Cartier said these are not fixed to the ground like you said. They'd be more like shed type of structures that aren't fixed. That to me makes a difference in looking at this overall from a long term standpoint and it will have to do with the location of the cistern; that's your concern and one of our concerns. The only other recommendation that I would have; two things 1) I believe the commercial zone extends to 800 feet from the road so I'm not sure how far back that goes in to your property to the back for the future. M. Murphy said I'm not sure either. R. Cartier

continued and 2) if you do change the existing structure to possible storage, just check with the Building Inspector to make sure the change of use is still acceptable in that area. M. Murphy clarified the existing building? R. Cartier agreed, yes the existing building, if you change that over to storage it would be a change of use. M. Murphy replied understood.

R. Cartier continued with the deficiencies that are in here now:

4) *The location of the existing water supply and septic system need to be shown on the plans.* R. Cartier said the septic I saw. M. Murphy said it's underneath the asphalt just outside the building. I have located it as best I can, I'm pretty sure that's where it is. There's a couple of man hole covers and it looks like the field extends in this direction. I don't have the best of plans from the former owner and I don't know what's on file with the state. I didn't go that route. R. Cartier said the location is fine, that's what we're looking for. If you need more information, which would be a good idea, you can probably get it from the building department or you could get it from DES. M. Murphy replied it was in 2000 I think it was. I'm not sure if it was at the state or not or how much level of detail was at the state but I can certainly look into it. The well is also shown, over here in the corner of the parking lot, kitty corner on the other side away from the septic.

5) *Add a completion schedule to the plan for 90 days out from March 21, 2018 Planning Board meeting. (June 21, 2018).* R. Cartier asked about a completion schedule. M. Murphy replied I didn't put anything on here yet because I figured it would be pending this meeting so I didn't put on here. I can either re-submit it or we can just write it on and I can sign it tonight; either way. R. Cartier said if the application is accepted we can put conditions on approval. I understand what you're saying and I can accept that at this time.

6) *Move the cistern; based on Town Standards for Installing a Cistern – This is part of the completion schedule.* R. Cartier continued the last one is the moving of the cistern. You found out it costs a little bit more. M. Murphy said a couple of things happened. I have a very good friend who is in or was an excavator operator and had been operating for years and he passed away. He and I were going to do this project, I have excavation experience as well, and he's very good and has his own equipment and that was going to allow me to do it a lot cheaper than any other method. With him gone, I do not have the expertise myself to do this, nor the equipment so now I have to go to the commercial market and it is going to be quite a bit more expensive and there's always the possibility that we break this tank in the process of moving it. The people who make the tank tell me you're on your own if you want to try to move that thing after it's been in the ground for 20 years. Does that mean it can't be moved, no, it just means they're not willing to tell me it's possible. I know that Dean spoke with one of the Severino brothers and they believe it's possible and they've moved tanks like this before. That said, they don't have any specific knowledge of this tank and the condition of this tank. No one will until it's unearthed and at that point it might be too late so there is definitely some risk in attempting to move it. There's a large amount of cost in attempting to move it. What I would like to do is whatever I have to do to make sure there is access to this tank at all times for the Fire Department and talk about relocating it as part of our bigger plan when we come back for approvals in the back and go to develop some self storage out back; at that point I'd be going to a bank and I'd be able to finance this. Right now to pay for this out of cash would be on us. Also the end result might be we spend a lot of money and Candia loses a cistern. That's a distinct possibility I can't put a probability number on it. Everyone's all over the map between 20% and 80% that they think this can be done but a lot of that's based on what people are willing to commit too and they don't want to be the one to say sure we can move it and then they break it. I don't want to spend a lot of money and have the end result be you guys don't have a cistern anymore. I think it makes more sense to have it where it is and make it part of the long term plan to move it yeah, if I have to stripe out more than what's shown; this is what's existing. I can do things over here; there are ways to have the doors all open on one side potentially. I've shown it here so there would be no door openings along this outside of the 10 x 100 directly below on this plan. The striped out area of the cistern. It would be an easy enough thing to stripe out more of this area, quite a bit more. I haven't had the chance to have a good sit down with Dean and talk about what he would like and I would obviously need his feedback for that. I didn't want to push this off and I have surgery scheduled on Friday and I'm going to be out of commission for a little while. I wanted to get at least his feedback and make the

plans I need to make, to talk to Dean to figure this out and get your feedback on the cistern location and potentially moving it later in the overall plan here. A. Hall asked so are you asking us to waive #6? M. Murphy replied I guess that would be the correct wording.

R. Cartier asked Chief based on the fact that this will probably only be a one or two year installation, what's your feelings on what he's requesting for that. D. Young replied I don't care as long as we can get to the damn thing but I've been there many times and we can't get to it. So that's the deal right there. You say you're going to haul stuff out of there; if you're going to go there every day and make sure there's nothing in the way, I'm good with that. But there's always stuff and we can't get to it. That's why up at the corner, there would be nothing in the way, ever. M. Murphy said it's the location, I agree 100%. As I said I don't want to spend a whole bunch of money and you end up with no cistern at all and I'd like to try to make a better plan that works for everybody. I think I can arrange these and do striping and have it work. An additional measure would be to put a camera on the building looking at that area and that way I don't have to actually be there every day but I can look at it every day easily and say there's somebody in the way, whichever tenant it is until such time as I don't have those concerns anymore. D. Young said I understand the money thing. I'm very sympathetic to that; I look at that a lot. M. Murphy continued I understand you have to be able to access that tank, I get it. D. Young said when we originally talked you didn't think it would be a problem to move it because you had your friend and everything and I'm sorry about you losing your friend. I have no problem Mr. Chairman if we can get to it, that's all we need to do. If he can assure me that we can get to it, I have no problem with leaving it where it is for now.

