

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
CANTERBURY PLANNING BOARD

February 14, 2012

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. It was determined that a quorum was present.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Snyder, Chair; Art Rose, Vice Chair; Chris Blair, Doug McCallum, Seth Cohn, and Tyson Miller, Selectman Representative.

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Christopher Evans, Alice Veenstra, and Joshua Gordon.

Draft minutes of January 24, 2012. Motion by Art, seconded by Chris, to approve the minutes. The Chair reported that a member of the public, Craig Pullen, who was present at our last meeting, has read the minutes and has proposed some fairly minor changes. Craig has sent them to him to see whether or not he could propose them to the board. The Chair stated that he believes that, if a member of the public wants to amend minutes, it is suitable for a board member to sponsor the changes. He then read the following proposed amendments to the minutes as presented by Craig:

Line 106 – Replace the sentence that reads: “If it is outside the aquifer, it is just as important as being inside the aquifer .” Change it to read: “It is just as important to prevent spills outside the aquifer area as within it.”

Line 112 – Replace a portion of the sentence that reads: “... it should be generally the whole line.” Change it to read: “... it should be the whole town.”

Line 113 – Replace the sentence that reads: “Craig responded that he sees a line going through his property.” Change it to read: “Craig responded that he sees a map line going through his property and he doesn’t even know where it is located.”

Motion by the Chair, seconded by Chris, to approve the amendments to the minutes as requested by Craig Pullen. Motion to amend passed unanimously. The minutes as amended were passed unanimously.

Pre-application conceptual consultation with Steve Cochrane regarding building a barn on property he owns on West Road in the agricultural/conservation zone.
(Tax Map 251, Lot 006.) Steve was present for this discussion.

42
43 The Chair commented that there are two questions here: One is whether or not this
44 proposed building meets the definition of residential use. It is close. If it does meet the
45 definition of residential use in the opinion of the board, then we don't go to the next step.
46 If it doesn't, does it meet the threshold to come in for site plan review? He then read the
47 definition of residential use in the Zoning Ordinance. He noted that Steve is under the
48 2000 sf footprint and also meets the raising of crops, gardening and agricultural
49 practices for personal use on the same or a contiguous lot to one's lot of residence.
50 The problem he has, even though this is under 2000 sf, is the fact that it is not an
51 accessory use to his residence because he doesn't live there. He does own a
52 residential building on a lot that is contiguous. The building is 2000 sf, so it meets that
53 criteria. The only place where it is problematic is the fact that this lot is a contiguous lot
54 to one's lot of residence. If Steve lived in the house, it would meet the definition of
55 residential use. Do we want to say that it meets the definition of residential use, or does
56 it meet the threshold for site plan review?

57
58 Art commented that the landowner and the applicant are one and the same. This barn
59 is going to be built near a residence that he owns. It doesn't matter whether he lives
60 there or not. He thinks that the ordinance in the zoning regulations assumes that the
61 residence is for the landowner. It doesn't necessarily have to be. The residence that
62 they refer to in the Zoning Ordinance assumes that the landowner lives in it.

63
64 Steve stated that he bought this field about six years ago. He farms the land himself.
65 He has five cows now and he milks two of them, selling raw milk. His son raises pigs
66 for people. He wants a place where he can milk the cows inside. He wants to be able
67 to bring them into a barn with an actual milk tank where people can come in and pick up
68 their milk. It will have a refrigerator. His goal is that someday his son or grandchildren
69 will live there and live off this land by producing hay, milk, etc. He noted that there is an
70 easement on the property that it has to be agriculturally farmed. There can never be
71 any development. It is right in the deed. Hopefully this will go into a trust someday and
72 stays there. He distributed a copy of a letter from the NH Department of Agriculture,
73 Markets & Food stating that this building is approved. They refer to the building
74 envelope of land, stating that it shall be the area to which the approval to build
75 agricultural buildings shall be confined.

76
77 The Chair stated that he thinks the criterion for site plan review is probably the potential
78 impact. If you feel that a project has the potential to have a strong effect on neighbors
79 and members of the town, then we might give them a chance to register their concern.
80 Seth asked about the size of the current building, and Steve responded that it is a three-
81 sided building, 16' x 36'. This building is in the same envelope. Art commented that it
82 doesn't matter to him whether he lives in the house or not. He is the landowner. Steve

noted that there is no one closer than his rental house. The Chair said that, if we don't vote no on this, the only way we send this to site plan review is if someone said we should and others don't vote him down. He closed the discussion and he issued the building permit without site plan review.

Pre-application conceptual consultation with Carol and Arthur Landry for an addition to their existing building for Brookwood Pet Resort, LLC. located at 37 Boyce Road. The Chair reported that the Landrys are not present tonight, as their architect did not get the drawings to them in time for tonight's meeting.

Update on Kimball Pond/Morrill Road intersection. Doug reported that he met with the CNHRPC. It is their opinion that this is an issue that should be addressed. In the last few years there were five or six accidents. They would like us to submit this issue to the Transportation Advisory Board. If they approve it, then they will put it on their schedule. It is worth doing. It is a very dangerous intersection. It is as much a political issue as a state issue. He is asking for approval of the board to go ahead, and he would like some authority to take it to the Transportation Advisory Board. Art commented that this is a responsible move. One of the problems is going to be acquiring a slope easement for the Hildreth Field. That would be part of the solution. Seth commented that he would be curious to know how the abutters feel.

Motion by the Chair, seconded by Art, that the Planning Board supports Doug's moving ahead with the next step on the Special Transportation Planning Project Nomination Form. Motion passed unanimously.

Other business. Chris read an article for the town newsletter regarding the two zoning amendments to be voted on at town meeting. He also indicated that he will put in the newsletter that there are several alternate positions open on the Planning Board.

The secretary distributed the 2011-2012 edition of the *New Hampshire Planning and Land Use Regulations*.

Motion by Art, seconded by Chris, to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Motion passed.

Nancy Lilly, Secretary

Next meeting: February 28, 2012, 7:00 p.m., The Meeting House.