

Candia Zoning Review & Revision Committee
Minutes of September 19, 2018
Approved Minutes

Present: Rudy Cartier; Al Hall; Mark Chalbeck; Josh Pouliot; Scott Komisarek, Ken Kustra; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Boyd Chivers, Board of Selectman and ZBA.

Guest: Nate Miller from SNHPC.

The purpose of this volunteer committee is to review potential changes to the Town of Candia Zoning, Subdivision and Site Plan regulations and make recommendation for changes or additions to the Planning Board. This meeting is open to anyone that wants to participate.

The meeting started at approximately 7:23 pm following the Planning Board meeting.

ZRRC Minutes from August 15, 2018:

J. Pouliot **motioned** to approve the minutes of August 15, 2018 as presented. A. Hall **seconded**. R. Cartier and M. Chalbeck **were in favor**. S. Komisarek and K. Kustra abstained. **Motion carried (4-0-2) for Planning Board Members including alternates.**

Review and discussion of the draft of proposed zoning ordinance changes presented on August 1st, by Judy Szot of the Zoning Board and the suggestions from Stantec received 8-15-18; to prepare for zoning warrant articles. R. Cartier wanted to get through the recommendation from the Zoning Board of Adjustments on the new zoning for home based businesses. Boyd Chivers approached.

R. Cartier said so we don't have anything right now structured for putting into a warrant article. B. Chivers replied these are our proposed changes. Do you mean do we have the ballot written? R. Cartier responded the final version that would be on the warrant article. B. Chivers replied this is it because it incorporates the changes that Stantec recommended with the exception of one. R. Cartier said so this would be ready to submit. B. Chivers agreed, that's correct.

R. Cartier responded to a question by Al Hall that when these are completed that yes it would have to be reviewed by Town Counsel and have a public hearing on it too.

The ZRRC Committee discussed the following draft (Revision 1.1) and made further suggestions and recommendations preparing the zoning amendments for warrant articles.

TOWN OF CANDIA - LAND USE OFFICE
REVISED SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO ZONING ORDINANCE
PRESENTED TO THE ZONING REVIEW AND REVISION COMMITTEE
AUGUST 15, 2018
REVISION 1.1

1. Article III, Definitions. Accessory Dwelling Unit. "A second dwelling unit attached to the main dwelling unit which is permitted by land use control regulations to be located on the same lot, plat, site or other division of land as the principal dwelling unit. RSA 674:21.

Purpose: To ensure conformity with Section 15.04 E 7

Committee discussion regarding the ordinance currently defines ADU as attached or detached. The intent is to remove detached as it needs to be attached. Would read as above with detached removed.

2. Article V, Section 5.01 D. Parking, Storage, or use of Major Recreational Equipment.

“No such equipment shall be parked or stored in the front yard area in the R district. ~~It and~~ shall not be used for living, sleeping, or housekeeping purposes in ~~either the R district or in~~ any district within the Town of Candia.

Purpose: To prohibit this activity in all districts

Committee discussed front yard; no living in and interpretation of this ordinance etc. and how to re-write it. Changes proposed: Put period after R district. Delete and; Add in It or Nor shall not be used for living....etc. Change it to something more specific? Delete R district and just leave in any district.

3. Article V, Section 5.02A, Residential.

Purpose: To add letter A to the subsequent series B through F

Board discussed that there is no A under 5.02 Residential now so A needs to be added. Typo update, correct the omission of A from the original table. To read 5.02A, Residential. Revise the title.

4. Article V, Section 5.02 (a-13), Home Shop. Add an S under residential district and --- under all other districts.

Purpose: To ensure consistency with the table of uses and permit the use by special exception in the R district and prohibited anywhere else

Committee discussed adding Home Shop into the table (Accessory use allowed use now on page 23 but it is not listed in the table on the previous page, pg. 22). Revise the table under article 5.02 (a-13), add new section under Home Shop (a-13) in the table of uses permitted in Residential district so put an S in for allowed by Special Exception in Residential district and a dash --- (not allowed) in all other districts in the table as stated above.

5. Article XIV. Section 14.06. “Variances and Special Exceptions shall expire unless used within a period of two years from the date granted. The board may for good cause extend the period by up to one year”.