A. Hall asked is it just a case that you're informing the violators or the tenants that are in front of the place that you can't park there or get out or is it more than that? M. Murphy replied I wish it were that simple. A. Hall said I presume you're talking about the trucks and vehicles in there. M. Murphy responded those trucks and vehicles are parked right where I show storage units now so the concept would be basically I'm defining an area over here that is storage related and everybody else, if you're not a storage tenant, you should be nowhere near there and then stripe out the access so even the storage tenants understand don't park along this area, this is fire truck access. The concept is to not just rely on enforcement but to change the understanding of what this area is and who can use it. So there would be no other trucks or junk parked here, as we now have and I'm not happy about it either. They would have to live in this area over here and that's it and they have to live with that it. They don't rent that pavement from me anyway so they have to stop using it.

R. Cartier said Mark Laliberte is our new Board of Selectmen representative on the Board. M. Laliberte said I hear what you're saying and that's great but you almost don't sound like you're convinced that this is really going to work and that's the concern I have. You're making it sound like I can't enforce it there; you almost sound like you don't trust that your tenants are going to not park there and then you were talking about a camera and all of that. M. Murphy replied what I'm trying to do is physically change the site so it's not possible for them to park where it's a problem. M. Laliberte added while still providing access to the Fire Department. M. Murphy said that's the point, yes. Currently there's trucks parked here. If I put storage units here they can't park there anymore. Instead of just being an enforcement of a policy...I can do...these guys have struggled to follow my policies. M. Laliberte said that's kind of where I was going. M. Murphy continued I want to physically change it so they are clear it can't be done over here and physically they really can't put vehicles over here. M. Laliberte asked and if they somehow manage to do it, you would have cameras too. M. Murphy replied correct. Yes, I would enforce that monetarily, they're going to get fined heavily. M. Laliberte replied now that you've put it that way; that sounds better. M. Murphy said I guess I was expressing some frustration with tenants following policies and the solution in my mind is the re-organization such that this is not their area and anything that's over there is immediately going to be a fine. Right now, this is their area and where's the boundary? So they keep creeping. I need to change that mentality entirely. My concept was to put the storage here; then it's clear. You guys belong nowhere near here. Anytime you're anywhere near here, I'm going to fine the heck out of you. I apologize;

I didn't mean to sound like I couldn't make it happen. I meant to sound like this is a physical change that makes this easier for me to ensure that it happens.

R. Cartier asked what's the distance between the long ones and the short ones. M. Murphy replied this one is about 30 feet. R. Cartier said but only one way in and one way out to the cistern. M. Murphy agreed. R. Cartier said so the Fire Department would commit an engine to the cistern. M. Murphy said what does that mean, I'm not following. R. Cartier explained if they were going to access the cistern, an engine would come in to tie it to the cistern to get the water back out. They can't go around here; they'd have to lay in here a one way. M. Murphy said this area in the middle is always open because there's constant traffic through here. What makes sense to me is the truck pulls in forward and then backs around into this area. I don't see that as a difficult thing to do, physically, I do this with my 26 foot box truck all the time. It's not that much of a challenge but I'd have to talk to the Fire Chief about the access to that. That is why I left a lot of area over here, the bottom of that 10 x 160 so that however they decide to pull in here and whatever makes the most sense, they have the room to maneuver out here and this is just a straight run backwards. I haven't had a chance to sit down with Dean to go over it. I've got a lot going on right now and it didn't happen, I wish it had.

R. Cartier said I think there is still a concern with access to the cistern. The other things have pretty much been taken care of but the Chief does have some concerns about that cistern being blocked and looking at the plans if anything happened in there, it's going to be tough to get too. M. Murphy said yeah, I understand if it was up by the road it could be used in the event of something happening here. I don't know why it was put where it was and it was approved by the Candia Planning Board at the time. I don't know why they didn't put it up here, I wish that they had. In the event of something happening here most likely they would be pulling water from somewhere else because this is just physically even without storage there, it's too close in proximity to the building for them to pull water out is what was expressed to me I believe it was by the last Chief, don't quote me who it was but it was expressed by someone in the Fire Department that we would never pull water from here if this building was burning because you can't do that. Yes, it would be better up here without a doubt and I would like to get it up here for you guys eventually, I had no part in the decision of where it went when it went in.

R. Cartier asked do you have any requirements that limit what can be stored in your storage areas and how would you enforce that; flammables, combustibles things like that. M. Murphy replied we do have policies and we do tell people this is not to be for the storage of combustibles like the storage of gasoline tanks and things like that. If someone wants to store a motorcycle and their not storing extra cans of gasoline with it, we have allowed that in the past. It's a common thing for people to ask but we do generally tell people it's in our contract no flammables, no explosives, no combustibles, etc. We do our best to enforce that to some degree in any storage facility people will try to slide things in that they know are not supposed to be there but we do our best. I can't tell you absolutely they'll never be a can of gas. I can't say that for absolute certainty. K. Kustra asked how do you intend to enforce any violation. M. Murphy replied the only thing I can think of is someone parking in the wrong spot and blocking access to the cistern. Monetarily. Fine them first time, heavy fine and threaten eviction 2nd time and evict them the 3rd time, with the building tenants. If one of my storage tenants does something stupid, that's a one shot deal; I'll just evict them. That's not a big deal. Empty your 10 x 10 and get out. I've evicted people for several things. The big guys I would give them a three strike policy. We have fined them before for various things at this point.

