

1 FINAL

2 Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting

3 May 24, 2022

4 In the Town Hall

5 Members Present

6 Greg Meeh (Chair), Scott Doherty (Vice Chair), Anne Dowling, John Schneider,
7 Kent Ruesswick (BOS rep), Lucy Nichols: and Hillary Nelson, Ann Berry, Logan
8 Snyder (alternates)

9 Members/guests absent

10 Joshua Gordon (PB): Kelly Short (CCC)

11 Others present

12 Conservation Commission members --- Ken Stern, Audra Klumb, Teresa Wyman

13 Agricultural Commission members – Wayne Mann, Mark Stevens, Benjamin Davis,
14 Jill McCulloch and Daimon Meeh

15 Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission Director Mike Tardiff, and
16 Matt Baronas (staff)

17 AGENDA

18 1. Call meeting to order

19 Greg Meeh called meeting to order at 8 pm.

20 2. Minutes of May 10, 2022

21 Scott Doherty moved the Minutes of May 10. Greg noted that at line 57, it should
22 read that the applicant needed a waiver from the Planning Board, not a variance
23 from the ZBA. Members voted for the minutes as modified, all were in favor.

24 3. Master Plan Discussion between Planning Board, Canterbury Conservation
25 Commission, (CCC) Agricultural Commission (Ag Comm) and Central New
26 Hampshire Regional Planning Commission (CNHRPC)

Greg introduced this section of the meeting. The CCC and CNHRPC had worked on the Master Plan, chapters 5 and 6, over the winter and shared that draft. The goal was to update rather than rewrite the 2010 Master Plan. To this end the PB is holding the visioning session, a charette, on June 18.

Mike Tardiff spoke about the work the CNHRPC had been doing to support the CCC, particularly with the mapping process that Matt Baronas had worked on. Mike wanted to talk about logistics for June 18 this evening. He gave credit to Kelly Short, CCC Co-Moderator, for doing a lot of the redrafting work on both chapter 5, and then the rewrite of chapter 6, polishing it up and including new issues and topics.

Greg led discussion through the parts of Chapter 5 that had been changed. These included:

- Line 53, reference to the Covid pandemic increasing the number of people working from home, likely to be a major trend in the future
- Line 63, reference to residential development in town being along main paved roads and the more traveled dirt roads
- Line 65, which was not changed, mention of ‘a few commercial establishments’ at Exits 17 and 18 led to discussion – PB members felt it was more than ‘a few’ but were not sure how to describe the increase – Lucy Nichols had counted 10 operating and approved at Exit 17 and 3 at Exit 18. Mike suggested a call out box about land use at Exit 17 as a topic for discussion
- This led to discussion about the ongoing issue of the PB working on the Table of Uses for Commercial and Industrial zones, to bring them more in line with what is happening rather than businesses having to get frequent variances from the ZBA
- Line 76, the end of the paragraph where the different types of agriculture found in town are mentioned, Mark Stevens (Ag Comm) commented that ‘a few large commercial agricultural businesses’ was incorrect – the larger farms in town (ex. Glines and Brookford) are really family farms and not largescale commercial farms in relation to national standards, though it was agreed they are relatively large

59 compared by Canterbury standards – **the Ag Comm members**
60 **offered to come up with language for this sentence**

- 61 • Lines 79-88, the paragraph about landowners and public access:
62 there was discussion between the different perspectives of Ag Comm
63 and landowners/farmers and the Conservation interest in public
64 access for recreation etc. A question was raised about the common
65 law assumption that the public may come onto private land unless it
66 is posted – should that sentence be specific about where exactly
67 public access is allowed (not ‘all property’) And at line 86, should the
68 sentence referencing Current Use also include ‘redundant’? Some
69 felt that it was helpful because not everyone understood what
70 Current Use meant. Perhaps this should have a call out box too. The
71 relevant RSA’s could be researched for reference in this section.
- 72 • Line 89, it should read ‘public access’ and refers to Chapter 6 with the
73 full list of conservation properties in town that permit public access.
- 74 • Line 100-101 - the list of State of NH owned lands/departments that
75 manage them in town – there is a typo – it should be Shaker ‘Village’
- 76 • Line 178 - in the section about the Management of Development and
77 Growth, it should be ‘reduce sprawl in the less developed’
- 78 • Line 189 – the ADU ordinance (*2019 Town Meeting*)
- 79 • Lines 232-3 – in the section on constraints on development, ‘many
80 dirt roads’ was discussed – it was agreed that whereas lack of good
81 broadband access was a constraint, dirt roads had not been – people
82 had moved and built on them anyway – lack of town water and
83 sewer facilities was also mentioned as a constraint on development
- 84 • Should building on Class 6 roads be discouraged? Not all members
85 agreed on that – so that could be a discussion topic on June 18
- 86 • Line 255, ‘Widening of I93’ - Lucy Nichols had written notes about
87 including more on the increase in development and traffic likely to
88 happen with the Concord Gateway Development when Market
89 Basket opens
- 90 • Lines 256 – 265 - in the section on New Challenges and Concerns – it
91 was noted that there is a legal requirement to be working to address
92 the shortage of workforce housing -and in the list of challenges,

