

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF
March 17, 2021
APPROVED**

PB Members Present: Rudy Cartier, Chair; Brien Brock, BOS Rep.; Josh Pouliot; Judi Lindsey; Scott Komisarek; Mark Chalbeck, V-Chair; Robert Jones, Alt.; Joyce Bedard

PB Members Absent: Mike Santa, Alt.

Audience Present: James Logan (applicant); Joel Asadorian (applicant-developer); Chad Brannon (applicant-engineer), Betsy Kruse (Conservation Comm.), Jeff Wuebbolt (Road Agent) and town residents.

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

Nominations for Chair & Vice Chair:

B. Brock **motioned** to nominate Rudy Cartier for Chair. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

B. Brock **motioned** to nominate Mark Chalbeck for Vice-Chair. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

Informational:

Applicant: James Logan, 273 Currier Road, Candia, NH 03034; Owner: same; Property Location: New Boston Road, Candia, NH 03034; Map 406 Lot 97.

Intent: To build an elderly housing development.

R. Cartier starts by reminding everyone that this is an Informational meeting only and there are guidelines for these types of cases/meetings. This will be a conceptual consultation and design review, but not a full application review. It's an opportunity for the applicant to present to the Board in a conceptual nature what they are presenting, and the Board can discuss with the applicant anything that might be of interest or concern and give them an opportunity to hear what the Board has to say. Nothing is decided at this meeting by the Board, but it is an opportunity to get up to date from the applicant and give them some input and direction on the potential project. It does allow some public input and the Board asks that when this is allowed, please identify yourself for the record.

C. Brannon, the applicants engineer, starts his presentation by stating that the development is a proposed elderly housing project. They do not have a lot of design specifics but are looking for feedback from the Board to incorporate into to design phases as they move forward.

C. Brannon states the project is positioned on the North side of the roadway, the zoning is residential, the subject property consists of approx. 98 acres and has about 1,250 ft of frontage along New Boston Road. The property is currently vacant and wooded throughout and the topography is generally mild with slopes ranging from about 5-10% and the upland areas draining to adjacent jurisdictional wetlands. The presented plan to the Board does show the wetlands and the proposed layout for the project. They have fields delineated and have mapped all those wetlands and are currently working on finalizing the existing conditions plan. The North Branch River does run through a larger wetland from west to east. The property is surrounded primarily by residential houses along New Boston Road but then large, vacant, and undeveloped land along the back of the property.

C. Brannon states the proposal tonight is to construct/develop a 39 unit elderly housing project. The density for the project is determined utilizing the matrix that is in the Elderly Housing Ordinance (*see zoning ordinance on town website for details). This project consists of approx. 98 acres of land but has about 78 acres of buildable area, which is how they came up with 39 units. They have situated the development to avoid the jurisdictional wetland areas and have an environmentally friendly layout. The main road for this project would be the most westerly road and that would extend about 1,970 ft and terminate in the cul de sac. There would be another shorter roadway to provide for 2 points of egress from the property and that would be approx. 600 ft in length. Because the shorter roadway connects to the main road, the project has been designed to satisfy and meet all the roadway standards as it pertains to the standards. The units are initially designed with larger sizes because there are usually changes in dimensions and distance as the process moves forward and this

allows for those necessary changes to occur. The average size of each unit is approx. 2,200 sq ft currently and typically elderly housing units range from 1,400-2,200 sq ft. These units have been positioned to be a minimum of 30 ft apart per the town regulations.

C. Brannon states that this project will be serviced by on-site wells and septic systems because there are no town water/sewer options. The development will also include a clubhouse. It is an amenity to the project as it will be approx. 2,000 sq ft in size and will be utilized by members of the Homeowners Assoc. for meetings, classes, events, etc. The mailroom will also be located in the clubhouse. Solar, geothermal and additional community space such as gardens are amenity possibilities for the design as well.

C. Brannon states they do not feel this development will be a burden on local services because the project will be privately owned, so all the roadway and drainage infrastructure will be maintained by the HOA and none on the school systems either. They are typically tax positive developments and believe it would be a benefit to the community.

C. Brannon states that one of the key factors in the layout is consolidating the development in one area of the property. You can see that the front portion of the site, which is about 30 acres in size, is where the development is concentrated. This allows the rear portion of the site, which is about 65-70 acres, to be permanently preserved in a conservation land. This project would far exceed the 40% minimum open space requirement in the ordinance and would probably be closer to about 70-75% land preservation.

