1	Planning Board Meeting	
2	March 18, 2025, 7:00PM at the Meeting House	
3		
4	Members Present: Greg Meeh (Chair), Rich Marcou, Joshua Gordon, Logan Snyder, Scott	
5	Doherty (BOS Representative)	
6	Members Absent: Hillary Nelson (Alternate), Megan Portnoy, Jonas Sanborn (Alternate),	
7	Brendan O'Donnell	
8	Staff Present: Jan Stout, (Land Use Administrator), Michelle Hammond, (Planning Board	
9	Secretary)	
10	Others Present: Matt Monahan (CNHRP), Kent Ruesswick, Clifton Mathieu	
11	<u>Agenda</u>	
12	1. <u>Call to Order</u>	
13	Greg Meeh (Chair) called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.	
14	2. Approval of Previous Minutes	
15	Rich made a motion to approve February 11, 2025, minutes, as amended, Joshua	
16	seconded, no discussion all voted in favor, aye.	
17	• Line 195 Brendan misspelled.	
18	• Line 404 Brendan misspelled, delete 4 at the end of the line	
19	• Line 408 "Shall" be replaced with "May"	
20	• Line 448 Joshua, "said"	
21	Minutes of Subcommittee will be moved at the next Subcommittee meeting which	
22	will be on April 10, 2025, at 6:30-8:00PM.	
23	New Business:	

Voting: Chair and Vice Chair:

Joshua moved to *postpone* the elections of chair and vice chair to the next meeting due to the absence of two members, Rich seconded, all voted in favor, aye.

Clifton Mathieu spoke up and would like to be considered as an alternate on the planning board. Joshua made a motion to move Clifton Mathieu as an alternate, Rich seconded and all voted in favor, aye.

Informational Discussion with Matt Monahan (CNHRP):

Conceptual Consultation and Design Review:

Both are non-binding; however, the design review is more complete. Regulations state that no drawings are to be used in a conceptual consultation. Greg asked the board if they would like to change that in the regulations. He feels they are helpful for the application process.

Matt referenced the relevant RSA that outlines specific language, consultation requirements, and the need for a design review. It also stipulates that abutters must be notified for the design review process. The Subcommittee will collaborate with Matt to research the RSA and ensure full compliance with its provisions.

Matt clarified that both the conceptual consultation and design review are non-binding. He emphasized that the board should begin each design review by referencing the RSA and clearly stating that the review is non-binding. Additionally, he reminded the board to conclude the design review with the same statement regarding its non-binding nature, and to include this information on the agenda, along with the RSA reference and the non-binding reminder.

Conceptual consultation and design review can be for both subdivisions and site plans, but we only need to notice abutters for design reviews.

Waivers:

The board must have sufficient information from the application to make an informed and defensible decision. Joshua stated that the board has the authority to waive any requirement that it has the power to enact. If a rule does not require town approval or is not an ordinance, the board can waive it. However, if it is in an ordinance and the applicant does not wish to comply, they must seek a special exception or a variance. Each lot is unique. Rich addressed concerns regarding precedence. Matt suggested that most considerations can be incorporated as conditions of approval.

Condition of approval: approval with condition(s) is not finalized until the conditions are met. The Land Use Administration follows the notice of a decision to ensure it is finalized. So be sure your conditions are properly listed. The best way to handle this is to have one member read off the list of conditions, (Make a motion to conditionally approve as read by Member, etc.) Signing of the plan does not happen until all conditions are complete.

Checklist: (what the applicant seeks a waiver for)

The board has the authority to approve the completeness of an application. While the checklist may be considered complete, it does not necessarily indicate compliance with all the regulations. The checklist and the regulations must be considered together.

The applicant is required to provide all the information specified on the checklist or request a waiver for any missing items to be deemed complete. Each waiver should be

accompanied by a written justification. Jan suggested allowing the option of marking items as "N/A" to potentially eliminate the need for waivers.

Variance and Special Exceptions:

There are certain matters for which waivers cannot be granted, as they fall under the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board. The Planning Board cannot issue a waiver for requirements in the Ordinance. For CUPs, the board cannot grant a waiver for a density bonus unless expressly authorized by the ordinance.

