

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 17, 2025  
APPROVED MINUTES**

PB Members Present: Tim D’Arcy, Chairman; Mark Chalbeck, Vice Chairman; Brien Brock, BOS Representative; J. Lindsey; Kevin Coughlin; Linda Carroll; David Labbe

PB Members Absent: Michael Santa, Alt.

T. D’Arcy calls the meeting to order at approximately 6:30pm, followed immediately by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**New Business:**

- **Case #25-008 (MAJOR Subdivision & Site Plan):**

**Applicant/Owner:** James Logan, London Bridge South, Inc. 273 Currier Road Candia, NH 03034; **Property Location:** 466 & 476 High Street Candia, NH 03034; Map 405 Lot 29 & 30; **Intent:** *Construct a 50-unit condominium-style elderly housing development.*

Chad Brannon, a civil engineer with Fieldstone Land Consultants, introduces himself and James Logan, the applicant. The property consists of 162 acres with 1,023 linear feet of frontage along High Street (Route 27) and frontage along Baker Road. The access to the development will be on High Street. The access roads will be 22-foot-wide private roads maintained by the Condominium Association. “Road A” will start adjacent to the Seward House, requiring a New Hampshire DOT access permit, and will loop around to the clubhouse. The existing driveway to the clubhouse will be maintained as an emergency access and will be gated due to inadequate site distance, with access for police, fire, and rescue via a Knox Box or crash gate. Fire Chief Dean Young states the fire department is satisfied with the project, and the agreement is to improve the fire pond in the northeast corner, providing additional capacity for the entire community.

They plan to preserve the existing residential structures, with one to be converted into a clubhouse. Existing amenities around the house will be preserved and rehabbed, including the pool area and accessory structures. A strong trail system will utilize existing cattle alleys and stone walls, with efforts made to preserve existing stone walls. The layout orients homes to capture views while still providing buffering to neighboring properties. The closest unit will be about 400 feet from the road and positioned on a plateau, preserving agricultural fields and mature trees to maintain the rural and agricultural aesthetic of the surrounding area. The barn behind the Seward house, on an easement, will be preserved as a site amenity, with a proposal to market the equestrian side and utilize agricultural fields for equestrian use by the residents.

Jurisdictional wetlands are scattered throughout the property, with only one formal wetland crossing proposed for road construction. Other parts of the wetlands will be affected with

proposed updates to the existing trails, but those updates are planned for further in the future and will be addressed at that time.

The site will have shared underground utilities and septic systems, with shared septic systems for two or three units where possible. A community water system with a well located entirely on the property is also proposed, subject to state permitting. There will be multiple stormwater management areas situated behind the units, and the road is designed as a closed drainage system, with front yards draining to the road and backyards draining away.

Board members now ask their questions regarding the development. This includes checking for endangered species on the property, to which Mr. Brannon states they are currently consulting with Fish & Game, inquiring about whether the undeveloped backland will remain as such, to which Mr. Brannon states yes, with a total 89% of the property in preservation, and if the walking trails will only be for the residents of the community, to which Mr. Brannon states primarily yes. A concern is raised about the subdivision on a Class VI Road, questioning its permissibility. Mr. Brannon mentions state laws promoting development on Class VI roads, requiring selectmen approval and a variance. They hope the board will consider these as a condition of approval. The worst-case scenario is that the unit could be absorbed back into the development as a 55 and older unit, requiring only Selectmen's approval for Baker Road access.

