

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 2026
APPROVED MINUTES

PB Members Present: Tim D'Arcy, Chairman; J. Lindsey; Kevin Coughlin; Linda Carroll; David Labbe; Patrick Moran, Alt. BOS Representative

PB Members Absent: Mark Chalbeck, Vice Chairman, Excused; Brien Brock, BOS Representative, Excused; Michael Santa, Alt.

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

New Business:

- **Amendments to the Candia Zoning Ordinance for the 2026 ballot & Planning Board Regulations:**
 1. Solar – create ordinance to regulate both accessory and primary
 2. Add “Driveway” definition to Zoning Ordinance
 3. Add light pollution ordinance
 4. Contiguous Frontage
 5. ADU submittal with major subdivisions
 6. Lighting amendment to include minimal needed and motion sensors

The board discusses the proposed solar ordinance, which aims to codify solar installations for both accessory and primary uses. Currently, the Town lacks a solar ordinance. Accessory use, both roof-mounted and ground-mounted, would be permitted by right through building permits in all zones. Solar as a primary use would not be allowed in residential zones but would be permitted in the other zones through a special exception. The ordinance outlines compliance with setbacks, lot coverage, drainage, height restrictions, and visual impact minimization. All solar systems must adhere to applicable codes, with new utility lines underground and designed to reduce off-site glare. Solar systems not generating energy for 12 months would be considered abandoned and require removal and site restoration, potentially secured by performance bonds for primary use.

T. D'Arcy opens the public hearing at 6:37pm

John Adams, 946 High Street, asks about the definition of "screening" beyond fencing, seeking clarification on the types of screening required to reduce visual impact. The board explains that the specific screening requirements would be determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the application and site conditions, aiming to maintain the town's visual character. He also raises concerns about the increasing size of developments and their impact on the town's aesthetics. K. Coughlin asks about a size limit to installations, and it is stated that Eversource's transformer

sizes effectively limit the scale. One of the main goals with the ordinance is to maintain the balance between property owners' rights and the need to manage aesthetics, with favoring flexibility in screening requirements.

T. D'Arcy closes public hearing at 6:44pm

Small typographical errors are mentioned and will be addressed prior to sending the ordinance to counsel for review.

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to accept the proposed solar ordinance with modifications. L. Carroll: **Second.** All in favor. **Motion passed.**

The board discusses a proposal to define "driveways" in the Zoning Ordinance, as the definition currently exists only in the Subdivision Regulations. The Zoning Board requested this addition for consistency and enforceability. The proposed definition, copied from the Subdivision Regulations, states that driveways are vehicular entrances to public or private land for direct access to a garage, residence, business, or off-street parking area serving no more than two adjacent dwelling units, with a maximum of two driveways (curb cuts) per lot.

T. D'Arcy opens public hearing at 6:48pm

John Adams states that the State permits driveways and curb cuts if the lot is on a state road. This is correct, and although the Town cannot control curb cuts on state roads, the definition can still be used to define a driveway.

T. D'Arcy closes public hearing at 6:49pm

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to accept the proposed driveway definition. J. Lindsey: **Second.** All in favor. **Motion passed.**

Next, the board discusses a "lighting" amendment in the Planning Board Regulations. The proposed amendment involves adding two statements to the construction standards section, stating that in residential districts, lighting should be kept to a minimum and in character with surrounding properties (new letter "e") and that in all districts, motion sensor lights should be used where appropriate (new letter "f"). The purpose of these additions is to provide a mechanism to reduce lighting requirements in new developments and subdivisions, addressing frequent waiver requests from developers. The board discusses the importance of keeping lighting to a minimum, particularly on roads, to maintain clear dark skies.

Small grammatical errors are discussed in the phrasing of the additions.

T. D'Arcy opens and closes the public hearing at 6:56 due to no public comment.

L. Carroll: **Motion** to accept the addition of “e” and “f” to the regulations. P. Moran: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

The board transitions to a discussion regarding lot frontage requirements in Section 6.02 of the Zoning Ordinance. Currently, a lot must have 200 feet of road frontage. The discussion centers on whether to make this requirement include the term “contiguous”, as some lots have fragmented frontage. Questions are raised about the frequency of such situations and whether the proposed change would affect existing lots. A concern is expressed about houses being built behind other houses, congesting the area. A suggestion is made to table the decision on the contiguous lot frontage requirement until next year’s election to allow for further research and discussion.

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to table the consideration of this ordinance change. J. Lindsey: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

The board moves on to discuss a regulation amendment that addresses a potential loophole where developers could build Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in a subdivision without explicitly disclosing their intention to do so, effectively doubling the number of residences. The board proposes adding a new section requiring developers to provide a build-out plan including the projected number of ADUs, proposed locations, and compliance with zoning ordinance requirements. The board emphasizes the need to account for water and sewage considerations.

