

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
CANTERBURY PLANNING BOARD

FEBRUARY 26, 2013

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; Doug McCallum, Chris Blair, Joshua Gordon, and Tyson Miller, Selectman Representative.

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Art Rose, Vice Chair, Seth Cohn, Alice Veenstra

OTHER PARTIES PRESENT: Luke Mahoney, Brookford Farms.

**Draft minutes of February 5, 2013.** Tyson Miller made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Doug McCallum. There was no discussion on the motion and the minutes were then voted on and approved unanimously.

**Public Hearing regarding Soil Shares, LLC (Brookford Farms).** Luke Mahoney appeared for review of his Site Plan Application of Map/lot 261-1-0 for completion and acceptance by the Board. The list of abutters did not include two possible abutters. The definition of abutter was discussed pursuant to RSA 672:3. There was discussion about abutters being across a street or stream, and whether or not a river is considered a stream. It was the Board's opinion that a river does not mean the same thing as a stream, but advised Luke to check into that question and make the determination himself. Luke was also advised to recheck his list of abutters at the assessor's office and let Lori Venie know as soon as possible if there are additional abutters needing to be notified.

Jim asked Luke if they were still proposing a playground as it was not on Luke's hand drawn map. Luke advised that if they do a playground, it will be for their personal use only.

The Board discussed the possible waivers Luke may want to request at the time of the public hearing and agreed that Lori would work with Luke in that respect.

The Board discussed whether the application was considered complete and Jim made a motion to accept the application as complete conditionally on sorting out the abutters list

41 and adjusting the fee accordingly. Joshua seconded the motion. Discussion on the  
42 motion: Doug asked Luke where the water was coming for the well. Doug was  
43 concerned with the quality of the water for the cheese making business and any  
44 possible contamination issues. Luke drew the location of the well on the map plan he  
45 provided. No further discussion on the motion. A vote was held on the motion and it  
46 passed unanimously. The public hearing will be scheduled for March 12, 2013.

47  
48 **Pre-Conceptual meetings and Site Review Thresholds:** RSA 674:43, 44, and 32-b.

49 The Board looked at whether they wanted to change the threshold for site plan review,  
50 particularly in agricultural projects, or form a committee of the fire chief, code  
51 enforcement officer and one member of the planning board. The committee would  
52 make a decision about the necessity of a site plan review. Another alternative would be  
53 to just leave the regulations as is. The current thresholds are 10% or 500 square feet.  
54 Joshua questioned what exactly what was being resolved. Jim stated the Board had  
55 from time to time made decisions at pre-conceptual consultation to waive site plan  
56 review, even if the project met the threshold. The correct procedure is to waive site plan  
57 review at a public hearing, not at pre-conceptual consultation.

58  
59 Jim clarified that site plan review is required for non-residential uses and changes of  
60 uses for non-residential uses, or expansion of non-residential uses of over 500 square  
61 feet or 10%. Residential use is defined in the ordinances as being single family  
62 dwellings and their normal accessory uses, and agriculture for personal use buildings  
63 up to a certain foot print. If things are left in the current form, the Board only needs to  
64 look at whether a project meets the threshold during the pre-conceptual consultation  
65 and if it does, the property owner would submit a site plan review application. There  
66 was discussion of other possible options for changing the threshold. The overall  
67 opinion was not in favor of a committee since Canterbury is a small town. The avenue  
68 most favored was adhering to the current guidelines of looking at the proposed project  
69 at a pre-conceptual consultation and if it meets the thresholds, they automatically move  
70 to site plan review. If the project is a minor increase to an agricultural use, the property  
71 owner can, at the public hearing, request the Board to waive the whole procedure due  
72 to the size and impact of the project. A board member would then make a motion to  
73 waive the procedure and the motion is discussed and voted upon. If any red flags come  
74 up in the discussion phase of the hearing, the abutters will have been notified and had  
75 an opportunity to be heard at that hearing. The Board could then decide to waive the  
76 necessity of a site plan review, or not to waive it and the project moves to site plan  
77 review. There was additional discussion about the waiver process and how general or  
78 detailed a waiver should be according to RSA 674:44-III.

80 **Other Business.** As a matter of disclosure, Joshua advised the Board that he is  
81 representing the towns of Salem, Durham, Peterborough and Northfield in the lawsuit  
82 between the Secretary of State and the Local Government Center relative to the  
83 overpayment of insurance premiums.

84  
85 Motion to Adjourn by Chris Blair, seconded by Doug McCallum. Motion passed  
86 unanimously, meeting ended at 7:58 p.m.

87  
88 Lori Venie, Secretary

89  
90 **Next meeting:        March 12, 2013, 7:00 p.m., The Meeting House.**