Purpose: To ensure consistency with RSA 674:33, I-a

Committee discussed this revision. It had said one year and the RSA (state law) says two years so we can't be more restrictive than state law so we need to change it to two years as stated above in the proposed text.

6. Article V, Section 5.02A 5. Boarding or rooming house whether or not intended for occupancy by transient guests or tourists. (Whether or had been added)

Purpose: To allow short term rentals in the R district

Committee discussed boarding and rooming houses, accessory dwelling units, short term rentals, transient guests etc. B. Chivers said now in the table for the type of land it says use under Residential, boarding or rooming house not intended for transient guests. That's permitted by special exception in the R district and permitted by right in the C district and rest of the districts and prohibited in the L district. What happens if you have your in-law apartment intended for transient guests? This says not intended for transient guests but we had an old couple up on High Street that have an accessory dwelling unit and they wanted to rent it to Airbnb guests and they can't do it because it's prohibited right here. We want to make that permitted by right in Candia. The argument people have is an accessory use dwelling they can put a family in there with two kids and those kids are going to go to school but if you rent it out on Airbnb; transient people are here for a couple of weeks or a month and they'll spend their money at the House of Pizza and won't put any kids in school. That's probably a good policy, to let their families open up their homes to transient (short term). Somehow in this ordinance it prohibits that. R. Cartier said that might open up a can of worms because it says boarding or rooming house. I hear where you're coming from and agree but I don't want someone's house to become a boarding house because that would be allowed in the Residential district because we change that. M. Chalbeck was concerned with them becoming flop houses; drug paraphernalia, transient. What

about allowing it with special exception? B. Chivers said that would allow us to put some safeguards in there. For an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) it is under special exception so the safe guards are there. They are all one or two bedroom. R. Cartier said that's the problem but if I read this, I can take my entire house and turn that into a boarding house and I could have people live there all the time. That's my concern. Is it against the regulations now? A. Bickum replied you can rent a room to someone long term, year, two years etc. but not nightly (short term). R. Cartier said like a B&B, that's where the problem is. B. Chivers said I went to a conference last week in Concord and the Town Manager from Lincoln talked about this and said we have some houses on the slopes of Loon Mountain being converted from 4 bedroom 4 bath houses to 8 bedroom 4 bath houses. He said 5 years ago on Airbnb we had 300 rentals, last week we had 3,000 available. We were just trying to accommodate this couple on High Street. Discussion ensued about a separate line regarding short term rental housing. Allowed in R area to avoid turning a house into a flop house. Airbnb should be allowed. It is allowed now by special exception to have a boarding house in a residential area; when this was written, Airbnb and similar didn't exist. R. Cartier recommended having a separate item in that table for short term rentals. B. Chivers said subject to separate restrictions. You have to define short term (less than 7 days or something). B. Chivers said how is that different than just striking not intended for occupancy by transient guests? A special exception addresses concerns this Board is raising. I think we should experiment, let this thing go and see what happens. Committee agreed. M. Chalbeck said scratch out words, they can still do it. R. Cartier said do we modify this? B. Chivers said I would scratch the words not intended boarding and rooming house period. Not intended for occupancy by transient guests or tourists. That eliminates that restriction. R. Cartier said if you get the special exception it gives the opportunity for the public to have some input on how big is this going to be and how many Airbnb's are you going to have in there; safety concerns to be addressed as well. S. Komisarek said it would be difficult to enforce. You're not going to be able to enforce it.

J. Pouliot said I don't think they should be combined in the same statement. I think boarding and rooming houses are different than Airbnb. I don't think we can have the same stipulations for Airbnb and boarding house. Committee discussed options to re-write it. Boarding, rooming houses and short term rentals. It pulls that out. R. Cartier said boarding is meals with rooming house, you don't get meals.

7. Article XVI. Section 16.04C. Filing of Complaints. Whenever any violation of this Ordinance occurs any person may file a complaint in regard thereto in writing to the Building Inspector. The Building Inspector shall investigate said complaint, and, upon finding a violation exists, shall act according to section 16.01A of this Ordinance.

