

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF June 5th, 2024
APPROVED MINUTES

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

Linda Carroll, Alt. (via Zoom)

PB Members Absent:

Judi Lindsey (excused)

M. Santa, Alt.

* Tim D’Arcy, Chair; called the PB meeting to order at approximately 6:30PM, followed immediately by the Pledge of Allegiance

New Business:

- Informational Hearing: Applicant/Owner – Michele and Dennis Vincent, 69 South Road, Candia, NH 03034. Property Location: 69 South Road, Candia, NH 03034 Map 410 Lot 108 *Intent: To create one new residential lot.*

Jason Franklin: What we would like to do, what Mr. Vincent would like to do is subdivide a piece of his property for his daughter. Unfortunately, some of the issues we are encountering are, he does have enough frontage but there are some significant wetlands in the front. So, trying to avoid a wetland permit, dredge and fill from the State. We would like to get your feedback on having a shared driveway. The access would be on the existing driveway and then branch off and sever the lot. Joe Wichert did the previous survey. We have no reason to doubt anything. There is 400.13 feet, so we would split that. Each lot would have approximately 200.06 or so. The main lot would have 3.11 acres and the other would have 3.03 more or less. So, that is what we are proposing, and we would like to get your feedback.

B. Brock: Well, we have done shared driveways before.

R. Cartier: Do you remember when Jim did something similar to this on Brown Road?

J. Franklin: Chester Turnpike? I do, we pulled it out of the archives and dusted it off. It’s almost exactly the same scenario. A little different configuration.

R. Cartier: We also did another one. It seems to me to be exactly the same. The only thing required at that time was that an easement is filed with the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds.

J. Franklin: We would have to do that. We would have a driveway maintenance agreement, driveway easements and we could provide those documents to you before you agreed to anything, so you could see the wording, etc. I think it is fairly simple and straightforward.

B. Brock: The fact that you can avoid the wetlands is a good thing.

T. D'Arcy: I think the town would rather have a shared driveway than cut through the wetlands.

R. Cartier: How confident are you with the calculations?

J. Franklin: I am pretty confident. Joe Wichert's a good surveyor, we are familiar with his work, we are friendly with him professionally and such. We have never had any issues with his work.

- Informational Hearing: Applicant/Owner – James Logan, 273 Currier Road, Deerfield, NH 03037. Property Location: 438 & 475 High Street, Candia, NH 03034 Map 405 Lots 28 & 30 *Intent: Proposed lot line adjustment and elderly housing development.*

C. Branon: Good evening, Mr. Chairmen, members of the Board, for the record, my name is Chad Branon, I am a civil engineer with Fieldstone Land Consultants, and I am here this evening representing the landowner, which is London Bridge South, Inc. and the owner is James Logan. Both of us are here this evening to answer any questions that the Board may have. Mr. Logan has purchased two properties along High Street, NH Rte. 27. As you stated they are lots / parcels 405 28 and 30. The properties do have existing residences on them currently. And so just taking a look at the plan that we have here, the lot situated to the East, North being straight up, is parcel 405 – 28. This parcel has frontage along Rte. 27 on the upper side of the plan. It's got about 342.7 linear feet of frontage there. There is a residence in this location. This tract comes down along here and then up the middle. The total acreage of that property is about 59.5 acres. And then, just to the West of that, we have parcel 405-30. This property is a 98.7-acre parcel. It has about 7701.5 linear feet of frontage along the highway up here. It also has a short section of frontage and there is an existing residence right up on the right-of-way line. It's an old homestead.

T. D'Arcy: I am assuming there is another residence in that gap?

C. Branon: There is a residence in this gap. There is also a home along 27 here and then there are some homes along Baker Road that abut the property as well.

So, in total, we have a property that is about 158.2-acres in size. Has about 1115 feet of frontage along the highway. It is broken up by some existing residences along that stretch and what my client is looking to do a lot line adjustment and then an elderly housing development. The lot line adjustment would consist of essentially creating a lot of 3-4 acres in size for this existing residence in the Northeastern section and that would be on its own parcel. And then we would take the remainder of the land and merge it with the adjacent lot and ultimately propose an elderly housing development.

