

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES of October 17, 2018  
APPROVED**

Present: Al Hall III, Vice Chair; Joyce Bedard; Ken Kustra; Scott Komisarek, BOS Representative; Josh Pouliot, Alt.

Absent: Rudy Cartier, Chair; Mark Chalbeck; Judi Lindsey; Mike Santa, Alt.

Present: Dave Murray, Building Inspector; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Bryan Ruoff of Stantec; resident Becky Hopkins; Rob Jones, President of the CYAA.

Vice Chair Al Hall called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Alternate Josh Pouliot sat in for Judi Lindsey.

Minutes October 3rd, 2018:

K. Kustra made a **motion** to accept the minutes of October 3rd, 2018 as presented. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed (5-0-0).**

*No applicant was present for the informational (Robert Johnston) so the Board continued.*

**18-010 Major Site Plan Application:** Applicant: JCC Legacy Realty Trust, LLC, PO Box 219, Candia, NH 03034, Owner: Same; Property Location: 33 & 43 Raymond Road, NH 03034; Map 409 Lots 207-1 & 206; Intent: To create a change of use for a storage container display area and tractor trailer exit with a snow clearing machine in the commercial district. Upon a finding by the Board that the application meets the submission requirements of the Candia Major Site Plan Regulations the Board will vote to accept the application as complete and a public hearing on the merits of the proposal will follow immediately. Should a decision not be reached at the public hearing, this application will stay on the Planning Board agenda until such time as it is either approved or disapproved.

Present: Robert (Bob) Kilmer of Sandford Surveying and Engineering; Earl Sandford of Sandford Surveying and Engineering; Bryan Ruoff of Stantec Engineering.

Abutters Present: Rob Jones, President of the CYAA

B. Kilmer presented updated plans, a list of six waivers and responses to Stantec's technical review letter dated October 3, 2018. The first sheet is your existing conditions plan showing the lot 207-1 and this small area lot 206. The proposal is to merge 206 into 207-1; 207-1 now is 33.9 acres and 206 is .49 acres so with the merger lot 207-1 would be 34.4 acres. What they're proposing is a site plan to have a storage container display area in front. This is the existing garage on the site now which will remain as storage. Proposing to pave an area and put a concrete pad in for a portable snow scraper to take the snow off the trailers before they go out on the road. They have 4 plug in truck stations on the side of the building here. The business, all use the existing entrance on 27. This was designed for the state as an in and out but mostly it would be used primarily in the winter months as an out (*exit*). Trucks come in, go through the scraper and continue out on their routes. There is a proposed landscape area in the front; this will be paved. The portable scraper will sit on a concrete pad 24' x 40'. A proposed utility underground is existing at the garage and they would be teeing off the garage and coming in to the portable scraper. Lighting; the scraper has 2 LED lights that would be downcast pointing back away from the road so they would see the trucks and operations. We designed a drainage swale here out to an outflow weir and then a level spreader and a

vegetative filter strip off this way. Most of the conditions on the site will remain as you see it, drive by it today. It will just be slight grading for drainage for this. We've got some snow storage areas in here to take care of the snow during the winter months.

Earl Sandford said we've addressed the comments (*from Stantec*) but we've just gotten them in today. Do you want us to go item by item? I'm always for brevity if there's a way to move it along without prolonging it too much.

J. Bedard said we need to accept the application as complete.

B. Ruoff asked what was the determination by the completeness review committee. We didn't perform a completeness review and I understand that that's being handled by the Board.

E. Sandford said by two faces I don't see tonight. We were both there at the review going through item by item going through the checklist and making sure they were satisfied.

S. Komisarek said it was reviewed by R. Cartier and M. Chalbeck. *The Road Agent did not need to review as it is a state road.*

J. Pouliot commented on the completeness review checklist; #12 construction drawings and details provided pavement and roadway profiles to be added. E. Sandford said we added those. A. Bickum said and we have the Police and Fire Department letters.

### **MOTION:**

S. Komisarek **motioned** to accept the application as complete. J. Pouliot **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (5-0-0).**

B. Ruoff of Stantec, the Town's Review Engineer, said there were 45 original comments, just scanning through the revisions and the responses; a lot has been taken care of. There are about 6 or 7 points to discuss with the Board and make a determination on and give them some direction. The first 4 comments are one's that warrant discussion. This is a simplistic site plan but unique in that it's in two different zones, commercial and residential. There's some regulations you may think don't necessarily need to be adhered to because the work isn't happening in the residential zone. Discuss these and then the submitted waivers.