D. Murray said Mr. Murphy has completed all the electrical upgrades to the existing building and it now sports a brand new fire alarm system. M. Murphy added with tested dialer and monitoring system, the whole 9 yards. D. Murray continued horns, strobes, pull stations, main panel, annunciator, state of the art. R. Cartier commented that is quite an advancement for that building.

R. Cartier said the only thing I see of any concern is accessing the cistern system that the Chief has noticed problems before. We could continue the application until there is some definitive response between the owner Mark and the Fire Chief. M. Murphy said that would make sense. J. Bedard asked didn't the Fire

Chief already comment? What is there left to discuss? M. Laliberte replied he made the comment that if there's no blockage he's okay. He just doesn't want to block it. J. Bedard replied but he said he's going to deal with the blockage. M. Laliberte continued but I think it would be incumbent upon the Chief to make sure of that on his own to make sure he's comfortable with that. You want to talk to the Chief to make sure that everything is copacetic in terms of that plan. M. Murphy replied I was hoping to have that opportunity before the meeting; yes unfortunately I didn't because of my medical stuff. J. Bedard asked do you feel that we can't move forward because you two need too...that was not what I got from what he said.

D. Young replied no, the whole deal was he was going to move it up by the road, now he wants to leave it because of the cost. I understand that because of the circumstances behind him losing his help, his friend. I don't have a problem with that but it does us no good to leave it there if we can't get to it. He knows the stuff that's down there and he just needs to make sure we can get to it. It's no different than any hydrant; if someone parks in front of a hydrant the car gets towed. Same thing. M. Murphy said I can make a notation or conditional approval or you could continue it and I can come back with a plan that the Chief has signed off in terms of where the striping goes.

R. Cartier said the task for us right now is to determine whether we're going to deem the application complete and accept the application and then move forward. M. Laliberte said so maybe he still does that plan but make it part of the condition. That we approve it conditionally and then what you talked about with meeting the Chief and signing off on that is the main condition.

K. Kustra commented I'd like to see once a month an unannounced inspection by the Fire Chief as to whether or not something is in the way. D. Young said I can do that when I go to the dump and check the dump road. The one that there's a car in front of and the other one that the guys got stuff in front of that I have to stop at and tell him to move his stuff. That will be a 3rd place I can look at. M. Murphy said he certainly has the right to do that anytime.

MOTION

J. Bedard **motioned** to accept the application as complete. M. Chalbeck **seconded**. K. Kustra was **opposed**. **The remaining members were all in agreement. Motion carried (6-1-0).**

R. Cartier continued so do we have the public hearing for this application tonight or do we continue it on to the next meeting 30 days after. A. Bickum said this was noticed as a public hearing. R. Cartier said so we can do it. Board agreed. I just want to make sure the Board's comfortable with that based on the conversations we had at the last meeting.

R. Cartier said I'm going to open up the Public Hearing portion of this and we can address the issues that have come up and see what needs to be done for conditions so you can get moving forward. We won't make you go through the whole thing again. A. Hall commented I would like to ask the Code Enforcement Officer if he's satisfied. I was just looking at the cease and desist order issued November 29, 2017. What's been done in the interim and is it sufficient to relieve his mind.

D. Murray replied I'm okay with that, this plan now. The structures were removed from out back and the existing building has received the upgrades that I requested; I'm good with this now. R. Cartier said and you're comfortable with the change of use as acceptable. D. Murray agreed, oh yeah.

R. Cartier said so the conditions were we're going to have Mr. Murphy meet with Chief Young to make sure the access is acceptable to the Fire Department for fire apparatus. Were there any other conditions that we discussed? J. Bedard said the completion schedule. R. Cartier said it doesn't look there's going to be much you're going to have to do at this point in time. Your feelings for completion for getting everything done including getting a letter from the Fire Chief for his approval. You had June 21st as your original target date. M. Murphy responded some of these might have to be the white box units I have now. I had intended on ordering these but not knowing the outcome of this and then the steel industry went nuts because of Trump tweets, now there's a 3-4 month wait on some of these buildings. So it might be white box units as opposed to the green door re-locatable more permanent looking structures in these spots until

then. I'm not sure if that's an issue with anyone. They would eventually be replaced with these when they come in but it's going to take us some time to get those in at this point. It wasn't like that a few months back before the tariff thing. R. Cartier reiterated so you would have something in there in the interim so they would be the size but would look a little different. I don't think we would have a problem. The size is there, that's what we'd be concerned with. I don't think that will hold things up. So does that make your June time frame good? M. Murphy said that should be fine. R. Cartier summarized so put in the condition that work is completed by June 21, 2018.

