

1 **Planning Board Meeting**

2 **April 8, 2025, 7:00PM at the Meeting House**

3 **Members Present:** Greg Meeh (Chair), Rich Marcou (Via Zoom), Joshua Gordon, Logan
4 Snyder, Scott Doherty (BOS Representative), Hillary Nelson (Alternate), Megan Portnoy,
5 Brendan O'Donnell, Clifton Mathieu (Alternate)

6 **Members Absent:**

7 **Staff Present:** Jan Stout, (Land Use Administrator), Michelle Hammond, (Planning Board
8 Secretary)

9 **Others Present:** Mike Tardiff (CNHRP), Resident Helen Loyd-Davis from Intervale Road

10 **Agenda**

11 **1. Call to Order**

12 Greg Meeh (Chair) called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

13 **2. Approval of Previous Minutes**

14 Greg made a motion to approve March 18, 2025, minutes, as amended, Joshua
15 seconded, no discussion all voted in favor, aye.

16 Line 6: Brendan O'Donnell (absent)

17 Line 26: "alternate" not "alternative"

18 Line 116: Planning board questioned, what is the definition of mixed use? Clifton
19 Mathieu, resident of Canterbury NH, expressed his concerns and frustrations that the
20 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.

New Business:

Review of CIP Spreadsheet:

Mike presented a comprehensive six-year program of expenditures, focusing on items costing \$10,000 or more, which are considered out-of-the-ordinary expenditures. This includes replacing vehicles.

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) serves as a precursor to the budget process and is an advisory document developed by the planning board. The process involves dropping a year and adding a year, providing an opportunity for department heads to discuss long-term budgeting. This practice aims to instill a habit of forward-thinking financial planning.

Jan Stout, Land Use Administrator, engaged with department heads to identify projects by year, demonstrating how costs are offset through the use of capital reserve funds. This approach helps make a case for capital reserves, ensuring financial stability over a four to five-year period. The goal is to consolidate all information into one spreadsheet, covering at least six years, and to facilitate discussions on future needs. This process is crucial for town meetings, extending beyond the CIP as proposed.

Joshua inquired whether the CIP is defensible enough to support innovative land use planning. Mike confirmed that it is comprehensive, although the library was suggested as an

42 additional department. He noted that an ambulance involves a different process and that schools
43 are not included.

44 Greg asked about the estimate for 2036, which includes \$35,000, and Jan explained that
45 amount was provided by the Selectboard. The spreadsheet shows costs above and below,
46 highlighting how they are offset. The key line is the impact on the tax rate, which should include
47 \$0.47 per \$1,000.

48 Joshua raised concerns about the sufficiency of the CIP in case of a lawsuit, and Mike
49 acknowledged that it requires annual updates and merits discussions with the planning board,
50 BOS, and department heads.

51 Mike emphasized that the core of the CIP is the process, but additional demographics can
52 be included. Greg proposed including the CIP update as an annual agenda item and suggested
53 narrowing it down to six years and presenting it on the planning board agenda with a one-page
54 summary for usability. The NHRCP will handle this procedure as part of the annual fee. Joshua
55 mentioned that we should include the data for years beyond 6 if we have it.

56 Rich inquired about the renovation of the transfer station study and its placement in the
57 CIP. Mike indicated that it would be included in next year's CIP, leading to a productive
58 discussion for the following year.

59 **Housing Related State Legislation:**

60 Senate Bill 84 proposes to reduce the minimum lot size to 88,000 square feet (2 acres). If
61 passed, it will go into effect in July 2026.

62 Resident Helen Loyd-Davis from Intervale Road inquired about the implications of this
63 bill and Logan asked about the objectives behind this legislation, to which Mike responded that

64 it aims to address housing affordability. A public hearing on this matter is scheduled for next
65 week. Another bill currently under committee review seeks to reduce frontage requirements to
66 50', and there is ongoing discussion about this proposal.

67 Resident Helen Lloyd-Davis, who attended the meeting on the bills, emphasized that
68 numerous bills are being addressed at the state level. She urged residents to attend the
69 committee hearings and voice their opinions, stressing that decisions should not be left solely to
70 the state but should involve the town's input.

71 Greg concurred and questioned the planning board's role in engaging the town to
72 become more active. He suggested that the board could include a letter in the newsletter to
73 inform residents. Mike agreed, stating that the municipal board should listen to the community's
74 concerns and send a letter. Greg asked if any board members opposed this idea and inquired
75 about the timeline, noting that Senate Bill 231 has a hearing next week, with their senator as a
76 cosigner.

77 Brendan mentioned that the passage of Senate Bill 231 is inevitable this year. Hillary
78 Nelson highlighted the ease of submitting objections online. Greg, as the chair, will draft a letter
79 opposing the bill, citing the town's 10-year plan and the significant impact this legislation would
80 have.

81 Hillary reminded the board of the existing building cap, which would be challenged by
82 the new bill. Logan moved to delegate the chair to present the board's opposition to these two
83 bills.

84 Brendan noted that the bill has left the Senate and is now in the House for a normal
85 session. Helen Lloyd-Davis, a resident, mentioned that the municipal association posts bills and
86 agendas online. Megan offered to speak at the hearing on the 15th.

