

Planning Board Meeting
7:00 p.m. February 10, 2026 at the Meeting House

Members Present: Brendan O'Donnell (Chair), Rich Marcou (Vice-Chair), Greg Meeh, Logan Snyder, Megan Portnoy, Joshua Gordon, Scott Doherty (Selectboard Rep)

Members Absent:
Hillary Nelson (Alternate), Clifton Mathieu (Alternate)

Others Present: Webster Stout (Surveyor), Kerry Pfrimmer (Abutter), James Wood (Abutter) Michelle Hammond (Land Use Administrator), Cheryl Andrew (Recording Secretary)

Call to Order

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Megan had requested review of the minutes be postponed until later in the meeting as she was not going to be present for the start of the meeting. Greg made a motion to postpone approval of the minutes until later in the meeting. The motion was seconded by Logan. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion carried.

Public Hearing

The Subdivision Application for Map 213, Lot 11, Baptist Hill Road was presented by Web Stout, Surveyor for the applicant, Kenneth Stern. The application included two waiver requests. Mr. Stout displayed the map of the property.

Areas on the map show the wetlands delineated on each lot with acreage indicated. The waiver request is that the map need not show complete wetland delineation as the map does show 5 acres for each lot and sufficient acreage for the wetlands.

The second waiver request is to allow the scale of the map to be 1":4000' instead of the required 1":500' as the requirement would produce a very large map. Brendan made note for the Planning Board to revisit the scaling requirement on the Application Checklist, and asked for any questions from the Board regarding the application waivers.

Greg made a motion to accept the application for Map 213 Lot 11, Baptist Hill Road as complete with the exception of the waivers requested. The motion was seconded by Joshua. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion carried.

Mr. Stout presented the request for subdivision. The property is located on Baptist Hill Road, and the lot is 29 acres in size. There are two foot contours extrapolated from granite by Lidar with field check elevations. The NH Landscape Association calls for one foot topography so the two foot contours give a leeway of one foot. The map shows elevations of all contours as well as 25% slopes. Property is in 2 zones, the majority zoning requirement of five acres is met. There is no need for state sub-division approval because the proposed lots are greater than five acres. The plan shows driveway points of access where the well and septic may fit. Brendan asked for questions from the Board. It was noted the plans do not include the wetlands stamp.

46 Mr. Stout said the plan he submitted to the Land Use Office does have the stamp, and the plan
47 will be recorded with the stamp. Scott made a motion to grant the subdivision with the condition
48 that if the plan has not already been stamped by a wetland scientist, that it will be added before
49 being recorded. The motion was seconded by Megan. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the
50 motion carried.

51
52 Kerry Pfrimmer, abutter, owns the property at 288 Baptist Hill Road and requested an
53 explanation of the waivers. Brendan explained the waivers are in relation to the application
54 requirements, not subdivision requirements. One is in regards to the scale of the map provided,
55 the second is in delineating the wetlands on the map. Brendan explained a separate requirement
56 called the Canterbury Rectangle which goes to uniformity and the building info. The plan
57 shows the proposed building envelope with the well and septic locations that would fit within
58 the area that is delineated. Mr. Pfrimmer asked for clarification and was told that the
59 subdivision would be for three buildable lots and to place houses on them. He explained he has
60 a right-of-way on his second parcel and wetlands all down the front of the land. He said that
61 when he applied for a subdivision previously, the Selectmen and the town attorney told him he
62 had to go a certain way and that he was granted an “illegal” driveway permit. He said he is
63 having a problem with subdividing this land so quickly. Brendan explained the Zoning
64 Ordinance, approved by the town voters and not enacted by this Board, sets minimum lot
65 standards, frontage standards and those standards control what can be subdivided. For a regular
66 shaped lot, having enough frontage and enough acreage, it is a pretty regular process. Mr.
67 Pfrimmer stated his counsel might have discussion about this given the way he was treated a
68 couple of years ago, because what the Board is approving here is exactly what he asked for. He
69 is not trying to impede the owner of the property, but he was impeded and will revisit his
70 request as he does not feel it is an equitable situation. He identified his lots on the plan and
71 showed the parcel that was problematic and said the records were very ambiguous. He agreed
72 that, in the current request before the Board, if all requirements were met, then this lot should be
73 subdivided. Brendan explained that driveway permits come from the Select Board, building
74 permits must be issued from the town. Mr. Pfrimmer stated that driveway permits were issued
75 in the names of people who don't own the land and deeds were not registered properly. He is
76 looking for equitable treatment. He also said that as a resident, property owner, and tax payer,
77 he is a bit surprised because everyone said the land was going to be preserved, yet less than a
78 year after acquisition, the land will be subdivided.

79
80 Brendan asked for additional public comments. James Wood, abutter (270 Baptist Hill Road),
81 stated he thought the property was under easement. He was told such when he bought his
82 property. His understanding was that the woods would always be woods. Brendan noted
83 easements are civil issues that do not come before the Planning Board.