Steve Keach, from Keach-Nordstrom Associates, is asked to share his review letters and other thoughts on the project. Mr. Keach first addresses the Baker Road issue, referencing a statutory change in RSA 674:41I(c) regarding building permits on Class VI roads. The current statute requires dispensation from the Board of Selectmen, but this will change on July 1st, 2026, after which a building permit can be issued with a waiver. He then outlines general comments, including the necessity of various state permits and a recommendation for a performance guarantee for site restoration and erosion control. For zoning matters, Mr. Keach refers to variances granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment on April 22nd. He notes that the site plan relies on these variances. He also discusses the conditional use permit for senior housing, which runs concurrently with site plan review. He also discusses the benefits of incorporating zoning requirements into the condominium documents. It is recommended the Board collect a draft and have counsel review it for compliance. Mr. Keach also mentions the 10% cap on 55+ dwelling units and suggests documenting this for the record. The architectural design and fire protection aspects are also discussed, with Mr. Keach noting the need for Board ratification of any alternative arrangements negotiated with the fire department regarding sprinkler systems. Next, he addresses the single wetland impact of 2,750 square feet, permitted under the Town's wetland ordinance. The proposed construction is essential to the productive use of the land. Regarding planning design matters, he discusses limited common areas around each unit and the need for these to be defined by meets and bounds. Mr. Keach then delves into the waivers requested for road standards, explaining that the Town's current standards are inappropriate for the compact condominium neighborhood. The proposed road construction is of a higher degree of finish and

cost. He also states that he is comfortable with the waiver request to modify the geometry of the turnaround and cul-de-sac, if the Fire Chief is. His review concludes by stating that the proposed design standards are appropriate for the development. He believes the application is complete and can be accepted. The Chair asks for clarification on the road for fire equipment, specifically the cul-de-sac. Mr. Keach confirms that the drainage is good and highlights the conversation about having a larger number of smaller stormwater management areas. He praises the stormwater design as close to a low-impact design.

The Chair goes through the checklist to determine a complete application and entertains a motion.

M. Chalbeck: **Motion** to accept the application as complete. J. Lindsey: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed.**

T. D'Arcy opens the public hearing at 7:41pm.

John Adams, of 946 High Street, raises his concerns about proper screening to ensure the units will not be visible from the road. Mr. Brannon responds to the concerns by stating that the closest unit will be approximately 400 feet from the road, and they will be keeping the existing stone wall and pine trees to preserve the agricultural aesthetic that currently exists on the property. At most, some rooftops may be visible from the street due to the development being far past the field that currently exists.

Kathleen Tierney, of 178 New Boston Road, asks what can guarantee the existing structures can and will be used, due to their age. She references another project that was supposed to restore and utilize an existing structure, but after approval the house was deemed structurally unsound and had to be demolished. Mr. Brannon states the clubhouse is of more modern construction than the example and is in good condition. It has also been vacant for much less time than the structure she mentioned. The farmhouse will be preserved for its historic character but will not be a public space, meaning it will not need to meet the same standards as the clubhouse.

Peter O'Neil, of 320 Baker Road, expresses his concern over the impact the development will have on his road, which is Class VI and has been maintained by him for the past 35 years. It is clarified that the development's main access point for the residents will be off High Street, except for one building lot. Additionally, because High Street is a state road, the Town has no jurisdiction concerning traffic. The developer will be receiving a NHDOT permit for the access, and it is pointed out that DOT standards are higher than the Town's, ensuring the access will be more than acceptable.

T. D'Arcy closes the public hearing at 7:56pm and Mr. Brannon requests to continue the case to the January 7<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting. All Board Members vote in favor.