There are two reasons why the existing lot is a non-conforming lot 1) because it isn't large enough 2) the existing shed is in the building setback. One is being corrected as the merging of the two lots the second the fact that the building is in the lot line setback is not. This is something where one of the reasons that this lot doesn't conform is not being corrected with this proposed merging of lots which is a requirement of two lots. It's confusing but that's how the zoning ordinance is written. The existing garage is too close to the property line so it's within the building setback in that zoning district. It's about a foot off from where it should be. Page 2 of the plan, the building setback line goes through the building.

J. Bedard said so it's not in compliance now. B. Ruoff agreed and the way the zoning ordinance is written, if two lots are going to be combined or merged or adjusted, a lot line adjustment for a non-conforming lot the resulting lot would need to be in conformance. This lot would still be in non-conformance even after a lot line adjustment.

B. Kilmer said the way I read the ordinance is talking about non-conforming lots and that would be the area part of it. Yes, as it sits, it would be non-conforming coming in for a site plan because it only has ½ an acre. That would be the zoning to me. Yes there is an issue with the existing building, but it's an existing condition that is treated differently from conformity. One's a lot and one's a structure. E. Sandford added we're not creating that by this merger, it's a pre-existing condition.

D. Murray, Building Inspector, added the garage in question is 20' x 20' if that and erected by the previous owner and there was a building permit and inspections were done. I'm not sure if he went through the ZBA or what but it was pre-existing before these people bought it. I would think it's a non-issue.

B. Ruoff said these first 4 all deal with zoning requirements, whether or not something should apply. My recommendation, since there is some gray area in the zoning and whether this lot is conforming

as it exists, I agree that nothing is being created that doesn't conform but probably where all of these items are a little gray from a zoning standpoint it's worth being heard in front of the Zoning Board. J. Bedard said I agree there's nothing they can do about it, we're not going to have them move the garage.

E. Sandford asked is it explicit in the regulation that it deals with buildings and not areas and setbacks that you're creating. This is something that happens all the time and I've never heard it interpreted this way before; a pre-existing condition you have to tear the building down if you want to add another ½ acre? That would be you're interpretation it seems. I'd like to take a good hard look to make sure this really does apply. I do not want to go to the ZBA on behalf of my client; we all know that that just adds complications and cost. It's easy for someone to recommend but I'm hoping that there is a voice of reason in terms of this. *Board moved on.*

B. Ruoff continued #2 the existing lot is again divided by residential and commercial district and a 100' vegetative buffer is required to be maintained along commercial zones and abutting residential zones. This is something that came up with the First Stoppe project as well. As specified in the regulations it should be noted that the existing conditions do not satisfy this but also there's no proposed improvements within the residential district of this property so it's another gray area. I suppose the residential and commercial district boundary goes through the property so they would be required to maintain a 100' buffer between the districts on their own property so in essence as long as they don't object to it, it seems like a non-issue but I wanted the Board to review. J. Bedard agreed.

D. Murray added the buffer hasn't been there for as long as I've been around. It was gone a long time ago when it was used as residential. I don't know if the Board wants them to put that buffer back; it's kind of grandfathered. J. Pouliot asked if there were any complaints. D. Murray replied no.

B. Ruoff continued #3 the plans propose to park four storage containers in the front yard of the lot facing Raymond Rd; this is proposed in the Commercial District section of the lot but is not allowed for lots in the Residential Zone which the lot is also a part of a lot that is in both commercial and residential zone it is recommended that the Board discuss whether this ordinance applies to this lot, in my opinion I would say no but it's your determination. B. Kilmer said on sheet 1, there's commercial zone in the black and residential here. J. Pouliot said if the containers are on the commercial side I think it's fine. J. Bedard agreed.

B. Ruoff continued #4 was initially was a comment because based on the description on the plans I wasn't sure if this was a changed use or just the expansion of an existing use and it's been clarified that it's not a changed use so it really shouldn't apply. The existing use isn't an accepted use in the zoning ordinances so I just brought that up. But where it's not being changed, it shouldn't make a difference. J. Bedard agreed.

B. Ruoff continued #7 so typically the Board for a lot merger or a lot line adjustment will have a separate lot line plan but I don't think it's required for this. What's depicted on the plan shows that very well. The question is are both property owners involved in the process or are both properties owned by the same owner? B. Kilmer clarified that both properties are owned by the same owner. The title on the deed to each property is JCC Legacy. J. Bedard said so both deeded to the same entity. B. Ruoff said it was more a procedural question about these lots being able to be combined and if they are owned by the same owner it doesn't make any difference and that comments resolved.