C. Brannon states they would need at least 1 waiver from Section 5.06(6) in the regulations. Under the Elderly Housing Ordinance, it is a requirement to have a minimum of 200 ft of frontage on an arterial road. This project is located on New Boston Road, but it is not an arterial road.

C. Brannon states that this is a good location for the project because it's their understanding that there was a transfer station on New Boston Road. The Elderly Housing Ordinance is under the Innovative Housing Ordinance so the PB does have the jurisdiction to waive the requirements that are outlined in that provision. Other waivers that are pretty consistent with this type of housing, and some may recall I was a part of the Village at Candia Crossing, and we are going to seek similar waivers to that project. When you have a private development like this, where the roads are dead end and the traffic is on a lower scale, we will often seek waivers for road width and material types. We would anticipate these types of waivers with a project like this.

C. Brannon states that if you come in the westerly entrance you will see the clubhouse and the units flank along that roadway, terminating in the cul de sac. They have allocated some areas for stormwater management. They have the solar farm and potential community garden area in the northern section. In the southern corner of the project, they have provided some parking. This is proposed to be trailhead parking with access to the trails in the back. It is their understanding that these would be open to the public so it would benefit residents and community members to have access to a good amount of open space for passive recreation and so on.

C. Brannon states that though they do not have a lot of design review details to share, they have done a lot of work onsite so he can speak to the existing conditions and what they would anticipate as they move forward. They are here tonight to collect any feedback from the Board as we launch into a design phase on this project.

B. Brock asks if this project was initially going to be suggested as elderly housing and J. Logan says yes but with a duplex design instead of single homes because of market demand.

B. Brock asks what the lot sizes will be, and C. Brannon says approx. 10k sq ft. B. Brock suggests about a quarter of an acre and C. Brannon confirms this approx. size, though it could change a little depending on the designs.

B. Brock asks if there will be individual wells or common wells and septic on this project. C. Brannon says they are looking at the possibilities of individual wells with community septic. It will depend on the test pits and what's best for the project.

R. Jones notes that the Board understands it's being proposed as a 55 or older, but did they actually look at this using the same innovative land use to do something more along the lines of inclusionary or affordable housing and is there a particular market price you think these 55 or older units will go for. C. Brannon says they have not looked at affordable or workforce housing for this project. They think in this location, this model may work best. As far as market pricing, he is not familiar with what the Village at Candia Crossing is selling for, but it's got to be close to that. He guesses it's upper 3's low 4's. S. Komisarek says they would go right into the 4's these days with what's going on with the market right now. An area like that and with lumber being crazy, geothermal, solar and a community appealing to nature with ponds, etc., people will be willing to pay more up front. R. Jones notes he has seen that this type of development has been pretty

successful but in general, he is looking at the market and in Candia the challenge isn't finding places for 55 and older to live, the challenge is affordable places for families to come to Candia and live. S. Komisarek tells R. Jones that is a function of our zoning. As a PB they are trying to implement the Master Plan but when they go to vote in March, the voters haven't supported that. You can't use Innovative Land Use or Conditional Use Permits for traditional housing or workforce housing.

S. Komisarek states that it's important for the residents to understand what's going on with housing in NH, the crisis we are in and the Housing Appeals Board, in which someone can appeal our decisions. He goes on to say that when he talked with M. Chalbeck (V-Chair of the PB) it was noted that Candia can't have zero growth, so we look at that and decide what they want. Each student is \$18,500 and you say the school should be able to absorb it, but the fact is, so many kids are coded and the costs (even you start at -unclear) so a lot of people are very fearful of children, except those who would like to have young families, which we know we need. We tried to add that, and the voters aren't going to support that so ultimately someone is going to have to take Candia to court.

R. Jones states that he believes he and S. Komisarek are talking about a few different things. He notes that he has been doing some research on inclusionary or affordable housing under the Innovative Land Use and they have done it in Chester, Exeter and other surrounding communities and it does not have to be a 55 and older. There is no reason that that development on New Boston Road couldn't be something that falls into a different category and still gets qualified as innovative use.