MOTION:

J. Bedard **motioned** to approve the application with conditions. M. Chalbeck **seconded**. **K. Kustra was opposed. The remaining members were all in agreement. Motion passed (6-1-0).**

M. Murphy replied so I will get with the Fire Chief; do I schedule another meeting? No? Ok so just close it out between you, me and Dave. A. Bickum said they just need a letter.

Continuation of 18-003 Major Site Plan Review Application: Applicant: In-Laws Construction, LLC, 298 Chester Turnpike, Candia, NH 03034; Owner: In-Laws Construction, LLC / Roger Demanche Jr.; Property location: 510 Old Candia Road, Candia NH 03034; Map 413 Lot 105; Intent: To build an office building in the L2 District.

(Application was not complete on 3-14-18 so this case was continued to April 18th, 2018)

Present: Applicant Roger Demanche, Owner In-laws Construction; Robert Breault; Bryan Ruoff of Stantec.

Abutters Present: None

R. Demanche handed out 11 x 17 copies of the plans and introduced himself for the record Roger Demanche Jr. In-Laws Construction. Robert Breault introduced himself.

R. Cartier read from the Incomplete Letter from March 14th, 2018:

REASON(S) FOR DISAPPROVAL:

1. *Too many incomplete or missing items on the submitted application and plan set.*
2. *See Stantec comments numbers 1-27 regarding the application completeness review on their letter dated February 27, 2018 and Rudy Cartier's initial review comments on the application review checklist.*
3. *Additional Stantec items numbers 28-69, pertain to the overall project and as many as possible should be resolved with meetings between the engineering firms prior to the April 18th Planning Board meeting.*

NEXT STEP(S):

1. *Have your engineer meet with Stantec to review the 69 items noted in Stantec's letter dated February 27, 2018 and address as many as possible prior to the next meeting, which was continued to April 18th, 2018.*
2. *Submit 4 copies of the revised set of plans to the Land Use Office along with any other information in order for the Planning Board to be able to accept the application as complete prior to April 18th, 2018. See the Major Site Plan Application checklist and/or our Major Site Plan regulations; online at www.candianh.org.*

R. Demanche said so we had 69 items. Marc Burnell, my engineer, he corresponded with Stantec and we worked on the 69 and then Stantec sent us another letter that we were down to 8, which you have there. We clarified those 8.

R. Cartier asked if he got a copy of Stantec's letter that was dated today. *Andrea handed him a copy.* We have Bryan Ruoff our engineer is also here. I haven't had a chance to look through it but there is approximately 88. B. Ruoff said yes there are 47 remaining comments. Just to clarify, our previous letter dated last Friday was a completeness review but not a technical review letter. Two totally different reviews. R. Cartier clarified so the one we have now that you submitted today is the technical review. B. Ruoff agreed, correct. R. Cartier said okay so we'll start off with the other letter for the completeness review. That is the one dated April 12th correct? B. Ruoff agreed. B. Breault said in your packet you should have a letter from Horizon Engineering addressing the 8 points following the discussion between Stantec and Horizon Engineering. R. Cartier said so this one goes along with the Stantec letter so if we have one of them we can do a one on one comparison. The April 12th letter from Stantec and the April 16th letter from Horizon Engineering would be the response to that. I believe you have put the comments from Stantec first and then answered on your letter so if we use your letter we can correlate them easily between the two. B. Breault agreed, that is correct.

R. Cartier read:

Dear Mr. Giffen:

Horizons Engineering, Inc. offers the following comment responses the latest completeness review submitted by Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

1. The application is required to include the existing zoning variances of special exceptions, although the plans indicate in a not that a special exception was granted for the Project the note must provide the details of that special exception. a. The variance is so that the commercial property that is less than 2 acres can be developed. R. Cartier said I believe what we would be looking for is to have that on the plans. We are looking to have that on the plans; the plans are what are going to be the record. If someone comes in to look at the project, they're going to look at the plans first. The more we have on the plans the better it is for review. I know the variance is on file but instead of saying see file if it's right on there, what the variance is, then there's no question, that's what we're approving. B. Beault replied that would be a simple addition. D. Murray said any variances that are granted; I also put them on the building permit. So it shows up on record. R. Cartier said the Zoning Board has that too but we as the Planning Board are looking at the plans you're submitting to us and if it's on the plan we have no questions.

2. The plans are required to show all proposed utilities, including telephone, electric and cable, which are not shown on the plans. a. See sheet 4, contractor to set new utility pole for 3-phase power. This is intended to include phone and cable. R. Cartier asked is that overhead or underground utilities coming in. R. Demanche said overhead and then underground. R. Cartier said you said that was on sheet 4. I see the water service. B. Breault confirmed there are two sheets 3. That should be 4 of 8 (not 3 of 5), that's the only one out of sequence. R. Cartier asked where is the electrical coming in. B. Breault pointed it out on the plan. R. Demanche said overhead from there and then underground to the building. R. Cartier confirmed so underground from the new pole you are setting. R. Demanche agreed. R. Cartier asked the propane tank is going to be owned by you or the supplier? R. Demanche said Viking, they do everything. R. Cartier confirmed so they'll put in the piping, riser, and regulator. R. Demanche replied everything. R. Cartier suggested that you put in the note that it's going to be installed and owned by whatever propane supplier that you have because it looks like right now, you're going to purchase the tank, which is an option. R. Demanche responded said it's still an option depending on cost obviously. It comes down to cost. R. Cartier said my concern and I think Bryan had this concern too, if you look at your elevation in the back, (in the architectural set) it's not clear where the tanks going to be located in relationship to the overhead doors. It has to be 10 feet from the building. B. Beault replied quite a bit to the right of that. If you look at the parking spaces in the back on sheet 3 of 8, the overhead doors are to the right; 2 of the parking spots line up with 2 of the doors and quite a bit to the right of that. It's intended to be put in at that slope of the parking lot closer to the building and the drive. If you look at the gradation there, it drops pretty severely,

