

1 **Final - Planning Board Public Meeting - Hearings for Warrant Articles**
2 **proposed by the Planning Board and Historic District Commission,**
3 **January 18, 2024, Town Hall, 6 pm, with refreshments**

4 **Members Present**

5 Greg Meeh (Chair), John Schneider (Vice-Chair), Kent Ruesswick (BOS rep), Rich Marcou,
6 Logan Snyder, and Ben Stonebraker (alternate).

7 **Members Absent**

8 Joshua Gordon, Anne Dowling, Hillary Nelson (alternate)

9 **Others Present**

10 Matt Monahan (Senior Planner) and Matt Taylor (Project Planner) from CNHRPC: Historic
11 District Commission members Kevin Bragg (Chair) and Jeffery Leidinger; town residents
12 including Heidi Cheney, Frank Tupper, Silvia Styles, Tiffany Brown, Tyson Miller, Clifton
13 Mathieu, Calvin Todd, Edgar Rivera (Libertad NE Press), Jeff Plue, David and Anne Emerson,
14 Donna and Jim Miller, Kal Mckay, Felipe Salas-Ogilvie, Tim Meeh and Jill McCullogh, Mindy
15 Beltramo, Beth Blair, Lisa Carlson and Al Edelstein, Craig Pullen, Beth McClure, Joanne and
16 John Michno, Jeanne Heinrich and Pete Helm, Samantha LeClair and Peter Lapierre.

17 **Agenda**

18 • **Call to Order and Introduction to the Order of the Evening**

19 Greg Meeh called the meeting to order just after 6 pm. He explained that the first part of
20 the evening was for the public hearing, for questions and discussion, to be followed by a
21 Planning Board meeting where members themselves would discuss and vote on which of
22 the articles would be put forward on the ballot for Town Meeting.

23 Planning Board Members introduced themselves, and also Matt Monahan and Matt Taylor
24 from Central New Hampshire Regional Planning.

25 **2. Warrant Articles Proposed**

26
27 • **Article 12 – Public Hearing to revise the Flood Plain Ordinance to comply with new**
28 **FEMA Flood Zone Requirements**

29 Greg introduced this warrant article explaining it was intended to have Canterbury comply
30 with the FEMA terminology and regulation so that people in town who are in the flood
31 zone can get FEMA flood insurance. He had experience of flooding from Hurricane Sandy
32 when living in New York, his business there was flooded, and FEMA was tremendously
33 helpful in the aftermath.

34 Nate Bragdon asked that if there was an amendment to any article made this evening, was
35 there time to have a second hearing. Greg responded yes, there was and Rich Marcou
36 confirmed it would be held on Monday January 29, if it was necessary.

37 Lisa Carlson asked if FEMA insurance covered residential and commercial properties in
38 Canterbury as well as cities like New York. Yes, it would. Rich added that this was
39 essentially a housekeeping measure, to update the language in the Canterbury ordinance.
40 It had been drafted by a former member of the CNHRPC who was extremely
41 knowledgeable about it. Nothing was being changed, just updated to comply with FEMA
42 requirements. A gentleman asked to clarify that it was not going to disqualify anyone who
43 was currently in the flood zone. Greg answered no, anyone who would have qualified
44 before will do in the future. The maps changed slightly, but more acreage is included, so it
45 would increase the number of acres covered. Clifton Mathieu asked about the town map
46 and terminology. Greg said they had to be compliant with FEMA. And that the people who
47 would be disqualified if the language was not updated will be able to apply for insurance.
48 Ultimately the town does not have much control over this - there is a flood map that towns
49 must abide by. Rich added that this was the least controversial of all these articles, but it
50 needed to be seamless with the federal terminology.

- 51 • **Article 13.2 – Public Hearing to revise Article 13.2 to indicate the boundaries of**
52 **the Historic Districts shall be defined by the official zoning map**

53 Kevin Bragg, Chair of the Historic District Commission, spoke to the two proposals the
54 HDC had drafted. The first was to state that the boundaries of both historic districts would
55 comply with the official zoning map, instead of using metes and bounds language that is
56 hard for anyone to understand. Greg noted that all the other zones in town are defined by
57 reference to the zoning map using different colors.

