

Minutes of the Antrim Planning Board Meeting December 29, 1992

Present: Judith Pratt, Chairman; Michael Oldershaw, ex officio;
Edwin Rowehl; David Essex

Public Hearing for Zoning Changes to be submitted to the voters
at the March 1993 Town Meeting.

Chairman Pratt opened the meeting at 7:30 P.M. She announced the purpose of this hearing and opened discussion to questions from the floor. Only two interested voters were present, Chris Baker-Salmon and Matthew Chauncey. Baker-Salmon expressed an objection to the provisions of RSA 483:B as they apply to the Contoocook, the North Branch of the Contoocook River including the shores of Pierce Lake and Gregg Lake being applied to Article XI, Section 5,A - Wetlands District and Article XII - Floodplain Development District. There was discussion of the definitions of high water and rights of way as they apply to RSA 483:B. The Chair stated that the Board's intention is to protect the rivers. The definition of public boundary was also discussed. Salmon expressed the opinion that this action would deprive him of his rights as a property owner and made reference to the public forum, with which he works, which is now conducting discussion under the Rivers Management Program. He observed that Antrim has double the frontage of other towns affected by this legislation on fourth order rivers. Chauncey also spoke in opposition of the proposal to add the requirements of RSA 483:B to the Antrim Zoning Ordinance. Chauncey addressed matters of the control of forestry practices and agricultural practices which in his opinion reduces the value of his property. He made the point that the Rivers Management and Protection Program has been worked on for many years and expressed misgivings about the encroachment on his property rights. He cautioned that stream, brook, and freshet are not presently addressed under RSA 483:B but could be included in the act at any time. Mike Oldershaw assured Baker-Salmon and Chauncey that the Board would consider this testimony and thanked Chris and Matt for their input. Baker-Salmon and Chauncey again expressed the desirability of having control at a local as opposed to the State and Federal level. Baker-Salmon made the point that two voters appeared against the proposal and no one appeared for the proposal.

Sign Ordinance: Chris Baker-Salmon argued that the proposed new Ordinance is more restrictive as it requires a permit for a sign six square feet or under where none is required under the existing Sign Ordinance and suggested that a provision be made in the Ordinance for speed as it impacts sight distances in the Highway Business District. He spoke ~~of~~ the ~~A~~ffect of zoning restrictions on the growth of business in the Town. The Chair pointed out that the proposed Ordinance is more liberal as it provides that the Building Inspector issue sign permits, as opposed to all requests for signs over six square feet being referred to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for action on a

Special Exception or a Variance. The Board agreed to take Baker-Salmon's comments under consideration.

Definition - Highways, Classification of: On advice of counsel the Board agreed to change the definition to conform to the State definition.

Buffer Strip: There was discussion and explanation of the intention of this change to the satisfaction of those present.

Mike Oldershaw submitted a change to the Highway Business and the Rural District which will allow additional housing for farm employees without further subdivision of the property, as a permitted use. This will be included as Article XIV (Supplemental Regulations) A.20.

Definition of Recreation: After discussion relative to the definition of excessive noise and referencing a critique from Board Attorney, Silas Little, the Board agreed to add that portion of the definition which applies to regulation as Article XIV (Supplemental Regulations) A.21.

Mike Oldershaw suggested that based on the testimony relative to RSA 483:B, the Board should consider tabling the issue until further informed. As to the matter of requiring a permit for a six square foot sign, the Board agreed to return it to the existing status of a use permitted in all districts without a permit.

Announcements:

Board of Adjustment, notice of decision for a Special Exception to the Peterborough Savings Bank for a conversion apartment on property on the Old Route 202.

Letter from Bruce Cuddihy protesting the decision of the Board to waive the requirements for Site Plan Review in the matter of property owned by the Monadnock Bank on South Main Street at the corner of Prospect Street. The Board agreed that a letter should be sent supporting the decision to waive the requirements.

Minutes of the Meeting held December 17, 1992: Ed Rowehl moved to accept the minutes as presented. Second Mike Oldershaw. So moved unanimously.

To a request for a motion from the Chair Mike Oldershaw moved to delete reference to the Shoreline Protection Act from the Wetlands Ordinance and the Floodplain Development District. Second Ed Rowehl. The vote: Ed Rowehl, yes; David Essex, yes; Mike Oldershaw, yes. So moved unanimously. This and other matters discussed will be the subject of a second public hearing on the Zoning changes for 1993 scheduled for January 21, 1993 at 7:30 P.M.

Ed Rowehl made the motion to adjourn. David Essex second.
Meeting adjourned at 10:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Elia, Secretary

12/29/92

Chris Baker-Salmon 588-2736

OPPOSED to the proposed addition of the requirements of the Shoreland Protection Act RSA 483-B to Article XI, Section 5, A Wetlands district zoning in Antrim.

There are many reasons to oppose this addition. First is the ambiguity of the definition of the public boundry as it relates to rivers, or where your land ends and the state's begins. Historically this has not been a problem because first rights of way were involved and you bought your property knowing that if your stream could float a canoe you had to allow anyone right of way. Then came water quality concerns and this was dealt with in a way that respected property rights as well as protecting the water. RSA 483-B uses a combination of their ambiguous public boundry and the 100 year flood plain to crawl out of the water flowing in the stream and up onto your land.

Secondly is the fact that any restrictions on land use that are covered in RSA 483-B are the sole responsibility of the local town by law which is one of the main reasons the state has been unable to shove this one down your throat although they ~~xx~~ wanted to. To give the state the right at this point, to regulate our land use and pay permit fees to the state every time we turn around you might as well give the bureaucrats the keys to the farm and pack it up and pack it in.

Thirdly there is a committee sitting, as we speak, in an advisory capacity working on land use provisions in close proximity to the Contocook and North Branch rivers. At least this is local. I have many disagreements with the members of this committee and I voice them in a local forum. If you don't want them taking your rights you should voice your concerns January 11, 7:15 pm Hillsborough town court. Again if you have concerns of being regulated out of your rights then address the local committee that is trying to do that. PLEASE DO NOT GIVE YOUR VOICE AND YOUR RESPONSIBILITY AWAY TO SOME BUREAUCRAT BY AGREEING TO SUBJECT US TO RSA 483-B

12/29/92

Chris Baker-Salmon
concerning proposed sign ordinance

My concern is that the sign ordinance not become more restrictive than it is presently. There were areas that were unclear and so clarification does seem in order. The new wording of D,6,b along with other revisions eliminates the use of the six square foot sign allowed to each ~~building~~ premise on a lot. I would say that in the Highway business district it would become ugly and unreadable to fit separate business names within 25 square feet. The speeds travelled and the set backs required in the highway business district would require the initial 25 plus six square feet per business premise. On Route 9 you are talking about people travelling at 60 mph with a closing speed of 120 mph trying to make out teeny tiny letters on a board 50 feet from the road. It seems unsafe to me and to no point. You may include a limit on the number of additions before a special exception but if the ordinance does allow for signage for separate premises on a lot then lets make it workable or rewrite the entire ordinance to eliminate separate premises on a lot and be up front about it. I don't think ~~it~~ it would pass. Let's not make it necessary to get a permit for a six square foot sign.