

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
CANTERBURY PLANNING BOARD

August 28, 2012

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Snyder, Chair; Art Rose, Vice Chair;  
Chris Blair, Alice Veenstra, and Tyson Miller, Selectman Representative.

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Doug McCallum, Joshua Gordon, and Seth Cohn.

It was determined that a quorum was present.

Draft minutes of July 24, 2012. Motion by Chris, seconded by Tyson, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Continued public hearing on an application for a proposed lot line adjustment of property owned by the Carole Stankatis Revocable Trust on Wilson Road (Tax Map 252, Lot 7, and Tax Map 259, Lots 22 and 23) in the agriculture/conservation zone. The Chair then gave a brief explanation about this application. The applicant wants to do a lot line adjustment on this property to take it back to the previously approved subdivision plan. However, zoning has changed since that time, and they can't do it now because there isn't enough frontage to go back to the previous plan. They were scheduled to go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment earlier this month to request a variance on the frontage, but they never showed up and they aren't here tonight for further discussion on the application. We either have to continue the hearing tonight or vote on the application. He then recused himself from acting on this application, and he noted that Art will act as Chairperson.

Art commented that the proposed plan does not meet current zoning regulations for frontage. As a planning board, we really can't approve anything that doesn't meet the current zoning ordinance. We could continue the public hearing or bring it to a vote.

Motion by Tyson, seconded by Chris, to deny the application. Art noted that, if the board were to vote to continue the hearing, the applicant would have to reconfigure the lot line adjustment or get a variance, and they have done nothing. Motion passed unanimously.

41 Land Use Trends in the Upper Merrimack River Region – Matt Monahan, principal  
42 planner for the Central NH Regional Planning Commission. Nancy Roy, the Canterbury  
43 representative on UMRAC, introduced Matt who presented an update based on results  
44 of the surveys completed last year by planning boards of the six upper Merrimack River  
45 towns. Matt presented a handout showing what can be done to protect the buffers.  
46 There was discussion about subjects that could be put on the website with links to  
47 places where people can get involved in protecting their land. Chris agreed to follow up  
48 on this.

49  
50 Update on board goals and objectives. Jim reported that he had done a little research  
51 on growth ordinance. On September 22, 2009, we re-adopted the existing ordinance,  
52 changing the sunset date from March 31, 2008 to March 31, 2014. We actually went  
53 from March 31, 2008, to town meeting in 2010 with no growth ordinance.

54  
55 Reading Article 11 in the Zoning Ordinance, we are fine on the sunset date for now.  
56 However, Article 11.9 says that, no less frequently than every two years, the Planning  
57 Board shall review growth rates in the region and shall make a recommendation as to  
58 whether the percentage growth rate should be increased or decreased in order to  
59 achieve the purposes stated in Section 11. It is probably the best time to review that.  
60 Tyson said he would check with the Central NH Regional Planning Commission to see  
61 what other towns are doing to see if growth rates in the region should be reviewed. The  
62 Chair commented that they are probably going to find out that growth rates are running  
63 below the 3%. He would like to see this matter put on the agenda as a review of the  
64 growth ordinance. We should have some justification for either changing it or leaving it  
65 alone.

66  
67 Art suggested looking at the time line again. We had an existing growth ordinance in  
68 place that sunset in March of 2008. We modified that in 2009 and refined it in 2010.  
69 Did we modify something that didn't exist? The Chair responded that that is a question  
70 that could be addressed by the Local Government Center. Tyson suggested asking the  
71 town attorney rather than the Local Government Center.

72  
73 Other business. The Chair referred to the town's policy regarding apartments. It is  
74 apparent that the town needs to do something to educate people in town so they will  
75 know where apartments are allowed and to make people more aware of what is  
76 allowed. We have the accessory apartment which has to be in the same building.  
77 We have converting a single-family into a two-family house. They still have to be  
78 connected, but it takes away the size requirements in the accessory apartment. You  
79 probably need a larger septic system. There is multi-family. You could have four two-  
80 family tenants. There is also the much-abused farm worker cottage. If you have a farm,

81 you can have a separate unit for people who primarily work on the farm. These uses  
82 should all be put on a list to let people know what is allowed in town and to decide if  
83 there are any appropriate changes. It will need a lot of research.

84  
85 As a point of information the Chair read to the board a letter he wrote to Ralph Boles on  
86 August 10 that states: "As discussed in the Planning Board minutes of March 8, 2011,  
87 the Boles project on Route 106 has been conditionally approved and can be finalized in  
88 a Planning Board meeting once those conditions have been met."

89  
90 The Chair mentioned briefly the proper procedure that should be followed regarding  
91 unmerging lots.

92  
93 Motion by the Chair, seconded by Art, to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Motion  
94 passed unanimously.

95  
96 Nancy Lilly, Secretary

97  
98 Next meeting: September 11, 2012, 7:00 p.m., The Meeting House.