Purpose: To provide the proper citation to Section 16.01A and to eliminate the word "immediately" from the text.

R. Cartier said so 14.01 A and it should be 16.01A? B. Chivers replied number 7 is the proposed text corrected. It eliminates the word immediately and makes the correct cross reference to 16.01A.

A. Bickum suggested when we're writing this for warrant articles we need to go back to the original draft and let people know what was changed. They aren't going to know from this streamlined version.

R. Cartier said so strike 14.01 A and renumber as 16.01 A. Above text took out immediately shall. Deleted immediately.

8. Article V, Section 5.02 (f-6) Commercial Stables and Kennels. Allow by Special Exception in the R district and Permitted by Right in C district only. Prohibited in all other districts.

Committee discussed wording on this new proposed article. B. Chivers said this is in response to a call in the Land Use Office for a 3 acre parcel for sale advertised as a horse property and they wanted to move 12 horses onto it. We recognize the danger of that. R. Cartier asked well you're keeping me from keeping my own horses on there; 12 pet horses for example. Committee discussed; personal stable vs. commercial. Permitted by right if meet criteria; change that to Commercial Stables and Kennels? D.

Lewis said when you read stables and kennels, it implies it's a commercial operation not a backyard barn. Committee discussed wording. Add commercial to headings. J. Pouliot said all 20 chickens are my personal pets. B. Chivers said we have to give Andrea credit for writing this one. A. Bickum clarified I got it from another town, I didn't write it.

Nate Miller from SNHPC commented you should probably clarify on that first bullet; 3 acres of contiguous non-wet land in the case of horses and one additional acre for each acre. You can have horses on 3 acres but you need one additional acre for each additional horse. Are you allowed to have as many horses as you can fit into 3 acres? Committee agreed; good point. N. Miller said just clarify what you're allowed to do on those 3 acres. B. Chivers said so you're suggesting its one horse for the first 3 acres? N. Miller said you can define it however. D. Lewis said one acre for each additional one then make it one acre for the first 3. One acre for each one. So maximum of 3. Committee discussed maximum of 3 horses on 3 acres. One acre per horse. One acre of contiguous non-wetland land for each horse. A. Bickum asked so is it still 3 acres required? R. Cartier replied no, it would be one acre for each horse, which would make sense if you have five horses you would need five acres. Rewrite this to make it one acre per horse.

8A. Article V, Section 5.03D Commercial Stables and Kennels. The keeping of all horses, dogs, cats, or other animals. The facility shall conform to the following:

- Minimum site area: ~~three (3)~~ acres of contiguous non-wetland land in the case of horses and one additional acre for each additional horse. No barn, shelter, or building used for boarding said animals or the storage of feed or supplies shall be located closer than 60 feet from any property line.
- Animal waste shall not be stored closer than two hundred (200) feet from any property line or surface waters.
- The area used for grazing, exercising, or training shall be securely fenced to prevent the animals from straying or a suitable restraint shall be provided.

Purpose: New Ordinance:

Committee discussed Home Service Contractor. M. Chalbeck brought up outside storage; maybe limiting it to back or side yard? D. Lewis agreed saying landscapers bring home mulch, or carpenter, store extra 2x4's, plumbers etc. Someone may turn a person in for a few things stored? R. Cartier suggested not in front yard. Committee agreed. Add anywhere in the front yard on all 3 to read "Outdoor storage of material prohibited anywhere in the front yard." D. Lewis asked to add hours of operation with all 3 levels. Committee discussed labeling section: Article V, Section 5.03 E-1, E-2 and E-3. Do this versus A, B and level 1, 2, 3. And it would be added to the table of uses as a new section. By special exception in R district and permitted by right in all others except for mixed use, prohibited.