84
85 Mr. Pfrimmer again noted that the waivers are procedural and confirmed that everything else in
86 the Board's mind is compliant. Brendan said that the application waivers are procedural; the
87 Board receives an application and votes to decide if the application is complete. The waiver
88 was just for the map information they were providing. In relation to the subdivision motion,
89 there can be no exceptions. If there are any zoning requirements, these must go to the Zoning
90 Board for a variance. Mr. Pfrimmer asked about the acreage requirement for both zones. The
91 requirement is three acres for the Rural District and five acres for Agricultural District. Both
92 new lots are five acres and satisfy either zone. Mr. Woods asked how many lots are requested.

93 There are 2 new lots requested for a total of 3 lots. The subdivision is requested for this parcel
94 only and does not involve any other lots.
95

96 Mr. Stout explained the plan shows steep slopes and topographical lines, but when recorded at
97 the Registry, the topo and slope lines are removed. The Registry does not want any shading to
98 cover the text. The town will have a copy showing the topo and slope lines. Rich noted the topo
99 is a requirement of the regulation. Mr. Stout said it is but without the text, there will just be
100 squiggly lines and most towns are ok with removal of the lines. Logan said the Board has had
101 this conversation with Web (Stout)'s maps before and they have been fine. Logan feels he knows
102 what he is talking about. Rich noted that Mr. Stout said the plan that he submitted had a wetland
103 stamp, but it did not. The file that was submitted and sent to the Board by Michelle last week did
104 not have a wetland stamp on it. Mr. Stout asked if Michelle had the electronic plan or the full
105 scale, as the full scale does have the stamp. Michelle said she sent out the electronic plan and
106 apologized for not providing the full scale map for the meeting. She offered to go to her office
107 and bring back the full scale plan now. Brendan said Mr. Stout is in front of us saying there is a
108 stamped plan, and that is a representation to us that the plan has the stamp, Brendan will follow
109 up on the recording piece to see what is done and required of other applications. Greg asked if it
110 would be possible to leave the steep slopes and remove the contour lines, but Mr. Stout noted the
111 contour lines determine the steep slopes. Brendan stated the plan that we have will always be
112 part of the town record in the property file. The purpose of recording is to show the boundaries
113 of the property and topographical information is not required. Greg noted building permits
114 require topographical lines, but that map will be in the town's file.
115

116 Brendan asked for any further discussion on the motion, being to grant the subdivision with the
117 condition that if the plan has not already been stamped by a wetland scientist, that it will be
118 added before being recorded. Hearing no further discussion, he put the motion to a vote. A vote
119 was taken, all were in favor, the motion carried.
120

121 Mr. Pfrimmer requested a copy of the plan and was told copies are available at the town office,
122 or on the town's website. He further noted that the plan would have been helpful if included in
123 the certified letter he received as an abutter.
124

125 **Discussion and review of Land Development Regulations Section 6.5.**

126 Brendan received a question from Jim Snyder regarding whether the Canterbury Rectangle is
127 required as it is not explicitly spelled out in the Land Development Regulations. The closest
128 match in the Land Development Regulations is in section 6.5.

129 The Zoning Ordinance does require it and the Planning Board does need that information, so
130 specifying the need for the Canterbury Rectangle should be added to the LDR.
131

132 **Other Business**

133 Megan drafted a communication about the proposed zoning amendments in the 2026 warrant for
134 the town newsletter and sent them out via email to each member of the Board. Rich noted he
135 received the document an hour before the meeting and did not have time to review it; an hour
136 before the discussion is very little time. Brendan stated we would all like to have information in
137 more time, but everyone is busy. He is very appreciative of the work Megan has done to put this
138 document together. As the Board is all here now, he would like to review the items one by one
139 and make changes as it is due to Beth by the 18th of February for the Newsletter.

140 Edits include:

141 **Wetlands Setback**

142 The last sentence was amended to read, “While some residents have advocated for a larger
143 setback, the Board proposes a short wetland setback, balancing environmental stewardship with
144 preserving the right to reasonably use the land.”

145 **Cluster Development**

146 The second sentence was amended to read, “In practice, the ordinance has been only partially
147 effective in providing the Board greater control over development outcomes.”

148 **Data Centers**

149 The fourth sentence referencing restrictions on local regulations failing to address specific issues
150 was removed. The final sentence was amended to, “The Board determined it was important to
151 address this issue in advance to provide clarity and avoid unintended outcomes.”

152 **Gross Living Area**

153 The first sentence was amended to read, “This article clarifies how Gross Living Area is
154 calculated for accessory dwelling units (ADUs).” The final sentence was removed.

155 **Legislative Compliance**

156 The semicolon before the RSA citing was changed to a comma and the final sentence of the
157 paragraph was removed.

158

159 Megan was thanked for her work and the document was sent to Michelle.

160

161 **Approval of Minutes**

162 Michelle noted she did not receive Megan’s edits of the minutes of the January 27, 2026 meeting
163 in time to provide all members with copies, so she suggested review of the minutes be moved to
164 the next meeting. Logan made a motion to bump the minutes to the next meeting on the grounds
165 of information shortage and the falling snow. Seconded by Joshua. A vote was taken, all were in
166 favor, the motion carried.

167

168 **Adjournment**

169 Logan made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:50 p.m. Greg seconded the motion. A vote was
170 taken, all were in favor, the motion carried.

171

172 Next Meeting: 2026 February 24, 2026, 7:00 p.m. at the Meeting House

173 Minutes submitted by Cheryl Andrew, Recording Secretary