

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF December 4th, 2024
APPROVED MINUTES

PB Members Present: Tim D’Arcy, Chairman; Brien Brock, BOS Representative; Kevin Coughlin Scott Komisarek (via Zoom); Judi Lindsey; Mike Santa, sitting in for Mark Chalbeck

PB Members Absent:
Mark Chalbeck; Vice-Chair
Linda Carroll

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

New Business:

- Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Accessory Dwelling Units: To consider a draft of amendments to the Candia Zoning Ordinance for the 2025 ballot. The full text of all proposed Zoning Amendments will be available for inspection on the town website as well as in the Land Use Office

The discussion centers on splitting a previous amendment into two separate amendments for clarity and effectiveness.

The first amendment pertains to allowing a detached ADU unit. The speaker mentions making grammatical changes to the draft, such as changing "unit" from plural to singular. The amendment aims to permit detached ADUs by right, rather than through special exceptions.

A question arises about the status of a related bill in the House and Senate. It is confirmed that the bill was tabled in the Senate and did not pass in the last session. The speaker emphasizes the importance of moving forward with the amendment regardless of the bill's status.

The discussion clarifies that the first amendment allows one ADU by right, while the second amendment would permit a second ADU by special exception, which must be attached, if the first one is detached. The rationale for this separation is to give townspeople a choice in how they want to regulate ADUs.

The speaker explains that the first amendment is about fairness and providing options for homeowners who may not have the ability to add an attached ADU due to property constraints. The goal is to allow more flexibility in housing options.

The conversation shifts to the process of obtaining permits for ADUs. The speaker notes that the proposed changes would eliminate the need for a lengthy Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) process, allowing homeowners to obtain building permits more easily.

A speaker expresses confidence that the first amendment will pass by a wide margin, as it aligns with community needs and expectations. The importance of publicizing the amendments to inform residents is also highlighted.

The speaker reiterates that the first amendment is about allowing detached ADUs without the burdensome ZBA process, making it easier for residents to create living spaces for family members.

A clarification is made regarding the wording of the amendments, with a suggestion to correct grammatical issues. The speaker mentions that the language used in the amendments is based on legal advice.

The discussion moves to public comments, with a resident named Scott Cunan, 85 Flint Road, sharing his personal experience. He expresses support for detached ADUs, citing his need for a separate living space for his mother, who has Alzheimer's. Scott emphasizes the importance of allowing detached ADUs, regardless of state legislation, to provide flexibility for residents. He notes that many people in town are interested in housing options and that detached ADUs can help meet those needs.

A speaker highlights the fairness of the proposed amendments and the need for more accessible housing options.

Concerns are raised about the potential tax impact of allowing more ADUs in the community. The speakers discuss the balance between providing housing options and managing tax burdens for residents.

The conversation touches on the practical aspects of connecting detached ADUs to existing septic systems. The challenges of accommodating additional living spaces without overburdening existing infrastructure are acknowledged.

The conversation touches on the regulations set by the state and town regarding the number of bedrooms allowed without needing a separate septic system.

One participant expresses a desire to downsize from a larger house to a smaller one, reflecting on the challenges of maintaining a larger property and the associated taxes. The conversation shifts to the changing dynamics of housing needs, noting that young families are struggling to afford rent and housing, leading to scenarios where parents may move into accessory dwelling units (ADUs) while their children occupy the main house.

A question arises regarding the minimum size for new constructions, with the state proposing a minimum of 800 square feet. The local regulations propose a maximum of 850 square feet for accessory dwelling units, ensuring that they remain subordinate to the primary residence. The discussion clarifies that there is no minimum size for ADUs, allowing for smaller units like 400 square foot studios.

The regulations stipulate that an ADU cannot exceed 75% of the size of the primary house to maintain its accessory nature. This is to prevent the construction of two full-sized homes on the same lot. The conversation also addresses the need for clear definitions and regulations to prevent misuse of the ADU designation.

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to accept zoning Amendment Number One with modifications for punctuation, after approval by the lawyer for the March Ballot. **Second:** J. Lindsey. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

The discussion then transitions to Amendment Number Two, which includes similar provisions regarding size and the addition of a second accessory dwelling unit on the property, with one being allowed to be detached.

The rationale for these changes includes anticipated state legislation and the desire to provide more housing options for families. The group discusses the potential impact of these regulations on the community, emphasizing the need for flexibility in housing options to accommodate various family structures and financial situations.

