

1 **Site Plan and Subdivision Subcommittee of the Planning Board (for the**
2 **Land Use Handbook)**

3 **April 2, 6 pm Town Hall (library closed) – Final Minutes**

4 **Present**

5 Matt Taylor (Senior Planner, CNHRPC), Greg Meeh (Chair), Rich Marcou,
6 Megan Portnoy, Lois Scribner (secretary).

7 **Agenda**

8 1. Conditional Use Permit – draft application

9 Matt shared a hard copy of a draft CUP application form. He will send it
10 digitally too. This CUP form will be relevant for several types of application.

11 Megan asked about fees. Those still need to be established (see Fees list on
12 town website). Differences between major and minor types of projects should
13 be reflected in the fee structure.

14 Megan noted she could provide an open-source AI tool called Notebook LM
15 from Google. It is possible to open an account, upload a pdf (ex. zoning
16 ordinance) and then ask questions and search.

17 **2. Issues raised**

- 18 • Goal is to have as much consistency between Site Plan and Subdivision
19 Regs as possible (ex. Road standards will be the same for each) so that
20 there is one general set of Regs and then a smaller list of items
21 particular to either site plan or subdivision applications – these would
22 be reflected in the check lists for both.

- 23 • One critical issue will be the various thresholds that trigger applicants
24 having to come to the PB for a CUP – ex. Major or minor subdivisions –
25 **Matt T said he would look at the Handbook draft Matt M has already**
26 **worked on and see if thresholds are included at this point.**

27 Discussion included numbers of units for cluster housing, (units not
28 number of buildings), potential changes to multi use commercial
29 buildings (ex. Mckerleys), changes to impervious surfaces by size or

30 percentage or both, for stormwater infiltration drainage requirements,
31 how to deal with grandfathered projects when new developments will
32 have to be up to new standards. **It was suggested that the whole**
33 **Board be asked if they felt a new site plan review should be triggered**
34 **if there was any change to the footprint of a business.** Ultimately the
35 goal is to bring applicants into compliance.

- 36 • Town Engineer role issue – the town does not have its own engineer
37 presently, but they hire one as needed – Matt encouraged the Board to
38 consider having second opinions from an engineer representing the
39 town even if applicants/developers use an engineer or surveyor. It was
40 agreed there could be some kind of threshold for seeking engineering
41 review. The site plan regs now use the term ‘shall’ for the Board using an
42 engineer. In practice there is resistance since applicants have to pay for
43 that. It is necessary for situations where drainage infrastructure might
44 trigger an engineering review. **Matt said he would research other**
45 **towns and see what might work in this regard.** Perhaps have a % of
46 the lot as well as the total size of a lot as part of the trigger for drainage.
- 47 • Erosion Control – this would be relevant for big projects and should not
48 be open ended – again there would need to be a trigger (overall size
49 and/or % drainage) for engineering review.
- 50 • Megan had to leave and asked about the forward planning for a CIP
51 subcommittee and what commitment that might be – nothing is going to
52 be set up until the Master Plan updating is done by the end of June.
- 53 • Lighting issues – would likely only trigger engineering review in a large-
54 scale project – the town should have standards though and it was
55 agreed it would be a good idea to have a technical description beyond
56 ‘dark sky compliant’. Glare that reaches beyond a project to abutters is
57 not desirable. Greg pointed out reflected light can be a problem. There
58 was discussion about the measuring of lumens at a site on the property
59 line and having some standards for where the lights would be and when
60 they would be on. And – given the experience with the Loudon
61 greenhouses, it was agreed that for Greenhouses in Canterbury there

62 could be a requirement to install and use shades. **Matt will look up**
63 **other towns and research that too.**

- 64 • Landscape standards – there was discussion about some commercial
65 projects that may require screening and some may want to be very
66 visible. It would need to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. There
67 should be some standards but also recognize landscaping can be
68 expensive. Greg suggested something like ‘a natural wooded visual
69 barrier’, and to require the maintaining of natural vegetation where
70 possible. There could be discretion used and some exceptions in the
71 commercial zone. But landscaping should be part of the site plan – the
72 Board has learned from one business in the Industrial zone where verbal
73 agreements about maintaining vegetation were not upheld.
- 74 • Definitions to be worked on – Road and Driveway need defining. Maybe
75 explain Overlay and Base districts too. It will be important to start with
76 the definitions that are currently in the ordinance so there are not
77 contradictory definitions in different town documents. **Matt will look at**
78 **other towns to see if there are good Definition sections we could**
79 **learn from.**
- 80 • Post Approval from Town Staff issue – there was discussion about how
81 to manage conditional approvals when there are few staff to follow up
82 on the Planning Board decisions. Rich noted that the recent OPD
83 training had distinguished between Precedent and Subsequent
84 conditional approvals for subdivisions. Matt suggested these should be
85 on the plat or site plan, so that any requirements or limitations can be
86 read there. It is important to be clear about what has to be done prior to
87 any approval being signed and things that have to be done before a
88 Certificate of Occupancy can be given, or a plat is recorded. That way
89 conditions would be on the site plans held at the town office and the
90 subdivision plats and the Mylars recorded at the Registry. These
91 requirements will need to be consistent with the checklist for both site
92 plans and subdivisions then.

93

- 94 • Conditions of roads – it was agreed that if a subdivision required roads
95 being brought up to Class 5 standards, then that must happen before it
96 is signed off and/or a performance bond is posted and cashed. That way
97 applicants are held accountable and road conditions are taken care of.
98 The Board can require road engineering and drainage – Matt noted that
99 in the current subdivision regs page 21 section 7 the ASSHTO standard
100 is referred to and that is not easy to access – so it would be better to
101 have some other standard referred to. (We did not make that an action
102 item?). Also, the General Standards and Professional Standards need to
103 be consistent too across site plan/subdivision regs.

104 **Action Items**

- 105 • **Matt T will send draft skeleton from Matt M – for site plan and**
106 **subdivision Handbook (done next day)**
107 • **And an example from another town’s Land Use Handbooks**
108 • **And digital version of CUP application (done next day)**
109 • **Examples of Definitions from other towns**
110 • **And research Lighting standards**
111 • **And triggers for Engineering Review in other towns**
112 • **Lois will forward on new ordinance to members when we receive it**
113 • **Subcommittee will report to Board that this is a work in progress.**

114 Respectfully submitted,

115 Lois Scribner, secretary

116