

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF April 5th, 2023
APPROVED MINUTES**

PB Members Present:, Mark Chalbeck, V-Chair; Brien Brock, BOS Rep; Judi Lindsey; Scott Komisarek; Kevin Coughlin, Tim D'Arcy; Linda Carroll, Alt. (sitting in for Rudy Cartier)

Mike Guay, Alt.

PB Members Absent: Rudy Cartier, Chair; Mike Santa, Alt.

*Mark Chalbeck, V-Chair; called the PB meeting to order at approximately 7:00PM, followed immediately by the Pledge of Allegiance

New Business:

M. Chalbeck: Opened the public hearing to Accept HOP Grant at 19:02PM

Motion to accept the HOP Grant - Tim D'Arcy. **Second** - J. Lindsey. All were in favor.
Motion Passed.

M. Chalbeck: Closed the Public Hearing at 19:03PM

Old Business:

- **Case #23-001: 19.04 Continued**

Applicant(s): Dillon O'Connor, 70 Riverside Drive, Allenstown, NH 03275; **Owner(s):** Dillon O'Connor, 70 Riverside Drive, Allenstown, NH 03275; **Property Location:** Deer Run Road, Candia, NH 03034; Map 408 Lot 30-21-1.

Intent: *MAJOR Site Plan.* 6,000 sf automotive repair facility.

Jason Lopez - Keach & Nordstrom: My understanding is that Steve went through the plan in some detail. We received a letter from Stantec.

Bryan can inform us if we need any further clarification.

1. *Elevation views and architectural renderings are required to be submitted to the Board for review, as specified in Regulation Section 4.03H and to confirm compliance with the Commercial and Industrial Architectural Design Standards in Regulation Section 8.03G. Additionally, additional detail needs to be provided on the building to determine whether a sidewalk is required for access to the building. The applicant presented sample elevation building views at the last Planning Board meeting; we defer to the Board on whether these are acceptable.*

J. Lopez - Dillon provided some images of what he would like to build. He isn't going to be working with an architect per say. At this point, I am not sure how the board wants to proceed with architectural renderings.

D. O'Connor: Rudy had brought up colors. I would like to use neutral.

T. D'Arcy: I think we would need something. And maybe we don't need specificity.

B. Brock: I don't think so.

M. Chalbeck: He has already given that to us. Dillon, it is going to match what is already down there? More of a traditional, rural look?

D. O'Connor: Yes.

K. Coughlin: I have a question more for my clarification. Does this board dictate color?

B. Brock: It is pretty general.

M. Guay: To follow up that question. Does it have to be consistent? Where is that identified what is not acceptable for Candia?

B. Stantec: The elevation renderings are for two reasons. To make sure you aren't missing anything. Those things are caught with that submittal. If the board so desired, they can make it a condition prior to construction just to make sure it is acceptable. It is your prerogative to say you have final approval on the building in those plans.

J. Lopez: Ultimately, we need to get a letter in the file from the fire chief. There was discussion at the last meeting. How do we get that?

D. Young: I want Dillon to pay \$250. Because the way it's written if you don't do a cistern or a sprinkler system. \$75,000 for a sprinkler and \$75,000 for a cistern. It's fine. We don't need a lot of money. We are fine at the fire house. I am not going to extort money from Dillon. He is trying to scratch out a living.

B. Brock: This is an area where we rely on the chief to guide us.

M. Chalbeck: I was asked by Rudy to bring it up. He wanted to see either the sprinkler or the cistern amount. He felt the \$250 was less. Is that something we should discuss in the future?

J. Lopez: Authority having jurisdiction. The only comment I have on that, is that in the regulation, it says.

It was the Boards position in the meeting that a waiver was not required for this regulation based on the following:

- The regulation states both "*as determined by the Fire Chief*" in section 8.08-B-1. And "*The Fire Department, at the discretion of the Chief, require the developer to contribute*

the cost for the installation of the Fire Chief's recommended fire protection system 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."

