

1 Draft Minutes

2 CANTERBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION

3 JANUARY 10, 2022, Meeting House, 7 pm

4 And by remote zoom participation

5 Members Present

6 Kelly Short (Moderator)

7 Members attending remotely

8 Steve Seron, Ken Stern (Chair), Sara Riordan, Teresa Wyman, Bob and Linda Fife,
9 Bob Steenson (BOS rep)

10 Agenda

11 1. Approve prior meeting Minutes.

12 Steve Seron moved the Minutes of December 13, 2021, and Sara Riordan
13 seconded. There being no discussion members voted and the motion carried.

14 2. Master Plan Discussions

15 Kelly thanked Sara for managing the Google Doc of the Master Plan, for cleaning
16 up the edits and creating a summary of the major points of the recommendations
17 and changes. Members had received that by email today. Kelly stated they would
18 use the summary for discussion that evening and then create another draft for
19 consideration.

20 Issues raised in discussion included: Ken, check the date of the original survey
21 2007?

- 22 • What to do about the difference in questions asked in the respective
23 surveys for the 2010 and 2020 Master Plans? The questions posed do not
24 always match. Regarding the high percentage of people who voted to keep
25 the rural nature of Canterbury in the 2010 data, there was no such
26 matching question in the survey for the new Master Plan. The more recent
27 survey had focused more on development issues and posing strategic

28 questions that would give direction to the Planning Board. **Kelly wondered**
29 **if there should therefore be a short supplemental survey put together so**
30 **that responses to questions might provide longitudinal information.**

31 Members felt that the 2010 data was still valid and should not be lost sight
32 of. There was a consensus that this was something the CCC should suggest
33 to the CNHPRC staff. **Kelly was to contact Mike Tardiff.**

- 34 • **Should there be a separate Committee for Trails in Canterbury? Members**
35 **agreed that this would be a good recommendation.** It was important to
36 have a subset of residents who could take responsibility for trails, and the
37 critical liaison needed with landowners. Furthermore, it was agreed that it
38 made sense to be proactive considering the publication last year of the
39 booklet highlighting many town trails. There were already different groups
40 of recreationalists competing for use of trails in different ways.
- 41 • **Should the CCC recommend minimizing barriers to entry for small scale**
42 **agricultural operations?** Ken Stern had pointed out that some of the
43 language in the Master Plan was outdated in its description of farming in
44 Canterbury. There had been a growth in smaller, diversified farms since
45 then and they could recommend that the Planning Board consider easing
46 the regulations and making the establishment of these ventures easier to
47 achieve.
- 48 • **Should the CCC recommend encouraging accessory dwelling units as a**
49 **way of increasing affordable housing?** It was agreed that this was
50 something to support by inserting language into the Master Plan where
51 housing issues were raised. It could make way for more dwellings to be
52 built in areas of the town that were already developed, rather than
53 threatening the more rural and undisturbed parcels of land off Class 5 and
54 Class 6 roads. Accessory dwelling units are already allowed in some zones
55 and therefore this would have less impact on undeveloped parts of town.
- 56 • **Chapter 6 to be organized around Resources, Goals and**
57 **Recommendations: Kelly would take care of that, creating a clean copy.**

- 58 • **Discussion of the Goals:** there was some wordsmithing to be done around
59 'Climate Resilience' and a decision to make as to where to include it in the
60 list relative to other goals.
- 61 • it was agreed not to include the specific acreage data about types of
62 landownerships:
- 63 • What language to use and what to include about air quality concerns?
- 64 • How to include and describe the large unfragmented open spaces in town –
65 index, mapping or named descriptions? Language in the existing master
66 plan identifies the highlands which straddle the Canterbury / Northfield like
67 (Bean Hill), the working lands around Shaker Village and the string of
68 wetlands running south from Baptist Road including the Schoodac and
69 extending to Hoit Road Marsh. These would be shown on a map included as
70 an appendix.
- 71 • **Ensure the Energy Committee is included in all these Master Plan**
72 **discussions** – request that the Planning Board invite them if they have not
73 already (Lois will notify Planning Board)
- 74 • How to word a recommendation to the Town/Highway Department about
75 maintaining the 'rural character and scenic beauty' of roads in town?
76 Concern was expressed about past road widening that had resulted in
77 damaged stone walls and trees, along Old Tilton Road for instance.
- 78 • Whether and how to recommend the prohibition of hard rock mining –
79 there was discussion about existing regulations that allow excavation with
80 Special Exception from the ZBA and Special Permit from the PB in several
81 zones and the difficulty involved in prohibiting an activity that may well be
82 protected by state law. Bob Steenson quoted the RSA which stipulates this
83 activity is regulated at the State level, not locally. 155-E
- 84 • The provision of a porta-potty at the Riverland area should be
85 acknowledged
- 86 • How to include some protection for Class 6 roads and wetlands areas
87 against development from road building? It was suggested this could be a
88 recommendation to deal with each road on a case-by-case basis – not all

Class 6 roads were the same in terms of conservation priorities but there may well be some that should not be developed at all.

- A recommendation should be made to evaluate and consider which, if any, town owned properties should be designated as Town Forests.
- Members agreed there were several examples where names of parcels of conservation land that need to be updated and made consistent in the next draft of the Master Plan.

Kelly offered to undertake the revision of the document and send a link to members for further discussion. It was acknowledged that the Master Plan should be an actively used document and not sit on shelves for 10 years. And that conservation minded people should be encouraged to run for Planning Board.

3. Conservation Property Priority Process

Only 4 members had filled in their surveys - Kelly asked the rest of the members to do the survey Kelly had sent by Friday this week so that data can be shared with the CNHRPC staff.

4. Membership, terms expiring, renewing members, new members

Ashley Ruprecht has submitted her resignation. Kelly stated that members Teresa Wyman, Ken Stern and Linda Fife have expired terms and should decide if they want to be nominated again. Members were asked to think of people they know who could be recruited.

5. Property Management Projects for coming year

There was discussion about potential project work this year –removal of the deteriorated boardwalk at the Riverland Conservation area, perhaps by trying to employ the prison workers group that the Police Chief has previously done? **Bob Steenson agreed to check with Chief Mike about that.** Kelly raised the issue of removing the rock piles on the Robert S Fife field as another project to pursue. There was no evidence that these were historic cellar holes. This will be pursued for the coming year

118 6. 2022 Goals

119 There was discussion about two possible easement projects. One in the Harmony
120 Lane area and one east of Shaker Village. Ken asked if they should include in the
121 Master Plan the concept of the town expanding conservation land by acquiring
122 lots adjacent to property the town already owns.

123 7. Other Business

124 (i) A thankyou Christmas card from UNH researchers who had worked in
125 Canterbury in the past was shared.

126 (ii) Kelly also shared a cease-and-desist order from the DES to a resident on Battis
127 Road claiming they had installed a culvert and crossing without permission. The
128 landowner had responded that they cared for the wetlands and the real damage
129 to the area had been done by the railroad company.

130 (iii) Kelly asked if the CCC might change the meeting night because Mondays
131 meant clashing with holidays during the year as well as with the Budget
132 Committee meetings that she attends. Kelly had checked the town meeting
133 schedule and **suggested they move to Thursday night. It was agreed to choose**
134 **the second Thursday of the month, and Kelly would contact Jan Stout and Ken**
135 **Folsom to double check the CCC could book the Meeting House on those**
136 **evenings. It would need publicity in the town newsletter and the CCC web page**
137 **would need to be changed.**

138 8. Adjournment

139 Kelly moved to adjourn at 8.55 pm.

140 Respectfully submitted, Lois Scribner.