The conversation highlights the importance of ensuring that detached units remain within a reasonable distance from the primary dwelling to maintain the character of the neighborhood. The group acknowledges that while there may be limited opportunities for multiple ADUs due to costs and land constraints, the regulations aim to provide options for those who can accommodate them.

The discussion touches on the potential for existing structures like barns to be converted into ADUs, which could provide additional housing options without the need for new construction. The group emphasizes the importance of legal compliance and safety in building practices, noting that unpermitted constructions can lead to significant issues.

The conversation shifts to the topic of parking requirements for ADUs, with the group agreeing that existing parking spaces should suffice without requiring additional spaces for each ADU. This approach aims to simplify regulations and accommodate homeowners who already have ample parking.

A motion is made to accept the proposed regulations with modifications for punctuation, which is seconded and unanimously approved by the group. The group discusses the need for clear communication to voters regarding the implications of the proposed changes, suggesting the creation of a one-page summary to help clarify the details.

B. Brock: **Motion** to accept zoning Amendment Number Two with modifications for punctuation, after approval by the lawyer for the March Ballot. **Second:** J. Lindsey. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Old Business:

- **Case #24-008 (Major Subdivision):**

Applicant: DAR Builders, LLC, 722 East Industrial Park Drive, Unit 17, Manchester, NH 03109; **Owner(s):** DAR Builders, LLC, 722 East Industrial Park Drive, Unit 17, Manchester, NH 03109; **Property Location:** Crowley Road, Candia, NH 03034; Map 414 Lot 152. **Intent:** *To create a right of way to a proposed 25 lot subdivision in Chester (24 buildable lots) and leave a 3.0- acre lot in Candia.*

*****continued to December 18th*****

The meeting agenda includes old business regarding Crowley Road, which has been continued to December 18th. A participant expresses a desire to share thoughts on the matter, although it is noted that there will be no discussion on it. The participant mentions having no personal stake in the issue but suggests that if residents are concerned about traffic, they might consider ending the road and not allowing through traffic, referencing a similar situation in Manchester where a road was blocked, and the land was sold to a school for playground use.

The participant acknowledges that residents on Crowley Road may be upset about losing access to Chester but emphasizes the poor condition of the road and the need for upgrades. The idea is presented as a thought to keep in mind, and the conversation shifts to the minutes of the meeting, indicating a desire to move on from the topic.

Other Business:

- Regulations
- Town Planning
- Approval of Minutes: 11.20.24

Before proceeding to the minutes, another participant brings up final plans for duplexes on High Street. They discuss a detailed review of revisions made to the plans, confirming that the changes are merely additional constraints and disclaimers without altering the original agreement. The participant indicates that everything is in order for signing.

The conversation then shifts to an engagement letter from Southern New Hampshire Planning regarding impact fees for a school and the Solid Waste District, amounting to \$8,000, which is within the budget for the year. The need to sign the letter to convert the funds is emphasized.

A vote is taken to approve the Chairman, Tim D'Arcy, signing the engagement letter, with all members present voting in favor.

B. Brock: **Motion.** K. Coughlin: **Second.** All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

Following this, the group moves on to discuss the minutes of the previous meeting. A participant points out a correction regarding their name, which was misspelled in the minutes.

Another participant shares a positive comment received from a Chester resident about the efficiency of the planning board meeting, highlighting the board's effective work. The group acknowledges this feedback, and the discussion continues regarding the minutes.

J. Lindsey: **Motion** to approve the minutes of 11.20.24 as amended. **Second.** K. Coughlin. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

A question arises about a three-page draft for a zoning ordinance amendment that had been previously discussed. It is noted that the amendment regarding steep slopes is still on the radar, but there has been no movement on it since the initial discussion. The group reflects on the need to revisit the topic, as it has not been addressed in recent meetings.

Concerns are raised about the wording in the draft, particularly regarding building codes, which should specify a date rather than referencing outdated codes. The group agrees that clarity is essential in the language used in the ordinance amendments. The group discusses the importance of ensuring that the information is accurate and clear for future reference.

- Any other matter to come before the Board.

B. Brock: The tax rate has been set. \$12.86 per thousand.

Motion to adjourn: J. Lindsey. **Second:** M. Santa. All were in favor. **Motion passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:25PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy M. Spencer

Land Use Coordinator

cc: file