B. Brock: So the Easterly piece there would not have frontage anymore until it's combined with the other?

C. Branon: The remainder wouldn't, correct. And so, what we are looking at here is a total of 46 units. This home here would be one of those units. So, we would have 45 units of elderly housing here. The nice part about this proposal and we have really spent a lot of time with the landowner on this trying to figure out the right layout. He has tried to create a layout that is very sensitive to the existing features, the environmental components of the property, the wetlands, the buffers. But also, kind of the rural character and that feel from High Street or Rte. 27. What I mean by that is we have taken a look at the topography and the proposed road layout, and we have really created a geometry that works with the topography and kind of tucks the roadway once you get up onto the hill behind some natural features. So, a lot of the homes would not be visible from Rte. 27 or High Street, just based on the topography. The existing clearing, the existing field area, that would be preserved and this entire field area here would be preserved. So, we would be behind the field area, in the wood line and that is really by design. And then the remainder of this site would be preserved. The open space numbers would be very, very favorable with this development the way it's laid out. Pretty consolidated and clustered but tucked in off the roadway. Also laid out to meet your regulations. So, we would have this stretch would be under 1500 feet length so we would meet the dead-end road standard requirements. And then we have a complete loop. We do have a clubhouse proposed on the right after you get past the existing structures. There is an existing barn here that we are looking to preserve and make part of the site amenity, there would be an equestrian component here. The existing house, we are looking to restore that and make that into a duplex. And I think that would really help preserve and maintain that rural character along the roadway. And then we are talking about trying to reconstruct the barn in the footprint where that existed. There is an old granite foundation up by the existing homestead. If we could reconstruct that barn and make that a duplex, it would look like an old farm from Rte. 27 and the highway, and I think it would be a really nice balance of development and sensitive layout if you will. We would have with this proposal a wetland crossing. There is jurisdictional wetland that basically bisects the entire property. So, we would have one crossing of that wetland there and then we are really working around the wetlands and the buffer areas internally as this is laid out. We don't anticipate any issues with the local regulations. The reconstruction of that barn structure may require a variance just because we are close to a jurisdictional wetland area down there so the existing foundation is inside the wetlands buffer. Not far in but just obviously that didn't exist back in the day when that structure was constructed.

R. Cartier: So you would just be restoring it? You wouldn't be enlarging it or moving it or anything like that. It's an existing structure.

C. Branon: It is but technically the way the regulations read is if it's been abandoned for over two years then you have to seek relief on a setback.

M. Chalbeck: Is that going to be a private road or a town road when you are done? Are you going to build it to town specs.

C. Branon: It would be a private road. We would probably be talking to this Board about some waivers from the design standards just because it's private. There's no reason to have a 28-foot-wide paved surface. We can work with; we have had luck with having those discussions with this Board in the past. The other waiver that would be a waiver of some design standards potentially.

The other waiver that we are looking at would be, in your regulations it requires it requires a single-story structure and we would like to have the option of two stories, just a typical layout where you would have a first floor master, all the critical and primary living space would be first floor but you would have a hobby room or a guest room or something on the second floor. It gives people a lot of options and variety of housing selection. I think it still meets the purpose and intent of the regulations, but it would provide some variety for people who are looking for that.

B. Brock: That's pretty much an industry standard anyway.

C. Branon: It's in the zoning ordinance under the elderly housing which is a conditional use permit and that's an innovative land use regulation, so the authority is this Board. It's a waiver.

R. Cartier: The voters took that out. It has to go to the ZBA.

C. Branon: I thought it was still in there under the planning board having the authority.

Collectively – No.

C. Branon: So, the planning board doesn't have the authority over that criteria?

R. Cartier: Correct.

M. Chalbeck: Yeah, over ordinances, we do not. You have to go to the ZBA for ordinance relief.

T. D'Arcy: The site plan and the regulations, town, major subdivision regulations, that is still us but the voters took that away from us last year. That is part of the reason for an informational hearing.

C. Branon: Absolutely, we appreciate the feedback.

R. Cartier: On the duplex, is that going to be also included in the number of elderly housing units?

C. Branon: It's included, yes.

R. Cartier: And then, you said you were going to keep the house that was over in the East portion of the land. What is that going to be for?

C. Branon: That would be a market rate home. So that would be broken off. It's part of the overall development just because it's part of the land mass but it's not going to be restricted as part of the elderly housing.

T. D'Arcy: The first piece to do would be the lot line adjustment where you would break that off into a building lot and then merge the two together, then it's out of the discussion for doing this. By the time this gets to us, that will already be.

M. Chalbeck: And that back acreage, would that be put into a conservation easement or something like that?

C. Branon: Odds are it would be protected in some fashion. We have not talked about exactly how that mechanism will be. It is a significant amount of land that far exceeds the 40% requirement. There's existing trails and beautiful scenery. It's really nice.

T. D'Arcy: And that gives you your recreational requirement for the elderly housing.

C. Branon: I haven't had the luxury of traversing that whole back area but I have heard a lot of great things about it so I will at some point. I've heard there are some really old forests up here and it's quite nice. There is an existing fire pond, I guess just for discussion purposes in front of that home on the Northeast Corner and so we are going to take a look at probably formalizing that and putting that in some kind of an easement for this development as well. And then, we will certainly work with the fire department and such on a review once we get to that point.

T. D'Arcy: I think the main thing is that you get to take away from this is the fact that for those zoning ordinance things, you have to go to the ZBA first before it comes here.