- the Fire Chiefs determination (based on his interpretation of the NH Fire Code) was that a fire suppression system wasn't required for this proposed development and
- the Fire Chiefs determination was that a contribution cost in the amount of \$250 for this project, which he indicated in the Planning Board meeting was consistent with what he has been requesting for the elderly housing units would be sufficient contribution for the project.
- Because the Site Plan Regulation language indicates that the developer's contribution is at the discretion of the Fire Chief, it was the opinion of the Board at the meeting that in accepting the Fire Chief's recommendation that a waiver was not required to satisfy the intent of this Site Plan Regulation.

*6. The applicant (or developer) is required to confirm with the Road Agent the driveway locations and obtain driveway permits prior to proceeding with the installation of the proposed driveway as specified in Ordinance 2.04. **Comment not addressed; the applicants engineer has responded that this is not required, we defer to the Road Agent for his determination on this.***

J. Lopez - Quick summary of that is whether a driveway permit is needed or correspondence from the road agent. That access point is already existing.

D. O'Connor: There is a driveway permit.

B. Ruoff: I wouldn't speak for Jeff, but I have spoken with him. We just want to make sure it is safe.

7. The scale of the plan is required to be provided at a minimum of one-inch equals twenty feet, as specified in Regulation Section 4.03E. Although one-inch equals thirty feet appears appropriate for these plans, the applicant is required to submit a waiver request to the Planning Board for review and approval for this deviation for the Regulations. The applicant has submitted a waiver request for this requirement for the Board's consideration, we recommend that it be granted.

J. Lopez – We are asking for a waiver for plan scale. We have provided the plans. We have provided a waiver to the board for that. That will need to be addressed.

15. The location(s) and details for the required fire suppression system(s) as determined appropriate by the Fire Chief are required to be provided on the plans, as specified in Regulation Section 4.03T.

J. Lopez: We just discussed that, not required.

*16. Vehicle turning movements are required to be provided in the plan set demonstrating access into, through and out of the site as specified in Regulation Section 4.03V. Turning movements are required to be provided for a WB-67, as specified in Regulation Section 8.03A-2. **Comment partially addressed. The applicant has submitted a waiver request for the requirement to provide turning movements for a WB-40 in lieu of a WB-67, we recommend that this waiver be***

granted. Additionally, it appears that based on the turning movements shown on the plans that the radii at the driveway intersection need to be increased to avoid potential collisions.

J. Lopez - After Bryan's review, he asked that we do increase that turning radius.

M. Chalbeck: I know we have been granting these waivers. We do not need a waiver for this. It's changing to the WB40. We've stopped asking for those waivers.

17. A table summary of the area in square feet of the total lot area, existing impervious area, proposed impervious area, existing green space area, proposed green space area and proposed landscaping area with associated percentages is required to be provided on the plans, as specified in Regulation Section 4.03W and confirm compliance with Regulation Section 8.12. Comment partially addressed; the proposed building setbacks and frontage that are specified in the referenced table are incorrect and should be updated to specify the correct distances.

J. Lopez – We will be changing that on sheet 2.

20. The plans are required to specify the details of the proposed signage in order to confirm compliance with Regulation Section 8.03E, 8.03F and Section VII of the Ordinances. Comment not addressed; the applicants engineer has responded that this will be provided by the applicant.

J. Lopez - At this point, Dillon is not planning on a sign. He will pull a sign permit in the future if he changes his mind.

40. Note#7 specifies that the existing and proposed frontage is 200.2 feet, but the plans indicate 100.3 feet of frontage, this discrepancy must be corrected. Comment not addressed.

J. Lopez - Site Layout Plan. Repeat comment talking about this chart. We will do a little housekeeping and change the text.

41. Note#13 specifies that 14 parking spaces are required, and 18 parking spaces are provided. However, only 10 of the proposed spaces are accessible with 8 spaces (potentially) being blocked based on the proposed configuration. The Board should discuss whether the parking spaces as proposed satisfy the requirements for the required minimum number of parking spacings, as specified in Article IX of the Ordinances. Comment not addressed; we defer to the Board for their determination on whether the parking configuration as proposed is acceptable. The cars that are there to be worked on and some spaces for employees and customers.

