

1 DRAFT

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)

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

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

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

- 39 • Line 53, reference to the Covid pandemic increasing the number of  
40 people working from home, likely to be a major trend in the future
- 41 • Line 63, reference to residential development in town being along  
42 main paved roads and the more traveled dirt roads
- 43 • Line 65, which was not changed, mention of ‘a few commercial  
44 establishments’ at Exits 17 and 18 led to discussion – PB members  
45 felt it was more than ‘a few’ but were not sure how to describe the  
46 increase – Lucy Nichols had counted 10 operating and approved at  
47 Exit 17 and 3 at Exit 18. Mike suggested a call out box about land use  
48 at Exit 17 as a topic for discussion
- 49 • This led to discussion about the ongoing issue of the PB working on  
50 the Table of Uses for Commercial and Industrial zones, to bring them  
51 more in line with what is happening rather than businesses having to  
52 get frequent variances from the ZBA
- 53 • Line 76, the end of the paragraph where the different types of  
54 agriculture found in town are mentioned, Mark Stevens (Ag Comm)  
55 commented that ‘a few large commercial agricultural businesses’ was  
56 incorrect – the larger farms in town (ex. Glines and Brookford) are  
57 really family farms and not largescale commercial farms in relation to  
58 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

127 1000 hog farm) – **Ag Comm to look at definition of ‘small scale’ that**  
128 **would work in Canterbury (acreage? Agricultural sales/income?)**

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

#### 132 4. Lot coverage

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

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

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

150 Teresa Wyman commented that clear definitions were necessary.

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

#### 153 5. June 18 Vision Session Planning

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 177 8. Adjournment

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

179

180 Respectfully submitted,  
181 Lois Scribner, secretary

182

183