C. Branon: If I may ask Mr. Chairman, just as it relates to that, the only thing we are talking about is, I guess it would be all buildings shall be single story above grade and height. Would this Board be amenable to us running currently to both zoning cuz that's not a critical factor on whether the project goes forward or not. It's just a function of what kind of housing style we would have. So, in a situation like that a lot of times we would handle that request concurrently rather than separate cuz it's not really a critical path.

B. Brock: In other words, if you get turned down, you'd build a single story.

C. Branon: They would be singles. We wouldn't have a choice. Other than the fact that we are trying to rehab an existing structure that's two stories, we would have to talk to them about that.

M. Chalbeck: I think they would be amenable to the two-story one because, for the existing because that's historical.

T. D'Arcy: Obviously, we could start discussions, but we couldn't get to site review and the like because we wouldn't have the full, we couldn't get to an approval / reject stage without the zoning board chiming in, right?

B. Brock: You wouldn't even have any renderings. We wouldn't know what we were looking at.

C. Branon: I think there is some confusion because there will be single-story options, so we will be presenting single-story options, so I think under most circumstances in this scenario, this Board would say, we approve the plan conditioned on, if we get this far and this is presumptive as far as it may not take that long. We would approve the plan conditioned on you securing the zoning board variance or these would all have to be single-story homes.

R. Cartier: Actually, you couldn't do that. The way that our regulations are set up is that you need to have the zoning board approvals before the planning board can accept the plans as complete.

C. Branon: But that's only if it's a critical component of the development. I mean that's just practical.

R. Cartier: The unfortunate part is the voters took it so that it's not in the purview of the planning board. So, it's only the ZBA that can do that. So, you need to go to the ZBA first and then come back. We can't do anything conditioned on the ZBA doing approvals. We have to do something

that the ZBA has either said yay or nay on. And then, the planning board can actually review the plans.

C. Branon: Just for discussion purposes, that would make sense if it was something that critical to the project.

R. Cartier: Oh, I don't disagree with you Chad, at all. But that's the way it is. What I would suggest, obviously, is to get on the ZBA as soon as you can. A lot of the standards that are coming up now are two-story and when these regulations were put in in 2008, maybe even earlier, it was looked at from the standpoint of well if it's going to be elderly housing why would you want to have a second floor because elderly people shouldn't be on stairways.

B. Brock: Either that or push the project through with single-story.

C. Branon: This will require obviously, DOT/ DES Permitting, it's the full gambit of permits with this development. We have a fair amount of work ahead of us.

R. Cartier: Just for clarification, you are going to cut off that small piece on the Eastern side and then are you going to eliminate the boundary between the two properties?

C. Branon: Yes.

R. Cartier: What was the advantage to you, to the developer to combine those two lots. Just as an interest point.

C. Branon: There is a density calculation component based on distance from the four corners in town. So, you need to have the land area to support the density. But also, this is just really nice property back in here and the owner wants it to be part of that preserved area. There is excessive area, we could more land with this house if we did it together, but I think in simplest terms it makes logical sense to break that off, they're renovating that home now. You can recoup some of the investment obviously if we can get that on the market a little faster.

R. Cartier: How many units?

C. Branon: 45 on the elderly. This plan at a large scale gives it a lot of perspective. You have this layout exceeds all of the standards. Building separation, we provide the buffer, the fifty foot buffer to the surroundings. We meet all the criteria and then you have, it really kind of tells the picture of this is what this type of development can provide from an open space, passive recreation, land preservation. Hopefully, everybody when we get to formally submit can see that there was a lot of thought put into trying to preserve that rural character and hopefully, we are successful with the zoning board with the barn. Obviously, if that changes, it doesn't take away from the density of the project, it just means now we are adding a couple more units back here, instead of trying to recreate that vision.

- Nate Miller – SNHPC – Impact Fees and Updating Regulations

N. Miller: I do have a power point. I will try to keep it as interesting as possible. Impact fees are a complicated topic.

Impact fees: (*Please see attached presentation*)

My hope is, if the stars align, we'd be able to have reports for you for these two impact fees by your next meeting, so I think that's June 19th. There is some additional data that I will flag along the way that we'll be asking town staff to provide to help fill in some blanks. Overall, I think you'll get a sense of how things work here over the next few minutes. There is always the ability if something comes in that's not on this list, we can certainly add it in...The other way would be to mine the CIP. It's best and more defensible if it is truly local data that informs it.

M. Chalbeck: So, option one, you get the information from the road agent.

B. Brock: I think you are looking at more like 2.5 for a mile of road. It's like \$500-\$600 a foot.

Laura Pitassi – 4 Healey Road: That assumption doesn't take into account the existing status of the road when they do the calculation. So, if a road is riddled with potholes versus one that was recently done.