J. Lopez - We have double-stacked that. Is the board okay with that layout.

T. D'Arcy: For that use, it is perfectly acceptable.

50. *It is unclear how the proposed driveway matches into the existing access road, and it appears that the proposed slope of the driveway exceeds the maximum 10% slope at the inside face of the proposed driveway curve at the corner of the building. It is required that a profile and cross sections, or a typical cross section be added to the plan set for the proposed driveway to confirm that the proposed construction forms with the Town of Candia Site Plan Regulations. **Comment partially addressed; the driveway profile shows the proposed grade sloping into the intersection at 4- percent but is recommended to pitch away from the access drive/road for 20-feet to avoid icing in the intersecting access driveway. Additionally, the added driveway profile shows stationing and a 10% continuous upward slope, but the driveway stationing is also required to be labelled and additional detail is required to be provided on how the driveway grade transitions into the slope/grades in the upper parking area.***

J. Lopez - This is getting into the slope of the driveway. On sheet 9. We are going to extend out. We are just going to extend out. We stopped at the transition where it goes into the parking lot. Also, Bryan was looking for us to extend it down, to show that.

M. Chalbeck: Bryan, is this one all discussed, and you are okay with it?

B. Ruoff: My concern would be, just make sure the pavement pitches away from the road. It's a non-issue quite honestly.

52. *The proposed grading to the west of the existing lot is shown at 2:1 cut slope with temporary erosion control measures specified but we recommend that permanent slope stabilization methods also be incorporated for this proposed grading to reduce the possibility of erosion and slope failure. **Comment not addressed, the applicant has responded that temporary erosion matting is sufficient, but it is not clear which North American Green product is provided for reference and no specific material is specified on the plans.***

J. Lopez - Erosion Control Matting: We are just going to specify the model number.

59. *The plans are required to specify all existing and proposed utilities, materials, and sizes, as specified in Regulation Section 4.03L. Some of the specified utility conduit material and sizes are not specified on the plans and must be added. **Comment not addressed.***

J. Lopez - Utility plan. We've got the utility line shown, it was just missed. We are going to run it up this side. Right on the property line between the two properties. We are just going shorter. We have it detailed on the detail sheet.

60. *Additional detail is required to be added to the plan regarding the proposed oil/gas utilities and whether an underground (or above ground) tank is required for the proposed developments. **Comment not addressed.***

J. Lopez - The heating system is going to be using waste oil. It will all be interior to the building. It will be handled with the generator. We will add a note on sheet 2.

*72. The proposed culverts are shown with less than the minimum recommended 2-foot cover for cross country culverts at both the outlet to the sediment forebay (HW#15) and the outlet to the proposed detention pond (FES#24). **Comment not addressed.***

J. Lopez – This is talking about the existing driveway pad coming in. Existing it is less than. Bryan and I discussed that this morning. It doesn't have the two feet, but it is an existing condition.

*73. The existing 15" HDPE culvert at the driveway entrance is shown with roughly 15-inches of cover, which is less than the recommended 3-feet of cover for HDPE under paved areas, it is recommended that additional cover be provided to eliminate the potential for heaving under the access drive. **Comment not addressed.***

J. Lopez - Pipe cover: Erosion control plan, we were calling out silt fence. We are going to call out perimeter control. Either silt fence or compost socks. We have the detail for both products. We just had to sort the wording out.

L. Carroll: What is the lifespan of that silt fence.

J. Lopez - It depends on the weather and how much use it gets.

B. Brock: It usually lasts until it is stable.

*86. The dimensions of the orifice sizes and overall dimensions of the Trash Rack must be specified in the detail, based on the outlet structure detail it appears but it is unclear on whether the trash rack extends for a height of 3.75' to cover the entire notched opening of the outlet structure inlet. **Comment partially addressed; additional details are required to be specified for the mounting of the trash rack.***

J. Lopez - Fairly simple one, we just have to add some details. This grate will keep debris out.

*92. Class C stone is specified to be installed at the top of the Overflow Berm, but this stone size seems too small for the intended use and would likely erode/washout, it should be confirmed whether this proposed stone size is suitable for this application. Additionally, it is assumed that the overflow weir is for the sediment forebay, but this isn't explicitly stated as part of the detail, this should be specified as part of the detail. **Comment not addressed.***

J. Lopez - We have a detail on the plan set that doesn't need to be there. It was causing confusion.

97. The specified culvert pipe slopes should reference FT/FT of %-slope. Comment is for the specified slopes in the drainage profiles, comment not addressed.