58 Kevin added there is some cleaning up to do with the CNHRPC in terms of having the
59 Shaker Village Museum Preservation District shown as distinct from the Shaker Overlay
60 District. They will be working on the corrected map. This did not mean any boundaries
61 were being changed. It has also been discovered that the assessing office information does
62 not line up with the zoning map so that is also being worked on. Greg clarified that all the
63 maps are being worked on as part of the Master Plan process. It is hoped they will be
64 ready by June. There will be further opportunities to look at them as they become
65 available.

- 66 • **Article 13.5 (A) – Public hearing to provide clarity on applications for public**
67 **hearings, including a waiver process for the public hearing portion of the**
68 **application**

69 Kevin explained that the second warrant article is to add an option to the current rule
70 making process. In the past there have been small projects done in the HD's that have not
71 had public visibility, and no impact on abutters and were in the spirit of the ordinance. So,

72 the HDC proposes that for such kinds of applications people can avoid the burden of time
73 and money by the commission deciding to waive the public hearing. It would require the
74 applicant to still make the application, to maintain accountability, but if they met those 3
75 criteria, and it was signed off by the Chair and BOS rep of the HDC, then the public
76 hearing process could be waived. It was intended to make it easier for property owners
77 and encourage them to comply with the HDC regulations. A building permit would still be
78 required. There were no further questions from the floor.

- 79 • **Articles 3, 5, and 6. Public Hearing to revise Articles 3, 5, and 6, regarding “Cluster**
80 **Neighborhoods”, including definitions, permitting requirements, incentives, and**
81 **open space/common space management**

82 Greg introduced this issue saying the Board had adjusted what was included having heard
83 feedback in past public meetings. The situation with the existing Cluster Ordinance is that
84 it is allowed in all zones except for Agricultural/Conservation and Natural Resource and
85 Commercial. That means anyone could have an abutter who decided to do this, and no
86 public notice process is required. The first new proposal is to have such a development via
87 Conditional Use Permit, and requiring public notice, abutter notification, public meeting,
88 and overall, more accountability than the ordinance gives now.

89 The second new proposal is to allow the Farmstead Alternative. It is intended to allow the
90 saving of old buildings in town for residential use, both farmhouses, and other accessory
91 buildings like carriage houses. Greg cited Canterbury Hall as such an example of
92 preservation and residential options. That had required the owners to apply for a variance,
93 which is a hard thing to accomplish. The large barn in the Center and the Peverley Barn
94 had both gone in the past few years. The goal here was to make it easier for historic and
95 historic looking structures to be repurposed and maintained.

96 Questions were posed by several residents. Clifton Mathieu noted there are not many
97 cluster developments in town now, which contradicted what Greg was saying about how
98 easy it was. Greg responded that there are several, but none were recently built. This
99 proposal is to anticipate future development pressure, and make it work in the Canterbury
100 way by preserving the character of the town. The town had to work within the NH state
101 requirements and had to be careful about putting restrictions upon development. Clifton
102 noted there is a lot to digest in the drafts. They had been on the town website for over a
103 week, both the redlined version and the clean version.

104 Nate Bragdon asked if this was like a buttress, something being put in place because of
105 what was anticipated. Greg responded there are two sides to it: in order to make it more
106 defensible some things have to be made more possible, to be achieved in the Canterbury
107 way to preserve the character of town and then make it harder in other ways.

108 Tyson Miller asked about potential new roads that could be built in the cluster. The town
109 was not keen to take on more road maintenance. Was there anything in this to stop a

110 developer calling the town to ask for that? Greg said developers would be required to
111 bring any new road up to 'Town Approved Standards' and then they could request town
112 maintenance. So, there might be circumstances in which the town might want to take that
113 road on. But it is not easy to do and would have to go before Town Meeting to be
114 approved, Logan Snyder added.

115 Calvin Todd asked about the amount of housing or units per acreage in a cluster and how
116 would that translate to the use of farm buildings even if you are on a site that is just 3
117 acres? What if you had 10 units on a 3-acre parcel? Greg clarified there is a 5-acre
118 minimum, and you are not allowed to have more than one unit per acre, and this is for the
119 Farmstead Alternative only. The maximum number of units still applies. For now this
120 would not be allowed in the Agricultural zone.