N. Miller: It's based on full depth construction. A full box cut and rebuild, that's what it's based on.

R. Cartier: When Chester did theirs, did they do their estimate based on their road agent doing the road or sending it out to a contractor?

N. Miller: They did it based on inflation from their previous assumption which their road agent was comfortable with.

R. Cartier: The other thing that I would be concerned with in Candia is that our road agents have always been very frugal. I want to make sure that there is enough of a buffer in there so if you need to have someone come in on a contract basis, then they can do it. Would you use the state's basis for construction.

N. Miller: I wouldn't just because in this context we want to make it as local as possible. They operate under a completely different set of design specifications than the town. There is another option here. We could just ask Jeff to provide a number and that's defensible because it's the road agent's number.

T. D'Arcy: We would have to convince him to take the sweat equity piece and bill it.

N. Miller: I guess there is a couple of things we could do here. We have option 1 in our back pocket. Option 2, we could see, I don't know if Jeff had bid anything out that's a full depth reconstruction and if he has, we can mine those numbers. But Option 3 would be, ask Jeff.

T. D'Arcy: I don't know that we are going to get the right number without getting a real number from a contracted company or an from something that Auburn or Chester has just done.

N. Miller: This is a fee that gets charged to the developer. It's always good to have every assumption in that be as defensible and airtight as possible and erring on the side of being conservative is not a bad thing here.

B. Brock: If you are going to talk to Jeff. I think the one you could ask him was about Healey Road. That was a complete job. That would have been as close a project as he would have done.

R. Cartier: Are accessory dwelling units included?

N. Miller: They are not but I did develop a methodology for Chester that is square footage based to do ADUs. I could do the same if that's of interest. ADUs are a little different than the rest but I did do a square footage-based methodology that I think works well and we can incorporate something similar.

T. D'Arcy: Are we going to have a tool?

N. Miller: Yes, there will be a table. You will have a look up table. We will have a big table which will cover most of what you are likely to see but if something else comes in, we can help the town with that.

N. Miller: The new police station and the addition to the fire station. The new police station for any capital facility, one of the core things that is a basis of how to calculate an impact fee is determining how many people that facility can serve. We are under the assumption that the existing police station is fully maxed out and can't serve any more people than the 4,013 people that currently live in the Town of Candia. We know that there is, in the CIP, a significant expansion of that and the cost of that expansion would be included in the impact fee calculation. So, now what we need to do is some math to determine how many people could that new police station...what population size if the Town of Candia could be served by that new police station and the most straightforward way of doing that is to say, the existing station is 1900 square feet and it serves the absolute maximum of 4,013 people, what can a 4,464 square foot police station serve and just based on that proportion alone we could assume that the maximum service population of the new police station would be 9,428 people but that new police station would be good to serve a much larger town of 9,428 people and that 9,428 maximum service population becomes the base of which the impact fee for that new police station is calculated from because the proportional impact of every new person coming into the Town of Candia paying their fair share of that new police station. That new police station could serve potential, a town of 9,428 before it needs to be bigger and better. There are many ways of coming up with that number, you could look at how many staff are currently served in the existing station and how many could be accommodated in the future station and develop a ration that way. I did it solely here on square feet.

T. D'Arcy: I would just argue with that assumption for one basic reason, in that, the current police station doesn't have standard facilities even for their amount of current activity. Women officers with no women's bathroom or shower and so on and so forth. I would argue that police station is substandard even for 4,013 people.

N. Miller: The other way of looking at it, potentially. There are certain standards of one police officer consumes x amount of square feet of space or should have allocated to them x amount of square feet of space in a facility. So, how many would the current facility accommodate if it was fully compliant and with whatever that standard is versus 4,464 square feet.

B. Brock: Square foot to square foot does not jive.

M. Guay: At some point there will be a tipping point.

N. Miller: At the end of the day, we need to arrive at what the maximum future service population of those improved facilities are. The new police station and the expanded fire station. And it's not a tipping point where one person now pays the difference. It's that we know what those costs are going to be and we are going to spread those costs out over time, over that entire maximum service population as development occurs.

T. D'Arcy: If the Chief says, when we cross the line of 6,000 residents, the fire station is not going to be an acceptable size anymore and we are going to have to build a new one, then that's something we need to start charging for now. Because both of these are in the CIP, identified as needs, programmed in the CIP and have defensible dollar amount associated with them, then it is defensible to include them. One of the state law prerequisites to having impact fees at all is having a CIP.

L. Pitasse – 4 Healey Road: So, my question is, I would probably assume 25 years ago, the town wasn't approving as many assisted living facilities or over 55 + housing communities if you will. Obviously real estate is booming right now, everybody wants to move to Candia. Is there a number that calculates the estimated population growth and then how does that correlate to the CIP. Because right now if we are not taking a statistic every year to measure what the population growth would be, how are those fees going to be distributed if we are only doing this measurement maybe once ever ten years? You could be really short, but you could also be charging a lot more.

