



**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Town of Greenland • Greenland, NH 03840**  
11 Town Square • PO Box 100  
Phone: 603.380.7372 • Fax: 603.430.3761  
Website: greenland-nh.com

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD**

---

Thursday, October 26, 2023 – 6:30 p.m. – Town Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Bob Dion, Phil Dion, John McDevitt, David Moore, Stephan Toth, Steve Smith (Selectmen's Rep), Frank Catapano (Alternate)

Late Arrival: Richard Winsor (Alternate)

Members Absent: Steve Gerrato, Catie Medeiros (Alternate), Stu Gerome (Alternate)

Staff Present: Mark Fougere

---

B. Dion opened the Planning Board public hearing at 6:30 pm. He announced a quorum was present and the meeting was being recorded.

1. Projects of Regional Impact

There were no projects of regional impact.

2. Design Review

125 Dearborn Road (Map R12, 12: Residential Zone)

**Owner/Applicant:** Jay Lajeunesse - Dearborn Woods, LLC

The owner/applicant proposes to subdivide approximately 22.12 acres into a 13-lot subdivision. This will be a conventional subdivision with 11 single family homes and two duplex lots. The proposed road will be off Dearborn Road.

Paige Libbey, Jones and Beach Engineers, addressed the Board. Also present was Jay Lajeunesse, River Birch Builders/Dearborn Woods. 125 Dearborn Road had been before the Board for Design Review in May; they were scheduled for the September meeting but opted to continue due to a notification error.

Modifications have been made to the plan set: the property has been surveyed, additional test pits have been done and the layout has been changed. The development originally came in off Stratham Lane; now it will be coming in off Dearborn Road, allowing the abutting lots and the proposed lot to have more privacy. A conventional subdivision is planned rather than a cluster or open space subdivision. The conventional subdivision will have larger lots. A cluster subdivision would not shorten the road by much. Large lots will allow more trees on the lot to provide more privacy for residents on the property. P. Libbey pointed out the proposed back lot off Dearborn Road; it will have a 50-foot right-of-way and require a Conditional Use Permit. There will be wells and septic on each lot; 28 test pits have been done. Each lot does have adequate receiving layer for septic. P. Libbey pointed out the location of the cistern, which should be approximately halfway down the proposed road. The length of the proposed road is 1,000 linear feet. A road profile was included in the plan set.

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

The plan set has been submitted to Eric Weinrieb, Altus Engineering, for comments. P. Libbey has also walked the property with E. Weinrieb. She has received some preliminary guidance on revisions.

**J. McDevitt:** Questioned the right-of-way. There is an abutting property that is mainly wetlands. **S. Toth:** Why did they change from a conservation subdivision to a conventional subdivision? P. Libbey responded that the property has a lot of frontage and they were able to get more lots. Lots clustered together would have to be on the new road rather than Dearborn Road or Stratham Lane. A cluster subdivision does not allow them to reduce the road length by much. It is more of a benefit to the prospective homeowner to have a larger lot, creating a nicer subdivision. **S. Toth:** Was there a reason to shift the road from Stratham Lane to Dearborn Road? P. Libbey stated it would provide more privacy for the lots in the subdivision as well as the abutters. Dearborn Road is more heavily travelled than Stratham Lane and it would be more appropriate to use Dearborn Road. **S. Toth** noted there was a blind spot with cars coming up the hill and was concerned about accidents in the future. P. Libbey stated they looked at the site distance. The plan set includes site distance and stopping site distance profiles, leaving the proposed road, and traveling on Dearborn Road. A road off Stratham Lane would be too close to the intersection.

**S. Smith:** Asked the distance from the corner of Great Bay Road to the new road, stating it was not a blind intersection but very congested. P. Libbey noted the distance would be approximately 300 feet. **F. Catapano:** Could the duplex porkchop lot come off the proposed road? The driveway length could be shortened by coming off the new road and have more buildable lot. P. Libbey stated it may require a waiver: the regulation for back lots states they have to come off an existing Town road. **F. Catapano** stated that Board may be open to a waiver for a driveway that is permissible.