R. Jones notes that he thinks S. Komisarek is bringing up is the vote the town had from a warrant perspective regarding the 4 Corners project. That did not pass so the development could not take place in the downtown area, but he doesn't think it excludes or prevents them from doing something down on New Boston Road. S. Komisarek says they would have to do a zoning amendment ordinance because the current zoning doesn't allow it. Innovative Land Use only gives the PB the authority to do 55+. We could work on a zoning amendment to go before the voters. He wanted to bring up the Housing Appeals Board because if someone looks at development and says it's evil, what the lesser of the evils because we can't indefinitely...somebody has a hundred acre parcel, at some point in time, something is going to happen. M. Chalbeck states that the Board of Appeals can overrule whatever the PB comes up with, so if the developer doesn't want that, they can take it before the Appeals Board.

S. Komisarek states that he knows in general, development isn't a very desirable thing and in general, people that live in town don't want development. We sit on the PB all the time and look at this and say what are we dealing with. We know what the State is saying to us, we know what the laws are, we know what our ordinances are. This guy (applicant) comes up with a plan like this and says I'm looking for a waiver on a road that everyone went to the dump 10 years ago on, where do we go from here if we deny him? What do we want if we don't support this? Show me a better idea.

B. Brock states that his conceptual concern for development of this piece of property is route 43. It is heavily impacted right now because it is the only way out of Deerfield pretty much. If this property gets developed, just regularly developed, it's probably going to have a younger clientele and will be part of that workforce and will be impacting 43 at the same time of day that it's impacted now. Given this would be an elderly housing development, typically that whole crowd is already retired for the most part. They will not be commuting at the same time on 43 that the rest of the world is so the impact on 43 would be less. Whether that's a good argument to grant the waiver, I don't know, but it was the thought I had about the impact on 43.

S. Komisarek states that the PB has the opportunity to say what is highest and best use for this property. Looking at it and asking what does the community at large want, right now, the people who vote in March, the 800 that vote, do they want zoning to change.....The answer is no. He can look at doing 25 homes if he wanted, on 78 acres or about 20 homes. We could get 20 families and you could run those numbers, and I know at some point you have to let families in too, but at this point in time, the people have spoken, and you really can't fight it. So, if we say to the applicant No, we're not going to let you do the 55+ and our zoning doesn't really....and we don't want single family.....what's he going to do? Then he could go to the State and say he wants to do 120 workforce house units and by the way, Candia is the poster child on a shortage on any type of affordable stuff. We have to look at a Board and say what's the best case scenario. He looks at a design like that on an environmentally sensitive parcel and the thoughtful layout they have and say what can we do that's better?

*R. Cartier stops the discussion because the Board is starting to touch upon things that they are not supposed to at this type of meeting.

R. Cartier brings up a couple things about waivers and reads from the zoning ordinances for Conditional Use Permits (*see zoning ordinance on town website for details). There are specific criteria the

Board needs to follow with waivers, and they need to be very well documented and stand up to legal challenge. The Building Review Board is not the courts. We've been through this before with some decisions by the Board that have been brought to Superior Court and the reason the Town was successful in those, is everything was documented properly. The same happens whether we grant it or deny the waiver. We still have to make sure it's in compliance with the law, not what we would like to see things being done but what we have to abide by under what we have in our regulations and the RSA's that we looked at.

R. Cartier notes to the applicant that this will be the biggest hurdle. It's definitely not a forgone conclusion. Every waiver the Board did for Candia Crossing was documented very detailed, so we knew it was only for this project and was not going to be a granted waiver for everyone. B. Brock notes that they were site specific. R. Cartier states that the hurdle right now is that the development does go against the ordinance for being on an arterial road. Although in the Master Plan, it does have a definite part for all economic and age groups, there is also the limitations in different areas.

C. Brannon states that they understand that and when they make a formal request for that waiver, they will definitely document the hardship and tie in the Master Plan. With what is allowed and what isn't allowed, sometimes the hardship lies in the ordinance with how there really isn't other options that allow for good land management, land preservation and so on. We will do our best to collectively bring all that together in that request and we appreciate you sharing that.

R. Cartier notes that the caveat to this is that the entire application must be submitted with the request for the waivers in there. It will be a lot of work, expense and engineering time to be done and there is also the possibility that the waiver could be denied. It's just one thing to consider when taking a look at all this to see how you want to proceed.