121 Donna Miller spoke concerned that any development be in the Canterbury way including
122 open space. She had been to all but one of the meetings but was glad to have the option
123 of watching the videos that were being made by Edgar Rivera. She was glad to hear that
124 open space was going to be protected if a cluster was built. She appreciated the board's
125 work in the face of inevitable pressure for more housing given the local and national
126 housing crisis. It was estimated that NH needed 60,000 more housing units by 2030. The
127 developers were going to show up and people needed a place to live, and this effort was
128 part of the solution not the problem.

129 Greg clarified the issue of open space, comparing the existing ordinance to the new
130 proposals. As of now open space is not adequately defined. The new proposals are to
131 create Designated Open Space that must remain undisturbed and cannot be developed, as
132 distinct from Common Open Space for residents where they can build amenities like
133 swimming pools and so on. If these were open to the public there would be a density
134 bonus.

135 Frank Tupper asked why clusters could not be in all zones, including Agricultural. Greg
136 responded that the Board had heard concerns about that in the public meetings. It could
137 be something to look at in the future, to expand into that zone, in conjunction with the
138 Conservation Commission, who were in favor of this idea to preserve open space. There
139 would be more work to do on the language used for the deeding and conservation
140 requirements.

141 Joanne Michno wanted to clarify that if the Board voted for this, the public could vote
142 against it at the ballot.

143 Nate Bragdon asked about future changes to clusters if a part was to be split off. Greg
144 said it was intended to make that impossible in the deed. He agreed there were concerns
145 about that though. This proposal was better than the current ordinance in that regard.

146 Clinton Mathieu asked about multi-family units. They would be allowed, there is no change.

147 Rich said he had heard about the 'buzz' among some people in town being concerned
148 about this cluster development. Given the recent developments around Exit 17, the
149 pressure is inevitable, and it was only a matter of time before it pushed into Canterbury
150 and he repeated the main points of the new proposals, to allow development in the
151 Canterbury way.

152 Nate Bragdon asked where the teeth in all this were. It incentivizes cluster instead of
153 single-family developments, which the town knows how to deal with, but it would be
154 different with an HOA. Greg agreed this was a legitimate concern, that HOA's might go
155 under, and he invited Nate to the Planning Board during next year to advise about
156 improving the protections.

157 Mindy Beltramo asked about multi-family dwellings being included. Greg said there could
158 be single-family or two-family, but it would max out at 6; the ordinance allows 6 units
159 maximum. Logan clarified that it was units not buildings that were being counted, that a
160 unit is a home, whether a single building or within a larger building.

161 Calvin Todd asked what would happen if someone proposed a couple of these
162 developments in subdivisions, how would the town address that in conjunction with the
163 3% building permit limit? Greg responded that every kind of development would be
164 subject to the growth cap.

165 Anne Emerson questioned if a 6-unit building could be 3-storeys. Greg responded yes, it
166 could be, the also Board has a height ordinance to be discussed where the idea is to keep
167 buildings of a height where they are serviceable by the fire trucks.

168 Jeff Plue raised the issue of some point in the future, if there were, say, 20 new families in
169 town, at what point and who was responsible for deciding if and how to upgrade all the
170 municipal services? Greg explained that the growth cap of 3% was allowed under the
171 Innovative Planning Service Act', and the town had to have a Capital Improvement Plan,
172 reviewed each year. That cap had to be justified, so it did take into consideration when
173 and if the town needs things like new fire department staff or trucks, or new police staff.
174 The state allows the town to apply those metrics to the growth limit, and that 3% is to
175 protect public services.

176 Nate Bragdon raised the issue of public access in the preserved spaces. It was explained
177 that the Designated Open Space is not required to have public access. Public access is a
178 separate issue that is being encouraged by various density bonuses, for such features as
179 allowing access onto open space or having common septic units or providing maintained
180 stone walls. If a bonus was given for public access and then not honored, it would be an
181 enforcement issue. Nate agreed that enforcement by the Select Board was often an issue.
182 He thought it would be easier to put such provisions in now rather than claw back later.
183 Greg repeated the invitation to him to help during the next year to improve the ordinance.
184 It was suggested too that if the land was in Common Use and the rules were not being

185 followed then the Common Use would be lost. Also, there would be bonuses for being
186 contiguous with existing conservation land. Logan added this was all being designed to
187 encourage large parcels of open space.