put it where nobody would park and keep it out of harm's way. R. Cartier reiterated my concern about underground tanks for a number of reasons, would there be any problem locating the tank off the paved area towards the right of way? R. Demanche said that's an option. B. Beault said that could be an option. There is kind of a drainage situation through there so we didn't want to put it in a wet area. R. Cartier replied the way you have it in there right now for the location of the utilities, this could be a discussion for when we finally do approve the application, that the location would probably not be the best location for the utility based on the traffic and if it's in on an area where coming down that hill I would be concerned in the winter, even though there would be bollards around it I've seen them get pretty wrecked up. It's underground so you'll just have the cap on the top. That's just a concern that I have on that.

3. The plans are required to show the existing tree line and proposed plantings. a. Due to the close quarters of the site, we are requesting a waiver on the proposed plantings. As far as existing tree line, the entire site outside of both right of ways (Old Candia Road, NH 101) is considered lightly wooded. R. Cartier commented you'd have to submit an official waiver for that. It's something you can do, no question about it. I think in part of Bryan's review, it's not showing the existing tree line which would be something that should be on the plans. B. Ruoff replied two-fold really, essentially the limits of disturbance are so close to hitting the requirement of a SWPPP and NOI, it really should be well defined what the limits of clearing and limits of disturbance are. The existing tree line and the proposed tree line should be shown. R. Cartier replied so it's protection for the applicant to make sure they stay below the threshold limits triggering. B. Ruoff replied if the intent is to not permit for SWPPP NOI which is my understanding from looking at the plans. R. Demanche confirmed, yep. B. Beault said on page 5 of 8 the limit of disturbance is noted, so anything outside that limit would not be disturbed. R. Cartier said I only see the 3 pine trees, everything else is clear and there's no tree line between that and the pond and the wetlands area. R. Demanche said it's lightly wooded. R. Cartier replied just put it on there that this area is lightly wooded. I think you said this would be the limits of disturbed so everything from there would remain lightly wooded in its natural state. As part of the process you just put in for an official waiver of any regulation, there's a format for that; basically the section that you want a waiver. B. Beault asked if there was a formal application for that. A. Bickum replied just a letter noting what you're waiving and the regulation.

4. The plans are required to identify the horizontal and vertical datums that were used for the development of the plans. a. Horizontal datum is New Hampshire state plane coordinate system. Vertical datum is NAVD 88. Provided on previously submitted boundary survey by Corner Post Land Surveying, Inc. R. Cartier asked was that something that was submitted in the package. R. Demanche said that was submitted, yes. R. Cartier said Bryan did you see the survey. B. Ruoff responded yes the survey was provided in the plans but this note isn't provided in this part of the plans. I would like to see this note on the plan. I think all these responses are reasonable but I would say that 6 of these items need to be incorporated in the plans for the plan submission to be considered complete.

5. The plans are required to list all pavement radii and curves for the proposed pavement. a. See sheet 3, layout plan includes all radii. B. Beault said you'll note as you come down the drive, 30 foot radius, another 30 feet over approximately 30 feet a 20 foot radius and continues on as you exit the site. Starts at the beginning all the way through and the front is a similar situation listed on both sides of the drive. I'd say that's complete. R. Cartier asked and there would be pavement markings and signage for the one way traffic. B. Beault replied that's the intention. R. Demanche said that's shown.

6. The plan set is required to include a landscaping plan. a. We are requesting a waiver for the landscaping plan, due to the tight quarters of the site. (Redundant)

7. *The plan set is required to include a circulation plan that demonstrates that a fire engine can service the site. a. See attached exhibit. Fire truck circulation was generated using AutoTurn 10 for AutoCad.* B. Beault said its part of the letter of submission here and you can make that part of the set. I don't know if the Chief has reviewed this at all. R. Cartier asked the Chief if he'd seen the circulation plan for the Fire Truck; Fire Apparatus. D. Young replied yes. R. Cartier said and you're comfortable with it. D. Young replied yes.

8. *The application submittal is required to include colored rendering of the proposed buildings. Although building plans have been provided, they do not meet the requirements of the site plan regulations to provide color renderings. a. Color renderings were provided both times of review.* B. Beault said in addition to that we have a presentation showing the intended colors of the building. R. Cartier replied let's start with the first one and see how the Board feels. B. Beault asked so you actually want to see a plan colored? R. Cartier said I believe we've done that in the past; where it's on the plans itself as close as possible to the rendering. The reason for that is it's hard to visualize the whole building just having the samples that are on there. R. Demanche replied so this color could be changed. R. Cartier said not initially, part of the regulations require that you submit to what you're to going to propose to have the building look like in the architectural renderings. So what colors you'd have in there, the colors for the shutters, roof and things like that. R. Demanche added and the siding. R. Cartier continued as close to possible what your plan is to have for the color needs to be submitted in the drawings. Are you doing horizontal siding; so if it's shown with horizontal siding and the color and it was in there. R. Demanche said most of the plans show horizontal siding. B. Beault said I missed that. R. Demanche replied when it was first submitted it was. It's right there.