J. Lindsey states that when the current 55+ (Candia Crossing) was allowed it was with the idea that it was close to services, walkable and close to the center of town. This project is way out and not really near anything. Again, I just reiterate arterial road, main highways and this one is not on it so that might be a concern. I'm not sure how far it needs to be from the center of town, but that may be a concern. I look at the layout and am concerned about all the wetlands, the septic, the wells and this is a critical habitat area. Headwaters of the North Branch. You know how important water is, with the drought that we are still in, it's so important to protect our water. We all live downstream from somebody. In the Master Plan, one of the big things is, besides rural character, is to manage, protect your natural systems that maintain clean water, native wildlife populations and unpolluted air. These are a few of my concerns.

R. Cartier notes that the engineer said they would potentially have individual wells and common septic systems. He then asks if they have any idea, looking at it from a conceptual plan, with all the wetlands in the areas, where those would be located and would you be able to size it properly for 39 residents without getting close to limitations of wetlands. C. Brannon says absolutely. There are a number of limitations that they run into with community septic systems. There are local requirements and setbacks and on a state level there are nitrate setbacks. An effluent field or a subsurface disposal system can only get so big because the nitrate setbacks can't extend off the property lines. What will happen is we are not going to have one large community system to service the whole development, we would likely have pods that service certain units. One thing to consider with a 55+ development is that their design flows are significantly less than standard homes. It's not 150gal per bedroom, it's actually 125gal typically per unit, so 2 units equate to 1 home in a standard development. When you think about that, the septic impact on a conventional development on this property, there would be a more effluent load on a conventional project than there would be on a 55+ based on the state standards and the guidelines that we have to follow.

C. Brannon states that this project would trigger an AOT permit, which is a water quality review from a stormwater standpoint and would also trigger a detailed local review with this Board and consultant. We would also be dealing with DES for the septic services as well. We have looked at areas we think we can allocate or design septic and stormwater management systems. There's likely to be a closed drainage system for the roadways. The homes drain to the road, that allows us to collect all the stormwater runoff, we capture that and route it to stormwater management areas so that it's treated prior to discharging into a jurisdictional wetland areas. The septic have to have the separation to seasonal, setbacks from wetlands, property lines and nitrate setbacks. All of those become part of the design as we move forward, and they all speak specifically to ensuring that we are not having a negative impact on the water in the natural resource.

C. Brannon states that when you talk about development, it's always balance. When I look at a project like this, whether you have 20 unit or more conventionally, you will ultimately have a much larger footprint to get there because you have to have 200 ft of frontage, 3 acre lots in this district, 1.5 acres of contiguous

upland area. So, what does that require? It requires this road to go back and that's allowed by right in the zoning ordinance but it's not what my client wants to do.

S. Komisarek says that would take them to the next wetland. If we say we're going to deny them based on the fact that with a 7 person Board and 4 people feel this is not a hardship, you can't do it and they go away. They are committed to doing something, and they come back and from an environmental standpoint, they show 20 homes, but they take another 50-60% of usable land to do it. Now we get the kids and you have to assign a number to that, and so we have a community that votes and basically says they want to keep the taxes down...

*R. Cartier stops the discussion because the Board is starting to touch upon things that they are not supposed to at this type of meeting.

S. Komisarek says they (the applicant) are coming in and looking for an indication of which way to go aren't they and R. Cartier says no, they are not. S. Komisarek asks then if they are going to go out and do a fully engineered project, isn't that the intention and R. Cartier again says no. The intention right now is for them to come up with a conceptual plan, not a debate on what they could or could not do, it's what they are proposing to do. What we (the PB) are trying to do for the applicant is to identify areas in their conceptual plan right now where there could be problems. What you are talking about is definitely going to be done in the application process. S. Komisarek says what it costs for a fully engineered set of plans, when someone comes in looking for an indication, we as a Board...you don't agree with that and R. Cartier says no, not in the conceptual plans. We can't discuss that because there is not an application. B. Brock says we have to be focused on what they are bringing before us. R. Cartier says we have to focus on what we have and if the Board identifies some potential issues or they give us an idea of what they are doing then that's fine. The discussion will be when they come in with a full set of plans and waivers. S. Komisarek says what if somebody comes in for an Informational and they are looking to the Board to get some indication and we look at it and say no way...we guide them. R. Cartier says we can't say no and we can't say yes. S. Komisarek asks then what do we say and what is the point of an Informational. R. Cartier says they are letting us know what their conceptual plans are. S. Komisarek says and we're not supposed to give them any feedback on how we interpret, and R. Cartier says no. B. Brock says just on that design. R. Cartier says we give them feedback on what their conceptual plans are and what potential issues they could be running into. S. Komisarek apologizes and says he misinterpreted and has always thought it was if someone came before the Board for an Informational, they were looking for information from the Board as to how the town...B. Brock says based on what they are requesting.