B. Ruoff said #40 and #41. I was looking at this from a fire protection and emergency vehicle access standpoint specific to #40 where the truck scraper is sort of in the lane and I was concerned about an emergency vehicle accessing this site and make it under the truck scraper. I think there is a second access to the site. E. Sandford confirmed there is ample room on either side of the scraper for a truck to pass through; it's a very open concept. B. Ruoff said the Fire Chief's letter he indicated he had no issues with the site.

#41 the last one dealt with the FEMA 100 year flood elevation and the response said see waivers but I didn't see a waiver for showing the 100 year flood elevation. B. Kilmer said you're right, I missed it. E. Sandford said I thought we were showing the 100 year flood. B. Kilmer replied we're showing the 100 year flood on the small... B. Ruoff said you do show it but it looks like it's digitized from the map instead

of being based on an elevation but it also looks like it's so far away from the site it's not going to be...B. Kilmer said it was my oversight and the reason why is the site development was so far away from even the digitized 100 year flood plain that that's why we would ask for that waiver. B. Ruoff said I think that explanation and clarification is fine although I think a waiver would be formally asked for on that. That covers it.

S. Komisarek said I'm concerned with the screeching cars you hear when the trucks pull out of there. They're trying to do a loop. They did work on the entrance. I don't think they were before the Planning Board but they worked on the two entrances trying to address some of the safety concerns. NH DOT approved the curb cut so it's a state road. That corner with people flying and those trucks coming out in first gear, second gear; it's only a matter of time. The sight distance isn't our issue. B. Kilmer said I don't think the trucks will come in and wrap around. That exit for the snow scraper would be for the trucks in the winter. I can't say that they'd never use it but it wouldn't necessarily be a turnaround because they'd have to go farther in to drop a container, pick up a container. S. Komisarek said so the entrance to the property now, is there any permit. D. Murray said for doing the end of the driveway, no. They flared it out. There was a driveway permit from the state. B. Kilmer confirmed the driveway permit for that is listed on there and you can contact them to see what it was. S. Komisarek said so it went to DOT on the initial entrance. B. Kilmer clarified correct when they did the original site plan back in mid to late 2000's. S. Komisarek said they had one curb cut, now they have two separate ones; are you saying that that's properly permitted? B. Kilmer replied I don't know. I can check with the state. From correspondence I saw from the other site plan, there were discussions and letters back and forth between Ray Shea and State DOT, at the time it was Jim Willis. S. Komisarek said it's about public safety, health and welfare and I would like to know if that's properly permitted to have those 2 curb cuts and now this curb cut but that's why I asked about that loop. They wouldn't need those two side by side. E. Sanford responded this was a specialized entrance only. The normal in and out would be the existing in and out that they have with the split. I remember discussions about it but Ray from our office was handling the nitty gritty. I don't know the answer but we're all after safety too. S. Komisarek said they have that state owned land purchased with federal money and some effort to get some additional acreage to the west of the state shed which would have combined with Carmen's parcel. It would have been nice for that use to stay down off of exit 3 but now it's up here and I want to make sure we do everything we can to make it as safe as possible. If this is specialized, then it makes sense to have those other two. I think the permitting is relevant. I think it was to address a safety concern but I'm not aware of them coming before the Board to do that and they created that. I'd like to know what the long term plan is and if this is just going to be a snow one and keep the other one the way it is. E. Sanford is that something we can handle as a condition. S. Komisarek replied we don't have Rudy here tonight, the chair, we're at a little bit of a disadvantage so I want to make sure we address everything properly. E. Sanford confirmed we did meet with the state guy out there and went over both; but he didn't say anything about non-conformity there and discussed the *traffic (unintelligible)* and that sort of thing. Being that it's their jurisdiction otherwise you could get your own guy to join in but it's the state's jurisdiction. They're strict.

D. Murray said I don't think there was enough disturbance there to come to the Planning Board. There was already a driveway there and they put a flare on it and split it down the middle with the stone work. The state's been there because when they hot topped it and I called DOT. S. Komisarek said so you're aware of where I'm coming from Dave. They needed to split that, so you called DOT before they paved that, that's good to know.