J. Lopez - We've got slopes or pipes, but we don't label the units, so we will add some text to clarify.

103. The drainage report is required to include NHDES BMP worksheets for the design of the detention basin and sediment forebay, as specified in Regulation Section 4.05B-e.

Comment partially addressed, a BMP worksheet was submitted for the pocket pond but not the detention forebay and must be provided.

*106. The stormwater management report is required to provide the summary of the pre and post rainfall volumetric flows in addition to the submitted stormwater flow rates for each modelled storm event to confirm no increases of runoff to abutting properties as specified in Regulation Section 8.06H. **Comment not addressed.***

J. Lopez - Pre and Post. We are missing the volumes in our report. Not just the peak rates but also the volumes. We will add that to the table.

*108. It is unclear what the 8"x4" box pipe channel represents in the Tc length calculation in the existing and proposed conditions, it is recommended that this be removed from the model. **Comment not addressed, the response is unclear, the existing culvert is a 15" culvert not a 8" x 4" box, this should be corrected and modelled as a pond in the drainage report.***

J. Lopez - We have an error. It says 8" and should be 8'.

*109. The proposed culverts in the closed drainage system are required to be designed (sized) for the 25- year storm event, as specified in Regulation Section 8.06-I.a with no surcharging during the design storm as specified in Regulation in Regulation Section 8.06-J. Based on this requirement the proposed 12-inch HDPE culverts are required to be increased in size. **Comment not addressed.***

J. Lopez - We have a closed drainage system coming from up on the slope. The water builds up. That's called surcharging. We surcharge up over the pipe by nine inches. I have provided a new waiver. The other option is to upsize all of the pipe.

B. Ruoff - By the letter of the regulations, they don't meet the regulations. The drainage as it is, it's Even though these pipes are designed to take this flow, it is all stored up and that is what causes the slight backup. It is very minor. Just inches over the pipe. It is still relatively. There is no reason not to grant the waiver.

*112. Per NHDES Stormwater standards a Sediment Forebay cannot be considered for stormwater capacity storage. The Sediment Forebay should be included in the model to confirm the appropriate size, but the model should also be run without the storage in the forebay, or associated storage considered. Additionally, the Sediment Forebay is modelled incorrectly, there is a weir proposed with an elevation of 209.50 in the plans but that is not reflected in the hydraulic model, only the outlet culvert is included in the hydraulic model. **Comment not addressed, because the volumetric capacity is variable a sediment forebay cannot be modelled with storm water storage capacity.***

J. Lopez - Bryan and I were having a conversation. It is part of the operation and maintenance plan for that to be cleaned out. Over time, you lose storage. You rectify that by a maintenance plan.

M. Chalbeck: That's in the plan?

J. Lopez - We handed in a full maintenance plan in that packet. To prevent that water from racing from the top to the bottom, we are putting a catch basin. Bryan was looking for the calculation. We have provided the calculation.

118. Some of the plan sheets show lines and boxes on the adjacent property, the intent is not clear on what is being proposed or intended to be shown.

J. Lopez - On some of the plans here, they are not labeled. We added on the distance of the building. I couldn't show it all on this plan, so I just put dimensions and labeled the distance.

M. Chalbeck: They won't need a waiver for that, will they Bryan?

J. Lopez - In the previous package, the previous submittal. At the end of the day on the plan set, we have just the critical information. Just the bare bones.

120. The light poles appear to be specified as being 20-feet tall but are required to be a maximum of 16-feet tall as specified in Regulation Section 8.03-D.2c.

J. Lopez - The regulations state that the maximum pole height should be 16' It was put at 20'. If we go down to 16', we have to add two poles. He is comfortable with the three mounted lights. This front row of parking won't be too bad.