188 Jeff Plue asked if something like a swamp or wetlands would be included in the calculation
189 of the open space. Greg said there is something about wetlands in the ordinance and that
190 is another thing for the Board to work on in the future.

- 191 • **Article 2 – Public Hearing to revise Article 2, General Provisions, regarding building**
192 **height.**

193 That had already been explained. There would be no buildings too high for the fire trucks.
194 There were very few questions or comments except for what might happen if someone
195 wanted to have a higher building in the commercial zone and paid for a higher ladder, the
196 ordinance could be updated.

- 197 • **Article 5.2 – Public Hearing to revise Article 5.2, Establishment of Minimum Lot**
198 **Standards, to specify flagpole height**

199 Greg said this is about the character of the town. The Board wanted to keep a limit,
200 though Rich had argued as a veteran, and being patriotic, no flag was too high. The Board
201 had compromised in removing any restriction on the size, so he compromised on height.
202 The content of flags cannot be controlled, due to 1st Amendment rights, Greg added. No
203 windblown advertising is allowed in town.

204 Mindy Beltramo asked if street lighting was included. Greg responded that the Board
205 required dark sky lighting now. A new light has been installed on Hackleboro Road and it
206 is bright. There was some discussion about the ongoing issue of enforcement and follow
207 through of violations. Kevin Bragg spoke to the volunteer nature of the boards in town,
208 that it was not the responsibility of members to keep track of what was being built. There
209 is hope that a new Land Use Assistant post will be created, and that position can include
210 some assistance with code enforcement. Greg also noted that these issues will be included
211 in the Master Plan as recommendation about enforcement being treated more seriously.

- 212 • **Articles 2, 5, and 18 – Public Hearing to revise Articles 2,5, and 18 regarding**
213 **requirements for, and permitting process of Accessory Dwelling Units**

214 Greg said the state requires the town to allow ADUS in any zone that allows single-family
215 units. There are 2 kinds – Attached and Detached - and they must be quite separate with
216 their own bathroom and kitchen. There are quite a number in town, they have been useful
217 and successful for adult children and/or seniors as a way of relieving housing problems.
218 Now the board was looking at the permitting process. They were proposing to change the
219 Table of Uses so an Attached ADU is an allowed use not requiring a Special Exception from
220 the ZBA, and people would then just go to the Building Inspector and show that their

221 septic system is adequate for the extra bathroom and kitchen usage. The Detached ADU
222 option will be permitted by a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). This is to ensure the Planning
223 Board can see that a proposed Detached ADU is, for instance, not too close to a neighbor
224 or in the middle of a field, and that it is within 500 ft of the principal dwelling so
225 emergency services would have access.

226 Jeff Plue asked if there were any changes to the size. There are not –the maximum
227 remains 1000 sq ft. The state minimum is 750 sq ft so Canterbury allows a generous size.
228 And Canterbury will allow a Detached ADU, whereas most towns do not. Attics are not
229 included in the 1000 sq ft and neither is garage space.

230 Rich added they have looked at acronyms, which were taken out and plain language put in.
231 Tyson Miller commented that people must have a plan for additional septic but not
232 necessarily have to install it. It is based on DES regulations.

233 Clifton Mathieu asked why they were removing the Zoning Board process. Greg replied it
234 was to reduce complexity and cost. Logan added that if it was easier and less expensive,
235 householders were more likely to comply, and these would be known about by emergency
236 services and the tax assessor.

237 • **Article 2 – Public Hearing to revise a new Article 2. Short-Term Rentals, to revise**
238 **permitting requirements and duration of a permit**

239 Greg spoke to this proposal, saying the Short-Term Rental (STR) Article was originally
240 vague and written before the town had both the campground and ADU ordinances. It is
241 known that there are too many STRs in one place in some parts of town.

242 Calvin Todd asked who would enforce this. Greg answered that people who already have
243 more than one on a property may have to be grandfathered in, but a lot depended on
244 whether neighbors and others complained to the Board of Selectmen. Lisa Carlson asked if
245 STR regulations require the owner to live on the property – the answer is no. In a place like
246 Sherwood Forest, many STRs are the whole house, rented seasonally. By comparison, if
247 you have an ADU the owner does have to live on the property.