T. D’Arcy opens and closes the public hearing at 7:06 due to no public comment.

D. Labbe: **Motion** to accept the amendment. J. Lindsey: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

The board introduces the topic of a light pollution ordinance, prompted by enforcement concerns. Currently, there are no regulations to prevent excessive lighting that affects neighbors. The ordinance aims to address lighting issues and their impact on residents. The board acknowledges that they may not finalize the ordinance during this meeting but would discuss it and then open it for public comment. The board reviews the light pollution ordinance templates provided, highlighting several key points. For example, one section states that any light fixture 100 watts or greater must be shielded and cannot emit light above the horizon. Another section prohibits lights or spotlights aimed directly at residential buildings or adjacent land, or creating glare for pedestrians or drivers, even if less than 100 watts. The board discusses interest in making the ordinance applicable to both new and existing houses and buildings to prevent future issues and fix current lighting problems in town. The board acknowledged the desire to make the ordinance retroactive but recognizes potential challenges.

T. D’Arcy opens and closes the public hearing at 7:14pm due to no public comment.

More time is needed to study the light pollution ordinance further, prompting an agreement to

continue the discussion at the next meeting.

- **Case #25-009 (MAJOR Subdivision):**

Applicant: Franklin-Verra & Associates, Inc., 143 Raymond Road, Unit 4, Candia, NH 03034; **Owner:** Shawn E. Reed Family Revocable Trust, 113 South Road, Deerfield, NH 03037; **Property Location:** Diamond Hill Road Candia, NH 03034; Map 409 Lot 142 & 143; **Intent:** *Create two new building lots from 143 and definitively define Lot 142, shown as a Lot of Record on plan D-3748 R.C.R.D.*

L. Carroll recuses due to being an abutter.

Chris Dane, representing the owner, presents the plan, stating the subdivision involves dividing a 12-acre lot into two lots, each meeting frontage and area requirements with done test kits confirming septic system support. Proposed driveway areas also have good sight distance. The discussion clarifies the history of Lot 142 as a lot of record despite a technicality from 1973. It's confirmed there are no building locations shown on the plan, just the subdivision of the 12.8-acre lot into two 6+ acre lots. It's confirmed there are no wetlands on the property. The subdivision is classified as major due to the size creating potential for future subdivision of the lots. Otherwise, the board notes it's essentially a lot line adjustment and one-lot subdivision.

D. Labbe: **Motion** to accept the application as complete. K. Coughlin: **Second.** L. Carroll: **Abstain.** All else in favor. **Motion passed.**

T. D'Arcy opens the public hearing at 7:24pm.

Gale Pellegrino, of 50 Diamond Hill Road, expresses concern about a Town culvert that causes drainage issues, washing out her driveway, and is concerned about the possible negative impact clear cutting the property may have. She is assured that the development won't make the drainage situation worse and any new driveway will not impede the existing water flow. The property owner commits to working with Ms. Pellegrino in the spring to address the drainage issues. T. D'Arcy also states they can make a condition of approval to ensure this.

T. D'Arcy closes the public hearing at 7:28pm.

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to approve with the condition that they receive state permits and approval and that any development will not infringe on the Town's culvert. D. Labbe: **Second.** L. Carroll: **Abstain.** All else in favor. **Motion passed.**

Old 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.

T. D'Arcy states the application was deemed complete at the previous meeting and opens the public hearing at 7:31pm

John Adams, 946 High Street, expresses concern about the appearance of the development and its impact on the town's character, fearing it will become an eyesore due to clustered development. He suggests spreading the development out more to be more visually pleasing. Chad Brannon responds, stating the project was designed to be respectful of the rural character, with homes positioned to be appropriately set back. He highlights the existing stone wall and mature trees that will help screen the development from the road. The access road is designed to follow the topography, further minimizing visual impact. The rationale behind the clustered design is explained, emphasizing the trade-off between visibility and conservation. Spreading the development out would require cutting into the woods and disrupting the open space. The goal is to balance visual impact with preserving a large conservation area with trails. The developer argues that clustering is preferable to creating a sprawling suburban landscape.

The George's, residents in Candia, raise concerns via Zoom about the potential subdivision of a lot on the Class VI road, questioning its legality. The applicant clarifies that it is legal under state law, which promotes subdivisions on Class VI roads, although local regulations may not yet reflect this. Zoning relief would still be needed. The Planning Board typically doesn't get involved with Class VI road matters, as they are typically handled by the Board of Selectmen. The discussion delves into the details of the state law regarding building on Class VI roads, including potential waivers and insurance requirements. The new law is expected to come into effect in July. The applicant states that if zoning relief for the Class VI road lot is not granted, the unit will become part of the 55 and older development. If the approval is not obtained, the Board states they would want to see how the unit is integrated into the plans. The possibility of coming back with a new layout if rejected is discussed.