9. Article V, Section 5.03 E-1, Home Service Contractor. (~~level~~-1). Permitted by Special Exception and subject to the provisions of Section 15.02. Includes customary tradesmen such as carpenters, plumbers, painters, and machinists. Subject to the following restrictions:

- The accessory use is practiced by the owner of the lot of record.
- Outdoor storage of material is prohibited. ADD anywhere in the front yard
- On site retail sales prohibited.
- No more than one employee shall be employed at the site who is not the owner of the lot of record.
- Use does not cause any additional vehicular traffic between the hours of 7PM and 6AM or on holidays observed by the Town.
- ADD The use does not cause any recurring non-emergency traffic between the hours of 7PM and 6AM or on holidays observed by the town

9A. Article V, Section 5.03 E-~~2~~, Home Service Contractor. (~~level-2~~). Permitted by Special Exception and subject to the provisions of Section 15.02. Includes customary occupations such as landscapers and arborists. Subject to the following restrictions:

- The accessory use is practiced by the owner of the lot of record.
- Outdoor storage of material is prohibited.
- On site retail sales is prohibited.
- No more than one employee shall be employed at the site who is not the owner of the lot of record.
- Minimum lot size is 3 acres
- Equipment storage must be beyond the following setbacks:
Front lot line: 100'
Side lot lines 50'

ADD The use does not cause any recurring non-emergency traffic between the hours of 7PM and 6AM or on holidays observed by the town

9B. Article V, Section 5.03 E-~~3~~, Home Service Contractor. (~~level-3~~). Permitted by Special Exception and subject to the provisions of Section 15.02. Includes contractors requiring the use of trucks and construction equipment. Subject to the following restrictions:

- Minimum lot size is 5 acres.
- Minimum road frontage is 300'.
- No overnight parking of more than 2 Class 8 vehicles is permitted.
- The accessory use is practiced by the owner of the lot of record.
- No more than one employee shall be employed who is not the owner of the lot of record.
- On site processing of materials is prohibited.
- Equipment and material storage must meet the following setbacks:
Front Lot Line 150'.
Side Lot Line 75'.
- The use does not cause any recurring non-emergency traffic between the hours of 7PM and 6AM or on holidays observed by the town. **ADD this to all 3.**

Purpose of Article V, Section 5.03: To expand the allowable uses in the R district in recognition of Candia's diverse occupations and livelihoods.

10. Article V, Section 5.02 (a-14) Home Service Contractor. S under R district and P under the C, LI-1, and LI-2 districts and --- under the MX district.

Purpose: To incorporate proposed addition of Section 5.03E to the ordinance table.

R. Cartier said we'll get this back in order and get it back to you guys. You can take a look at it and make sure we captured everything and then we'll make our recommendations and have a public hearing. B. Chivers said so plenty of time to get it on the warrant.

Nate Miller from SNHPC will present revised Village District large scale maps for the discussion of the Village District area with the ZRRC.

N. Miller said so the Board had asked us to prepare some revised maps of the proposed Four Corners district so I have a map of the Town view of where the district is based on what the Board had provided for revised boundaries. We also prepared a map that showed those environmental constraints and zoomed in on the revised district and showed the environmental constraints on the map. The first draft when Carol Ogilvie was doing the work last summer/fall, the first draft looks like the district was

821.78 acres. Based on the revisions and the new boundary that the Board provided and I do want to make sure we have this boundary correct as you drew it, I think we do. Hopefully you can verify that. The new district boundary is 239.02 acres. So that is 1.2% of the overall Town. The previous district was 4.5% of the overall Town so it's substantially smaller than last year's draft. R. Cartier said I think we were all in agreement that it was way too big.

N. Miller continued on the environmental constraint, we mapped the publicly owned land, poorly drained soils, wetlands and a 100 foot wetland buffer so you see those here on this map. Total development constraints in this district is 113 of those 239 acres, have some level of development constraint on them. Just under 48% of the proposed district has some sort of development constraint. That's making the assumption that publicly owned lands are not going to give those up. That's what's shown here. Did we translate the boundary that you drew for us correctly and does this reflect what the Board's vision for the district boundary was. K. Kustra asked how much is this now? N. Miller scaled out the map and from the Four Corners about 1500 feet to here; in the widest part of the district it's about 2000 to 2200 feet from the center of the intersection to this boundary. S. Komisarek confirmed to the courthouse. That makes sense to the post office and the courthouse, to that point.

