



TOWN OF SPRINGFIELD

2750 MAIN STREET | PO BOX 22 | SPRINGFIELD, NH 03284
PHONE (603)763-4805 | www.springfieldnh.org

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, July 16, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Springfield Memorial Building

NOTE: The following minutes are in draft form. They are subject to review and approval by the Planning Board at a future meeting. Changes may be made prior to final approval.

PRESENT:

Tanner Jacques – Chair
Steve Dzubak – Vice-Chair
Mike Howard – Member
Ken Jacques – Member
John Trachy – Member
Darrin Patten – Member
Tim Josephson – Upper Valley LSRPC
Tim Bray – Zoning Coordinator
Jen Roberts – Ex Officio

AGENDA:

1. Appointments:
 - 7:05 p.m. Select Shepherds – Continuation of Site Plan Application Hearing 6/18/2026
2. Review of June 18, 2026, Minutes
3. Review of Zoning Ordinance for 2026 edits

ALSO PRESENT:

Attorney Sheridan Brown, Jill Hastings, Justin Hastings, Sgt. Ryan Gamble, Steve Piispanen, and Gene Hayes.

- The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Chair Jacques. The Board members introduced themselves to the audience.
- John Trachy moved to accept the June 18, 2026, meeting minutes as written. Mike Howard seconded the motion. Darrin Patten abstained from voting. All other Board members voted to approve the motion.
- At 7:05 p.m., Chairman Jacques began the continuation of the Site Plan Application Hearing for Select Shepherds that was held on June 18, 2026, at 7:05 p.m. Chairman Jacques stated that before deliberations continue at the advice of legal counsel, he recused himself from the rest of the hearing. Vice-Chair Dzubak also recused himself from the rest of the hearing. Member Darrin Patten also recused himself from the rest of the hearing.
- Jen Roberts stated that legal counsel advised that the Planning Board hear a motion and vote on a member to take over as chair for the remainder of the hearing. John Trachy nominated Ken Jacques to chair the remainder of the hearing. Ken declined the nomination. Ken Jacques nominated Mike Howard to take over as chair for the remainder of the hearing. Jen Roberts seconded the motion. Mike Howard called for a vote and all board members voted aye. Ken Jacques provided Mike Howard with the Planning Board checklist, document to record draft conditions, and notes on conditions that were discussed at the last meeting.
- Mike Howard stated that the way he would like to proceed was that at the last meeting the Board had set out several conditions, and the main outstanding condition was how the kennel was going to be populated with dogs of various ages. Mike Howard stated the sticking point on that specific condition was the decision that came from the ZBA to the

Planning Board wasn't clear on the exact number if any was given for puppies. Mike Howard read the clarification provided by the ZBA to the Board (Appendix A). Mike Howard stated that ZBA clarification provides what the ZBA intended when the Special Exception was granted, of no more than fifteen (15) adult dogs and no more than thirty (30) transfers in a twelve-month period. The applicant proposed a condition of no more than fifteen (15) adult dogs (dogs older than sixteen (16) weeks) and twelve (12) puppies (dogs less than sixteen (16) weeks) shall be kept on the property. Mike Howard questioned Attorney Brown if that proposed condition was still on the table. Attorney Brown stated that was up to the Planning Board. Mike Howard stated that he felt it was clear what the ZBA wanted to allow and the proposed condition from the applicant is within the ZBA conditions and therefore the Planning Board should accept the applicant's proposal as one of the conditions of approval for this site plan. Mike Howard called for vote on that condition. Mike Howard moved to accept the applicants proposed condition of no more than fifteen (15) adult dogs (dogs older than sixteen (16) weeks) and twelve (12) puppies (dogs less than sixteen (16) weeks) shall be kept on the property at one time. Jen Roberts seconded the motion.

