

1 **Planning Board Meeting - Work Session - Final Minutes**

2 **February 28, 2023, Meeting House**

3 Members Present

4 Greg Meeh, (Chair), Scott Doherty (Vice Chair), Kent Ruesswick (BOS rep), John
5 Schneider, Joshua Gordon, Anne Dowling, Lucy Nichols

6 Members absent

7 Logan Snyder, (snow absence)

8 Others Present

9 Harold French (applicant): Mike Tardiff, Executive Director, CNHRPC

10 Agenda

11 1. Call to Order

12 Greg Meeh called the meeting to order at 7 pm.

13 2. Minutes of February 14, 2023

14 Kent Ruesswick moved the previous minutes. Scott Doherty seconded. John
15 Schneider abstained due to absence at that meeting. No comments – all voted in
16 favor.

17 3. Harold French – preconceptual subdivision at 114 West Road

18 Harold French shared an initial plan to subdivide 37 acres on 114 West Road, to
19 give his daughter 3 acres. She is currently renting on what was the Jody Hildreth
20 lot. Harold French has been working with Brian Cressy and Keith Anastasy who
21 own the land behind his and want to develop it.

22 Discussion with Board members focused upon issues of frontage for a residential
23 property in the commercial zone. Reading of the Article 5 in the ordinance made
24 it clear that 300 feet contiguous frontage is needed for any lot used for residence.
25 This property was grandfathered in prior to residential being prohibited in the
26 commercial zone. It was suggested that he would need to go to the ZBA for a
27 variance specific to his property. It was also suggested that he could then apply
28 for a lot line adjustment rather than a subdivision. In the commercial zone lots

have to be 2 acres. Harold French was appreciative of suggestions made by Board members, to have his proposals redrawn, seek a variance and then a lot line adjustment. He thanked the Board and left the meeting.

4. Master Plan – Draft Chapters – Mike Tardiff

a) Transportation chapter

Mike noted that this chapter has lots of data. It can be very informative, especially if residents do not know much about the subject. It can also have implications for grant funding. Planning Board members had read and marked up copies, which were handed to Mike later, to be considered and suggestions integrated. Mike thanked members for taking time and giving such feedback.

Various suggestions were made in the discussion including:

- Clarification on ‘East of Canterbury Village’ needs to be understood to be Canterbury Center and not Canterbury Shaker Village.
- Page 2 – Vision Statement paragraph - mention of trails – for transport or recreation – they do need to be included.
- Graphs shown on page 10 for Paved Shoulder, Bike Lane and Separated Paths – that data needs to be described more clearly in terms of ‘pedestrian infrastructure’.
- There is nothing about stone walls in the transportation text – they can be an obstacle to road widening and are a significant feature on roads in town.
- Perhaps the detail on page 11 regarding Transportation Planning could be cut a bit.
- Adding to the known trouble spots – Kimball Pond and Morrill, Center Road, Rt 132 etc. – perhaps Shaker Road should be added? There are two dangerous trouble spots on Shaker Road – just south of Wyven Road and just north of Baptist – speeding in town is an acknowledged problem and there is only one police car out at a time – perhaps the idea of a stationary or mobile speeding device could be included as something to consider in the Master Plan text – have a place holder about speed and traffic calming

63 initiatives for the future – Mike will ask Matt and Matt to come
64 out to look at these road issues and also to fix the graphics – they
65 could include speed as well as numbers of vehicles in their
66 surveys.

- 67 • Baptist Road was mentioned as a road that has had a 40-mph
68 speed limit for years yet has ever increasing residences and
69 driveways and usage making it very dangerous for pedestrians,
70 joggers etc. Mike detailed the steps needed to contact the state
71 to make the case, repeatedly, for lowering that speed limit.

