

1 **Planning Board Subcommittee – Site Plan and Subdivision Regs**
2 **and Land Use Handbook**

3 **Tuesday April 16, 6 pm, Town Hall**

4 **Members Present**

5 Greg Meeh (Chair), Matt Taylor (CNHRPC), Lois Scribner (Secretary)

6 **Agenda – working on the skeleton Handbook and other materials**
7 **from CNHRPC**

- 8 • Matt had copies an example of a **Notice of Decision** from
9 Boscawen, to make a template that Canterbury can use – **Lois**
10 **to make a template in Word for next meeting**
- 11 • Discussion about subdivisions where a road has to be built,
12 state law dictates that there has to be a financial guarantee in
13 place that the road is going to be build to avoid sale of lots
14 without access - ? which RSA 674 maybe?
- 15 • **Handbook Page 17 – re soliciting written statements from**
16 **other town officials before hearings, change from ‘shall’ to**
17 **‘may’**
- 18 • Discussion about bringing roads up to Class 5 standards and
19 Board’s previous discussions re a ‘less than Class 5 standard’,
20 an idea that Greg had shared with Board of Selectmen the
21 previous evening and it was rejected by the Chair on grounds of
22 emergency services requirements. There is a different vehicle
23 that can get to emergencies on the campgrounds in town but if
24 a property is on a road, then it has to be up to Class 5 standard.
- 25 • Matt noted there are road standards included in the Handbook
26 in the Appendixes – may need some work

- 27
- **Greg will get the copy of Road Standards** that he got from
28 Ken F to bring next time
 - Greg said refer this back CNHRPC and their highway dept
29 liaison – Matt to take that **back to regional planning to talk**
30 **directly to Canterbury Highway dept** and then we can look at
31 it again.
 - Greg took the **Definitions** handouts Matt had – to review for
32 next time and see if any are relevant to us.
 - On Page 14 re **Preconceptual** applications – add language to
33 indicate the Board **strongly recommends** or encourages
34 applicants to come for preconceptual –
 - Page 15, one week is not sufficient so require preconceptual
35 applications to be in **21 days**, as for other applications
 - And **combine sections 2.2 and 2.3** so there is one
36 classification of preconceptual application with those
37 standards laid out
 - Add **reference to checklist to section 2.5** so it is clear that is
38 part of completeness review (idea being the checklists to be
39 used by Board will be based on these regulations) – Greg had
40 been advised by town counsel that the checklists are a
41 governing document so it needs to be very specific
 - **CNHRPC to produce the checklists based on section 4 for**
42 **Board to look over and include references to the zoning**
43 **ordinance for items in the Checklist – these Checklists to**
44 **be in the Appendices**
 - And although the checklists the Board currently has are long,
45 there is one last point saying ‘anything else the Board’ might
46 want – it would be better to have specifics of things regarded
47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54

55 as important in addition to light/traffic studies etc. And the
56 checklists for site plan and subdivision to be as similar as
57 possible

- 58 • **So – add requirements for language to cover i) ground water**
59 **quality, or water quality, and ii) road engineering including**
60 **drainage report and also iii) impact on property values in a**
61 **fiscal impact report or something similar**
- 62 • In other words, as much information and detail as possible
63 before a completeness review and hearing
- 64 • **Page 24, section 4.1, 7, re having a determination letter**
65 **from Building Inspector re zoning compliance – Greg wants**
66 **Board to consider that requirement for applicants**
- 67 • **There needs to be reference to the official map as the one**
68 **to be used rather than tax maps**
- 69 • Discussion about variances being needed for subdivisions on
70 private roads, with no frontage on a town road.
- 71 • Exemptions from site plan review are listed on page 12, and
72 needs rewording – discussion about kinds of criteria to add, ex.
73 Same number of employees, no increase in septage, noise,
74 lighting etc
- 75 • **Section 5.1 – add a reference to exemptions**
- 76 • Matt gave Greg some materials from other towns re
77 exemptions from site plan review – what are the thresholds to
78 trigger the need for site plan review? **Greg to look at that and**
79 **report back**
- 80 • **Language re visual barriers and natural vegetation in**
81 **setbacks. Matt to look for some examples of that and bring**
82 **back to be specific and strong.**

83 **NEXT MEETING TUESDAY MAY 7, 6 PM, VENUE TBD (but could**
84 **well be Town Hall again)**

85 **ACTION ITEMS:**

86 **Matt:**

- 87 • **Edits as in these Minutes – page17 shall to may**
- 88 • **Page 14-15 and strongly recommend preconceptuals /21**
- 89 **days for application, combine sections 2.3-2.3**
- 90 • **Request CNHRPC talk directly to Highway Dept**
- 91 • **Checklists – add ref to section 5.1 and bring checklists that**
- 92 **will eventually be in Appendices, with references to zoning**
- 93 **ordinance included – and add criteria about ground water,**
- 94 **road engineering and drainage and property value impact**
- 95 • **Check refs to maps are for official map not tax maps**
- 96 • **Bring language for visual barriers and natural vegetation in**
- 97 **setbacks**
- 98 • **Ref exemptions in section 5.1**

99 **Greg:**

- 100 • **Look at Definitions Matt brought**
- 101 • **Get copy of town’s Road Standards for next time**
- 102 • **Look over the thresholds for site plan review examples**

103 **Lois:**

- 104 • **Make template for Notices of Decision**

105 Respectfully submitted, Lois Scribner, secretary