## **Old Business:**

- **Case #24-009 (MAJOR Subdivision)**

**Applicant/Owner:** Bentley Circle, LLC, 163 Chester Turnpike Candia, NH 03034;

**Property Location:** Diamond Hill Road Candia, NH 03034; Map 409 Lot 228; ***Intent:***

*Request permission to commence land clearing phase of approved development.*

L. Carroll recuses herself due to being an abutter to the property.

Kevin Landry introduces himself as the owner of Bentley Circle, LLC. He explains he purchased the project after the Board conditionally approved it and has faced unexpected issues since. He is requesting permission to begin non-structural site work, including stumping, stripping of loam, stockpiling topsoil, and moving boulders, before the final mylar is formally submitted, signed, and recorded. No underground utilities, road construction, or building construction will begin before mylar completion. The request is due to unforeseen delays related to the mylar: Jones and Beach Engineering, the initial firm used for the project, cannot stamp the mylar because they didn't conduct the boundary surveying. Hayes Engineering, which did the surveying, has closed its doors, and the licensed surveyor is now retired. Mr. Landry has hired a new surveying company, which is now working to certify the perimeter for the mylar. This, understandably, will take time due to the size of the property. The Chair agrees it is a reasonable request due to the extenuating circumstances, and Mr. Landry confirms they have received all required state permits. All conditions have been met except producing the final mylar.

The Chair clarifies that site plan regulations prohibit construction without the mylar, but do not specifically mention grubbing and clearing. However, the standard operating procedure has been to wait for the mylar and pre-construction meeting before commencing any work. Because of this, he wants the decision to be voted on by the entire Board.

T. D'Arcy opens the floor for public comment at 8:05pm

Linda Carroll, of 117 Diamond Hill Road, mentions a spring along the proposed road and asks if the road construction will affect the spring's flow and if there is a drainage plan to maintain it. Mr. Landry clarifies the road will be to the right of the spring and it will be sloped and graded to maintain drainage. Additionally, they plan to utilize ground up stumps as a natural silt fence.

Steve Keach is asked if he would like to add any comments from his perspective. Mr. Keach explains this is a very unique situation, stating he has never seen this in his 41 years of practice. He emphasizes that Mr. Landry bought an approved project and is fulfilling the conditions. He suggests the preparatory work is best done now while the ground is frozen. Limiting the work to preparatory tasks is acceptable as long as the surety is in place for erosion control and restoration. The issue was brought to the Board because the correct course of action was unclear. Steve clarified that a waiver isn't necessary, but a fair and equitable dispensation is appropriate

due to the encountered problems. He recommends allowing Mr. Landry to proceed with the work while the other matter is resolved, with supervision from his office and the surety in place.

D. Labbe: **Motion** to allow land clearing based on the surety bond being in place and regulations followed with supervision from Keach-Nordstrom. J. Lindsey: **Second**. L. Carroll: **Abstain**. All else in favor. **Motion passed**.

### **Other Business:**

- Impact Fee Review with Nathan Miller, SNHPC

Mr. Miller presents an updated Solid Waste Impact Fee, which has been in place since 2009. The calculated impact fees have changed slightly, with single-family priced at \$933, duplex at \$759, multi-family at \$620, and manufactured housing at \$720. He explains the methodology for deriving the impact fees, which involves determining the capital cost of solid waste facilities per capita across the serviced population, translating that number to a per capita cost, and then to a dwelling unit cost based on the average number of people per unit. There has been very modest population growth within the past couple decades, which Mr. Miller attributes to the natural decline of the aging population, and the Town having more deaths than births. However, the immigration is keeping the population growing slightly. The purpose of the impact fees are to offset the Town's investment into infrastructure to serve future population growth; the Town's total investment in solid waste capital facilities is \$2.368 million. Mr. Miller suggests the Board takes time to go through the draft and contacting him with any questions or comments.

When asked about school impact fees, Mr. Miller states he has not yet finished due to an important document that states the maximum enrollment capacity for the school being missing. He has been working on finding the document, but may need to resort to a back-up plan by requesting a completely new document from school administrative staff. He states there is no need for the Town to wait for a school impact fee to be finished before scheduling a hearing and implementing the new solid waste impact fees, if the Board wishes to do so. The school impact fee draft may not be ready until early next year due to the difficulty in finding the enrollment capacity report.

- Approval of Minutes 11.19.25

J. Lindsey mentions two spelling errors with her name.

L. Carroll: **Motion** to approve the minutes of 11.19.25 as corrected. J. Lindsey: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to adjourn. L. Carroll: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:43pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Megan Ross

Land Use Coordinator

cc: file