Abutter: Rob Jones, President of the CYAA commented we're the abutter to the west. So we abut the current access to the property. I wanted to hear what they had going on with this proposal with the other lot and changing some of the entrance ways. We have some requests to the property owner but that doesn't have to do with permitting here. We just want to make sure there's good visibility to our entrance coming and going on either eastbound or westbound on 27. We can take that up with them individually. As Scott says, they're going pretty fast down that road so if they have storage containers at the end of their entrance

way, you don't see our sign or entrance until you're well past the property but I think where these containers are going to be, it's further up the road. I think that's the small parcel where the Fire Department did there burn a few years ago. E. Sandford agreed and the trees for the wetlands block; are the most blocking view versus anything we're putting on for anyone coming around the corner. I think they've been working to get permission to cut that back but I don't know. B. Kilmer added again if you think stuff is too close to the road they do have to keep anything off the state property, the state right of way and it's a large right of way in that area. E. Sandford thought it was 100'. R. Jones replied I don't remember what the setback was for our sign but that's why the sign is so far back off the road so if you have to adhere to the same setbacks or even further for those containers then I guess the sign's visible. I know for a while there was a container close to the road cutting down visibility to the sign. We can take that up with them individually. Another topic was regarding property buffer lines. We recently cleared a bunch of trees up to the edge of our wetlands so we could do some expansion of some baseball fields and other fields so we're going to be wondering how far on the other side of that property line can they come up and do any building or expansion of their current facilities.

K. Kustra asked how many containers are to be displayed. B. Kilmer said four. K. Kustra suggested staggering the containers to allow more sight lines, more visibility. B. Kilmer said they gave us that layout, they're on the plan.

Another discussion about speeding cars ensued.

E. Sandford confirmed they're 60 feet back from the road. Well outside any sight line of any cars traveling on Raymond Road. The sight line for a car stays within the right of way and the natural vegetation is the most restrictive site impediment. There are some tall trees and bushes in here and those are only 15 feet off the road. We're 60 feet back; we're 4 times further back than the closest trees along the road.

Board discussed working through this with the help of Bryan Ruoff or do we continue it. Board discussed that as Rudy and Mark did not make any negative comments from the review, keep going. J. Bedard asked B. Ruoff if they could approve this or are there still things that need to be worked out. B. Ruoff said he needed at least a day to review everything I just received and I can issue another letter by the end of the week. E. Sandford said we'd be happy to continue on conditional approval that he's satisfied. B. Ruoff added the big thing that's been discussed is confirming all DOT permits so if the Board is going to approve it with conditions that it be a condition of being produced and the other permits that are being applied for as well.

J. Bedard said I'd like to make a motion to continue until Rudy's back. Board discussed and seemed comfortable with proceeding; these are small things. E. Sandford said from a safety standpoint, we don't know when the first snow is coming and we want to be ready and not have snow flying off those trailers. We're trying to facilitate something that's going to increase safety. J. Bedard said I didn't get a second so the motion is dead.

B. Ruoff reminded the Board that there were 6 waiver requests. The Board reviewed the six waiver requests. B. Kilmer went through the requests that were given to the Board that evening.

#### **1) Item 4.03E; Scale of plans**

- Existing conditions plan;
- Overall site at 200 scale
- Site at 30 scale
- Site Plan and Landscape and Drainage Plan;
- Area of proposed Site Plan at 20 scale

E. Sandford explained that this at 100 scale, the second one's at 200 scale to show everything together, otherwise we have to cut sheets and paste them together.

B. Kilmer said so it's required for 100 scale and existing conditions plan; we've created sheet 1 of the property at 200 scale and we have one site plan sheet 2 at 30 scale where it's requested at 20 scale. 34

acres at 20 scale would require several sheets. Showing the area of proposed site improvements is adequate since the remainder is not going to be altered with these proposed improvements.

### **MOTION**

J. Pouliot **motioned** to grant the waiver. S. Komisarek **seconded**. **All were in favor. Waiver granted with a vote of (5-0-0).**

B. Kilmer continued **2) Item 4.03G; Existing and proposed topography** of entire parcel. B. Kilmer explained that this was for the proposed topography of the entire parcel of 34.4 acres and we feel that showing just the area of the proposed site improvements that the rest of the area is not changing is a reasonable request.

### **MOTION**

J. Bedard **motioned** to grant the second waiver. J. Pouliot **seconded**. **All were in favor. Waiver granted with a vote of (5-0-0).**

B. Kilmer continued **3) Item 4.031; wetlands and man-made features on entire site**. The site consists of 34.404 acres and the requirement of showing the entire site at 20-scale would require several sheets. We feel that with the overall general site at 200 scale shown on sheet 1, anything within the proposed site plan would be a reasonable request to ask for a waiver instead of doing the entire site.