B. Brock asks the applicant if after they have done further research into the water and septic details and find out what they can and can't do, is there any thought that maybe they would reduce the number of units to accommodate all of this or do they really feel that this can go forward with what they have for usable land. The applicant engineer says they 100% believe they can get the 39 units designed here. The question comes down to do we have to go further into the site if we have a septic loading issue. The land can definitely support the density. What happens with this type of development (cluster or innovative housing), you do site loading on the entire lot so we know for sure the site will support 39 units. It's just what are the appropriate placement for the septic in proximity to the homes themselves. B. Brock says it becomes a cost thing and how far will you have to push it out to use. C. Brannon says they have field delineated all the wetlands and have done soil samples, so we don't anticipate issues with this layout, but they have to prove that.

R. Cartier asks the applicant engineer if the delineation has been done but a wetlands scientist and that is confirmed. He then asks if the test pits have been done and C. Brannon says no, they have not been performed yet, just the soil samples. The next step is to do the test pits for the septic, drainage and to do a site specific soil survey so they can understand the soil conditions everywhere they are proposing the development.

R. Cartier says when they are talking about common septic, looking at the right hand side of the lot where the cul de sac is, that area that looks like buildable land could possibly be used as a septic area and that is confirmed by the engineer.

R. Cartier asks if you found out you would have to expand the footprint or anything like that, would you come back with an Informational based on the knowledge you have or come back with an application with everything you found, and it might go from 39 up to 45 or cut down to 25. Would your next step be to submit an application or come back to the Board for more of an Informational to get a better idea? C. Brannon says typically they would just come forward with an application because the reality is that we're still going to far exceed the 40% requirement for open space, and his client's objective is to minimize the growth to the back land and preserve a good portion of that back area. Our task is to make it work in the footprint we are showing. If we have to go back further, he will have to explain to his client the reasons why and justify it. It's not the

direction they want to go in, but they don't anticipate it being a large change so they would come forward with the application at that point.

R. Cartier says the applicant mentioned conservation land or preserving the land. Would it be put in a conservation easement or what would be the intent to protect that land from being developed. I know it's common space but what would be the protection to make sure it stayed common space and wasn't developed. Part of it you may not be able to get to because it's across the river and would need a wetlands permit to cross it. C. Brannon says they would be able to get a permit, because as a landowner his client has rights to access his land, but it would be a box culvert, it would be something expensive and there is currently a road that you can get there. R. Cartier says it looked like the wetlands went right across the whole property and C. Brannon says it does, but you'd have to walk through it. C. Brannon says there is definitely going to be a mechanism for ownership of that land. Whether it's a homeowner's association or a conservation easement, there has been talk about a conservation easement but that would have to be lined up with a third party so that's something they would explore and discuss more as they proceed and gain more knowledge on what the options are.

R. Cartier asks about if any preliminary stuff done with endangered species and C. Brannon says they filed for the Natural Heritage Data Check but have not received the results back yet. They have done a lot of work in sensitive areas and this requires an AOT permit. Part of the AOT permit now requires a wildlife study, and that study is reviewed by Fish & Game, so they are part of the state permitting process, so if there is mitigation for T&E species (Threatened and Endangered), it happens through the AOT permit. This is good because now it's handled at a very high level.

R. Cartier asks if there are any questions from the Board but there are none and says he will take questions from the general public, and he notes that they keep their questions informational to ask particular questions, not whether it's something wanted or good at this point in time. This is to find out information on the project not whether it should be approved or disapproved and to please identify themselves.