72
73 b) Housing chapter

- 74 • There was much discussion about the workforce housing
75 ordinance, which is not written in such a way that it can be
76 utilized. It is not being triggered. Perhaps it needs to be rewritten.
77 It came about shortly after the statute was passed some years
78 ago. It was agreed that a definition was required to explain what
79 was meant by ‘workforce housing’, knowing that it can be
80 confused with other terms. It was suggested that focusing on the
81 diversity of housing to be available in town could be helpful. Also,
82 that thinking about the term in relation to a typical teacher, for
83 instance, employed in town but not able to afford housing here,
84 might be helpful.
- 85 • There was some suggestion that the draft text presented the high
86 rate of owner occupied housing in Canterbury as negative aspect
87 of the town’s life whereas many residents would see that at a
88 positive thing – as in if 45% responded positively to workforce
89 housing, that meant 55% did not want it. CNHRPC staff did not
90 write the draft intending to be critical of what makes Canterbury
91 characteristic but rather were responding to issues raised in the
92 Vision sessions where lack of affordable housing was a recurrent
93 theme. Perhaps there can be a shift in the text to include both
94 what is valued and liked about the town, things to preserve and
95 also what is needed to change in the future, which would
96 distinguish this Master Plan from the previous three versions

- It was suggested that the text could be changed to focus on telling people ‘we heard you’ and then move on to key findings and the things that could be used as tools to open up development – there is an inherent conflict between the desire to keep things as they are and the rural nature of the town, but also to have more housing and commercial opportunities.
- ADU’s – Mike’s office does not have those numbers yet.
- Fair Share table – members found that confusing.
- Is the permit limitation currently in the ordinance defensible in the long term? It expires in 2025 – it is something that could be examined, even if past data is of limited use.
- Page 5 data on graphs does not quite tie in with the conclusions drawn when contrasting Canterbury and the other towns – that data could be helped with some bullet points and interpretations or takeaways from the data – and maybe make that section longer.
- Page 4 – graphs on Housing Occupancy and Median values – the ‘elephant in the room’ is income differences between the towns so perhaps income per capita could be included
- And if color is to be used, give a legend to explain it – and color usage throughout could be standardized (ex. black means bad, green means good, red is fire/worrying, the yellow is too pale to be seen)
- Page 7 (the second page 7) – section on growth management – needs some correction and longer explanation.
- An appendix could be helpful – or some way to have data included but not necessarily all in the text.

Mike agreed to return for more work on Tuesday March 14 (election day). He will bring further edits to these chapters and the Natural Resources chapter.

Greg expressed appreciation to members for reading the draft texts so thoroughly to give feedback.

130 5. Invest NH Grant funded work – time frame for public engagement

131 **Mike is expecting to talk to the BOS after Town Meeting to concur with them**
132 **on the work that will be funded by Invest NH through the town**
133 **administration.** He could add permit limitation to that list of topics. There will
134 be significant public engagement necessary to prepare for Town Meeting 2024
135 zoning amendments and the Master Plan approval.

136 It was agreed to take a break in August, then schedule public meetings in mid
137 September, mid October, early November and then we have the Town Hall for
138 December 12 already booked. Book Tuesday evenings, not weekends.

139 **Secretary to contact town office to do this.**

140 6. Setbacks

141 Tabled for a later meeting.

142 7. New Business

143 a) Nature Playschool

144 Greg had been contacted by a group who want to set up a nature playschool at
145 the Friends Meeting House. This is an educational proposal, not a church
146 activity. It would need a Special Exception from the ZBA first therefore as it is
147 separate from that applying to church functions. They could start with a
148 preconceptual meeting with the Planning Board.

149 b) Feuerstoss LLC

150 Several Planning Board members had attended the recent ZBA meeting granting
151 the special exception to Michael Malone for gun manufacture at 6 Oxbow Road. It
152 was suggested that the Planning Board should write to him to make a date to
153 come before the Board. The use is sufficiently different from other tenants in the
154 McKerley building that he should come for independent site plan review. The
155 conditions that were imposed in the Special Exception should be incorporated
156 into the site plan so that the Code Enforcement Officer is given criteria to follow.

157 c) Adjournment

158 Kent moved to adjourn and all were in favor. It was 8.45 pm.

159
160 Respectfully submitted,

161 Lois Scribner, secretary

162

163

164

165

166 .

167

168

169

170