### **MOTION**

K. Kustra **motioned** to grant the third waiver. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Waiver granted with a vote of (5-0-0).**

B. Kilmer continued **4) Item 4.03T; Use of properties within 500' of site**. Since this proposal does not include additional building area and proposes no additional traffic because it's a coincidence use to the existing and that the proposed use is connected to the existing use of the property, we feel that this request is reasonable. We have shown within 300, the completeness checklist asks for and we've shown that on the 200 scale. B. Ruoff said it would be nice to know which driveways are within 500' of the existing driveway. It may already be depicted but it sounds like traffic in that area is a concern. Depict driveways within 500'. E. Sandford said the challenge is it's over a 1000 foot swathe so we can do that on a scale so that we're not pasting sheets. A lot of Towns use Google maps, they pass it out. I apologize for not providing that to you. Can we make it as a condition to do it on an 8 ½ x 11 showing the vicinity within 1000'.

### **MOTION**

J. Pouliot **motioned** to grant that waiver with an additional condition that an 8 ½ x 11 sheet depict the driveways within 500' in each direction. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Waiver granted with a vote of (5-0-0).**

B. Kilmer continued **5) Item 4.03M: Exterior Lighting and Signs**. The only lighting proposed at this time are lights connected to the portable snow scraper consisting of 2 LED lights downcast and shining away from Raymond Road for their use to access the scraper. If any additional lighting is proposed a revised Site Plan will be required. No signs for advertising except, those approved under the previously approved Site Plan. There is a sign shown at the other entrance that was approved from the previous site plan. That's the existing site plan, not this one.

K. Kustra asked how long the lights would be on. B. Kilmer said when they're using that, I don't know the hours. K. Kustra asked are they motion. B. Kilmer said my understanding is they will be lit when

they're using the scraper. D. Murray added right next door to the east side there is a residential use right there so the lighting might be a problem but on the other hand, we're talking safety and trucks going in and out all hours of the night it might be good to have the end of that exit lit at night. It's a tough call. Some things to think about. Board discussed lights. No one was sure about the hours of operation. E. Sandford said I think they are a daytime operation but I can't confirm.

B. Ruoff added there are two reasons to require a lighting plan. One is to make sure that the lighting proposed on the site doesn't spill over and bother other people, into the roadway etc. The other is to make sure there's sufficient light for the hours of operation so I would say if lighting is not anticipated to be required for this site then some kind of restriction needs to be noted on the plan as far as what the working hours are. If the site isn't going to be operated at 9 or 10 o'clock at night then you probably don't need lights for the site if it's within normal daytime hours but should be explicitly stated on the plan. If it's not adhered to the Board could always pull the plan and say you're in non-compliance and working outside the hours you said you were going to, you need lighting now. I can't really speak to what the light level of LED lights are but I think the wattage is pretty low. The Board should get that information to get confirmation of how strong the lights are.

### **MOTION**

S. Komisarek **motioned** to grant the waiver with the condition that they note the hours of operation on the plan and that they provide the wattage of the LED lights. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Waiver granted with a vote of (5-0-0).**

B. Kilmer continued:

6) **Item 8.11**; Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. We have a combined sheet in the plan set that encompasses Landscape, Drainage and Erosion Control. Due to the minimal size and disturbance of the proposed site plan, we feel that this is enough information to fulfill this requirement instead of having one complete sheet. B. Ruoff agreed, make it simple.

### **MOTION**

J. Bedard **motioned** to grant the waiver. J. Pouliot **seconded**. **All were in favor. Waiver granted with a vote of (5-0-0).**

B. Kilmer said Bryan the only other one I had asked for a waiver for the 100 year flood. You can see from the 200 scale plan that it's far removed from the site plan. Do you need a formal written waiver? Board discussed. It's required. E. Sandford confirmed so it's an elevation that we're lacking? So we're asking not to put an elevation on what the graphical representation was which could take some survey work in an area that's remote. S. Komisarek said I don't see an issue where there would ever be flooding in that spot. B. Ruoff said if it's a waiver it needs to be submitted in writing per the regulations but in this instance where they are already showing the 100 year flood elevation, it's just shown in different means than I would recommend, one could argue if even a waiver is required; it's a gray area.

Board agreed it's a non-issue; they don't need a waiver.

S. Komisarek said so there are things you still need to work on so if we approve this with conditions. B. Ruoff said I haven't gone through the new drainage report and plans and I'll check that but if the Board is looking for conditional approval, under the condition that all Stantec comments are satisfactorily addressed.