John Adams asks a question regarding road access, and it is confirmed there are two ways in and out of the development, with one being an emergency gated access. The road design meets all requirements.

T. D'Arcy closes the public hearing at 7:51pm.

The board moves on to Steve Keach's engineering review letter, focusing on zoning matters. The developer received three waivers from the Zoning Board: height relief for two-story dwellings (planned for approximately 30% of units, with one-story units prioritized for the front row), relief for private road specifications, and lighting relief to limit exterior lighting with motion sensors. The board also addresses the planning and design matters, noting that minor issues in the letter have been corrected. The developer hopes the board will consider a condition of approval to address all outstanding engineering comments.

The waiver request letter is reviewed by the board. Requests are as follows:

1. Article V, Section 5.06.14 of the Zoning Ordinance – Regarding the maximum building height in an elderly housing project.

The developer has already received a variance from the Zoning Board. Due to the way the regulation is written, it's unclear if the Planning Board has the authority to grant the waiver, resulting in the applicant to err on the side of caution and include the previously approved Zoning Ordinance variance requests.

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to acknowledge the approval of the waiver from the ZBA. L. Carroll: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

2. Article V, Section 5.06.18 of the Zoning Ordinance – Regarding roads, access drives, parking lots and walkways

The developer also received a variance through the ZBA for this. In his engineering review letter, Mr. Keach also agrees with the approval. The proposed roads are in a private development and will be maintained by the HOA, with the design intended to maintain a rural character. The roads will be under the HOA's oversight, allowing for lower speed limits. The turning radii for fire truck equipment are acceptable according to former Fire Chief Dean Young.

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to approve the waiver to build the road to the specifications in the plan instead of Town specifications based on Steve Keach's design matters section in his review letter. J. Lindsey: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

3. Article V, Section 5.06.20 of the Zoning Ordinance – Regarding lighting

The developer requests a waiver, stating that there is no public lighting in Candia, and the intent is to allow residents to enjoy the night sky without light pollution. The houses will be equipped with motion sensor building lights that are shielded and dark sky compliant. Additional motion lights are proposed for the community center, as a condition of approval for the variance received through the ZBA.

J. Lindsey: **Motion** to approve the waiver to limit the public lighting as requested. P. Moran: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

4. Articles 14.13 and 19.16 of the Subdivision Regulations – Regarding cul-de-sac designs

In their letter, Fieldstone Land Consultants states, "The design of this project has focused on trying to minimize the disturbance to the property while creating a neighborhood setting.

Requiring very large cul-de-sacs will increase the required length of roadway, associated drainage requirements and will require additional land clearing and earth disturbance. We have proposed a design that will reduce the cul-de-sac design significantly while providing for adequate turnaround design for emergency response personnel. The design proposes an interior radius of 39 feet and an exterior radius of 61 feet. The proposed design is consistent with typical cul-de-sac design standards that we have used and employed in various projects in the past. Strict enforcement of the Town's cul-de-sac turnaround design would result in financial hardship to our client as it would require additional construction, pavement and drainage with no measurable gain to the Town or Public. The cul-de-sac as designed will handle normal traffic, delivery and services vehicles and emergency response personnel when and if needed. The design will be reviewed and approved with the local Fire Department to ensure that the final design and dimensions will meet and exceed their design vehicle requirements.”

J. Lindsey: **Motion** to approve the waiver permitting a reduced cul-de-sac design. K. Coughlin: **Second.** All in favor. **Motion passed.**

5. Article 14.15 of the Subdivision Regulations – Regarding classification of streets and the standards for street design

In their letter, Fieldstone Land Consultants states, “We believe that the proposed road width, built to Town standards will provide safe access to the development and would be consistent with other elderly projects that we have designed. The roadway as designed would support emergency response vehicles as well. In our opinion reduced road widths in this setting will actually improve the safety of the neighborhood and provide for an environmentally responsible design. From a safety standpoint the roadway at a reduced width will slow traffic down creating a better neighborhood for its residents. A reduced road width will also reduce the overall impact required for land clearing, drainage and erosion and sedimentation controls. Based on all of the above, we believe requiring a 30-foot-wide Private Roadway to service a 48-unit Elderly Housing Development would be an excessive requirement as it would create an undesirable setting, result in additional disturbance and drainage mitigation and would create an unreasonable financial hardship to our client.