B. Kruse (Conservation Comm.) says she would like to tell the PB that the Commission is very concerned about this property and have spoken with the owner, Mr. Logan about it. He has indicated to the Commission his interest in conserving some of that land. She says the Conservation Commission is very interested in conserving as much of that land as possible. She passes out a map to the PB of a wildlife action plan for Candia. The map is a State Plan that is approved by the Fish & Game Dept. of NH. The red colors on the map are considered the highest priority wildlife habitat. She notes specific areas along Allenstown, Hooksett, Deerfield town line and also properties that are hatched, and those properties are either conserved lands or town owned lands and therefore considered that they probably won't be developing those lands. If you follow the Deerfield lines, there is a delineation where on the left side of Rte. 43 it's green and red and on the right side of 43 it's yellow. Follow the left side where New Boston Road crosses 43 and you'll see the hatched area where the Deerfield Road Town forest is, where the old town dump is, and across the road where the conservation area is, and then you'll see a pink spot, and then you'll see another hatched area which is private conservation land. The area that is the pink spot is the property in question. This is very sensitive land. It is in a corridor that is considered by the State and also the US Fish & Wildlife to be a very important area and therefore development needs to be done with extreme caution. So, we have talked with Mr. Logan and we are very interested in helping him to conserve as much of that land as possible. What we would hope he would do is to consider reducing at least the size of the development of the impact to this area. They have the North Branch of the Lamprey River headwaters that cross this property and what we are sending down stream is whatever runoff comes from not only this area, but also of course from other areas down stream in Candia so that is a concern. She says she is willing to work with Mr. Logan and knows that he has had conversations with others and also that there are some land trusts that he would have to work in order to conserve the land. The land trusts she is aware of are not interested in holding an easement when the property next to the road is developed to this extent. R. Cartier notes that as part of the review process now, we do send the plans over to the Conservation Commission and the information suggestions are taken into account when we do the application process.

C. Brannon notes that they are aware of this map and work with it and Fish & Game on all of their projects. He says most large acreage properties in the state find their way into a higher ranking wildlife standpoint because they try to maintain the corridors whenever possible. Based on our vast experience with Fish & Game, they are going to be very happy with a proposal like this, that preserves 70% of the land. Landowner's do have rights which are defined in the local regulations and they it doesn't necessarily mean that they have to preserve anything and that's where we come back to balance. He says he does appreciate the

information sharing and it's something that is part of the wildlife study and a lot of other resources that are pulled into that as well.

Mark (resident-178 New Boston Rd) says he is across the street from this property and currently has a survey stake on his property, so he definitely has an interest in what's going on. He says if he's reading the plans correctly, when he opens his front door, he will be looking directly at the clubhouse. He wants to know what accommodations will be made for people like him that are looking at a project that is totally out of character with the rest of the properties there. He says it's doubling the housing density. He said today he started at Deerfield Rd and counted 39 houses and it's 1.8 miles you have to go, almost to Currier Road before you get to 39 houses. This is a significant impact on this area and there's nothing like it there. Selfishly, he doesn't want this thing in my front yard. He understands that the owner has the right to develop it and he's not against development as long as it's reasonable. The owner's asking for the absolute maximum density, 39 units on 78 developable acres and he's not sure that's reasonable. He'd like to hear what accommodations might be made first of all to him so that he doesn't have to see the clubhouse every time he goes out his front door.

R. Cartier states that there may not be anything to give him right now, but they understand his concern as it's going to change the view and rural characteristic of the road they have now. Mark says that this is a designated scenic road. R. Cartier says it sounds like the resident is saying it would have to have some kind of aesthetically pleasing look to it as opposed to just putting up a building, cutting down trees and making it look like there are 39 houses all sitting in the road. Mark says yes, it has to be in keeping with the character of the road.

Mark (resident) is also concerned about the quality of the road. Every Saturday he goes out and pulls chunks of New Boston Road from his front yard because of the traffic that is already on this road. He is extremely concerned about adding to this. Mark also notes about the wildlife review and has been there many times, last summer he did find endangered species (Blandings turtle) and what is that process. R. Cartier says the applicant's engineer has already notes that they are working with Fish & Game on the wildlife.

Mark says he is also concerned about drilling 40 wells right across the street from his house and the impact that will have on his well and the aquifers. He has one well and wants to know what is going to happen when there are 40 more sunk in across the street on the same aquifer. He wants to be very sure his well will not go dry because of this development.