R. Cartier said so those are the items that Bryan had noted. There were a couple more when I looked at the original application review checklist, most of them having been addressed. I'll just go over the ones that are still outstanding;

- Name and street address of owner put that on the plans (*if not on there*)
- With the abutters, you should have the State of NH for an abutter for the right of way on the highway. The abutter would be the State of NH, *State Route 101*. B. Beault said list it on the plan. R. Cartier confirmed yes. R. Demanche said it's stated right there. B. Beault said are you looking for more elaborate language? R. Cartier said where you have the abutters address and name, all you need is to put that on there but it makes it complete that all the abutters are listed.
- The other one I have the use of all abutting properties shown, you did put the houses on sheet 1 so that's in there.
- I also mentioned the zoning variance.
- The radius of the curves is done.
- Bryan have you had a chance to do the pipes adequate for a 25 year floodplain and the storm water plans. B. Ruoff said yes.

R. Cartier continued the other one was the on-site water supply which we need to discuss. There was a conflict in how that was addressed so I think we need to address that first before we can get the application approved for you too. I know in the letter from the Chief he had proposed that you make a donation; contribute \$1.50 per square foot to the Fire Department Water Supply Capital Reserve Fund – Cost would be approximately \$5,130.00. The problem is in the Major Site Plan Reviews, donations aren't allowed. What the section says: *All new multi-family structures of three or more dwelling units, commercial and industrial buildings constructed in the Town of Candia shall have provisions for on premise use water supply in accordance with the NH State Fire Code NFPA#1142.* There is one option that you can do in there. *The fire department may, at the discretion of the Chief, require the developer to contribute the cost for the installation of an on-site cistern or fire pond to the Town of Candia Water Supply Capital Reserve Fund if it is determined that this option will improve the overall fire protection of the Town.* Thus the only other option with doing either a sprinkler system, a cistern or a fire pond. R. Demanche said I already

talked to the Fire Chief. B. Beault said he's prepared to contribute. R. Demanche said I'm going to contribute to that. R. Cartier replied in place of the...alright. Do you know what the cost of the cistern is? R. Demanche said the cistern, no. R. Cartier continued that's one thing you'd have to determine first to see how much would be the contribution into the cistern because as we said before on the application that just came in here, cisterns are running \$30,000 or \$40,000 up to \$60,000 dollars. R. Demanche said that's not quite what I talked to the Chief about but I need to. D. Young replied I'm good with the amount he's going to pay, that's the Chiefs discretion, that's my discretion. That's what I come up with for an amount for that. R. Cartier said unfortunately Chief there's nothing in the zoning that allows it that way. D. Young said it says the Chief's discretion of what it would cost. That's my amount; Chief's discretion. R. Cartier replied not in that case, your discretion is whether *to require the developer to contribute the cost of the installation of an on-site cistern or a fire pond to the Town of Candia*. D. Young replied \$5,000, my discretion, \$5,000. Much better for the Town of Candia than to have him put a cistern in over there or dig a fire pond or sprinkle the building. Much better for the citizens of Candia to get some money in to our...and its so cost prohibitive to him to spend \$30,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000 to put into an amount. Much better for the applicant to do that. Much better for the citizens of the Town of Candia; for the Fire Department. R. Cartier said the problem is the amount of money that would be contributed. There's nothing...I know that your letter says it would be \$1.50 per square foot but the way that the regulation is stated, it has to be the cost for the installation of an on-site cistern or fire pond. D. Young said well fine then he can ask for the waiver for the amount that I've come up with and I'm sure the Board would agree with that because I think they would agree with my way of thinking that it's better for the Townspeople, the Fire Department and it's better for him. R. Cartier said he can definitely request a waiver and we can look at it. But the way that it is right now and the way it's been interpreted and done and been put into play in Candia for the last 20 years or so. D. Young commented not in the last 10 Rudy. Not in the last 10 since I've been Chief. R. Cartier said the last one we had put in was probably Candia First Stoppe and they put a cistern in. D. Young replied that was before, they've been there. I've been Chief for 9 years. You haven't been Chief for 9 years. I've been Chief for 9 years so it was before that. R. Cartier replied so the precedent has been set. D. Young replied it's the Chief's discretion. R. Cartier reiterated but the Chief's discretion is only...D. Young replied well I disagree. I disagree, I whole heartedly disagree. I talked to the applicant about it and that's what we've been using and it's worked very well in the past. We've bought a lot of good stuff for the Fire Department with the money we've gotten from Carmen Sarno; from the Steel Company; people who have given to our fund. R. Cartier said you can request a waiver and we'll address it at that particular point in time.

R. Cartier said those are the comments we have for the application. What's in front of us now is whether we want to accept the application or with the items noted and the waivers requested we either continue the hearing to the next time that's available for you and the Board or we deny the application. I'd be open to a motion. B. Beault said we were hoping to leave here with a conditional approval so that we can start planning on construction; construction season is around the corner and he'd like to get this built before the snow flies again. There is a sense of urgency on our part to get some kind of conditional approval having a list of conditions to satisfy, some of them are basically notations on the plan and rather simple to do and with a list to work from we can satisfy all the requirements and move on. J. Bedard said so are we saying the application is incomplete Mr. Chair? R. Cartier replied yes. J. Bedard continued so we're not even at that point, you're getting way ahead of us. J. Lindsey said the motion is on the floor to continue. R. Cartier said they have a couple of waivers to submit and a few other minor things. B. Beault said the next meeting is May 2nd. R. Demanche said I won't be around May 2nd. B. Beault said I can come present on the 2nd if we satisfy all the requirements. R. Demanche said he can do the 2nd.