248 Clifton Mathieu asked about if a property sells that included a permitted ADU, does it stay
249 permitted. Yes, it would. This led to discussion about people using an ADU as a STR. A
250 license would be required from the town. The owner would still have to live in the principal
251 residence on the property and rent out the ADU. Calvin Todd asked about people going to
252 Florida and renting out space. That could be long term rental. The STR maximum time is
253 30 days.

254 Craig Pullen asked to whom people had to apply for the license every 2 years – that would
255 be the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer. Greg commented that Joel French was
256 keeping a list, with renewal dates on it, and although it was not wholly comprehensive, it
257 was better than in the past and at least there was a schedule of renewals. It is like a

258 Certificate of Occupancy. There is no fee, it was thought. As an aside, Greg noted the
259 Board will be looking at instituting reduced fees for amended site plans in the future, to
260 encourage people to come in and show what they are doing.

261 Nate Bragdon asked if there were any zones where STRs are permitted by right. No, it is
262 allowed with a license renewed every 5 years currently. Matt Taylor noted that STRs are
263 not allowed in the Industrial zone and it is by Special Exception in all other zones. That
264 requires public notifications. In the new proposals the license would be renewed every 2
265 years instead of 5.

266 • **Article 5 – Public Hearing to revise Article 5 to permit limited residential use in the**
267 **Commercial zone**

268 Greg explained that the Commercial Zone around Exit 17 had started as a Home
269 Enterprise zone some years ago. It then morphed into the Commercial zone and a few
270 houses remained there. Now the industrial units going in often have ADU's. The Board
271 was therefore trying to regularize what is actually happening in the Commercial district.
272 Apartments are good for taxes. This proposal does not affect any other zone.

273 Lisa Carlson confirmed that they had learned in ZBA hearings from the Mckerleys that
274 having residences with the businesses was a safety issue. There were lights on at night.
275 Employees and seasonal employees have been able to live on site. Greg said that similar
276 concerns had been raised over the lack of residences at Exit 18, with its proximity to the
277 Interstate making it vulnerable to smash and grab attacks. There was no further discussion
278 about the proposal.

279 • **Article 11 – Public Hearing to revise Article 11 to clarify provisions for the granting**
280 **of building permits**

281 Greg explained that the existing Article's wording was not clear. The Board has looked at
282 the language. It had only counted single-family homes but there are other types of
283 dwellings to be included. So, the Board is regularizing it to include the total number of
284 dwelling units that are to be counted towards the cap.

285 Tyson Miller asked if this included ADUs. Yes, they would be included. Tyson noted that
286 this would make the size of the building cap bigger, it would be 3% of a bigger number.
287 Greg said that was what the Board wanted. The total number of dwellings counted would
288 increase and so would the building permits but not by a huge number. Logan said again
289 that the town has not come close to reaching the growth cap in many years. Currently the
290 cap allows something like 27 new properties per year.

291 Jeff Plue asked about the end results in terms of cluster developments. Greg said if you
292 have a single building with 6 units it counts as 6 as does a multi-family building with 6
293 units. If a developer put in 10 x 6-unit buildings, it would exceed the number for the cap.
294 Mindy Beltramo said it would slow down the number of cluster developments. Logan and

295 Greg pointed out the Board had worked on making the language easier to understand and
296 ultimately it should be easier to enforce.

297 Fred Portnoy asked to clarify that it was the number of units not permits that the 3%
298 stood for.

299 Clifton Mathieu said the current language had been in place for years without a problem.
300 Tyson said he wrote some of this and he understands it though it is legal language. All
301 these proposals will have to go through town counsel, Greg said. Tyson also noted that
302 the Board had removed the section about accelerated permitting if conservation goals
303 were met. That had been there for a very good reason. The town wanted things to be well
304 constructed as well as to conserve land. A builder would have to build the right number of
305 units just to be able to do it, for it to be worthwhile. He suggested putting back section
306 11.2. 3 on expedited building and eligibility for that as it had gained the town some
307 significant conservation land. The town needed some flexibility in this matter, if a builder
308 needed to construct more units than the cap would allow. Greg responded that no single
309 person or developer could have more than 25% of the total in any one year. It used to be
310 that a builder could get one permit at the beginning of the year and later if there were still
311 permits available by June 30, they could take more. Logan said that limitation was not in
312 the new proposal – the one permit only limitation is removed.