R. Cartier said we went down Deerfield Road about ¼ of a mile. N. Miller said you went down about 1300 or 1400 feet in that direction. R. Cartier said let's take the core area and make it so shops, a cohesive core area then if the Town folks think it's a good idea, we can expand that to a new zone around that with less dense housing but would also be flowing back into that center area. S. Komisarek said that European model. M. Chalbeck everything outside of this area would still be the 3 acre minimum. R. Cartier agreed. This area would be mixed use. I think that captures what we were looking for. N. Miller asked if it anyone thought it didn't capture everything going off of a pen drawing and we checked and triple checked everything. Board discussed the recent Copart expansion but that it is a lease agreement so it's still one lot with the courthouse on it.

N. Miller continued drawing on the work that Carol did and I did print out this report from Carol where she laid out dimensional requirements and uses within the district. Does what Carol laid out still make sense to everybody for this district or are you wanting to see tweaks as it relates to this area.

A. Hall asked why did we exclude one of the major commercial sections of Town, mainly Copart and the shopping center. M. Chalbeck said I think Carleton had said we would restrict something with the commercial zoning with that, if you went into those areas. S. Komisarek said if the goal is to someday have a quintessential small little village, it makes sense to just go to the courthouse and the post office. With ATS and Copart you can see their use. That was a logical place to go to. A. Hall asked about an area in purple on the map..

N. Miller said that's the CYAA land. We called it publicly owned land under the assumption it's going to remain as it is, recreational land. Quasi public enough and not presumed to see changes so we colored it purple on the map.

R. Cartier said we're not talking about major development in this area, we're talking about small things that will be in there. Getting the concept of a little village area. We're leaning towards that now with the library with the concerts in the summer, we have CYAA over here, we have the Town offices, the school. Now can we get more business support over in here with some housing above, mixed use type of things and see what can be done. There are some concerns because there are Brownfield sites in this area, one of them being Goff Chevrolet and all over to the Fire Station and the old Simano garage has the same issue too. N. Miller asked if those sites were assessed (Brownfield assessments). R. Cartier replied yes, assessments were done on those properties, they are known. N. Miller said Brownfield's assessment would show what contaminants were on site and what re-use possibilities there might be.

S. Komisarek said I think for the people of Candia the architectural controls in Candia are key, I don't know how far we can go to restrict. There is a certain look and feel that you want to achieve in this area. If you could just imagine a quintessential little New England village, a tight area like that;

what zoning would allow for that but it's important Nate that we have to keep the ratio of commercial; for each parcel there has to be a relationship between commercial and residential. It has to be balanced out properly. N. Miller said so there's a couple of ways to tackle that. Do you want to see buildings have both of those uses in them; all buildings or buildings in a certain part of this district or within a certain distance of the major roads be both commercial and residential. S. Komisarek replied I think each parcel would have to have, for this to work and the fiscal impact and what we're trying to bring and what people want, they want the little coffee shop, they want that use. Or some office space but we have limited opportunities for affordable apartments. There has to be some relationship so we can ensure we get what we're envisioning. K. Kustra said do we want an increase in population. So if you have something they'll come, if we don't have it. M. Chalbeck replied but where do the kids go to work in Town. They go to Raymond, Hooksett, Manchester, there's little work here in Town. When you're going out there, where are you spending your money, it's not here in Candia. The more money you can spend here and keep it here and it will help the Town. You'll have some shops, with rentals above, a place where people can walk, that will bring them in and businesses will come in. K. Kustra said and then we have to fill the school. A. Hall commented we want controlled growth. D. Lewis said to Nate, I agree with what Scott says but what has been the success rate of trying to achieve that in a small Town like Candia. Do you end up with an over abundance of commercial growth on the strip? Do you end up with an overabundance of apartments and housing? Have you had much luck achieving the balance between the two? S. Komisarek added you want to specify what that balance is. You want a mix so you can specify what that balance is. D. Lewis asked is it a realistic goal I guess is my question. S. Komisarek said you look at the state it gives us the cost of services analysis and you look at commercial and on average in the State of New Hampshire it's .50 cents on the dollar so to me any type of commercial will bring revenue into the Town. Then when you look at what's Mark saying, we have all this slack capacity. You're not going to get very many children out of the Village District, with apartments. You might have a couple of kids and slack capacity so I can't see there will be an increased cost. A very large portion of that residential revenue as well. Whatever we do, if you look at a build out analysis and you look at the number of acres that are there and you take some period of time, 10, 15, 20 years; it's going to take time to implement that. It's 1% of the Town as it is and it's not going to overwhelm Candia with children. The whole thing is to try to make the community better. You get off at Exit 3 and come through and no offense to say like Goff, there's a redevelopment opportunity in that area right there. It's very small but it sets the tone. R. Cartier said it's not going to happen overnight. We're seeing more people coming in for Old Home Day and they're looking for things like that; to feel like part of the community.

