

1 Canterbury Planning Board – Final Minutes

2 Tuesday June 13, 2023

3 Members Present

4 Greg Meeh (Chair), John Schneider (Vice Chair), Anne Dowling, Kent Ruesswick
5 (BOS rep), Rich Marcou, Logan Snyder, Hillary Nelson (alternate), Ben
6 Stonebraker (alternate)

7 Members Absent

8 Joshua Gordon

9 Others Present

10 Deborah Follansbee, of Pathfinders Nature Playschool: Greg Heath, Concord
11 Friends Meeting: Mike Tardiff, Director and Matt Monahan, Senior Planner,
12 CNHRPC

13 Agenda

14 1. Call to Order

15 Greg Meeh called the meeting to order at 7 pm. Hillary Nelson was seated in
16 lieu of Joshua Gordon.

17 2. Previous Minutes of May 23, 2023

18 Kent Ruesswick moved the Minutes of May 23 and Rich Marcou seconded.
19 There being no discussion, members voted in favor of approving those
20 Minutes.

21 3. Site Plan Review Application – Deborah Follansbee of Pathfinders
22 Nature Playschool, Oxbow Pond Road

23 Deb Follansbee re-introduced herself, having been to the Board for a
24 preconceptual hearing earlier this year. She has had inspections with both
25 state licensing and the fire department. Her nature Playschool will follow the
26 school schedule.

27 Greg moved to determine if the application was complete. There was a
28 narrative description of the project. And the site plan being used was the
29 version made for the Friends Meeting House in 2008.

Greg Heath said that after this plan was created, they acquired some more property around the Meeting House and much of the area to be used by the playschool is in this newer property. Indoor activities will be in the Friends house and mostly the outdoor activities will be on trails. It was determined that this should be represented on the site plan, so that the location of the outdoor play activities would be clear on the 2008 site map. Greg Heath amended it to do this, and it was agreed this would be referred to in the motion for approval.

It was further determined that there would be no changes to the building or landscape or parking facilities. The signage would comply with the ordinance and be a small sign hanging on the existing Friends sign. The play school will use the same waste and haulage and snow removal companies as the Friends. There were waiver requests for the noise, traffic and lighting studies, on the grounds that there will be little extra noise, normal traffic for that zone and no additional outside lighting. The licensing documents were attached and would be required to be completed and kept updated for the Board to issue a conditional approval. There were no other requirements from the site plan review check list.

John Schneider moved that the application was complete. Kent seconded. All members voted in favor.

Logan Snyder made a motion that the application was not of regional impact. Rich seconded. All voted in favor that it was not of regional impact. It was also agreed that a site walk was unnecessary given that many members had been at the site in recent months.

Anne Dowling moved to grant the waiver request for the noise study. Logan seconded. All in favor.

Rich made a motion to grant the waiver for the traffic study. John seconded. All in favor.

Logan moved that the waiver request for the lighting study be granted. Hillary seconded. All in favor.

There were no further questions about the merits of the application.

John made a motion:

62 “To conditionally approve the Nature Playschool application at the Quaker
63 Meeting House on Oxbow Pond Road with the following conditions:

- 64 (i) All necessary State licensing is granted and kept up to date.
- 65 (ii) The applicant obtains and keeps up to date a Certificate of
66 Occupancy from the town of Canterbury for the number of people
67 and use as specified in their application, amended site plan and
68 supporting documentation.

69 Given that the proposal, in the opinion of the Planning Board complies
70 with the Zoning Ordinance and the site plan approval regulations given
71 the plans presented and the waivers granted”.

72 The motion was seconded by Hillary and all members voted in favor. The
73 Board thanked Deb Follansbee and Greg Heath for attending and wished her
74 good luck with a venture that they felt was good for the town.

75 **4. Master Plan – ongoing work – with Mike Tardiff and Matt Monahan,**
76 **CNHRPC**

77 Mike reported that they had received approval for everything sought. Greg
78 thanked the Board of Selectmen for supporting the regional planning
79 collaboration. The CNHRPC staff are excited about putting together a Land
80 Use Handbook and cheat sheet for Canterbury.

81 Mike wanted to take time this evening to revisit issues pertaining to
82 development at the Commercial zone at Exit 17 and the Industrial zone at
83 Exit 18.