- Waiver: Applies to requirements outlined in the Planning Board Regulations.
- Variance: Pertains to exceptions from the Zoning Board Regulations.
 - **Special Exceptions:** Require applicants to meet specific criteria beyond the standard five, with clearly defined requirements.

Conditional Use Permit:

A CUP is established under **Innovative Land Use RSA 674:21**, not solely through the Planning Board, and it defines what the board can and cannot act upon. Ideally, a CUP outlines the specific criteria required to obtain a permit and details what must be included in the application.

The ordinance may specify what the Planning Board is authorized to waive. The criteria for granting a CUP often aligns with those for a special exception, followed by the required submittal materials. Many CUPs include criteria that reference consistency with the **Master Plan** as a key consideration.

Matt explained that the CUP process is a negotiation with established guidelines. When determining what the board can waive or require, he emphasized the importance of referring to the ordinance. The CUP process is a collaborative effort, allowing for discussion and adjustments to ensure the project's success. It is designed to provide flexibility within traditional zoning requirements, which are explicitly outlined by the Planning Board. Ultimately, all decisions should be guided by the ordinances.

Training for Board Members:

The Municipal Association will send training to us at a Planning Board meeting.

These trainings are usually presented by Steve Buckly, (head of legal at the Municipal Association).

We need to schedule this through the NHMA web site. Greg will be in touch with Ken F on this as it requires log in credentials.

Engagement plan for the NHHOP Grant: Proposed Dates: One 5/27 or 6/10, one 7/22 or 8/12 and one 9/23 or 10/14.

Proposed topics:

Workforce Housing update.

Better protection of rural character, viewscapes, open fields, stone walls, etc. in our Ag / conservation zone. Residents have expressed a lot of concern about this. To accomplish this we need to explore how it can be done in a way that works for residents.

Greg and Matt mentioned that the tools we have are the innovative land use provisions in the law which allow us to offer incentives like bonus densities rather than ordinance restriction like stricter dimensional requirements which would not be defensible in court.

Greg passed around training options to interested board members.

Right to Know Training April 17, 2025, at Town Hall 6:00PM

Definitions:

Mixed Use:

Planning board questioned, what is the definition of mixed use? Clifton Mathieu, resident of Canterbury NH, expressed his concerns and frustrations that the planning board set forth a warrant article to the residents of Canterbury for a zoning change from "commercial" to "mixed use/commercial," in reference to a piece of land near exit 18, without knowing and/or understanding the definition of "mixed use." The planning board is now seeking clarification on the definition of "mixed use," from NHRPC. Matt will come back with an existing definition; the board has the right to interpret and apply.

Old Business:

- Master Plan: Matt will send the Master Plan in Word and PDF Format to Jan to be securely archived.
- **Updates to the Master Plan**: Chapter 8, Appendix, Matt is editing for a minor change. The board asked for edits on the Radar Graph, Matt can *not* modify but able to change some labeling to make it clearer.

131	• Regulations Checklist Update: Will be addressed at the next subcommittee
132	meeting, it was discovered at the last subcommittee meeting that design review
133	references 5.1 of the regulations and 5.1 says nothing about design review. Rich
134	updated the board with edits he found to be necessary. Joshua suggested avoiding
135	cross references as much as possible as it can create problems. The subcommittee
136	will focus on placing primarily in design review and avoiding cross references as
137	practical. Next subcommittee meeting will be held April 10, 2025, at 6:30-8:00
138	PM
139	• Updates/Corrections to Design Review section: will be continued at the next
140	subcommittee meeting.
141	Traffic Count Study:
142	The board agreed to survey roads that have not been done in the last 5 years.
143	(Baptist Road, Center Road, Dump Road, Shaker Road, Oak Hill Road)
144	Action Items:
145	• HHOP Grant engagement Plan (Next Agenda 4/8/2025 with Mike Tardiff)
146	 Work Force Housing and Ordinance to ensure compliance with state law
147	• Definitions
148	The next meeting will be on April 8, 2025, at 7:00PM at the Meeting House.
149	Joshua motioned to adjourn the meeting Logan seconded at 8:44pm.
150	Respectfully submitted,
151	Michelle Hammond,
152	Planning Board Secretary