- Mike Howard asked if there was any discussion regarding the motion. John Trachy stated that the information provided by the Zoning Board does not indicate the age of the dogs or puppies in their original decision; It is provided in their clarification. Ken Jacques stated that he understood that the ZBA clarification had been vetted by the Town attorney; Ken felt that the Planning Board should not be second guessing this. John Trachy stated that he just felt that this information should be included in the Findings of Fact. Mike Howard stated that to him the ages of adult-dogs and puppies is clear, it is in the clarification from the ZBA and in the applicant's proposal, and so it should be in the conditions of the site plan. John Trachy stated that he didn't disagree with that, but the ZBA didn't include this in their original decision, and how can you clarify something that was not included in the original decision. Mike Howard stated the clarification the Board received from the ZBA is that the Zoning Board members went back and remembered what was discussed but was not clearly stated in their minutes, and all members who voted agreed that this is what was discussed regarding adult dogs and puppies when setting their conditions. Mike Howard stated what the Planning Board is doing now is voting to accept this as a condition of the site plan. John Tracy stated that the Board could vote to add this as a Findings of Fact. Mike Howard stated that the Findings of Fact are not something the Board has done for any other applicant; one of the hallmarks of how the Board operates is that they use the same process for each applicant to be fair and to all of a sudden dump a whole bunch of extra rules on one particular applicant is out of keeping in the way the Board has traditionally operated. Mike Howard stated he felt that it is not fair to this applicant to ask them to jump through hoops and that the Board has not asked this of much bigger operations in the past. Mike Howard stated that the Board has approved plans that potentially had much larger impacts on their neighborhoods and to make this applicant suddenly must abide by a different set of rules is patently unfair. Mike Howard stated this issue was discussed at the last meeting and that the Board's consensus was that they were not going to do the Findings of Fact. All the paperwork that John presented and represented by email, included nothing particularly new in the most recent documents, and so the Board should stick with their decision from the last meeting. Ken Jacques stated he thinks the Board has gone full circle on this issue, the applicant came to the Board for a consultation, with an open discussion on what the applicant was trying to do, at that time the Board gave the suggestion to connect with Dog Starr and try and model after that type of facility. There was a long legal process that took time, but now the applicant has come back full circle, and Ken stated in his opinion the applicant has put in the work to make sure this facility is going to be suitable to handle the type of operation they're proposing. Mike Howard asked if there was further discussion on the motion, seeing none, he called for a roll call vote. Jen Roberts voted aye, Ken Jacques voted aye, Mike Howard voted aye, and John Trachy voted aye.

- Mike Howard proposed the Board look at the conditions to add to the site plan in total. Mike asked Ken Jacques to read the proposed conditions out to the Board. Ken started with that as far as Health Officer Tim Bray is concerned, the septic that has been proposed by the applicant meets with DES approval and Town Health Officer approval. Ken stated that this is not a condition, but what has been approved by NH DES for their septic approval and included in the applicant's site plan application.

- Ken Jacques stated that a condition would be to provide a building plan to the Planning Board before a zoning permit would be issued to include items like lighting that were not shown on the plan provided in the application. Attorney Brown stated that there was a lighting plan included in the application. Ken Jacques apologized that he has missed the specific lighting plan in the application.
- Ken Jacques stated that any sign would have to meet town ordinance of no more than twelve (12) square feet.
- The Board will require as-built plans when construction is completed. Mike Howard stated that as of the last meeting, the applicant was not sure of the building materials to be used, and that there was some question of whether the building would have a gravel floor or a concrete floor, and it would be clearer if before a building permit was issued, the Board would be provided plans that included what the building is going to be made of, what types of concrete are being used, grading around, and all the items that a normal plan would have on it, including specs on what is being used for sound mitigation. Attorney Brown stated that he has an objection to that because it's kind of a duplicative process, and that is what the applicants are here for, and they've agreed to a noise limit, and they can certainly provide specs of what the structure is going to look like and have already said in the application the building will be on a concrete pad; so, the floor is concrete. Attorney Brown also stated the material is most likely wood with vinyl siding over it, the soundproofing is largely going to be mass-loaded vinyl soundproofing positioned inside the runs and the applicants have addressed this in the application. Attorney Brown stated that he had a concern about coming back with something and having an additional process where it is said "no that's not good enough". Mike Howard stated that he didn't think the Board would say "no that's not good enough" and what would determine whether the building isn't good enough is the post construction sound test that will be done by the expert acquisition. Mike Howard stated that the Board would like to see a plan of what the building will look like and have that on file. Attorney Brown stated that if the Board is talking about what the building looks like that is fine, and that what he would ask for is for the Board to issue in the conditions specifically what they would like to see in the building plans, because the applicants "have just come out of a situation starting with the Zoning Board trying to get to clever by half, and at the end of it, it ended up nebulous and had to get clarification there." Mike Howard stated that if the applicants wanted the Board to present a plan, then the Board would hire an architect on their dime to spec out the building and was that the way the applicants wanted to go. Attorney Brown stated that he wasn't sure that they needed to be adversarial over it. Mike Howard then stated that the Board wasn't in the business of designing a building for the applicants. Attorney Brown stated that if this request was consistent with what others have been providing for plans, including what they're using for sound proofing material and everything else, if what the Board was looking for is dimensions, appearance, number of windows, doors, all stuff that has zero to do with noise, which is ostensibly the reason the whole process has been so difficult, that they address noise and then get into a million different other things, that are not actually about noise. Attorney Brown stated that he wanted to know what the plan needs to look like, if it's an architectural plan, fine, but all throughout the applicant has been very clear that they are going to work with an expert acoustician, and he will be treating this building as he needs to, to get the noise level where it needs to be. Attorney Brown stated that he did not know if that could be drawn out on the front-end, because there will be a building built, then the first stage of noise mitigation, then testing to see if the noise mitigation worked or if something else is needed and then move forward to add that. The initial installation of the side skirts and treatments in the runs, which should substantially cut down on noise, but there is just not a way at the beginning to say what is going to be needed without potentially committing to a whole lot more expense to mitigate the