N. Miller: The hard counts take place at the census. Each year the State of NH does a population estimate, town by town. So, there is a fairly defensible estimate. The US Census Bureau also has something called the American Community Survey which is not a hard count but it's a fairly broad survey and they publish on an annual basis, population numbers, even at the county subdivision level, which is town level. But those are estimates as well, they aren't hard counts.

T. D'Arcy: There are decades and decades and decades of government agencies that do extrapolate the population growth down to town by town from census to census. So that's also, I think why the government is stuck with the ten-year census because first of all, it's really expensive, second of all they've got the real science down to extrapolate that growth out over time at a fairly local level.

L. Pitasse: It makes complete sense. I'm just saying like, the impact fees that you are talking about right now, you are saying that the last time we got these done was in 2009 if I heard you correctly.

M. Chalbeck: We have been trying to get this done for almost six years.

L. Pitasse: Is there a reason why it has taken so long? I'm not trying to be rude, I'm just curious.

T. D'Arcy: It's a process. There is an entire process you have to go through.

R. Cartier: The state requires certain things that we do before we can do other things. We had a very hard time getting the CIP Program done and as Nate said, you can't do impact fees unless you have a CIP. And the CIP just took a long time. As a matter of fact, it was like pulling teeth to get information, but we finally were able to get it with a lot of help. Nate, I have a question for you on that though. If I remember right, SNHPC did a buildout analysis of Candia a number of years ago. And then along that same line, SNHPC also did a cost of services study for Candia which probably should have been upgraded because the copy I have is probably about 15 years old. Would this incorporate any of that type of data in there?

N. Miller: No. The cost of services study is sort of a different animal that yields different information. That sort of thing would not be, this is, really as we walk through the steps of it, the core idea here is you're determining what the town's capital investment in this case in public safety facilities. How much does the police station, the fire station, and all the rolling stock cost and then you're calculating how to apply that on a per square foot and a per job basis so that when somebody comes in with a new house and you know that the new house is two and a half people, two and a half people are going to live in that house according to the US Census and the Town of Candia or whatever that number ends up being. It's probably two and a half or thereabouts.

R. Cartier: Capital instead of operational.

N. Miller: Correct, in fact operational in this case, operational is what you are going to get more out of the cost of community services. In the impact fee, operational and maintenance expenses are exclusively barred. We are not allowed to include those in the impact fees. This is simply capital needs of the town. That's the distinction between cost of community service analysis versus impact fee. The nine regional planning commissions, as well as the state office of planning and development, which is now under the business and economic affairs department. We do coordinate on population projections. We pool funds and we hire a demographer. The current ones were done in 2022 out to 2050, that's where these 2030 numbers come from. They are reasonably new and still very defensible. The growth that was seen throughout Southern NH in the 1970s, 80s, and 90s is going to slow down. On a top line population basis, that number is slowing down and the reason for that when you look out to 2040 and beyond is that we have an aging population, and that aging population is going to naturally decline and there are not enough new births to offset that decline so the population will stay more flat than it has been over the past decades because of that dynamic.

N. Miller: Next up, proportionate share. We need to calculate what is the proportionate share of residential demand on public safety versus non-residential demand. Believe it or not, once we have this data in hand all of this comes together fairly quickly, and I don't think it will be an extended period of time before we have reports ready. In a perfect world, I would target your next meeting which I believe is June 19th. That will be my goal.

S. Young: Could you tell me why the school system isn't included in the impact fees?

N. Miller: The town can certainly develop a school impact fee. There is a methodology for that. It is allowed.

R. Cartier: You gave us a proposal. That was put in the budget.

N. Miller: It sounds like we may be working on that in the future as part of a future contract.

S. Young: That would be great. I would assume that would contribute highly. Wouldn't the school have a higher impact on the impact fees?

N. Miller: It's hard to say. It's capital specific.

S. Young: Can I ask one more question? We just approved something a couple of years ago for 2.5 million. We can't include that in any impact fees for the future, is that correct?

N. Miller: You can...recouping the existing investment. The proportional share.

S. Komisarek: Would commercial be exempt?

N. Miller: Yes.

D. Young: I have been sitting here listening. A lot of calculations and stuff to do. What the hell is this going to cost? What are we talking about? Are there any towns that you already know what they charge?

N. Miller: Yeah, I can look up Chester's. Public Safety in Chester for a single-family house, detached \$1,440 for a Public Service Impact Fee. Road Impact Fee in Chester for a single-family house – \$1,176.

D. Young: So, we're worried about old people in this town. You are going to price young people right out of town. No young kids, they will never be able to live in this town.