Horizontal and vertical curve designs are directly tied to the desired speed and sight distances provided for driveways. The desire for this project is to create a community setting with reduced speeds so smaller vertical and horizontal curve radii will help achieve this. We have designed the roads to fit the land and avoid wetland impacts. This would not be possible with strict conformance to the Town's specifications. The design will still provide for adequate safe sight distances as well. In addition, large vertical curves are difficult to grade and tend to have insufficient pitch which results in ponding and icing in the winter.”

D. Labbe: **Motion** to approve the waiver. K. Coughlin: **Second.** All in favor. **Motion passed.**

6. Article 14.20 of the Subdivision Regulations – Regarding curbing

In their letter, Fieldstone Land Consultants states, “Our client would like to build the project with cape cod berm curbing. This type of curbing works well with the driveway curb cuts and the bituminous concrete sidewalk. The proposed roadway and associated curbing will be maintained by the homeowner’s association so there will be no burden on the Town. We have seen properly installed cape cod berm curbing be a viable solution for projects and last for 20+ years and is the standard in some New Hampshire communities. Strict enforcement of this requirement would result in financial hardship to our client as it would require the installation of sloped granite curbing which cost more per linear foot is more labor intensive to install and offers no real gain to the to the Town or Public as the roadways are proposed to be private.”

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to accept the waiver. P. Moran: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

7. Zoning Article V, Section 5.06.24 – Regarding sprinkled residential dwellings

In their letter, Fieldstone Land Consultants states, “The applicant and the Candia Fire Department has reached an agreement to expand the existing fire pond in front of Lot 405-28. For these reasons we request that the planning board waive the requirement to install sprinklers in the dwelling units.”

J. Lindsey: **Motion** to accept the waiver. K. Coughlin: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**.

The board returns to the discussion regarding screening concerns. The property was clear-cut about 12 years ago, resulting in smaller trees. The plan is to save as many existing trees as possible, rather than planting new ones. The goal is to preserve trees between houses and throughout the property. The discussion covers the approach to tree maintenance, contrasting leaving the trees alone versus actively maintaining them. The idea is to keep trees as close to the houses as possible. An arborist's input is suggested for selecting which trees to keep for optimal growth. The presence of hemlocks on the property is noted, and their potential for transplantation and use as a screen is discussed. The plan shows that all vegetation will be maintained at the entrance of the site. The existing house will be remodeled in its current location. The granite wall will be pulled back for sight lines but maintained. The agricultural fields will also be maintained. Mature trees within the stone wall will be preserved, with no grading proposed near them. A slight adjustment to the driveway is planned to save the maple trees at the entrance, using tree wells. The goal is to maintain mature trees on the front of the project, minimizing the need for additional landscaping. The possibility of augmenting existing trees with hemlocks for additional screening is mentioned. The plan shows a 30-foot elevation difference from the road to the first building, influencing the landscape. The road alignment is designed to avoid a linear entrance, and the topography will be vegetated with lawn and field areas. Jurisdictional wetlands will

remain vegetated, and the existing barn and house will be preserved, maintaining a natural landscape.

The members of the board review the Conditional Use Permit Criteria and agree that the development meets all 6 criteria outlined in Article V Section 5.05 in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Brannon then introduces a phasing plan for construction, dividing the project into three phases. Phase one includes constructing the first 1,050 linear feet of “Road A”, the community well, associated infrastructure, and fire pond improvements. Phase two completes the loop on “Road A” and includes associated units and the clubhouse. Phase three includes “Road B” and applicable areas. The phasing is driven by practical building considerations like infrastructure and intersection construction. The board acknowledges the phasing plan as part of the plan set, ensuring the project is vested upon completion of phase one. The proposed phasing plan is to be added to the plan set.

T. D’Arcy states the conditions of approval (below) and entertains a motion.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Approval to subdivide the single-family home on Baker Road by Town of Candia
2. All required state and other permits to be approved and provided to the Town and listed on the plan coversheet.
3. State approval of communal septic and water
4. Add proposed phasing plan to plan coversheet
5. Add improved retention pond to final plan
6. Homeowner’s Association Agreement reviewed and approved by Town and Town Counsel
7. Address all outstanding engineering issues from the Keach-Nordstrom letter dated December 10th, 2025

K. Coughlin: **Motion** to approve with the conditions stated. L. Carroll: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed.**

Other Business:

- Approval of Minutes 12.17.25

In multiple areas, “Stewart House” needs to be corrected to “Seward House”.

L. Carroll: **Motion** to approve the minutes of 12.17.25 as amended. D. Labbe: **Second**. P. Moran: **Abstain**. All else in favor. **Motion passed.**

P. Moran: **Motion** to adjourn. J. Lindsey: **Second**. All in favor. **Motion passed**. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:13pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Megan Ross

Land Use Coordinator

cc: file