noise. Mike Howard asked, what if the applicant provides the Board with the expert acousticians first stab at what will be implemented to mitigate the noise, assuming that the expert acoustician has worked on kennels before. Attorney Brown stated the expert acoustician has done many projects including wind turbines and is one of the best in the business. Attorney Brown stated that the applicants will provide the building plan, as they assume that this will be challenged anyway by the other side, and that the applicant will have an opportunity then to bring counter claims and address it all in one swoop. Attorney Brown stated that he was looking to not run up multiple expenses to have an expert to come from northern Maine to here, charging mileage, and overnight expense to be here and to have him come down to do something once, run it by the Board, try something new, just looking to have efficiency in the process. Mike Howard and Ken Jacques clarified that the Board would just like to have a plan on file of what is being done, and then if further levels of mitigation might be needed, those plans would be added to the file. Attorney Brown stated that he was not looking to get into an ongoing situation, not worried about the Board, but the peanut gallery comments of “this needs to be this or this needs to be this”. Mike Howard then stated that the peanut gallery had spoken during public comment, which is closed, and that they are not involved in the process in front of this Board. Attorney Brown stated that expectations need to be the same on both sides of the table, and that he did not want to leave the meeting and have the Board thinking the applicant had agreed to something more detailed. Attorney Brown stated he just wanted to be very clear on what the Board was looking for, if the Board wanted an architectural plan that contained dimensions, building design, and listed materials used for initial sound mitigation, the applicants would be happy to do that. Mike Howard and Ken Jacques clarified that is what they were looking for. Attorney Brown stated that he just did not want a secondary approval process. Jen Roberts stated that to her understanding that was not the intention, just a plan to have on file. Attorney Brown apologized if he misunderstood the Boards request. Ken Jacques stated that he felt it was going to be useful when the applicants go to the building permit process, the Zoning Coordinator will share the plan with the Board and then be able to issue a permit. Mike Howard stated that the final matter will be once the building is built, populated with dogs, and the initial ambient sound test is completed, and that he was reassured that the applicants will meet that goal, and if the goal isn’t met the site plan isn’t working and the approval will be reviewed. Attorney Brown stated that the difficulty with noise is telling what the source is, you have to know where the noise is coming from, and in the past the applicants have dealt with some questionable observations that may or may not, most likely not related to this applicant, so it’s just a matter of clarity. Mike Howard stated that the Board will work with the applicants so that the testing gets met, and that there is understanding that if the initial testing happens when a neighbor is doing tree work, that test is contaminated because it’s picking up noise from outside the property. Attorney Brown stated that the expert acoustician will be able to identify that, but that history suggests that some caution is needed that everyone has the same expectations, really clear on what plan is going to be submitted, and that he guesses we have that now.