C. Penfield: It may be tough on the new kids coming in. However, if they don't pay the impact fees, the people that are already here and aging in place will pick up that slack. So, somebody is going to pay this money.

D. Young: Some people have different opinions on whether you need certain things and you don't need certain things. Some things cost a lot of money. Some people think they need things that cost a lot of money. Some people think things don't have to cost so much money. That's a way you can run a town, so it maybe doesn't have to cost so much to live here.

N. Miller: I just want to clarify; I have that for an illustrative context. Chester's needs and facility costs and planned investments and all of that are significantly different than the Town of Candia's. Candia's Impact Fees may be higher or lower than that based on your program of projects and what's in the CIP. But the question was asked illustratively of what does a neighboring town's impact fee in those categories.

T. D'Arcy: You take that \$2,500 and you amortize it over thirty years. That's a couple, few hundred bucks a year.

R. Cartier: We already have impact fees in Candia now. This is not anything new.

B. Brock: We are just trying to upgrade and include them all, that's all.

T. D'Arcy: Let me make a recommendation that we don't chase too far down this rabbit hole because we are going to have this discussion when the impact fees come back. So, let's not put cart before horse. We are going to have a number in our hand in a couple of weeks and then we can say does this make sense or not.

N. Miller: Just because we calculate a number that is (x), your Board can adopt something lower than (x). You don't have to adopt (x). You can adopt what you are comfortable with as long as it's lower than (x).

Old Business:

- Carla Penfield - InvestNH HOP Updates – Steering Committee

Anne Lacey, Pattie Davis, and Judith Szot are also here. I think initially, you wanted me here to talk about our communication issue with SNHPC. We may have solved the problem, but we may have not solved the problem. At our last meeting, we did bring up with Cam, the fact that we had a long vacancy of lack of communication. So, we discussed that and we were told that that would be improved on. But some information that I thought you might want is... first let me ask a question, did the planning board get this grant?

Collective: Yes.

C. Penfield: You made the application for the grant and then you brought SNHPC on board.

T. D'Arcy: Well, they helped write the grant, so they were involved in the entire process.

C. Penfield: So, they helped write the grant and then we have this scope of work. In the scope of work, it says that during phase 1 that you would be meeting or that SNHPC would be meeting with the planning board, and I don't think that happened. My next thing is, have you received any invoices?

N. Miller: The town has received invoices.

T. D'Arcy: We wouldn't necessarily see the invoices.

C. Penfield: So, you don't know if you...do you know?

N. Miller: Invoices have been submitted on a monthly...so I will give the context here of I'm not fully up to speed on whatever may be going on with the HOP Grant but if there's follow-up items, I can certainly bring those back to the office and make sure that are staff follows up on them. I do know that SNHPC has submitted invoices to the town every

month since the project started. All of those invoices are in arrears. None of them have been paid, so that accrual is now 8 or 9 months back and I have asked our staff to look into that with the town and my understanding is that there is kind of a process here where we invoice the town, the town invoices the HOP Grant Funding. HOP Grant pays the town, the town pays us. And as I understand it, that process is just about resolved and I think all of the existing invoices for the project should be paid I think June 20th or something along those lines. But yes, SNHPC has invoiced monthly.

C. Penfield: So, they have not been privileged to see the invoices yet, so I thought what I would do is give you a rundown on what we have done for work, in regard to what the scope of work really is. This was supposed to start last May. The first meeting was in September. So, we met in September for an hour. We met in October for an hour, and we discussed a survey. In November, December, & January, we met once each month. We had three more meetings, at which time, we edited the survey that was to be sent out. The survey went online. We had 303 responses to an online survey and a paper survey. You'll be getting a great big colorful report with lots of graphs and lots of pie charts. But the summary of the report, I printed out the summary pages for everybody. You won't be surprised by what you read. You could have guessed it. Consequently, from last September until now, the committee did a survey and got results from the survey. The rest of the scope of work that was designed, in my opinion, hasn't gotten done. We will be setting up a booth at the Farmer's Market, asking for more input as result of the survey. So, that's basically the rundown of what we've done. We are supposed to wind this up in July and we will be done once we are finished with the Farmer's Market. Do you have any questions.

T. D'Arcy: My thought process is yes; I am a little disappointed in the length of time this has taken and the feedback that we've gotten. Obviously, I would like to know a lot more detail.

C. Penfield: You'll get a lot more detail.

T. D'Arcy: The interesting thing that we keep talking about point is that ADU is a common theme in the summary. Once we see the final results, I think then we and you as a committee might have more work to do just from the results from what's here.

C. Penfield: The thing is that this is supposed to be wrapped up in July. I am speaking strictly about Phase I. Phase I terminates in July, so whatever work you wanted to have done in Phase I, it's done and it's not exactly what you asked for.