84 Mike also mentioned the ongoing training produced by the Housing Academy
85 and the NH Housing Toolbox. Some of the Planning Board members
86 participated in the recent Toolbox presentation regarding Cluster
87 Developments. Greg noted that several speakers in the Toolbox training had
88 mentioned the proviso “provided you can get your town to agree” to
89 developments. The message was not to overreach and to take care with
90 public education. Mike reiterated that they would have to separate the issues
91 for Town Meeting 2024 from those designated for Town Meeting 2025. He
92 also mentioned that Matt M was walking range roads in Pembroke to come
93 up with some options for the town of Pembroke to help them decide how
94 proactive to be in terms of encouraging development.

95 Several ideas were raised and discussed regarding Exit 17:

- Might there be interest in posing different levels of density within different parts of the Commercial zone? “Phased density” for areas closest to the retail and roundabout versus areas closer to the Oxbow and river?
- Would Mixed use (commercial/residential) be closer to the retail outlets? Would businesses want to be closer to the large new retail area anyway? Would a site walk with this in mind be helpful? Could there be a “buffer zone” with less density that would be closer to the conservation area?
- What kinds of housing should be encouraged? What other services might be needed if housing increased in the area?
- There could be language in the Master Plan that encouraged Mixed Use and allowed for new opportunities with gradations of density in the future.

Discussion regarding the Industrial zone at Exit 18 included some other issues and ideas, including:

- Would the town consider larger scale, smaller units, more affordable housing in that area? What would be the impact on the school system? Housing for over 100 households is more common in larger towns/cities but not Canterbury.
- Regional Planning has data on school districts, by grade, and could have projection figures available for public sessions in order to consider housing options.
- The committee that is considering the pros and cons of removal from Shaker Regional School District was mentioned.
- There might be benefits for the town in promoting gradual and incremental changes in that zone – infrastructure development would have to be considered – there are annual limits to the number of Building Permits issued, for instance.
- What options for types of more affordable housing were possible? A diversity of housing stock is one solution, including multifamily duplexes.
- Another solution is to be creative with the ADU Ordinance and encourage ADUs as a way of increasing housing stock, especially smaller affordable units.

- There has been pressure to have more than one driveway with ADUs, in effect making two households – the Canterbury ordinance allows for detached and attached units which is helpful but creates two households within one tax lot though the smaller one is more affordable and can allow extended families to live on the same lot for mutual benefit.
- Perhaps the size limit for ADU's can be reconsidered? 1,200 sq ft instead of 1000 sq ft.
- And the town could consider making ADU's an allowed use in the Agricultural, Rural and Residential zones - perhaps an ADU could be something that the Building Inspector could sign off on rather than requiring a ZBA hearing – or require Conditional Use Permits from the Planning Board so there was some oversight into ADU development? Over time it might become something that is administrative rather than requiring a board hearing.
- The Zoning Ordinance is a 'living organism' and is never 'done' so changes can be tried and revised as necessary, in an incremental fashion.
- Should there be a change to the frontage requirements to allow access for cluster development in large enough lots? It would require property owners by the road to allow access to land further back. Frontage and access are separate legal issues. There would need to be a right of way to the back acres in such a scenario. Maybe people in town would resist such a change, if they had purchased land thinking the land around them would not be developed? Could there be buffer zones ('forested buffers') to both protect the density bonus as well as a buffer to protect existing residents? The reduced frontage could only work if there was enough acreage and depth on a lot (to avoid 'bowling alley' shaped lots)
- Perhaps the way to start is small and see how it plays out offering some density bonuses, use Conditional Use Permits for oversight, and any change to frontage requirements would just be for the cluster development, not single-family homes in general.

Mike thanked the Board for discussing all these issues.

166 His staff are working on the Land Use and Economic Development chapters.
167 They still need to brainstorm the Invest NH topics with the Board and plan
168 the public sessions, starting in mid-September. They are working with Kelly
169 Short's comments on the Natural Resources chapter and collaborating with
170 her on the software.

171 The Board thanked Mike and Matt and they left the meeting.

172 **5. Other Business**

173 There was discussion about ensuring alternates were involved in work session
174 discussions as well as being seated if there is a vacancy for a voting member.
175 It would mean being seated for part of a meeting. Perhaps the agenda could
176 identify portions of the meeting where alternates will be involved in
177 discussion?

178 **6. Adjournment**

179 Rich made a motion to adjourn, and Kent seconded. It was around 8.30 pm.

180 Respectfully submitted,

181 Lois Scribner, secretary

182