- Ken Jacques stated that lighting and signage are addressed in the proposed conditions by the applicants.
- Ken Jacques stated that a condition proposed by the Board for visitation would be 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. with no on street parking.
- Ken Jacques questioned if there was a proposed solid waste management plan. Attorney Brown stated that the proposed waste management plan was what was laid out in the DES approval for the septic system. Ken Jacques clarified that what the Board was referencing was removal of bagged waste weekly from property. Attorney Brown confirmed that is the process that is already happening. Ken Jacques stated that the Board would add that as a condition of approval.

- Ken Jacques also stated that another condition would be what the Board just addressed, a post construction noise testing being ambient or below at the property line.
- Mike Howard then addressed the Board and asked if there were any other conditions to be added other than those Ken Jacques had just listed. John Trachy stated that there is a whole list from the last meeting that people had voiced concerns about and suggested these be included as conditions. Mike Howard asked John what list he was referring to. John stated that if the Board looked at the minutes of the last meeting, that were just approved, there were approximately 20 different concerns expressed by the Board members. Mike Howard questioned if these concerns were expressed by all Board members. Jen Roberts stated that there were proposed conditions the Board did discuss at the last meeting, and if she was correct in her understanding that these proposed conditions were provided to the Board by John at the beginning of the last meeting. Jen Roberts then asked John Trachy if these were his concerns. Mike Howard asked John Trachy if he had a list of concerns and if he could read these to the Board. John Trachy read out topics that were discussed at the previous meeting of noise issues, definition of adult dogs, location of the structure, discussion on earthen berm, compass direction the run is facing, run is to include skirts, open run is covered by screens, construction material of the building, acoustic test result post construction, construction drawings, no more than fifteen (15) dogs and twelve (12) puppies, applicant did not intend to have public come to the kennel, visitation 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., pet license with municipal approval, documentation for septic approval from NH DES, DES Reference to discharge of existing septic system, full concrete pad, possible non-porous vinyl flooring, waste absorbed into wood shaving, bagged and disposed, refuse to be taking to the dump or changed to a private hauler to remove it, solid waste how long on site, lighting motion active and down shielded, signs no more than twelve (12) square feet, traffic, on street parking, no change in traffic levels anticipated, no snow removal in the play yard, recording ZBA conditions on the plan, recording at the registry, as built plans submitted to the Board, and final plan construction drawing with physical site features. Mike Howard stated that virtually all of the topics John listed are addressed in the conditions that Ken Jacques just read out to the Board, and just to confirm that Tim Bray, Health Officer has stated to the Board that he is comfortable with the DES approval and waste removal plans provided. Ken Jacques stated that the Board has never required any other applicant to register a site plan with the Registry. Mike Howard stated that Registry will not record site plans anyway. John Trachy stated that he is not so sure about that. Mike Howard stated that whether John is unsure or not, the Board has been assured by the Town staff that they have been informed by the Registry that they will not record site plans in the Registry of Deeds, they are interested in boundaries, not site conditions. Mike Howard stated to John that he was trying his patience. John stated that it is just him reciting what is in the minutes. Ken Jacques replied to John that what he just recited, John included in the minutes, not the Board as a whole. Mike Howard stated that the Board should continue with the drafted condition list the Board has worked on, because most of the items Mike heard John list out were in the drafted conditions and that these were issues that were discussed and dealt with during the last meeting. Mike restated that the Board had decided to take Tim Bray's word and DES assurance in their letters that the application was consistent with DES regulations.
- Ken Jacques asked John Trachy to go through his list again and the other Board members would let him know which items they felt were already addressed, just to help clean this up. Jen Roberts asked John Trachy to please let other Board members know where he was reading this list from, specifically what page in the minutes. John stated he was looking at page one of the minutes, bottom of the page, potential noise issues and definition of dogs. Mike Howard stated that the definition of dogs has been addressed. John then stated location, contained in the first paragraph of the minutes, second page. Jen Roberts stated that location was discussed on the site visit. John Trachy stated that first paragraph, second page, deals with the run facing northwest towards forested areas, and that this was a conversation between the Chair and the applicant. Jen Roberts stated that when the applicant was in front of the Board and discussed an earthen berm. Mike Howard asked which condition the Board was discussing because as he recalled the berm was a possible addition if sound goals were not met with the sound proofing of the building. John Trachy stated that he felt the Board was going a little crazy putting down