A. Lacey: My view of this is that you gathered us, you appointed us as a committee to generate this survey to get the townspeople's opinions about this and in addition to this little piece of paper that we got initially, in addition to the survey, there was also attention to business owners, somebody was talking about developers, getting their input, none of that was done, even though it was mentioned. We didn't do it. We only did the survey to the townspeople. So, my question is, is it supposed to be done? We didn't pay for this thing, right? And then the last thing is the master plan contribution because there was a

big discussion when we were first appointed that the master plan was not going to be, we're not changing the master plan. And we're not doing it, the committee is not doing it. You guys are doing it. Any change or alteration to the master plan. The four items on the master plan concerning housing. So all that stuff is supposed to be done, as Carla said, by the end of the month. Do you care that some of that stuff wasn't done?

B. Brock: I think the survey is the important thing that we wanted to get back.

A. Lacey: So, what's going to happen now? At the Farmers Market on Saturday and maybe a couple of other things. We are going to have the results there. The people that stop by are going to have the opportunity to finetune it and then that is going to Cam and then he is going to regurgitate something.

T. D'Arcy: Phase II is where we actually dig into the master plan, the zoning ordinances, and the regulations. That is not something that either this Board or you guys can do without professional help. I think the main part of Phase I was to assess the town's needs for housing and I believe Cam was going to also bring in other outside data in terms of how we compare to other towns around us as far as housing units and that type of thing. That's what all this was about, gathering all that data. We haven't seen anything yet either.

A. Lacey: The results are on the website, and it's beautifully presented.

P. Davis: The scope of work that was going to be done. Task #3 from March to July was to be performed by SNHPC with assistance from the Town of Candia, which was to set up and maintain project information and establish links and public comments. Coordinate and facilitate input sessions to be held in June. Develop, distribute, and analyze the survey and periodically prepare press releases. Then Part 4 was meetings with the planning board between March and July and with the assistance of the planning board to have these meetings. \$10,500 they were estimating this to happen. I don't see us having done \$10,500 worth of anything in the last two months. We did the survey which was \$2,000 or \$3,000. I just think you guys got gypped is the best way to say it. I think the amount that came up, we had nine of us on the Board and when Carla brought up last time that there was going to be a second task force and that you all were interested in having this one continue. Five of the people have spoken to me and said it was a waste of our time, I do not think that was worth it. Just letting you know. You want to get people involved in something and they feel like it was a waste of time

T. D'Arcy: That wasn't the feedback that we hoped.

R. Cartier: I was intimately involved originally with Phase I. There were two results that I was under the impression that I was under the impression we were going to get from them. One of them was an analysis of what our current housing is. And an analysis of what they would like to see done. I was always concerned because when I was Chair, I never saw an invoice to approve. I have no idea who approved any of the invoices. I have no idea what was on there for what done and the hours being in there. This is a

shock to me that SNHPC has been submitting invoices for the last eight months and the Chair of the planning board, neither myself nor Tim have seen these invoices to approve. It's required that the Planning Board Chair approve any invoices for any funding. You are right, it was a \$25,000 contract and I haven't seen \$25,000 worth of work because I haven't seen the invoices and I know they do detailed work on their invoices.

C. Penfield: I would offer up a couple of conclusions.

T. D'Arcy: I do want to say Nate that the planning board has received very little feedback in this entire process, and we are not pleased.

C. Penfield: We were told initially that SNHPC was in charge of everything, that I was the token Chairperson and we had someone taking notes but SNHPC would handle everything. And in your scope of work, it does state that you will get reports from SNHPC, that you would get invoices. You didn't get those. From where we all sit, not all of the work that was mentioned in the scope of work was done. So, there a couple of things that I would like you all to think about and then I think we can draw conclusions from.

1. There was an enormous lack of communication. Communication from Cam to the committee. Communication from SNHPC to the planning board. Lack of communication between the planning board and this committee. We had no idea who we were supposed to be following. There was such a lack of communication. The other thing I want to say is the group of people worked very, very well together. We had differences of opinion. We were able to resolve our issues, draw conclusions. The fact that probably half of this group is very disillusioned and is saying they don't want to move on to the next phase is disheartening because you are losing if they decide not to proceed into Phase II. You are going to have to replace them and it's going to be difficult to replace them. I would hope that everyone would come back, and I would think that with the information that we've given you tonight and the information that you are going to get from SNHPC that Phase II would be better organized. It was a very frustrating experience for most of us.

P. Davis: In the beginning of January, we were told that Cam was going on his paternity leave. 4-6 weeks. I was a little disappointed that there was no one else in SNHPC that took that job over. Now we were just dead for six weeks which turned into all of February, all of March, and most of April. We didn't hear from him until late April.

C. Penfield: I know this is difficult to hear and especially difficult for you to hear while you are sitting here.

N. Miller: I appreciate you bringing it up and I appreciate the conversation. It's not the feedback that I want to hear but at the same time I can bring this feedback back and talk with our staff and figure out an appropriate path forward. What would the Board like to see happen here, given this discussion.