313 Calvin Todd asked if you build under the Cluster ordinance and build them all at once it
314 should not be held up. Tyson reiterated the point about flexibility offered to developers in
315 return for conservation land – which after all would be looked over by the Conservation
316 Commission as it would mean a ‘deal’ between housing and conservation.

317 There was further discussion about the school being impacted if a cluster development
318 brought in many more children, and Greg made the point that this was all managed by the
319 Capital Improvement Plan, allowed under state regulations. Logan stated that the 3% cap
320 is the lowest cap the town is allowed to have.

321 Joanne Michno asked about the implications of the cap for Sherwood Forest. Could it have
322 its own cap? If even 5 houses were put in there the road infrastructure would be impacted.
323 Greg agreed it was an interesting idea. The services there were overwhelmed. Joanne said
324 there was land that could be built on, even though it should not be developed. Greg said
325 that was a whole new thing not previously discussed but he would make a note for the
326 future.

327 Nate Bragdon asked what would happen, given that ADUs would be part of the cap, if 3
328 developers came in the same year and each wanted to do 6 units, and that would sap up
329 18 permits. That would limit the number of ADUs available for that year. It was something
330 to think about for the future since the town is not close to reaching the cap right now.

331 Lisa Carlson asked if there was a formula for the tax assessor to figure out what is a fair
332 pay back to the town for residential ADU's, say if an adult son comes back to town with 4
333 children living in an ADU with grandparents. Who pays for the impact of that? Greg had
334 talked to Assessor Mandy Irving about this. Attached ADUs are assessed like the rest of
335 the house – so taxes go up for extra bathroom, bedroom and kitchen. It is similar if you
336 have a detached ADU. You get taxed on that. But Greg believed that an ADU did not bring
337 in the same level of taxes as the primary dwelling unit. And ultimately the Board has no
338 control over who lives in an ADU. Tyson noted ADUs could be useful and affordable for
339 seniors.

340 Clifton commented that if the goal of the Board was about minimizing development, they
341 should not eliminate section 11.2 regarding multi-family dwelling units. That paragraph
342 had set a reasonable cap on multi-family dwelling units in town and taking that away
343 opened up a big can of worms. Matt Taylor pointed out that only one of these permits
344 each year can be used for multi-family dwelling, for instance in a Farmstead property with
345 up to 6 units, there would only be one building permit issued, per year, on that property.

346 Greg said the language is confusing – they want to count dwelling units not permits.

347 Greg calculated one builder can only get 25% of around 30 permits. Clifton's picture of
348 several developers wanting to put in 6-unit complexes would be taken care of in section
349 11.1, Matt Taylor argued. Greg concluded the Board might well look at this again next
350 year.

- 351 • **Table of Uses – Public Hearing to revise the Table of Uses to reflect updated Cluster**
352 **Neighborhood changes and Accessory Dwelling Unit changes**

353 Greg introduced this proposal. These changes had been talked about, but this was
354 schematically showing those changes.

355 Jeff Plue asked about Conditional Use Permits – Greg said they were like a Special
356 Exception with a little more flexibility. Abutters are noticed in the mail and public notices
357 are posted.

358 Greg read from the Table and the various zones that are alphabetized. If there was an A it
359 was allowed and all someone had to do was go to the Building Inspector. SE was a Special
360 Exception from the Zoning Board. Lisa Carlson said there are 7 criteria for those
361 applications and the forms in the Town Office listed them clearly. CU was for Conditional
362 Use Permit, by permission of the Planning Board. Jeff asked again about how this differs
363 from the SE – it is more flexible, Greg said, and the Board can take up different issues from
364 the ZBA. For instance, the ZBA would look at very defined issues like setbacks – whereas
365 the Planning Board's CUP will let you look at issues in a more discretionary way.

366

367 Beth Blair asked if a key could be added to the bottom of the Table to clearly explain all
368 the abbreviations and put something about the CUP being granted by the PB and a SE
369 being granted by the ZBA. Greg agreed those could be worked into the Master Plan. He
370 mentioned the SPP (special Select Board permit, as needed for an event with over 100
371 people). That is not in the Table, but it is in the Ordinance.

372 Donna Miller asked which of these proposals would be voted on at the First Session of
373 Town Meeting on Tuesday March 12. All of them would be. Voting would be at the Town
374 Hall. The articles will be separate. Clifton noted that one was missing from the list online,
375 the separate version of the residential use in commercial zone.