berms, direction, and location, and the Board should be concentrating on the noise level and lights, and not the itty-bitty stuff, and these were the topics that were brought up. Mike Howard stated that he wanted to make sure all the Board members are satisfied with the conditions proposed to put in the site plan now, and he for one is satisfied. The main issue of sound is going to be taken care of by the design of the building and post construction testing, the applicant has committed to a decibel level that has been acceptable to the Board and if it is not met then their site plan is not valid because site plan conditions have not been met. Mike Howard then asked if there were any conditions a Board member felt should be in the site plan that was not heard when Ken Jacques read the draft conditions list or a proposed condition that is already present in the application.

- Ken Jacques asked Emily Rogers to read back the draft conditions to the Board
- Conditions drafted by the Board were:
 - Implementation of proposed waste disposal plan as approved by DES and Town of Springfield Health Officer with waste removal done on a weekly basis.
 - Building plans to be provided to the Planning Board before construction for review to allow Zoning Coordinator to issue a zoning permit.
 - As built plans to be provided to Planning Board after initial construction and ambient noise testing done at the property line.
 - No light trespass, no direct lighting leaving at the property line, lighting must be dark sky compliant and have shielding.
 - No lighted signage and signage must meet Town specifications laid out in Site Plan Review Regulations of no more than 4' x 3', no more than 12-square feet.
 - No on-street parking.
 - Business visitation between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. only.
 - No more than 15 adult dogs (dogs older than 16 weeks) and 12 puppies (dogs less than 16 weeks old) shall be kept on the property at one time.
 - No more than 30 dogs shall be transferred, as the term is defined by RSA 437:1, in a 12-month period.
 - Adult dogs shall be housed in a structure designed with an expert acoustician to mitigate potential noise. A portion of the structure shall be fully enclosed, and said structure, along with accompanying mitigation measures (e.g. siting vegetation, fencing, operations management) shall reduce peak noise levels measured at all points of the applicant's property line at or below ambient noise levels in the Hogg Hill neighborhood.
 - Upon completion of the kennel structure and installation of necessary mitigation measures, the applicant's expert acoustician will re-measure ambient noise levels and kennel-related noise to ensure sufficient noise reduction has been achieved.
 - Applicants shall maintain quiet hours of 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. during which dogs will only be allowed outside for individual bathroom breaks.
- Attorney Brown noted that page 38 of the application laid out the proposed waste removal plan. Ken Jacques noted that this was part of the DES application that had been approved. The Board reviewed the draft conditions and noted also including the applicants proposed site plan conditions.

- Mike Howard asked if there was further discussion on conditions. Seeing none, Mike Howard made a motion to approve the application with conditions for the Select Shepherd's Kennel. Jen Roberts seconded the motion. Ken Jacques voted aye, Jen Roberts voted aye, Mike Howard voted aye, John Trachy vote nay. The application was approved by majority vote.
- Hearing was closed at 7:58 p.m.
- Chairman Jacques returned to Chair the remainder of the meeting.
- The Board reviewed the proposed changes to the 2026 Zoning Ordinance. John Trachy provided a list of grammatical changes that the Board could make and a list of changes that would require Town Meeting vote (Appendix B). The Board redlined a copy of the 2026 Zoning Ordinance for all the grammatical changes and provided this to the secretary. The Board then redlined a second copy of the 2026 Zoning Ordinance to note changes that would require Town Meeting vote. A copy of this red-lined document was provided to the secretary. Further work will be done to present these changes in warrant article format for the Board to approve before bringing them to Town Meeting in 2027.
- The Board discussed reviewing solar ordinances in an upcoming meeting and possibly inviting a representative from Clean Energy NH to come to an upcoming meeting and assist the Board with drafting solar ordinances.
- Chair Jacques adjourned the meeting at 9:06 p.m.