### **MOTION**

J. Bedard **motioned** to approve the application with these conditions; we need proof of permitting from the State for the driveways and all the Stantec comments are addressed. S. Komisarek **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried. Application was approved with a vote of (5-0-0).**

**Other Business:****Ken Kustra Resignation:**

Al Hall said Ken will be leaving for the North Country soon and we wish him well. We have other things in process for you and we hope we can present them otherwise you'll get them in the mail. We appreciate your time and your efforts for several years. K. Kustra said six years. A. Hall said we wish you well.

**Ashwood Development Donovan Road BOS Recommendation Discussion:**

The Board decided to save their discussion on their recommendations to the BOS regarding Ashwood Development and Donovan Road for the next meeting on November 7<sup>th</sup>. B. Ruoff asked if Rene LaBranche could come to clarify the letter from Fieldstone regarding a perceived conflict of interest between his client, Ashwood Development and Stantec. B. Ruoff stated there were some allegations that were made about him that aren't exactly correct and I want to clear the air. It makes sense for him to attend as well.

S. Komisarek said so Bryan we had that discussion and that whole discussion about why they thought it was justified for them to bring somebody else in. That decision was made. B. Ruoff said we're not looking for the decision to be over turned; we just want to clear up the incident. There was a lot of misrepresentation provided in that letter so we just want to clear things up. If there is an instance where we feel there is a conflict of interest, we will bring that to you. We'd say we're in a conflict of interest and we can't review this application. We didn't in this case because we didn't think we had one, and still don't.

J. Bedard asked what letter are you referring to. B. Ruoff replied the Ashwood Development letter for the Donovan subdivision asking us to be removed. The reasons were falsified in my opinion. D. Murray said that letter's in the minutes. S. Komisarek said as far as that RSA, there's some confusion. I've heard that any applicant has a right to do that but....B. Ruoff clarified every applicant has the right to request but you have to prove just cause and I think all they stated was that they had worked on a project with Rene before. That it didn't necessarily go smoothly in their opinion. No one was fired as a result of that project, not Rene, not my father so for them to say they were fired as a result of that is not true. S. Komisarek said it was in Milford and what was represented to us, Dufresne & Henry who was the engineer, as a result of something on that project ultimately was dismissed by the Town of Milford and someone else came in. B. Ruoff said that's incorrect. We actually still work for the Town of Milford so that was poorly represented and Ashwood, who actually recommended Keach-Nordstrom to replace us; Keach-Nordstrom was the engineer on that project in Milford.

J. Bedard said so if we were given incorrect information don't we have to revisit that. That's not okay, we didn't verify the information; we took him at his word. I think it needs to be discussed. B. Ruoff said we can discuss at the next meeting. There were allegations made about him so Rene is happy to attend and clear things up. J. Bedard said that's important. S. Komisarek said let's get to the essence of it, obviously some dynamic. B. Ruoff said I didn't know all the details involved so I didn't want to interject. S. Komisarek said we look forward to getting to the truth.

**Cancellation of the November 21<sup>st</sup> Planning Board Meeting:**

The Board cancelled the November 21<sup>st</sup> Planning Board meeting; the night before Thanksgiving. Rudy isn't available and Al's not available.

**MOTION**

J. Bedard **motioned** to cancel the November 21<sup>st</sup> Planning Board and Zoning Review and Revision Committee meetings. S. Komisarek **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (5-0-0).**

**Application Discrepancy:**

A. Bickum said in our regs it says a major site plan review application is a \$200 application fee but our applications all have \$150.00 and it's been at \$150.00 for a long time so I want to see if we can change that



on our application to meet what it says in our regulations. We've talked about this in the regulation review meetings but haven't approved anything yet so I just wanted to change this and have it referenced in the minutes that we changed the amount to reflect what it says in the regulation. Board agreed.

**MOTION**

K. Kustra **motioned** to change the \$150 major site plan application fee to \$200 to match the regulations. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in agreement. Motion carried (5-0-0).**

**MOTION:**

J. Pouliot **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 8:20 pm. K. Kustra **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (5-0-0).**

A Zoning Review & Revision Committee Meeting work session will take place on Monday, October 29<sup>th</sup> at 6 pm at the Town Hall Meeting Room, Town of Candia, NH.

The ZRRC meeting for November 21st, 2018 has been cancelled.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrea Bickum  
Land Use Secretary

cc file