376 Greg asked Matt Taylor and Matt Monahan, when could they have the final language ready
377 to go on the website? **The actual wording of the warrant article will be a bit different –**
378 **these will be put up well before Town Meeting. Should there be the red-lined as well as**
379 **the cleaned up final versions? Matt M said we should put both up, separate, with different**
380 **headings.**

381 Clifton Mathieu asked if the Board was unanimous about all these proposals, pointing out
382 not all of the members were there. Logan said that what was presented followed a
383 collaborative process, the Board was pretty much agreed upon all these proposals.

384 Greg concluded the public hearing.

385 Kent thanked the Board for their work on these warrant articles.

386

387 *****

388

389 Ben Stonebraker was seated, and the Board met to vote whether to bring forward the
390 various proposals to Town Meeting ballot.

- 391 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
392 article to revise Article 12, Flood Plain Ordinance, to comply with the new FEMA
393 Flood Zone Requirements. Rich Marcou seconded. All members present voted in
394 favor.
- 395 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board and The Historic District Commission
396 submit to Town Meeting the warrant article to revise Article 13.2 to indicate that
397 the boundaries of the two Historic Districts shall be defined by the official zoning
398 map. Rich Marcou seconded. All members present voted in favor with no further
399 discussion.
- 400 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board and the Historic District Commission
401 submit to Town Meeting the warrant article to revise Article 13.5, (A), to provide

402 clarity on the application for public hearings, including a waiver process for the
403 public hearing portion of the application. Rich Marcou seconded. There was no
404 discussion and all members present voted in favor.

- 405 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
406 article to revise Articles 3, 5, and 6. regarding “Cluster Neighborhoods”, including
407 definitions, permitting requirements, incentives, and open space/common space
408 management. Rich Marcou seconded. There was no discussion except the Chair
409 noted there was more work to do but this revision gave more protection than the
410 town currently has.
- 411 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
412 article to revise Article 2, General Provisions, regarding building height. Rich
413 Marcou seconded. All members voted in favor with no further discussion.
- 414 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
415 article to revise Article 5.2, Establishment of Minimum Lot Standards, to specify
416 flagpole height. Rich Marcou seconded and there being no discussion, all members
417 present voted in favor.
- 418 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
419 article to revise Articles 2, 5, and 18, regarding the requirements for, and permitting
420 process of Accessory Dwelling Units. Rich Marcou seconded. The Chair noted that it
421 is not perfect, but it is better than the town currently has. All members present
422 voted in favor.
- 423 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
424 article to revise Article 2, Short Term Rentals, to revise permitting requirements and
425 duration of a permit. Rich Marcou seconded. All voted in favor.
- 426 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
427 article to revise Article 5 to allow limited residential uses in the Commercial zone.
428 Rich Marcou seconded. The Chair noted again that there is more work to do but it
429 is an improvement on the current situation. All members voted in favor.
- 430 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
431 article to revise Article 11, to clarify provisions for the granting of residential
432 building permits. Rich Marcou seconded. All voted in favor.
- 433 • Logan Snyder moved that the Planning Board submit to Town Meeting the warrant
434 article to revise the Table of Uses to reflect updated Cluster Neighborhood changes
435 and Accessory Dwelling Unit changes. Rich Marcou seconded. In discussion, it was
436 noted that a key should be added to explain abbreviations and include Conditional
437 Use Permits too. And put it on the same page as the Table. All members voted in
438 favor of this motion.

439 It was also agreed that the CNHRPC staff would prepare these final versions for further
440 posting on the website and in town.

441 **3. Previous Minutes of January 4, 2024**

442 These Minutes had been edited and circulated. Rich moved to approve. Kent seconded. All
443 voted in favor of accepting those Minutes.

444 **4. Adjournment**

445 Rich made a motion to adjourn, and Kent seconded. It was about 8.45 pm.

446 **Action Items**

- 447 • **Matt M and Matt T to work on warrant articles language (to see if the Town will**
448 **vote to) and get to the Board in time for their January 23 meeting.**
- 449 • **Secretary to check on public postings when the final language is agreed upon. And**
450 **check that the residential/commercial zone article is listed separately too.**

451 **Next meeting is Tuesday January 23, 7 pm, Meeting House.**

452 Respectfully submitted,

453 Lois Scribner, secretary.