Submitted by: Emily Rogers, Administrative Assistant

**TOWN OF SPRINGFIELD
P.O.BOX 22 2750 MAIN STREET
CLARIFICATION
SPRINGFIELD, NH 03284
PHONE: 603 763 4805**

**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
NOTICE OF DECISION**

Re: Clarification of Zoning Board of Adjustment Decision – Select Shepherds, LLC

To the Springfield Planning Board,

At its July 7, 2026 meeting, the Springfield Zoning Board of Adjustment reviewed the Special Exception previously granted to Select Shepherds, LLC and voted unanimously (4-0) to provide the following clarification regarding Conditions 1 and 2 of its decision. The Board believes this clarification will assist the Planning Board in its ongoing review of the associated Site Plan application.

1. Condition 1 – Adult Dog Limitation

Condition 1 was intended to limit the proposed kennel to no more than fifteen (15) adult dogs, defined as dogs sixteen (16) weeks of age or older.

During the hearing, the Board's consideration of this condition was focused on the potential impacts associated with the kennel operation, including noise generated by dogs housed within the kennel and related outdoor areas. Breeding activities were disclosed as part of the proposed operation; however, puppies younger than sixteen (16) weeks of age were represented as being housed separately within the residence. As such, those puppies were not intended to be included in the fifteen-dog limitation established by Condition 1.

2. Condition 2 – Breeding Operation Limitation

The Board further clarifies that Condition 2 was not intended to limit the total number of dogs present on the property at any given time.

Rather, Condition 2 was intended to regulate the scale of the breeding operation by limiting the number of puppies produced and sold during a twelve-month period. The Board's intent was that Condition 1 address the number of adult dogs permitted within the kennel operation, while Condition 2 address the scope of breeding activity. These

conditions were intended to regulate separate aspects of the approved use and were not intended to be interpreted as conflicting or cumulative limitations on the total number of dogs on the property.

This clarification reflects the intent of the voting members at the time the Special Exception was granted and is provided for the Planning Board's consideration as it continues its review of the Site Plan application.

Respectfully submitted,

**The Voting Members of the Springfield Zoning Board of Adjustment by Tanner
Jacques, Chair**

CONFLICTS/CLEANUP OF THE 2026 ZONING ORDINANCE

Validity / correction language in Article XII Miscellaneous Provisions, says the Planning Board may correct typographical and punctuation errors and may assign or modify numbering and sections, provided no substantive change occurs. The same article says substantive amendments require Town Meeting. So there are some fixes we can do now and some that should wait for Town Meeting 2027.

Corrections that can likely be made now

These are clerical, formatting, numbering, or obvious scrivener's errors.

Location in 2026 draft	Problem	Correct now?	Suggested correction
Front matter, page 2; amendment history, page 49	Front matter says most recent amendment was adopted March 14, 2026, while amendment history says March 10, 2026.	Yes, if Town Meeting records confirm the correct date.	Use the actual Town Meeting adoption date consistently.
Table of Contents, pages i-ii	§3.12 is missing from the 2026 TOC, even though §3.12 remains in the ordinance body.	Yes.	Add "3.12 Uses Permitted by Special Exceptions" with correct page number. List the section where it actually begins, likely page 30. A cross-reference on page 28 does not need to be in the TOC.
Table of Contents	§8.22 is listed as "28 & 30."	Yes.	
Multiple headings	Missing spaces: e.g., "ARTICLE I.PURPOSE," "3.11Permitted Uses," "3.13Requirements."	Yes.	Add spacing and clean heading format.
§4.16 Prohibited Uses	Lettering skips from F to H and I.	Yes.	Renumber H and I as G and H, with no text change.
§4.24(C)	"sonatubes" appears; §4.15 uses "sonotubes."	Yes.	Correct to "sonotubes."
§6.22	Sentence reads: "Driveways	Yes.	"Driveways crossing