MOTION:

J. Lindsey **motioned** that we continue it to May 2nd. M. Chalbeck **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed (7-0-0).**

Other BusinessThank You Letter and Certificate for Tom Giffen:

R. Cartier asked if everyone had signed the letter and certificate for Tom Giffen. The Board requested that Tom Giffen be invited to the Planning Board meeting on May 2nd so they could present him with them in person.

Crowley Woods Meeting on May 16th:

J. Bedard said I've talked to a few people in Town on the upcoming meeting on Crowley Woods and I would like to reverse my position on not having people speak up because there are a lot of bad feelings out there. This one person told me that it doesn't have to be noticed as a public hearing for people to speak. Is that true. A. Bickum said I think you can ask the abutters if they want to say something during a public meeting; a planning board meeting. J. Bedard said but why can't other people. J. Lindsey said because we haven't decided one way or the other, it hasn't even been accepted as complete and then to talk about a bunch of stuff that may not even pertain to a plan, that's what I see. J. Bedard said I agree. I'm the one who suggested it last time. But now I'm hearing people are going to be upset if they can't speak. M. Laliberte asked is there a mechanism that would allow for that, an unofficial mechanism to do that. Have that sort of outpouring without it being an official meeting. J. Lindsey said if they feel strongly they could submit their feelings to the Board ahead of time but I think it's too premature to start discussing a bunch of stuff that hasn't even been decided yet. I talked to other people too and May 16th, not time to discuss at this point, it's not even complete. R. Cartier said that's the key point. We don't even know if we're going to accept the application at the 16th. J. Lindsey said so why waste hours discussing something that...R. Cartier said there are still outstanding issues that haven't been addressed yet. B. Ruoff agreed, there are. R. Cartier said I've had comments too from people that say it's frustrating to come to these meetings and not be able to talk about it but people have to realize we have certain procedures we have to follow. We did get an advisory opinion from the lawyer too on that. Basically he said do exactly what you said (in your last meeting). I know it's going to be frustrating for people because it's a hot button issue and we'll get a little bit of heat for it but people have to realize we just can't open it up to everybody and not even have an application. J. Bedard I agree. D. Lewis said one thing, maybe at the very beginning of that meeting; just what you're discussing should be said at the beginning of the meeting so they are aware that you aren't just blowing them off. You have a procedure you have to follow and what they bring up may not even pertain to what's on the plans so they need to be informed of that so they don't just sit there with their pent up anger, ready to explode.

M. Laliberte said whomever writes an op-ed and puts it in the sparsely read Hooksett Banner but then is something that can be linked to the Facebook page or could be put on the website to communicate best we can. It won't cover everything and won't make people happy but we get the message out of the procedural issues we must do before the May 16th meeting and say listen, we get it but this is what we're required to do and not do. R. Cartier said I was going to ask Andrea to talk to the lawyer about that same thought. The Candia Facebook page has 1000 people on it or something and I thought that would be a good venue to do exactly what you said, we're going to have the hearing but this is legally what we have to do and how it will be structured. I don't mind writing it up and sending it to the Board. M. Laliberte said my feeling was if there was any concern you could have written the op-ed and a quote concerned citizen could have posted that onto the Facebook, that page. You're on that page and you could have responded to any comments that came from that if required. R. Cartier said I have to be careful if I put it on there...A. Bickum said I think that's a really bad idea. I think putting it on Facebook is a bad idea, period. M. Laliberte said well he's not putting it on Facebook. A. Bickum said I don't want to put it on Facebook, I'm not on Facebook. M. Laliberte said what I'm saying is if Rudy does an op-ed and it goes into the Hooksett