N. Miller said I want to go back to Dennis's question. There are some examples from what other communities have done with some success. It's very hard to take an entire area because there's all different land owners and different development ideas so how have other small communities shaped that growth to achieve what Scott and Rudy are talking about; a few different things. 1) you envision this as a rural village center. There is always concern about any zoning change especially with traffic going through about big boxes etc. so some communities have implemented form based requirements. Requirements about what the buildings are that go in there. For instance the Town of Enfield; a town of about 5,000 people, they implemented some form requirements within their zoning to get what they were looking for, a rural village center. They set a cap on the square footage of any one building in the district. I think their cap was 40,000 square feet. That was enough to have a rural commercial enterprise but it wasn't going to be Wal-Mart. Enfield again and other communities have required pitched roofs so from an architectural perspective no flat roofs, we want it to look like New England and have a certain amount of window coverage on the front facing façades. They also set maximum setback. The effect of the maximum setback is that buildings are brought closer to the road. So you don't you have 20 rows of parking in front of the building. You set a maximum setback that gives maybe one row or maybe 2 rows of parking in the front and you steer the rest of the parking to the side or behind the building. You can put a sidewalk in there and then you have something that feels like a

rural village center. You incorporate landscaping requirements and it looks like a nice attractive area when it builds out. In terms of the mix of commercial and residential or even office and residential; lawyers office, Doctors office etc, one of the tools I've seen some communities employ, I don't know the level of success but they'll say you can't have anything that's residential only within X feet of the major road. That effect is that residential only happens here and back and if you say within X feet of the road you can have residential but it has to be a component of a building that has some other use whether it be an office or commercial. That has the effect of encouraging a mixture of uses along the road segregating the residential only uses behind that. R. Cartier said so similar to what we have now with the pizza place and Charmingfare Place.

D. Lewis said if we are going to reconfigure the traffic pattern there at some point when that process starts we need to incorporate these same ideas into that process to make that happen. N. Miller replied those are just all things that can get to what you were asking about in terms of what tools are in the toolbox to achieve that vision. D. Lewis asked did Enfield have good success. N. Miller replied yes, interestingly Enfield passed their ordinance, which passed a few years ago and which is still in place today. The first development, they had a sewer project. They were getting ahead of their sewer project. They knew the doors would open when the sewer project was done and they got ahead of that. So they passed the ordinance at Town meeting in March. The sewer project is constructed that summer. In the fall, the first development comes in under the new ordinance, its Family Dollar, national chain retail store. Basically they came in with a plan that looked like a bunker; a fallout shelter. Their standard Family Dollar and the Town said here are the requirements in this district, this isn't going to work here. You can take your chances with the Zoning Board for a variety of variances but this ordinance just passed three months ago with 80% of the vote and Family Dollar came in with a revised proposal that did everything, pitched roof, parking to the side of the building. They can do this stuff, it's not their first try but they can do all this stuff.

D. Lewis said we need to make sure we have all those safeguards in place before we go forward so we end up with what Scott was envisioning here. M. Chalbeck said if you drive around New England there are towns that do that with buildings that look more home town. R. Cartier said we do have architectural standards in our regulations but maybe more detailed in here (*Village District*).

N. Miller said those are things we can help you to incorporate; taking Carol's work as a starting point and help you incorporate those types of items into it and those will all be safeguards to help ensure that what happens here is a rural village as you envision it to be.

