

1 **Planning Board Meeting – Work Session Final Minutes**

2 **7 pm, June 11, Meeting House**

3 **Members Present**

4 Greg Meeh, (Chair), John Schneider (Vice Chair), Rich Marcou, Kent
5 Ruesswick (BOS rep), Logan Snyder, Joshua Gordon

6 Hillary Nelson, Brendan ODonnell and Ben Stonebraker (alternates)

7 **Members Absent**

8 Megan Portnoy

9 **Others Present**

10 Mike Tardiff (Executive Director, CNHRPC); Clifton Mathieu

11 **1. Call to Order**

12 Greg Meeh called the meeting to order at 7pm.

13 **2. Mike Tardiff – Master Plan update**

14 Mike Tardiff handed out sheets, Plan for Tomorrow Update Implementation
15 Priorities, for each of the 4 chapters recently drafted. This is very much a
16 working document. He was requesting Planning Board members prioritize
17 each task identified in each chapter objective. There was no one way to do
18 this and different towns have opted to do this step differently. Members were
19 glad to see the detail in the objectives and welcomed the opportunity to
20 prioritize. Mike said this was to reflect the Planning Board perspective, and
21 what the Board’s priorities were. He would take the papers back next week
22 and they would score them collectively. CNHRPC would create a qualitative
23 narrative based on that scoring. The Implementation chapter in Master Plans
24 is deliberate and it is to ensure the documents do not sit on shelves. It is
25 required by statute. There was discussion about the NHMA recommendation
26 that Boards review Master Plans annually to stay on top of the Implementation
27 tasks.

28 In terms of scoring, it was decided to have 3 categories in terms of time. High
29 priority would be 0-2 years, Medium would be 2-5 years and Low priority
30 would be 5 years plus. Members could add 2 asterisks if something was
31 especially important to them, for any of the categories (ex. It could be medium
32 in terms of time but still important to do).

33 The next step for CNHRPC would be to assign the tasks to the people or
34 institutions responsible for carrying them out, the 'who is going to do it'
35 section. This includes Conservation, Zoning, Select Board as well as Planning
36 Board and others.

37 Mike then turned to the section on Community Facilities and asked what the
38 key issues would be to highlight there. Mike emphasized that this was the
39 place in which to include issues that might be dealt with in the future, and
40 they could be elevated to priorities more readily if they were mentioned in the
41 Master Plan. It always helped in seeking funding to have the issue highlighted
42 in the Master Plan.

43 There was discussion about

- 44 • Staffing issues (ex. highway department is chronically understaffed
45 currently – should it be subcontracted out?)
- 46 • Or increased telecommunications – broadband and cellular and solar
- 47 • Hazardous waste day
- 48 • Trails committee
- 49 • Recycling priorities
- 50 • Recreation center for kids in town (idea from the Recreation Committee)
51 and Mike cited the example from Hillsborough where the town did
52 succeed in getting varieties of funding for that
- 53 • EMT and ambulance service based on the municipal contract between
54 neighboring towns – members were interested to know the level of
55 demand on the town from institutions in town (ex. Drug rehab facility) or
56 from the I 93 corridor within Canterbury – Mike said all rural towns in the
57 state faced the issue of the cost of these services being high and still

- 58 having a wait time of around 20 minutes or more for an ambulance to
59 arrive
- 60 • Calls to the Police Department – what are the highest demands on them
61 (including monitoring the river beaches in the summer)
 - 62 • Community Power – Mike to contact John Schneider to check on their
63 priorities – and include net metering for the future – to get text for that
64 section
 - 65 • CIP – Capital Improvement Program – have it in place to be started as
66 soon as possible – ideally this would be reviewed early summer each
67 year to be in place for budget season

68 This led to a brief discussion about having some kind of calendar in place for
69 the Planning Board throughout the year, to include the various legislative tasks
70 to be remembered in different months (ex. Review of CIP and Master Plan and
71 prep for zoning amendments). Logan mentioned software for Project
72 Management that can be useful.

73 Greg thanked Mike for attending. **Members to get their scoring worksheets
74 to Lois however they can (scan, mail to PO Box 242, drop off with a text
75 first at 2 Baptist Road, or drop off at town office, next week by end of
76 Tuesday June 18.)**

77 **3. Previous Draft Minutes of May 28**

78 There had been no suggested edits sent in. Rich Marcou moved to approve the
79 draft Minutes of May 28. Kent Ruesswick seconded. All members voted in
80 favor, with abstentions from Brendan O’Donnell and Joshua Gordon who had
81 not been present that evening.