**J. McDevitt:** Would the duplexes be condominiums? J. Lajeunesse stated they did not intend to build a duplex. P. Libbey noted that two of the lots were large enough to be duplex lots, but the intent was to build single family homes. **F. Catapano** noted it that was the case, the lot could be reconfigured. **S. Toth** questioned if lot 12-11 was off the new road or Dearborn Road. P. Libbey responded that it was undecided; a couple of lots may come off Dearborn Road so they could be built before the road goes in. **S. Toth** stated that the less driveways on Dearborn Road would be better for traffic flow. He preferred all lots to access the new road to control traffic. P. Libbey clarified it would be for lots 12-11 and 12-3; both had frontage on Dearborn Road and Stratham Lane. She noted that some of the lots did not have frontage on the new road and would have to use Dearborn Road or Stratham Lane. **D. Moore** and **S. Toth** preferred Stratham Lane: Dearborn Road is heavily travelled, no shoulders and many people walk that road.

**S. Toth:** Questioned the stormwater development to be implemented in the subdivision. P. Libbey stated there will be two rain gardens: one at the front section of the road will treat the front piece and anything that comes onto the property; some of the house lots in the development have been in the design. There is also a second rain garden in the back. Most of the road slopes down to the rear rain garden. **S. Toth:** Was there curbing or something similar on the sides of the road to direct the water to the rain gardens? P. Libbey: There are swales along both sides of the road that will be mowed by the HOA. **S. Toth** noted that should be a condition of approval. **S. Toth:** Permeable pavers in the development? P. Libbey responded not for the road but there might be something for the house lots. Permeable asphalt will not be used for the road; it will be a Town road. **F. Catapano** noted those roads do not work well in the northeast.

**J. McDevitt:** Was the road within the wetland buffer? P. Libbey: A small section was but may be relocated out of the wetland buffer. They were following the trail on the property with the road. **S.**

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

**Smith:** Will the end of the cul-de-sac be paved in the center or is the center vegetated? **P. Libbey:** It will be vegetated. **S. Toth:** Will the lots be clear cut, or will trees be left? **P. Libbey:** Some trees will be left. **S. Toth:** Street trees? **F. Catapano** noted they could be seen on page L1 of the plan set. **P. Libbey** stated they have proposed street trees to meet the requirement. She added that any trees blocking site distance will be removed. **S. Toth:** Will the stone wall on Dearborn Road be preserved? **P. Libbey** responded it would be preserved.

There being no further questions from the Board, **B. Dion** opened the meeting to public comment. **Frank Manter, 158 Dearborn Road:** Will a peer review and traffic study be done? **B. Dion:** They are not done for the Design Review. **F. Manter** preferred access from Stratham Lane. There is a lot of history on that road, and it should be maintained.

**Tom Lyons, 64 Stratham Lane:** Concerned about wells going dry and the saturation of septic systems. **B. Dion:** Testing will be done to measure the refill capacity of his well, both before and after; the expectation is that it will be fine. **B. Dion** noted that DES regulates the septic system. **T. Lyons'** concerns were noted. **R. Winsor:** There is no draw-down testing of individual wells, only community wells. He clarified that there would be no testing of individual wells. **P. Libbey:** Most of test pits were approximately 2 feet. There are fairly high-water tables in that area. There are adequate receiving layers on all the lots; the lots will be larger. **F. Catapano:** Very rare that a 13-lot subdivision would dry up wells around it, unless there was an existing problem with the well. **M. Fougere** noted the property was on the edge of an aquifer.

**Deborah Beck:** The biggest problem would be drainage. Rain gardens would not be able to deal with drainage, which are basically depressions that need to be maintained by homeowners. She told the Board they needed to look at the subdivision and make sure the drainage worked. It was a big subdivision for a small piece of land.

**Rick Bombard, 10 Drake Drive:** Questioned wetlands. **P. Libbey** explained the first plan was a concept and based on aerial interpretation of the wetlands. Their wetland scientist has flagged the wetlands and the reason the current plan has a different wetland delineation. **R. Bombard:** There is a vernal pond that does not go away, and the area is wet. Wells and drainage were a huge issue. This is a massive disruption to an area that has problems with water. He was concerned about putting that much in a pretty volatile area. Do the Town and people living in that area need something that large? **R. Bombard** questioned if there was a moratorium on the number of houses built in Town. **P. Libbey:** The stream was not flagged as part of the initial delineation. The wetland scientist has flagged the stream. The measurement off the stone wall was used to show it on the plan. The buffer will impact lot 8 and possibly lots 7 and 9 (slightly). **P. Libbey** stated a vernal pool requires an outlet; there is no outlet, so there was not a vernal pool. **R. Bombard** asked that he be notified before accessing his property.