J. Pouliot asked how does this fit in with master plan. R. Cartier replied it was part of the master plan update that was done over the last couple of years and there were a lot of discussions in here on the master plan, this is one of the ones that came up; being one of high interest. B. Chivers added the size of this thing is consistent with what the master plan envisioned a couple of years ago. I think this is what people had in mind.

K. Kustra asked what do you see for walking distance from the Four Corners; 500, 600, 700 and stores within that 500 feet. N. Miller said for the average person? The rule of thumb for convenient walking distance is about ¼ of a mile. What people would be willing to walk generally. K. Kustra said so what was said earlier about parking, you could be talking a parking garage or field. N. Miller replied when we do school plans to help kids walk to school and what sidewalks are needed, generally speaking the rule of thumb is ¼ mile for walking, ¾ mile for biking. J. Pouliot asked are we seeing any problems with property owners on this one like the last one that went wrong. R. Cartier replied I don't think we'd see issues with land owners. I think we had more opposition when we had the 800, it was way out of control. We've got two property owners on board with this.

D. Lewis said it would be important to do a build out analysis for what you envision here and take that; all the department heads should get a copy. Say the Police Department has it in their mind that if the Town population reaches 5,000 you'll need a cruiser and another officer. 5,000 is an arbitrary number but the Fire Department decides it needs to go to full time and needs an ambulance. You add sidewalks. The Town has to maintain those sidewalks. Plowing, you'd have to provide that

service and the department heads could go to the Board of Selectmen and the Budget Committee and get support for that because sometimes when a Town expands and does projects like that it's up to the department head to go fight for money to maintain them and function properly. It's key to have everyone in Town on board with that prior to making a decision. Once you create something and if you don't have the backup to support it; it's up to department heads to fight for the money to do their jobs properly so I think everyone needs to be on board before it goes to a vote. R. Cartier added we could use you and Southern NH Planning to do this. I would be under the impression it would be a separate cost issue to do the work on this other than what we're currently paying you. N. Miller replied we've been provided a donation and I would need to speak with the donor to see if we could potentially use the funds from that donation to support this assistance. R. Cartier said it sounds to me that it would be prudent on our part to have you take this, the next step further for us; the build out analysis, the considerations, the architectural things. You have some experience from Enfield, is that a good thing we could take a look at and incorporate that into here. Like Dennis said, we're looking for something that's already successful, let's follow that guide. D. Lewis said we need to plan it in its entirety. S. Komisarek said when you look at this acreage, this doesn't take Candia to 5,000. That's what gives you the confidence to say this makes sense; the build out, fiscal impact and impact on the school.

N. Miller asked so process wise, this is a small area to do a build out analysis on but in order to do that, I need to have direction about the dimensional aspects of the ordinance. As it relates to what Carol put together, I think Carol had half acre lot size. Minimum lot width of 50 feet, 20 feet on front side...these are setbacks. In terms of ½ acre, those types of dimensional considerations have a lot of impact on what a build out is in the area. So we want to have some clarity on those dimensional aspects before we can develop the build out. B. Chivers asked doesn't that map include a soils map too can you tell by looking at that if it will support ½ acre zoning. N. Miller replied we'd have to make some assumptions. We do have the soils on here. We have the poorly drained soils but everything with build out is assumption. D. Lewis agreed, absolutely. N. Miller continued we'd need to make an assumption with the Board about how to treat these areas with poorly drained soils whether we assume that those develop at a lower intensity because of the nature of the soil there or that they don't develop at all; there are different options. These are the areas Boyd in this brown. This light brown area is what's showing as poorly drained soils.

B. Chivers said our zoning ordinance has a 50 foot setback from poorly drained soils. N. Miller replied oh, okay so we would need to incorporate that here which changes the development constraints. A. Hall asked if he had a copy of our zoning. N. Miller said yes, does the poorly drained soils buffer apply to all districts in the Town. We have the 100 foot wetland buffer on here we did not have the poorly drained soils buffer so we can add that if it would apply to this district.

D. Lewis said the road configuration is important because we could be changing the frontage and we may want certain buildings to be fronted on certain parts of that new road configuration. Where if we move it from the Four Corners here there's way less traffic. Those things are important because we want it to look right when we're done. Not to be built on what's there and then all of a sudden the road gets moved and why is that there. N. Miller said that's harder because we don't know what the future configuration is going to be.

