

Board of Adjustment
Canterbury, NH
Minutes of Hearing
22 October 2025

Case No. 2025-6 Special Exception

Present were: Chairman Jim Wieck, Scott Herrick, Christopher Evans, Web Stout, Sean O'Brien, and Randi Johnson. Also in attendance were abutters Jennifer and John Weberski, Brittany and Brooks Bergholm and Virginia and Ronald Litalien.

Chairman Wieck advised those present **Ann Margaret Swanson** is seeking a special exception as regards a home occupation on her property. The application involves Tax Map 105; Lot 2100 located at 45 Old Tilton Road in the residential zone. The proposed use states "Dog training". The application references Article 5.3, Section C Home Occupation. Chairman Wieck gave a detailed description as to the conduct of the hearing.

Ms. Swanson advised they have recently moved here, and she does in-home dog training. She primarily travels to her clients' homes for her work. She does on occasions have a dog or two dogs get dropped off at her home for a day long training session then are picked up and taken home. She does not keep them overnight. She works with one client a day. Chris asked is the nature of her training, obedience, behavior, protection. Ms. Swanson advised no protection training is done by her, just behavioral. Her work is done inside her home. Randi asked about taking the dogs outside. When the dogs go outside, they are double leashed. Chris asked would most of the clients be dogs with behavioral problems or just general behavior training. Ms. Swanson advised dogs that are going to inside her house and not going to be "at risk" dogs. She has a small child. Most of her work is about leash training and house manners. Chairman Wieck asked if she plans to have any signage. She would like to. He referred her to our sign ordinance allowing for one sign of a certain size. Randi asked if she would ever plan to expand into dog daycare or boarding. Ms. Swanson advised she has no interest in doing dog daycare. She has been asked by clients about overnight boarding. She does not want to compromise her application here before the board about training nor to complicate it. Chairman Wieck advised she can always come back before the board with another application. He advised kenneling is not allowed in the residential zone. She advised she has a small fenced-in area for potty use. This is the only fenced area on their property. Chris asked if she includes all breeds; excludes any breeds. She includes all breeds.

Chairman Wieck asked if anyone wished to speak in favor. Brooks Bergholm, abutter, spoke saying he is in favor. John Weberski, abutter spoke saying they are in favor. Virginia Litalien spoke saying they are dog lovers and are in favor with the concern they do not want to listen to barking. No one spoke in opposition. The applicant advised if there was ever any barking it would be momentary barking from their own personal dogs, and she would quickly reign that in. Scott asked if she has plans to add employees. She does not. She explained much of her work is in clients' homes. If she is working with a dog at her home, once they have a breakthrough, they return to the owners' home for further training. Chairman Wieck asked if it would be fair to say she might have a dog there every day at some points. That is a possibility. Scott asked about how she came to be qualified. She advised there are certifications out there for certain methods. Chairman Wieck asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition. No one spoke. There were no further questions from the board. The testimony portion of the hearing was closed. There was no further discussion from the board. Web made a motion to **GRANT** the application for the following reasons:

1. That granting the permit would be in the public interest. Owner has dogs of her own. This would be low key and have only a maximum of two dogs at any one time.
2. That the proposed use would not adversely affect the property values in the district. It would not. Most if not all the training would be done in-house.

3. That the specific site is an appropriate location for the proposed use. It is. It is just a home occupation.

Case No. 2025-6 cont'd

2

4. That the proposed use would not affect the health and safety of the residents and others in the area and would not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent or neighboring properties. It would not and it's going to be in house.
5. That the proposed use would not constitute a nuisance because of offensive noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odors, heat, glare, or unsightliness. It will not. It is going to be inside the existing structure.
6. That granting of the permit would be in the spirit of this ordinance. It is. We do grant home occupations
7. That the proposed use would not constitute a hazard because of traffic, hazardous materials or other conditions. There will be no other traffic other than the dog(s) getting dropped off and picked up.

Chris seconded the motion. The Board vote was a unanimous decision to **GRANT** the special exception. Chairman Wieck explained the thirty-day appeal process.

The Board voted to accept the Minutes of Hearing from the 27 August 2025 as written.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Carlson, Clerk
Board of Adjustment