**F. Catapano:** Questioned if runoff would be increased on the site. **P. Libbey:** As part of the required analysis, the pre-development stormwater flow onto abutting properties must be compared to the post-construction stormwater flow. They must propose stormwater management that will accommodate it. She clarified that it must be included as part of the design submission. They must prove to the Town's engineer that the existing runoff to abutters is matched or reduced. **J. McDevitt** noted plans would be reviewed by the Planning Board's engineer. **M. Fougere** noted there would be a Library impact fee of \$3,800 to \$4,000 assessed on each home.

**Gregory Crisp, Dearborn Road:** Would there be a streetlight? **F. Catapano:** It is not required. **P. Libbey:** No. **G. Crisp:** The proposed road is directly across from their property; would there be any buffering? **P.**

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Libbey, J. Lajeunesse: The intent was to keep as many trees as possible. Some may have to be cut for sight distance. A DOT permit is not needed; the DOT section ends further back. **G. Crisp:** Questioned the well radius from the road. P. Libbey: If the well radius goes off the road, they do not have to comply with the abutters well radius. If the well radius is off the property, the property owner releases their rights to have nothing in it. She did not think there were any septic systems in the front corner, which is where the road enters. There would not be any septic systems in his well radius. **F. Catapano** noted it is a Planning Board requirement. **G. Crisp:** Questioned clear cutting up to the road. **F. Catapano** stated there would be a serious discussion about cutting.

**Terry Taylor, 138 Dearborn Road:** Questioned the final decision made at this meeting about the road. **B. Dion** stated there is no final decision; the Board has a new proposal that shows the road on Dearborn Road. It was clarified there are two lots proposed on Stratham Lane and the remainder will be off the proposed road onto Dearborn Road.

**Carrie Bivona, 146 Dearborn Road:** Dearborn Road is dangerous for walking and driving. Adding more houses on that road will require more caution. She did not think the road could support that many residences. It will also impact the quality of life for existing residents. Her house is downhill from the water that drains in that area; there are streams on both sides of the property. There is a great deal of water movement in that area.

There being no further public comment, B. Dion closed the public hearing and returned to the Board. R. Winsor explained the process to the public. The Board was not making a decision at this meeting; there was no formal application. The process takes a long time and there is a great deal of engineering. It could take four to six months before a decision is made. The public's opinion was very helpful. The Board will try to address anything within their control. F. Catapano added there would be reviews by the Planning Board engineer, the Fire Department and Police Department. Other studies can be required if deemed necessary by the Board.

S. Toth strongly believed that the road should be off of Stratham Lane rather than Dearborn Road, making sure all the lots were off the new road and not an existing road. It would be better for traffic flow and safety. S. Toth also wanted more work done with low impact development techniques. Drainage and wetlands were a big topic. R. Winsor noted the Board would have to be extra vigilant about drainage. A site walk might be needed; there may be some high impact zones in that area.

### 3. Site Plan Review

150 Bayside Road (Map R17, 21: Residential Zone)

Owners/Applicants: Peter Endres & Claudia Bartolini – Bird Dog Cider Company & Bird Dog Farm

The owners and applicants are proposing a small tasting room which would be open to small parties and events as well as infrequent larger events. Agritourism events are also proposed.

Christopher Berry, Berry Surveying and Engineering, addressed the Board. Also present were Claudia Bartolini and Peter Endres – Bird Dog Cider Company and Bird Dog Farm, owners and applicants. The project location is 150 Bayside Road.

P. Endres was before the Board approximately two years ago and received approval for a small cidery. There is a home as well as two existing barn structures on the site. A conservation easement encompasses most of the project site. There is an exclusionary for the home and two barns. There is an existing well and septic system on site as well as a driveway on Bayside Road onto the project site; those

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

are shown on the existing conditions plan. The orchard has been growing over the last few years. Cider is being produced under the approval granted by the Planning Board.