R. Cartier said if you take Carol's and start with that one and do the build out, I'm glad Boyd brought up the soils too, we need to look at will the land handle the water and sewerage needs for these buildings. Are we going to allow longer buildings, so if you say we have a ½ acre lot with a 25 foot setback on either side, that kind of eliminates little stand alone shops, you might get like a mall or strip, smaller towns with more dense buildings in there. N. Miller said we need to do some tweaking to the setbacks that Carol laid out. I would recommend that you consider at least along the few major roads a maximum setback and bring those buildings closer to the road eliminating the parking that goes between the parking and the building. I don't think Carol had that explicitly in here so I'll need to take a look at those setbacks and maybe we might need to recommend a couple of tweaks to that. The big things are you okay with the ½ acre lot area to be used as an assumption and are you okay with the

uses she laid out for the district. A. Hall asked about DOT and N. Miller replied he was never with DOT but yes, the project in the 10 year plan is listed as “improvements to 27, 43 and Raymond Road in the Town of Candia.” Period. It’s intentionally vaguely defined because the Town will need to work out design alternatives. DOT is going to need to work out design alternatives and build consensus on a preferred alternative with the Town so we didn’t predetermine any conclusions about what the ultimate design of that project would be. A. Hall said they should be made aware of what we’re trying to do and maybe coordinate with them. Maybe one of them should come to one of these meetings. N. Miller said we can certainly invite, definitely as this advances towards being ruled out for public comment we can include the district folks as well as the State Safety Engineer and the State Traffic Engineer, Mike Dugas and Bill Lambert. Because there was a fatal crash in this area it was the subject of a road safety audit, they have some familiarity with the location so we would seek their input certainly. B. Chivers stated the setback requirements from the zoning ordinance: 50 feet from poorly drained soils and 100 feet from poorly drained soils.

R. Cartier said so Nate we’d like you to put together a proposal to handle all of this stuff we talked about tonight because I think your expertise is extremely valuable and take a look at what the cost would be and if you can use the donation that’s fine. We do have money in the budget exactly for this type of thing and that’s why we have it in there. N. Miller replied I will do that. Do you have another meeting at some point? The committee discussed another meeting where Nate could come back to continue to work on this. A work session in between meetings was suggested. R. Cartier agreed. I’m gone the week of October 17th. October 10th at 6 pm was suggested. S. Komisarek and said look to the Board for direction and what we want but there’s a certain vision but we would look to you when you look at the best density, best ordinance with your expertise. This is what this density would look like to people. Visually for me I don’t know what that really looks like. D. Lewis added and how it works; how it functions in other towns. M. Chalbeck commented I like what you said about the two rows of parking.

N. Miller said from now until October 10th, we’ll make some tweak to this map. We’ll take Carol’s work as a starting point and use that to develop a draft adding in some of the concepts we talked about tonight and get that to a point where October 10th we can walk through it and the Board can make any tweaks to that draft on October 10th and from there, between October and November we’ll work up a couple of build out scenarios for the district based on that. B. Chivers said what at the tweaks. N. Miller said we need to include the buffer for poorly drained soils. That needs to be on there. Nothing will change on the boundaries but if there’s a 50 foot buffer on poorly drained soils we need to make sure that’s on here. Nothing will change with this map but this map we need to add that buffer. D. Lewis said isn’t October 10th the Budget Committee Meeting that night? Budget Committee meets here. Committee discussed other options, locations, dates or a separate night for a work session. ZRRC Committee and Nate Miller from SNHPC will have a work session on the Four Corners Village District to review revised map showing poorly drained soil buffers for Monday, October 29th at 6:00 pm.

ZRRC WORK SESSION SCHEDULED for MONDAY OCTOBER, 29TH 6 PM
TOWN HALL MEETING ROOM.

MOTION:

A. Hall **motioned** to adjourn the Zoning Revision meeting at approximately 9:06 pm. S. Komisarek **seconded**. **All were in agreement. Motion carried (6-0-0) for Planning Board Members.** It was the consensus of the entire committee present to adjourn the ZRRC meeting at approximately 9:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary