

1 **Planning Board subcommittee Land Use/ Regulations,**

2 **Thursday, June 13, 6.30pm, Library Conference Room**

3 **Members Present**

4 Matt Taylor, CNHRPC, Greg Meeh, Chair, Rich Marcou, Lois Scribner, secretary

5 **Members Absent**

6 Megan Portnoy

7 **Working Session**

8 Matt gave out another copy of the future Handbook with updated redlining, that included
9 changes suggested by members from the last meeting, for discussion this evening. The
10 relevant sections were 4, 5, and 6, to include All Application Requirements, then additional
11 Site Plan and Subdivision application requirements.

12 There was discussion about trying to avoid repetition, combining requirements where
13 possible, because that could ease the insertion of future changes into the document. **It**
14 **was agreed to keep to the model of having a section for All Applications, basic**
15 **requirements, then follow that with sections specifically for Minor and Major Site**
16 **Plans and then sections for Minor and Major Subdivisions and other types of**
17 **subdivision.** Numbers of sections and subsections will likely change from the last version
18 in a number of places.

19 Basic requirements for each would be in Minor, then additional requirements in Major (the
20 town has not yet had any applications deemed Major). There were definitions of Minor and
21 Major Site Plan criteria in sections 1.8 and 1.9 and it was agreed to refer back to those as
22 needed in sections 5 and 6.

23 Matt took notes on his copy for the next clean copy to be made, as well as having a redlined
24 copy if it was required to see changes.

25 Changes/rationale included:

- 26 • Page 24, to **add to Section 4.1 reference to applicant meeting with the board**
27 **prior to filing, refer back to 2.2** where it asked preconceptual applicants to do this
28 – in other words, it should be clear that all applicants are strongly encouraged to
29 come for preconceptual meeting for any type of application.
- 30 • Anywhere that said a determination letter was needed by Building Inspector re
31 zoning to be struck – the Board does that, not BI
- 32 • It was agreed the Board had voted to ask for 5 copies of applications

- 33 • The sub section about Drawings which is 4.1 new 11, to have the section 5.2
34 Drawing Requirements (from page 27) to be added **to it so all requirements about**
35 **drawings are together in one place, section 4.1, 11**
- 36 • Site Walks – ref on page 24 – agreed to put that in Section 3, **by adding a # 9 to**
37 **section 3.3 and make it about procedures for site walks (there is guidance in the**
38 **PB Handbook for NH)**
- 39 • P. 27, Rich had suggested corrections like ‘septic’ for sewage disposal
- 40 • Discussion about 5.1 section labeled Change of Use or Occupancy – for specific
41 definition of what that was about – agreed it was likely for internal changes – and
42 would be judged along with the list of exemptions in section 1.10. depending on the
43 type of change involved (ex would traffic change) – **add that it was there to cover**
44 **projects that are not exempt under 1.10**
- 45 • It was agreed to **add the topo lines at 2 ft intervals to Section 4.1** requirements, ie
46 for all applications – add it to drawing requirements
- 47 • Section 5.2 for Minor Site Plans – refer back to 1.8 criteria for minor or major site
48 plan application – **Matt may see if that can be reworded**
- 49 • And – this section is essentially what will be the check list for Site Plan applications
50 – it could be organized to put requirements into categories – like residential issues
51 and commercial issues – **Matt to take a stab at reordering them**
- 52 • Strike all references to **Impact Summary report as redundant – but include**
53 **requirement for a report to cover those criteria**
- 54 • Strike (p. 29) #31 requiring letter about public utilities – not relevant
- 55 • P. 32, **Title Block drawing ref in 6.4, #3,a, - put that in section 4.1 for all**
56 **applications**
- 57 • P. 33, **6.3, d, ref to Existing Zoning Requirements to be noted on plan – have that**
58 **in table form** – it is about the zoning in place when the plan is approved so is
59 important
- 60 • P. 33, Strike 6.4 on 1000 ft around – not relevant to Canterbury
- 61 • P. 34, Subdivision minor, it says where soils are to be mapped – members wondered
62 where the initial requirement was to actually map soils?? It does not make sense to
63 have that included unless we know where it originates – **Matt to look into that**
- 64 • Check lists to be based on what is in these regs – **Lois to look at existing checklists**
65 **just to make sure we are not forgetting something we already have**
- 66 • **Add another number for including engineered road drawings – language like ‘for**
67 **engineered road drawings include drainage for road improvement and new**
68 **roads” – include that in Major site plan checklist, 5.4, #4 and subdivision**
69 **checklist.**

- 70 • P. 30 – combine the refs to traffic study and traffic generation in Major Site Plan
71 section
- 72 • Greg had some comments—ground water references to be added for all
73 applications – end of Section 4.1 – because ground water protection is so
74 important with all properties having private wells
- 75 • Add a new section 4.1, # 19, asking for additional reports for things like ground
76 water, various forms of pollution –
- 77 • Add a section on Lighting standards – put it in 4.1 – Matt to think about that –
78 luminem standards – to require and then applicants would ask for waiver if not
79 applicable – it should be in for site plan and major subdivisions (add to page 35
80 #7)
- 81 • Easements - -was mentioned in 4.1

82 MEMBERS HOMEWORK IS TO LOOK THROUGH SECTIONS 7 AND 8, PP 38-59 FOR NEXT
83 TIME. MEETING DATE TBD – LIKELY JULY 1 OR 3. PLEASE LET LOIS KNOW IF YOU HAVE A
84 PREFERENCE THEN VENUE CAN BE FOUND.

85 Matt said he was going to move to AZ so we may only have one or two more meetings
86 with him in July.

87

88