R. Cartier: Was there something in there about making recommendations for the Master Plan?

N. Miller: I am not familiar with this particular scope of work, I haven't worked on this project, but I can go back to our office and coordinate with our staff and make sure the things that need to get done, get done.

C. Penfield: That is true. There was work done other than at our meetings. We had five meetings where we had input, where we participated. Work was done by SNHPC.

K. Coughlin: The form that is on the website was generated by SNHPC. It is incredibly frustrating to be working diligently and not get the support you wanted.

B. Brock: At the very least, I think Cam was lacking in communication.

N. Miller: He did go on paternity leave for a period of time.

P. Davis: I get that, but I also get that SNHPC is not Cam. I think that when you entered into it, you didn't enter into it with Cam, you entered into it with SNHPC, they gave you Cam, and if he couldn't be there...

R. Cartier: I would like to make a suggestion. This is all talk, we have no idea what went on. Probably one of the things that would be extremely useful, at least to me, is if there was a summation for what has been done in each of the tasks down here and where they stand. For example, updating master plan chapters, we should have a report on that last month. That's one of the key items. The survey went fine. I think the other thing, I know you had the data for the existing housing stock at SNHPC. To me, that's the backup data and the data data. That's a key aspect for us to be able to do. To work on anything else we do from a planning board standpoint. Do we need to update our Master Plan because our housing needs and our current housing don't jive.

C. Penfield: My conclusion is that you got the money, you wrote the scope of work, you hired SNHPC, and you thought everything was going to be fine.

M. Chalbeck: We formed the committee.

C. Penfield: Yes, you did. But then you didn't keep track of us. You did not keep track of the project.

1.17.24 minutes – committee update. *(Please see attachment)*

N. Miller: When I go back to my office tomorrow, what is it that the Board would like me to do to move this whole discussion in the direction where it needs to go.

M. Chalbeck: An email to Tim and myself. How far you have come, with the invoices, what's billed, and what still needs to happen.

N. Miller: So basically, what Rudy said.

M. Chalbeck: Then we need to schedule another meeting with the HOP Committee and have the master plan pieces so they can adopt it and then bring it to us.

K. Coughlin: I would be very interested to know what work product was actually created as it relates to the invoices submitted.

R. Cartier: I would think that the Board should get a copy of that.

P. Davis: I think Carla should get a copy too.

R. Cartier: I think the entire committee should and the entire Board should because it's public knowledge, it's public funds, and it's a right-to-know that everybody should get a copy of the status of all the tasks.

C. Penfield: It's frustrating that this did not work well.

N. Miller: 1. Send an email to Tim and Mark or have Cam send an email to Tim and Mark detailing a summation of what has been done in each task of the scope of work. 2. Particularly with a focus on the master plan update status. 3. Schedule a meeting with the committee. 4. Detail or provide work products created in relation to invoices submitted.

J. Szot: Is Carla going to get a copy?

K. Coughlin: Copy Amy

R. Cartier: Copy Amy

C. Penfield: Can we talk about Phase II for a minute? It appears that Stantec is going to handle Phase II?

T. D'Arcy: Yes, part of it. Stantec will be doing some work on Phase II, yes.

N. Miller: Thank you all for the feedback. We will move forward with that list of things. Apologies for any frustrations that may have been caused through the whole process. Apologies to the committee for their frustrations. That's not how we like to do business, so we are going to work to make it right.

M. Chalbeck: Carla, you did a great job. She has done a great job as Chair, and I would like to see her stay on.

K. Coughlin: I would like to thank you all for your perseverance.

- Approval of Minutes, 5.15.24 – Postponed until next meeting.

Other Business:

- Town Planning

T. D'Arcy: I want to know if the Board wants to make a motion that we cancel the meeting on July 3rd.

R. Cartier: **I'll make that Motion.** M. Guay – **Second:** All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

- Any other matter to come before the Board.

R. Cartier: Southern NH Commissioners, we do have a new Commissioner. We are going to need someone to replace me because I can't spend enough time, so we'll need to have someone else. We have two spots and I think it's something that's very important that we participate in it. I was on both the regular and the executive committee which meets at 7:30 tomorrow morning.

T. D'Arcy: Is that something we do or the Select Board does?

R. Cartier: We do.

K. Coughlin: What does it entail...I am willing to give it a try. What do I have to do Board wise?

R. Cartier: Just submit a letter.

Motion for Kevin Coughlin to represent Candia for the Southern NH Commissioners. R. Cartier. **Second** : S. Komisarek. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Motion to Adjourn: M. Guay. B. Brock: **Second.** All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Meeting adjourned – 9:06 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Amy M. Spencer

Land Use Coordinator

cc: file