Greg pointed out that the town's demographics and development patterns are changing, with large properties owned by older individuals likely to be passed on in the next 10 years. This underscores the need to address these issues proactively.

NHHOP Grant Engagement Plan & Goals with Mike Tardiff

Greg initiated the discussion by emphasizing the importance of an outreach program that addresses community concerns. The Invest NHHOP Grant, applied for in September and approved in December, aims to support the planning board's efforts towards the Town Meeting 2026 and the establishment of regulations. This grant focuses on the predictability of land use regulations.

Another meeting for the subcommittee is scheduled for the 9th, which is a significant part of the NH investment program. The outreach efforts are moving away from rushing to make changes and are starting now as a public process. The community may be dealing with a different landscape, and it is essential to consider what this means for the cluster ordinance.

Mike presented The Community Engagement Plan (draft), and Greg suggested organizing a Q&A session. Mike proposed framing the discussion around specific issues that need to be addressed. He highlighted the importance of the workforce housing being in compliance with legislation. The discussion should cover what workforce housing is and the available options, leading into other housing topics. ADUs are a great example. A significant part of this process involves hearing from the public and discussing potential changes.

Greg inquired about the use of visuals, and Mike said that was possible and reminded that we added a lot of visuals last year in the zoning and the farmhouse design standard amendments.

109 The board continued discussing more of the effects of the Senate Bill 84. Brendan and
110 Mike agreed that that based on the Senate committee meeting, the discussion will continue and
111 proceed to an executive session, however noted that the municipal opposition could halt the
112 process.

113 The bill stipulates the maximum lot size, overriding the zoning. Mike pointed out that it
114 would also affect property evaluation. It still stands that the lot must have correct septic and
115 meet setbacks, etc.

116 Megan moved that the planning board authorizes the chair or delegate to appear before
117 the relevant committees to express their opinion and oppose Bill 84 only. No further discussion
118 ensued, and all voted in favor, with Brendan abstaining due to a separate conflict.

119 The limitation of the minimum lot size is not defensible, as it restricts innovative land
120 use regulations. If this went into effect, we would have to change our dimensional requirements
121 and could not require lot sizes larger than what is mandated by the bill. Mike mentioned that
122 development along a road with 300-foot frontage and cluster is still possible.

123 Outreach: If this passes, what are the outreach plans? Mike suggested considering
124 changes to regulations or the zoning board. Joshua noted that the entire ordinance would need to
125 be reviewed, which cannot be accomplished within a year. Mike acknowledged that every
126 community would face these challenges, and that there seems to be little interest in slowing
127 down the process at this point.

128 Resident Helen Lloyd-Davis expressed that there is considerable opposition. She
129 encouraged people to speak up and applauded the planning board for their efforts and
130 perseverance.

131

132

133 **Public Discourse, Bias, Perception of Bias:**

134 Mike noted that the proposed new legislative bills could diminish some of the planning
135 board's roles, which is a valid concern. Hillary reiterated this by reminding everyone that the
136 recent Master Plan process is being undone.

137 Greg asked if it is acceptable for board members to post on Facebook. The board
138 responded emphasizing that it is a matter of freedom of speech. Branden clarified that board
139 members can express their opinions on legislation.

140 Greg stressed the importance of good outreach in the town. Hillary suggested providing
141 links to relevant information to encourage participation.

142 Megan highlighted that while testifying is helpful, most changes occur due to threats to
143 the seats held by legislators, making direct contact crucial. This can lead to a loss of votes for
144 them. Howard Pearl, the state senator, is a sponsor of this legislation.

145 The board also discussed that the legislation could have amendments attached.

146 Greg reminded the board that the board has asked for all meeting information to be
147 consolidated into one email with all supporting documents. He requested that this information
148 be sent to Michelle, who will then distribute it to the planning board members.

149 **Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair:**

150 Josh nominated Greg for Chair, who expressed willingness to serve for one more year.
151 Megan nominated Brendan O'Donnell, who was also willing to serve as Chair if supported by
152 the board.

153 The board was informed that voting via ballot when a member is attending the meeting
154 via Zoom constitutes an RTK violation and that votes must be conducted through roll call.
155 Despite this, the board proceeded with ballot voting.

156 Rich made a motion to table the voting until the next meeting due to technical
157 difficulties unable to hear with the Zoom application. Joshua seconded the motion, but Logan,
158 Scott and Megan disagreed. The board agreed to have Rich text his vote to Michelle. The results
159 were three votes for Greg and three votes for Brendan, with one abstention, resulting in a tie.

160 Kal McKay joined the meeting via Zoom and discussed RSA 91-A:2, reiterating that
161 voting via ballot is an RTK violation and that votes must be conducted through roll call. The
162 citation 91A:2, section III(e) and section IV(b), outlines the requirements for roll call votes.

163 Joshua moved to postpone the voting until the next meeting due to changed
164 circumstances, and Rich seconded the motion. Logan stipulated that there should be no further
165 delays. With no further discussion, the motion passed with all in favor except Megan, who voted
166 nay.

167 ***The next meeting will be on April 22, 2025, at 7:00PM at the Meeting House.***

168 Logan motioned to adjourn the meeting Scott seconded at 8:44pm. No further
169 discussion, all voted in favor.

170 Respectfully submitted,

171 Michelle Hammond,
172 Planning Board Secretary