CONFLICTS/CLEANUP OF THE 2026 ZONING ORDINANCE

Location in 2026 draft	Problem	Correct now?	Suggested correction
Driveways	crossing Overlay Districts shall meet the in the Springfield Driveway Regulations...”		Overlay Districts shall meet the requirements in the Springfield Driveway Regulations...”
§6.31 Adequate Parking	“Conditional User Permit”	Yes.	“Conditional Use Permit.”
§3.13(E)(4)(a), Workforce Housing	“The conditional use is subject to Section 11.45.” There is no §11.45.	Likely yes.	Change to §8.22 if that was the intended CUP criteria section. This is a numbering/cross-reference correction.
§4.24(F)(1), Shoreland CUP	Also says CUP is subject to §11.45.	Likely yes.	Change to §8.22.
Article XIII, ADU definition	Says “Accessory Dwelling Unit—Defined by RSA 674:41.” RSA 674:41 is about erection of buildings on streets/appeals, not ADU definitions; RSA 674:71 is the ADU definition section.	Likely yes, but I would document it as an obvious statutory-citation typo.	“Accessory Dwelling Unit—Defined by RSA 674:71.” The 2026 §7.20 already refers to RSA 674:71-73.
§7.20 opening sentence	“RSA 674:71 -73” spacing/style.	Yes.	“RSA 674:71–674:73.”
§7.30 text	Page-break artifact in “Short-Term,” inconsistent capitalization “Short term.”	Yes.	Use “Short-Term Rental” consistently.

CONFLICTS/CLEANUP OF THE 2026 ZONING ORDINANCE

Corrections that should wait for Town Meeting

These would change meaning, review authority, applicant obligations, or the scope of a regulated use.

Location	Problem	Why it should wait
Article XIII, “Guest Facilities”	Still includes “short-term rentals.” §3.12 sends “guest facilities” to the ZBA for special exception, while new §7.30 sends STRs to the Planning Board for CUP and site plan review.	Removing STRs from “Guest Facilities,” or adding “except Short-Term Rentals regulated under §7.30,” changes the approval path. That is substantive.
§7.30 STR section	The new STR section is thin. It requires CUP/site plan review but does not include many operational standards.	Adding occupancy limits, inspection requirements, septic documentation standards, responsible-party filing requirements, renewal criteria, noise standards, or revocation standards would be substantive.
Article XIII, STR definition	The 2026 version replaces the full 2025 local definition with “Defined by RSA 48-A:1 V.”	Replacing that with a broader or more tailored zoning definition would affect what is regulated. NHMA specifically recommends clarity in the zoning definition of STRs, but that clarity should be adopted as a zoning amendment, not inserted administratively.
§7.21 Minimum Lot Dimension Requirements	It still begins “An attached ADU...” even though §7.20 now allows attached and detached ADUs.	Changing “attached ADU” to “ADU” affects dimensional treatment of detached ADUs. That is probably substantive, even though the Town must administer the ordinance consistently with state ADU law. RSA 674:72 now allows one ADU, attached or detached, as a matter of right and limits extra local requirements.

CONFLICTS/CLEANUP OF THE 2026 ZONING ORDINANCE

Location	Problem	Why it should wait
§6.31 Adequate Parking	The sentence ends with a fragment: “number of bedrooms, plus one additional parking space for each dwelling unit.”	Turning that fragment into an enforceable parking formula would create or clarify a substantive parking requirement. Fix the typo “Conditional User” now, but leave the formula for Town Meeting unless the exact adopted warrant text proves this was a transcription error.
§6.22 Driveways crossing overlay districts	It refers to ZBA special exception review under §§4.14, 4.23, and 4.30.	Any change from ZBA review to Planning Board CUP, Selectboard permit, or another review path would be substantive.
STR / ADU policy choices generally	Any change to permitted uses, CUP criteria, site plan triggers, owner-occupancy rules, renewal terms, or enforcement standards.	These are zoning policy choices and should go through public hearing and Town Meeting.

Practical approach

I would prepare a short “Non-Substantive Codification Corrections Sheet” for Planning Board approval. It should say the Board is acting only under the Article XII authority to correct typographical, punctuation, numbering, section, and obvious citation errors, with no substantive change intended.

The two items I would treat most carefully are:

1. ADU definition: RSA 674:41 → RSA 674:71. This is probably a correctable citation error because §7.20 already cites RSA 674:71-73 and RSA 674:41 is plainly a different subject.
2. §11.45 → §8.22 cross-references. This is probably correctable as a numbering error because no §11.45 exists and §8.22 is the ordinance’s CUP criteria section.

For the Guest Facilities / STR conflict and the §7.21 attached-ADU language, I would not rely on Article XII. Those should be cleaned up in the next warrant article.