

Planning Board Subcommittee Meeting

Meeting House 1:00 PM

March 5, 2025

Members Present: Greg Meeh, Rich Marcou

Others Present: Jan Stout, Matt Monahan (CNHRP), Michelle Hammond

Working Session:

Matt recommended the checklist for reference which includes an extensive list of potentials that could be included in the final checklist. The objective of this checklist is for the applicant to look at the checklist and if they need more information and details they refer to the ordinances.

Edits to draft checklist:

- move 4.1 and added state approvals, etc., to the front because that will be all applications.
- 6.4 The column after the description, move over and right justify the numbers and Left Justify the text.

Matt is going to paste into a word document, top will be the basics, general description.

Continued Checklist discussion:

If it is on the checklist, they have to supply it, unless it gets a waiver, in order for the application to be complete. The checklist helps guide them to make sure this information is on the application

Matt offered three different types/options of checklists that you can have; a subdivision, site plan, or a combined one and they can build off each other.

Jan was concerned that if you're going to do a checklist, you have to allow an option for N/A or there will be an abundance of waivers. Matt said that it is up to the board to decide. Greg pointed out that our ordinance says that if there is a new road, it becomes a major.

Matt suggested coming up with a new category and he is going to come up with a different term, instead of N/A, so it is not a discretionary piece.

Rich suggested editing by grouping, one checklist, starting at the beginning, 6.4 Submission requirements for all subdivisions and that at the bottom see: 6.5 major or 6.6 and the next page have 6.5, 6.6.

Greg suggested putting everything we have under 6.4 and 4. 1 on one-page, minor subdivision 6.5 on a separate page, major subdivision on another page, either a minor or a major, ignore which one it is not. Subdivision and Site plan, 4.1 all plans, it was decided to separate. Moved redundant information, so that there is something that is not applicable it should go back into 5.1 or 6.1.

Jan asked how do you show proof of access to class 5 or better road. Matt said that it depends, you need to go in and read the regulations, that is where a professional would be used, and it would show on the plan. Jan recommended adding requirement professional stamp on all the plans.

Greg brought up addressing the state law that requires frontage, classification of the roads, tax maps that say one thing and the state labels road and registered deed what the town calls the roads.

Matt added that there might be multiple sources and that it is important to have professionals sorting through that. If the board has questions, the checklist is all about what is in the regulations, so if the RSA is saying what you need to have, if it is vague, you don't have enough information to approve, site walk is needed or legal advice. A lot of towns define the road classification, and we are taking it a bit further by actually showing the road the classification. Rich felt that it is going to be a case-by-case process.

Matt suggested edits: take one document and call it section A, B, C. Section A is 4.1, then the instructions say if you're doing a subdivision, go to section A (all the 4.1 info) B is subdivision specific and C is site plan specific. For site plans, Section A and Section C, for "As Built", Section A and Section D is one option. The other way is 2 physical checklists, both site plan and subdivision. (Everyone gets 4.1 checklist)

Rich suggested a 4th checklist for voluntary lot merger, conceptual plan review, as needed, a catch all for things that are not related to each other.

One design review requirement that we ask for is an impact study. Matt clarified an impact study as being broken down by the regulations into 2 categories, one high level, a glorified narrative and one that is more detailed where the board may ask for a traffic study prepared by an engineer.

Greg referenced the regulations, section 2.3 #2 "A development impact summary report set forth in section 5.1" 5.1 pg 24 "change in use of occupancy only", we have a problem with number references. **Rich will look into the correct reference.**

Jan asked for clarification under the final application submission regarding determination letter from building inspector, fire and police, etc., and asked if that is included in

a TRC, which we don't have. Matt addressed that it is in the regulations, so they would have to get approval from the different departments, which can be communicated via email.

There is an applicant under our commercial cluster ordinance claiming that any unit in their dimensional allotment saying that they can use any unit for anything they want. Matt reiterated that a business is one unit and there is not a density concern. Matt added that in terms of a business, a commercial cluster could have McDonalds; one unit, storage; another unit, barbershop, another unit, so that is 3 units of commercial.

A storage unit that has multiple buildings is still part of the storage facility, but the applicant still has to fit in with the dimensional requirements. If they are doing residential as well with commercial, they have to balance how big that facility is going to be verses the storage and houses.

Matt referenced the zoning, and the entire ordinance is set up so that the board can have some discretion.

Greg asked if Matt could educate the members about the dimensional allotment ordinance requirements at the next Planning Board meeting. Matt added that the Chichester Planning Board Chair is going to attend the next Canterbury PB meeting.

Greg asked Matt for clarification of the undisturbed open space. Greg pointed out that the communal open space is for residents' protection. Matt clarified the term open space in the regs tells the applicant what the town is intending for that space.

Housing Ombudsmen Court- rulings against towns are not happening by interpretation of the ordinance but by violation of procedures. The next Planning Board Meeting will be

addressing, voting by roll call vote, properly addressing the chair, and using formal titles, last names. Matt shared examples of other planning boards violation of procedures.

Next subcommittee meeting: TBD

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Hammond
Planning Board secretary