

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
CANTERBURY PLANNING BOARD

February 28, 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; Doug McCallum, Christopher Evans, Alice Veenstra, Joshua Gordon, Seth Cohn, and Tyson Miller, Selectman Representative.

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Blair.

Draft minutes of February 14, 2012. Motion by Art, seconded by Tyson, to approve the minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair noted that, since there are two conceptual consultations tonight, he will review the parameters that apply to both of them. The board can answer procedural questions. We can't make any decisions or vote on anything. We can determine whether or not a project meets the threshold for 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. Carol and Arthur were both present. The Chair gave a little history about this project. It was in for site plan review some years ago when it was started, and it was approved by the board. They want to know, if the expansion increases the project by 10% or by 500 square feet, whichever is less, does that trigger site plan review.

Arthur then presented three drawings of the expansion plans. They are proposing to add 20 feet to the length of the building and then adding a 90-foot concrete pad onto that addition. He explained the purpose of the addition. Two-thirds of it would have areas used to enhance their day camp. They have outdoor events in the summer and they want to be able to use them year round. The 20-foot addition will blend in with the building as it is now. The arena would be a steel erected building. They have taken the previous site plan and put the additional building on it to show that they meet all requirements for septic, well, etc. The site plan was about seven years ago. He asked if they can use the old plan on which they have put the additions rather than complete a new survey. They want some feedback from the board.

41 The Chair noted that their question is whether they need to come in for an amended site
42 plan review or do they need to re-do the survey. He knows there is a requirement in the
43 site plan review regulations about the percent of coverage of the lot, but it doesn't
44 appear to be a concern as there is plenty of acreage. Tyson commented that it does
45 seem that the changes are big enough to come back for site plan review. The Chair
46 added that there is a significant amount of change so that members of the community
47 might want to weigh in on it, but he doesn't see why additional buildings can't be added
48 to the plan.

49
50 Art asked Arthur if he has any plans to engage a site engineer for this. Arthur responded
51 that they have an architect who basically did the site plan, and he is working in
52 conjunction with Milestone Builders. Art suggested having someone look at the plan to
53 see if it was built exactly the way it was approved or if there were slight changes. If it
54 were as built with only very minor changes, we could say that you could use the plan as
55 intended. There is a list in the site plan regulations that we would like to see on the
56 plan. Arthur commented that they presented a plan to the building inspector, and he
57 had no problem. There was no change in the building. It was just as they originally
58 proposed.

59
60 Art suggested that they think about it a little bit. It wouldn't be as detailed and time-
61 consuming as a survey would be. It would be good if a surveyor looked at it. The only
62 thing you would have to change is the area where you didn't follow the plan exactly.
63 You would show any deviations. We are relying on that plan to be pretty much the way
64 it was when it was approved. Arthur said they built it exactly as the plan. The Chair
65 commented that basically they would be looking at the footprint and the basic
66 elevations.

67
68 Doug told Arthur that he doesn't need a new survey. It is just a matter of whether the
69 building is where he thinks it is, or did he double the size of the building during
70 construction. The Chair stated that the next step would be the building permit process.
71 He told Arthur he could come in for site plan review when he is ready. Art commented
72 that there is allowance for items that he may want to waive. It is pretty straight-forward.
73 The other things he might want to consider for site plan review are elevations, size,
74 landscaping, etc.

75
76 Pre-application conceptual consultation with Luke Mahoney regarding the potential of
77 building a bakery at Brookwood Farm. The Chair reported that he had done some
78 research on this. It seemed like it was a simple question. He thinks the question is
79 whether or not they need site plan review or is this an approved use for that site. Luke
80 commented that he doesn't know the routine. He just wanted to know if he could do it in

81 the future. The Chair said that the ordinance is strangely silent on the issue of
82 processing products that you grow on farms. He called the Department of Agriculture,
83 and they did not call back. He finally talked to someone there, and they came up with
84 an agreement saying that it ought to be reasonable that anyone growing a product
85 should be able to process it with what is grown on the farm. If someone told him he
86 couldn't process anything, he wouldn't be able to offer syrup for sale, he would only be
87 able sell sap. Using common sense, we probably would have seen no problem and
88 allowed Luke to go ahead without bringing it up to the board. However, our Zoning
89 Ordinance specifically allows a wholesale bakery in the commercial zone but not in the
90 agricultural zone. We need to sort out what we are looking at here in the way of farm
91 products. If you are turning milk into cheese, you are processing something. Luke
92 noted that it is a big farm with the potential of growing wheat, probably 500 loaves a
93 week.

94
95 The Chair stated our Master Plan says that we want to be friendly to agriculture. We
96 need to make it as easy as possible for farmers to process their farm products.
97 To tell farmers that they can't process things they are raising doesn't make any sense.

98
99 Luke noted that this will be a retail store and a farmer's market. The Chair stated that
100 this will trigger state inspection. He asked if that is true for the cheese and other
101 products, also. Luke responded that it is true. The licenses go by volume. There are
102 Class A, Class B, etc. The Chair commented that he had an informal conversation with
103 Joe Halla about this matter, and he is pretty much on the same page.

104
105 Seth asked if there is anything we need to do if we consider it to be part of the farm.
106 The building permit will be a different issue. The Chair responded that the only thing we
107 need to determine now is whether this falls within our common sense notion of
108 agriculture as opposed to the fact that it does not fit the use in the ordinance. Art said
109 he doesn't see a problem with it. He stated that, if it were presented along the line of a
110 farm stand, it is identified as a by-product of that farm. The Chair commented that the
111 board has a common sense opinion that farming covers products that they grow or that
112 they process into changed products for sale at the farm or elsewhere. That is a
113 reasonable farming activity.

114
115 Luke asked about the next step. If the bakery is successful and they can grow wheat
116 down there, is there a limit on what they are allowed to bake from the harvest? What
117 would be his next step? They have decided to go forward with creating a building and
118 then show it to the building inspector or show it to the board. The Chair responded that
119 it would be site plan review, and they would apply for a building permit. Luke stated that
120 this is a priority. The other buildings were a dream. The Chair stated that site plan

review is required unless this board, during the conceptual consultation, decides that we don't want site plan review for the bakery.

Luke asked if the board would need a drawing of the building to see whether it is necessary for site plan review. Art suggested to Luke that he should take the plan of his property and a crayon and have someone scale out a couple of blocks, noting what they are and scale off the size of the building. At least there would be something to talk about. It gives him an opportunity to ask for any waivers he might like. At least he would have some sort of plan as a starting point and all of this will be a benefit for him.

The Chair told Luke that it is not an insignificant effort to come in for site plan review, but it would be really good to put together your wish list on paper. If you get everything down at once, if something changes, you can deal with that. Other board members commented on the need to include the footprint of the bakery so the building inspector can make sure that it is not too close to the border of the property, scale in the dimensions of buildings and label things with "future" if not important now, include property line setbacks, etc.

The Chair noted that it is the opinion of the board that the bakery is a non-issue at this point. Not hearing anything that requires site plan review for this bakery, we are going to say that it doesn't meet the threshold for site plan review.

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

Nancy Lilly, Secretary

Next meeting: March 13, 2012, 7:00 p.m., The Meeting House.