82 **4. Rules and Procedures Update**

83 Greg reported that the calls to town counsel recently had overspent the
84 Board’s budget for counsel this year so in the future he would seek answers
85 from the NHMA. He had received some further feedback both from town
86 counsel and NHMA. These additions to the Rules and Procedures could not

87 be voted on tonight, but when notice had been given, they could be voted on
88 next meeting. This would include:

- 89 • Voting on the changes to the Minutes policy regarding members sending
90 requests for changes to the secretary,
- 91 • The issue of time limits had been cleared with NHMA,
- 92 • Requesting people having private conversations leave until done
93 talking,
- 94 • The issue of electronic devices should be tabled until the Board sees
95 the draft code of ethics from the Board of Selectmen and sees if there is
96 a policy for use of devices during meetings. Greg said that town counsel
97 had been adamant at the first Right to Know seminar that devices
98 should not be used during hearings due to the perception of ex parte
99 communication occurring. Board members consensus is that devices
100 can be very useful for looking something up and perhaps this was a
101 case of counsel being overly cautious.
- 102 • Board members could use their personal knowledge, but are not
103 supposed to research issues pertinent to hearings – the onus is on the
104 applicant to answer questions board members might have – there was
105 discussion about the value of doing some research prior to a hearing
106 and thus being able to ask more relevant and detailed questions of
107 applicants – and the context of this is that town boards traditionally
108 have not wanted to burden applicants with the cost of studies for one
109 thing or another.
- 110 • Precedent conditions – before this goes into the Rules and Procedures
111 Greg is waiting for some confirmation from Ken Folsom and the Select
112 Board to do with proof of access as part of the final approval of a
113 subdivision, for example, a road waiver being required. The town
114 administration has asked not to have conditional approvals because of
115 the difficulty of tracking the conditions. So, an applicant can be required
116 to show they have met the conditions, and then return to the Board for
117 the Chair to sign the mylar and have it taken to the Registry. In some
118 towns this is common practice.

119 • There was further discussion about the potential benefits of having a
120 form for applicants to request extensions – there were different opinions
121 about the helpfulness of a form, depending on whether the extension is
122 requested by an applicant because they need it for information required
123 by the Board, which is also under the obligation to decide within 65 days
124 after completeness. The experience with the recent Nash subdivision
125 application had highlighted some of the issues to do with extension
126 requests. The decision to grant an extension would be reflected in the
127 Minutes. **Greg will ask NHMA for good practice advice.**

128
129 5. Input from the Agricultural Commission

130 Greg had asked the Agricultural Commission for their views on the presence
131 of PFAS and sludge recycled materials. Mark Stevens had called Greg back.
132 They shared the general concerns of the Planning Board and would support
133 something like the regulations in Belmont that require monitoring and
134 reporting. The Ag Comm expressed concerns about increased regulation.
135 Ultimately it would be something for an ordinance and to be taken to Town
136 Meeting.

137 6. Other Business

138 (i) Joshua Gordon had asked Kal McKay to pull up local coordinates on
139 the screen so members could understand the point he wanted to
140 make about developers complying with minimum standards, for
141 example, with turnarounds. He was concerned about the
142 overdevelopment of back roads, as on Hancock Road in town, where
143 road widening led to trees and stone walls being taken down. Joshua
144 showed 2 examples of turnarounds, one on Labrador Lane,
145 Hampstead, which was large and ugly, versus one on Greenview
146 Drive, Loudon, which is more of a scenic loop. Greg added that
147 maybe there should be regulation about replacing tree canopy as a
148 road standard. In Canterbury there are already a couple of examples,
149 around Cambridge Drive, and at the Spruces, where the road loops
150 round and surrounds green area and trees as well as allowing

151 turnaround for larger vehicles like school buses or emergency
152 vehicles.
153 (ii) Greg had measured Asby Road, following discussions about road
154 width in the previous meeting. There are 2 narrow pinch points,
155 which are 16 ½ feet, most of it is 18 ft and some parts are 20 ft wide.
156

157 7. Adjournment

158 Logan Snyder moved to adjourn and Rich Marcou seconded. It was 8. 29 pm.

159 **ACTION ITEMS**

- 160 • **Members to prioritize Master Plan Implementation chapter**
161 **objectives and get to Lois by end of Tuesday June 18.**
- 162 • **Mike T to follow up with John S about Community Power goals text,**
163 **score the Implementation data and prep more drafts for PB**
164 **members for June 25 meeting.**
- 165 • **Chair to ask NHMA about extension policy and value of a form for**
166 **requests.**

167 **Next Meeting – Tuesday June 25, 7 pm, Meeting House (site plan review**
168 **hearing plus work session).**

169 Respectfully submitted,

170 Lois Scribner, secretary.

171