R. Cartier asks C. Brannon if they would have to do a water supply study for the property to make sure the aquifer would support the development. C. Brannon says they would have to do that for community wells but not typically for individual wells. R. Cartier says that would be an item to put on the list as a concern. As J. Lindsey noted we are in a drought situation and with little snow this last winter, the spring is not likely to be like normal. Mark (resident) notes that the aquifer is already sensitive because of the concern of when the landfill and incinerator were there. He wants to make sure every time he turns on the tap, it doesn't go dry because the retirement community across the street is using all the water.

Jeff Wuebbolt (Road Agent & resident of New Boston Rd), states that his biggest concern is with the road. Putting 39 houses is going to add most likely about 75-78 cars that use that road on a daily basis. As far as an arterial road and this development specifically, it is a little different than what went in up the road (Candia Crossing development). That development didn't really have an impact really other than Fire, EMS and Police because it's a private road that empties onto a state road. Although this may also be a private road, it's going to empty onto a town road. We all need to keep that in mind and maybe if this goes further in the planning process, maybe we should talk about putting the burden on the developer to improve the road up to that point such as other towns have done. It would really take some substantial improvements, but if something like this is to go in, that is something that would need to be required to bring it up to the standard that will be needed. If we say it's 78 cars, that's a couple hundred trips a day depending on who you are. Also, the people that are moving into these houses, although they are 55+, most people can say you still have 10-15 yrs of work ahead before retirement. From a Road perspective, I wanted to bring these concerns to the Board as well.

R. Cartier notes for the record that Jeff is the new Road Agent in Candia.

J. Wuebbolt also cautions that the Board regarding the waiver wording because it does set a precedent if you give a waiver to go on a non-arterial road. Anybody can go get a waiver and then that burden falls on the town for all the roads. R. Cartier notes that the PB is very sensitive to that.

R. Cartier says he understands the concerns with the road and asks the Road Agent about the bridge. The Road Agent says the bridge is owned by the State over 30+ yrs ago and the road is actually falling apart right there where the State built that. You can see the old road underneath where they shimmed and paved,

and the bridge would definitely need to be improved for the added traffic. People also need to think about the truck traffic that will be coming through there because of the construction. He says he can get some information about the bridge, but from his talks with Dennis, the bridge is not where it needs to be to carry that much traffic on top of all the traffic New Boston Road already gets.

R. Cartier says that would be one of the concerns because the town has never accepted it. The Road Agent says he doesn't know that much about it (we ALL wish Dennis was here☺), but he is aware that the installation of that bridge was not how it was supposed to be. He feels if the town was to approve this development, this would also be something that would fall to the developer and not the Town.

B. Brock states that could be information the Road Agent could gather and submit to the PB at the next level if the application moves forward. R. Cartier notes that for informational purposes for the applicant's engineer, it's good to know.

R. Cartier asks if there are any other questions and there are none.

Minutes -March 3, 2021:

The Board agrees to defer the minutes to the next scheduled meeting date.

Other Business:

- B. Brock asks the Board about examining alternative options for more affordable housing potential in town. The goal would be to look at zoning, specific districts, the land capabilities, how it could affect taxes, revenue, schools, etc. The Board briefly discusses the feasibility and the opportunities it could open in order to keep or bring new people and families here that are looking to start out in a nice small town. The Board decides this is an item they would like to pursue further and will start gathering information.
- R. Cartier notes that all the zoning amendments that the PB submitted to the ballot for voting passed.
- J. Lindsey asks for an update regarding the mapping system and R. Cartier states that the Flood Mapping is complete and Stantec was asked to complete the steep slopes to go with that. Once everything is complete, the PB can then coordinate a combination meeting with the Conservation Commission to review the information provided and determine next steps.
- M. Chalbeck notes that he has information regarding the ridgelines and steep sloping amendments and has given them to the Land Use Coordinator for distribution and review. The Board can come back at the next meeting to discuss further.
- J. Pouliot and R. Jones have been working on the "Woodstock" project. They have come up with some guidelines and would like to confirm with the Board that not only are there no conflicts with current zoning, but that it is something with the potential of allowing in the residential zone.
- J. Pouliot asks about the possible solar project in town. The BOS and the Conservation Commission will be working to determine the next steps. J. Pouliot offers his assistance with any information as he has experience in the solar field.

MOTION:

J. Lindsey **motioned** to adjourn the PB meeting at approximately 8:46pm. J. Bedard **seconded**. **All were in favor.**
Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Galica
Land Use Office Coordinator
cc: file