Banner or the Union Leader, at that point it's public and anybody can put anything on the Facebook page. Any person can do it. If they see it, they can cut and paste and do that. That's not us putting it on the Facebook page, that's a quote concerned citizen. R. Cartier said the problem is anybody who is on this Board who does this; you have to be very careful because it could show a bias. And if you show a bias then the applicant has....M. Laliberte said the way that Board's going, it doesn't have to be any one of us. R. Cartier said you did a great job writing up the public hearing notice that went in the paper. A. Bickum replied it wasn't a public hearing notice. R. Cartier said public meeting. A. Bickum replied a legal public notice where the public hearing will be scheduled later. R. Cartier said I saw that and I said that's perfect, see if that can be put out somehow in the broadcast world. A. Bickum responded it will be when the public notice comes out, 10 days prior to the meeting. In two locations; at the post office and the Town Hall. R. Cartier said the problem with the public notices like Dennis was saying, I don't know of many people that get the Union Leader anymore but you can count on five hands how many people actually read the legal notices in the paper. How do we get that information out to people so that they know ahead of time? D. Lewis said I wouldn't post it on Facebook. I wouldn't go with anything. They come to the meeting and there's an announcement by the Planning Board to the audience. D. Murray commented let the people do their due diligence and follow along in the hearings. A. Bickum picked up the *New Hampshire Planning and Land Use Regulation book 2017-2018 edition* and said this says two public places and newspaper of choice. That's it and website if the Town has a website. M. Laliberte said I get that. I get there are legal things we have to do in terms of posting and we don't want to open ourselves up to liability. That's fine but the people coming into this meeting on the 16th, unless they're fully understanding of this, unless there is some way this gets out to the world, they're going to expect to talk and if they don't, you've seen people get upset. J. Bedard said this is the 3rd time where they can't speak. J. Lindsey reiterated but it hasn't been accepted and they need to learn it. How can we tell them that they need to be educated and we can't let them speak until we've accepted it, it's that simple. M. Laliberte commented I don't disagree with you but that doesn't necessarily change how people are going to feel about this. There are people desperate for a venue to vent however they want to. J. Lindsey said how can we get the message out in a nice normal way. R. Cartier said we do that at the beginning of the meeting and read the notice of the meeting at the beginning of the meeting. A. Hall said Clark Thyng the moderator did that at the last meeting and read the game plan and this is the way it's going to be. J. Lindsey said can you include remember this is a public meeting we cannot take public comment at this because it has not been accepted as complete. Can that disclaimer be added to the newspaper notice? Can we put it on the school sign? R. Cartier said what Andrea said, you have to post it at the Town Hall and the Post Office but I don't think there is anything prohibiting us from having the announcement of the public meeting in any media. J. Lindsey said can't you put something simple, May 16th Planning Board Crowley Road, sorry no public comment yet. R. Cartier suggested the legal notice on the sign. J. Bedard said but it's really long. M. Laliberte said 10 days out, we post the public notice. Could that verbatim be on the Facebook page? J. Bedard asked do we have a Facebook page. No, it's an unofficial community page. R. Cartier said someone who is not on the Board and not related to anyone on the Board could do it and we wouldn't get into trouble because we're not putting it out there. M. Chalbeck said my wife, Beth runs that. She's the admin and if there's any fighting over that she's going to take it down. She can block it. M. Laliberte reiterated I think people do need to know about this as much as possible and educate themselves as best as they possibly can and then we say at the beginning of the meeting...J. Bedard said but this doesn't say that people can't speak. A. Bickum said I don't think I can legally say that. J. Bedard said I'm not saying you should.

B. Ruoff asked it's possible although albeit unlikely that Eric Mitchell could provide the documents required to consider this application complete; it's possible. My question to the Board would be what would be the cutoff to review and confirm that. If he's going to come in the day of the meeting to expect, and I could see him possibly doing that, because I've seen it done before. I'm not saying he's trying to pull anything but it's frequently done in the business. So the question for me becomes what is a reasonable amount of time to make a determination of whether his application is complete because that's a big ticket

issue of whether anyone can speak and the legal ramifications of just one person speaking that's not on the Board or the applicant and then starts the clock of the Board needs to make a determination within 60 days on the application and the plans and obviously if it's incomplete, you can't do that. I think the Board needs to know going into the meeting if they're going to determine it complete or incomplete because you need to educate everyone there. We need time to actually confirm that the application is complete because there is a lot involved and there are a lot of people opposed to it.

R. Cartier said we get stuff at the last minute and if we had it 15 days in advance, everyone could at least take a look at it so you come to the meeting prepared. If it comes in 2 days before with the application, I could probably review it because I work part time but everyone else has a life. To me it's not fair to anyone on the Board to have something like that happen so that does have to be conveyed to the public and I think Dennis's suggestion is the only way to go. We can do word of mouth; we can tell people exactly what goes on. People have asked me when the little note was on the bottom about the public meetings and that came from the discussion we had with Matt (*he meant Mike*), so that way people will get a feel. We're going to have this meeting on May 16th but we still haven't accepted an application so that's what we're going to be looking at, is it complete. We can't comment on it as a Board either until its deemed complete. Then we can look at it. I think if we have limitations on the meeting times, it's going to go more than one night. J. Lindsey stated right, so when it becomes complete, our next meeting would be at this time and that when people can come and there's going to be a lot so you'll want to have another meeting. A. Bickum added and that has to be noticed again because it wasn't noticed as a public hearing. R. Cartier said we'll think about this and at the next meeting we'll bring it up again. I have some quick things.

Side note: Mark Chalbeck is signed up to attend the OSI Planning and Zoning Conference.

Tracking Cases:

R. Cartier said I'm trying to keep track of when we've approved plans, I'm trying to keep track of outstanding items that we don't have back yet.

- 1) Candia South Branch Brook Holdings – Site Plan: when Ron Severino came to us for his new office building. I think we need to send him a letter saying to submit the revised site plan because there were some items that were missing that we needed to have so if you could send him a note.
- 2) Candia First Stoppe: – where they switched the location of the ice cream area, we need the new site plan for that showing the new building location, the changes for where the old one was and the utilities going to that new building. An update to the site plan. It's a significant change to the site plans so we need a new updated site plan.
- 3) Proposal for Hook Road and Brown – Informational thing in here so just keep track of that one. (*Thompson Informational*)

MOTION:

J. Lindsey **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 8:45 pm. A. Hall **seconded**. **All were in favor.**
Motion carried (7-0-0).

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

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary
cc file