93 'broadband' could read 'high speed internet' - otherwise no changes
94 to that list

- 95 • Line 298 - in the section on Policies and Objectives, referring to
96 minimizing conversion of agricultural land for non-agricultural uses
97 through zoning, there would need to be consideration for the loss of
98 equity to the landowner - **Ag Comm members to work on language**
99 **for that section.** Conservation hope to preserve agricultural land
100 without impairing landowners' rights. It was noted that this is a
101 significant issue for discussion in town, possibly too extensive to be
102 dealt with on June 18, and there was a need for education on both
103 sides of the argument, between conservation and landowner goals.
104 Rather than call it conflict, members could see these standpoints as
105 'different objectives' that could be compatible with good operators
106 on both sides. The charette and the Master Plan are both vehicles for
107 identifying issues and tensions, and posing questions, as well as
108 giving direction for the future
- 109 • Line 357 - in the section on Recommended Actions, reference to
110 renaming Agriculture/Conservation zone to Conservation or Open
111 Space – issues discussed included that farms exist in different zones
112 in town, not all are in the Agricultural zone, and that forestry as well
113 as other forms of agriculture have conservation value, current zoning
114 prohibits certain things like housing and roads being built in that
115 zone. Agriculture is a land use rather than a physical zone – **both Ag**
116 **Comm and Cons Comm asked to think about language for this and**
117 **get back to PB with advice**
- 118 • The question of whether there is a noise ordinance was raised – yes –
119 it is in the Ordinance, General Provisions, 2:1, obnoxious uses - along
120 with noise, odors, light or traffic as issues that the Board of
121 Selectmen decide upon
- 122 • There is a typo in Ch 6. third page, Canterbury Town Forest, where it
123 says Brian Bush Road
- 124 • Line 383, reference to encouraging 'small scale farming' with revised
125 town ordinances – there was discussion about what that meant, why
126 'small' was there in the first place (to discourage something like a

1000 hog farm) – **Ag Comm to look at definition of ‘small scale’ that would work in Canterbury (acreage? Agricultural sales/income?)**

Members of the Planning Board thanked the Conservation Commission for their work on the Master Plan and both CCC and Ag Comm for attending this work session. They looked forward to hearing back from the other commissions.

4. Lot coverage

Greg wanted to ask the other commission members about the 35% impervious surface standard currently in use. The PB has had several applications where the request is for a waiver of 50% and more for impervious surface. If these businesses can provide 100% infiltration and up to date storm water run off measures, should the PB be granting these waivers? Should there be a hard cap?

Ken Stern mentioned a CCC discussion recently on this subject. It was more in terms of a process rather than a cap. The exact language about storm water management had been crafted by Kelly. CCC discussed it at their 4/14 meeting and concluded that since the key thing was to guard against erosion and harmful runoff, **their preference would be that the Planning Board require the applicant to install sufficient stormwater control measures to avoid erosion.**

Daimon Meeh said in the course of his job he had seen examples of agricultural and water crossings with 100-year storm planning still get degraded in different ways. For example, a driveway and conservation parking lot had made some acres on one farm unusable. The ‘off property uses’ of land were important too. And what kind of storm event was being planned for. Clean up and maintenance are also important in storm water management.

Teresa Wyman commented that clear definitions were necessary.

Greg thanked the other commission members for coming to work with the PB that evening.

5. June 18 Vision Session Planning

Mike Tardiff’s staff had put the 6 categories into 3 for June 18. Land Use, Economic Development and Housing. There would need to be CNHRPC staff as well as members of the PB present with each of the 3 groups to facilitate discussion and answer questions.

Typically, these events start with an Introduction from the PB Chair and then Mike will speak for the CNHRPC, sharing survey results, demographic data, advisory role of the gathering etc. Participants can attend 2 of the 3, with a quick break in between. He hoped to have 4-5 of his staff so he could move around the different groups.

It was agreed that sign up could be at 9:30 am with refreshments available then. (Library porch is available if needed). Hillary Nelson and other members will make some of the refreshments and get coffee locally. Structured childcare will be provided by Danielle Krautmann, with teenagers to help, in the school playground.

The Town Hall provides most space – it was agreed to be ‘base’. It was further agreed NOT to try hybrid remote/in-person this time but to facilitate something further online afterwards if there was a sense that would be helpful.

Mike will send his Agenda/Questions for discussion draft over for PB members to look at and comment on if any changes are needed. Secretary to forward on to PB, Ag Comm and CCC. Should there be an introduction on it to stimulate discussion?

PB Meeting June 14 will be the last occasion to do logistics planning. It would have to be after 8 pm, following 2 Site Plan Review Applications.

8. Adjournment

John Schneider moved to adjourn, and Scott seconded. It was around 8.30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Lois Scribner, secretary