D. O'Connor: Aesthetically, I think it looks better that way.

121. The updated drainage report that we received appears to be incomplete, a complete, updated drainage report must be submitted for the record.

J. Lopez - Bryan requested that we submit a full and complete.

B. Brock: It will be less confusing.

122. The proposed driveway and parking area are proposed in significant cuts locations intercepting groundwater, it is recommended that additional underdrain be proposed in the cut locations within the limits of the proposed paved areas.

J. Lopez - Deals with underdrains. We discussed adding one more. I will add one additional section.

123. The test pits indicate that the existing ground water depth is between three-and five-feet depth, with proposed grading intercepting the ground water table. Additional detail must be provided on how the site will be dewatered to eliminate erosion and slope collapse during construction in the locations where cuts are proposed.

J. Lopez - Dewatering during construction. Every contractor is going to handle that different. We are digging into this; we are cutting into that hill pretty deep. In here, we

are digging down, 18' deep. We went out there and we did some test pits. We were getting weep. Once we get down 18' feet deep, the groundwater. Do they want to construct the ponds first and use the ponds. How many times do they want to go back and review these for stabilization?

K. Coughlin: The water table is seasonal.

M. Chalbeck: We should probably check them off, so that it is in the record.

J. Lopez - Existing buildings, added in flow arrows. Architectural renderings we did that. Fire suppression. Provide copies of all permits. Dillon is not going to pull that permit until he has an approved site plan. No AOT, no DOT.

B. Brock: Not really. There are a couple of updates to the plans that need to be made. There is nothing that cannot be confirmed.

B. Ruoff - In the 10 years, I have been the town engineer, we have never received a letter from the building inspector. Waiver to be addressed. However, the board feels about. It has always been approved.

M. Chalbeck: Waiver, do you want to right it down that you are asking for a waiver on the surcharge.

Bryan Ruoff: 8.06 I. A Waiver and 8.06J. Just 8.06J, sorry.

M. Chalbeck: Any discussion from the public?

From the board: No

T. D'Arcy - **Motion** to accept the four waivers presented. L. Carroll: **Second**. All were in favor. **Motion passed**.

M. Chalbeck – I would accept a Motion to approving the plan with conditions:

CONDITIONS:

1. State Permits. The following state permits shall be submitted to the Planning Board (Major Site Plan Article 4.05 A):
 - a. Approved NHDES Subsurface Disposal System Permit
 - b. Renew Driveway Permit
2. Applicant has satisfactorily addressed all remaining Stantec concerns as confirmed by Stantec.
3. Construction and Inspection fees escrow, and a Project Completion Surety Bond as determined by Town Engineer shall be provided (Major Site Plan Article 5.00 (B) 2, 3 and 4, and Article 5.05).
4. No work shall be initiated until the final plan of the proposed site plan has been approved by the Board. (Major Site Plan Article 1.05 and Article 5.02 (1))

5. Work shall commence within one year and be completed within 2 years of Planning Board final approval. (Major Site Plan Article 5.02 (2))
6. Provide copies of the plan to the Building Inspector and Fire Chief for approval.
7. Provide one Knox Box at a location determined by the Fire Chief and provided a master key for all buildings access.

J. Lopez - Septic Design prior to building permit. Boards discretion. Before a building permit.

B. Ruoff: It's a reasonable ask.

Motion to approve the plans with conditions, K. Coughlin. **Second:** J. Lindsey. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Close the public hearing at 8:06

- Approval of Minutes, 3.20.23

Motion to accept the minutes as presented: J. Lindsey. **Second:** B. Brock. M. Chalbeck: Abstain. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Some discussion transpired about mandated underground utilities versus overhead.

Motion to adjourn: Kevin Coughlin. **Second:** J. Lindsey. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Appeal Updates:

- ***Foster Farms, New Boston Road*** – No Change
- ***23 Main Street - No Change***

Other Business:

- Town Planning
- Any other matter to come before the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy M. Spencer

Land Use Coordinator

cc: file