The proposed project is to expand the site to include a small tasting room inside the primary barn structure and agritourism that would include 'pick your own' other small events. There would be a limited number of larger events that would take place.

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to accept the application for 150 Bayside Road (Map R17, 21: Residential Zone) as complete. Second – R. Winsor; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

C. Berry reviewed the Existing Condition Plan. The project site fronts on Bayside Road. The existing driveway extends to the existing home and primary barn. The secondary barn is a well that is below grade and is located within the existing driveway. The septic system for the home is at the rear of the site. Deidre Benjamin, a certified wetland scientist, was hired to delineate the area. There is a wetland system associated with the brook. There are small wetland pockets adjacent to the driveway. Some of the wetland pockets are jurisdictional buffers, others are not; they are itemized on the plan. Topography is generally flat in the area of the existing driveway. There are small rises but generally flat in the fields. Much of the orchard is east of the existing driveway. There is open field and woodland. Seasonal high-water tables are approximately 2 to 2 ½ feet throughout the entire project area.

Overall Site Plan: The primary function of the tasting room is for small gatherings. The number of parking spaces required is small. Other proposed events will require additional parking. They have shown a primary parking area on the eastern side of the driveway. A secondary parking area is proposed for the western side of the driveway. Additional parking will be in the back field for larger events. Larger events will be limited to three times per year. There is ample overflow parking available. They have used the ITE Parking Manual to determine the number of parking spaces required for this type of project and events. Details were provided for the temporary fencing that will be used for parking; there will be no encroachment inside the easement area. Parking spaces are designed to be 10x20. The center island area has been widened; it is a grassed area and will not be lined. A secondary parking area will be built using wood chips; pavement is not proposed. It will be elevated approximately 12 inches above the existing surface. Vegetation will be removed. The wood chip surface will allow any stormwater to infiltrate into the ground; maintenance will be required over the years. Employee parking will be at the rear of the secondary barn. ADA accessibility is proposed at the rear of the site. Events have been noted on the site plan and includes hours of operation for each event, number of times per year, timing of the year, if employees would be needed, and if food trucks are proposed. R. Winsor: Total number of proposed parking spaces. S. Smith: 95 in the two front lots and 18 in the rear. Approximately 112 plus employee parking. C. Berry stated that number was based on the ITE parking generator for peak events, proposed for three times a year. 250 people is the maximum allowed on site for larger events.

Detailed Site Plan: Details how traffic will be moved on the site, how traffic enters and exits the site, traffic intended to be at the rear of the site, the aisle width, etc. The various turnouts along the driveway entrance for passing and emergency vehicles have been reviewed by the Police Chief; she has written a letter (copy on file). A letter was also written from the Fire Department (copy on file). Snow storage will be provided on site; a large snow load is not anticipated. The primary lot does not require much grading. Grading on the secondary lot is shown; it will be elevated. Sediment and erosion control may be necessary. Grading around the structure, ADA spaces and thresholds to get people safely in and out of the structure was reviewed. Grading was also shown for the proposed effluent disposal field at the rear of the house. That was designed for a larger event; there will be two bathrooms inside the

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

structure. The larger events that are proposed will require port-a-potties. The maximum occupancy in the barn is 99. There could be events outside the barn.

**Traffic Analysis:** A traffic analysis was prepared (copy on file). It takes into account the estimation of traffic based on parking demands. The ITE Design Manual does not discuss these types of events when determining traffic to and from the project site. Using the parking calculator, they were able to back into the parking number utilizing various peak time figures.

**Services:** The only water usage would be the facilities internal to the barn. Water is not served on site. There is no water that goes into the operation and making the cider.

**D. Moore:** Biggest concern was the light at Bayside Road/Rt. 33, which has an 'F' rating. There would be a backup at that intersection with 250 cars leaving the site. **C. Berry:** The study does not review the intersection. There would be a low frequency of larger events taking place. Typically, people would be arriving at the site within one peak hour; exiting events would be a more metered response: they would not normally all leave at the same time. The full event would be 9 am to 9 pm; most events would take place in the afternoon and there would be short evening hours, leaving off peak on Rt. 33. **J. McDevitt:** Also concerned about traffic. He requested an analysis of the larger events and traffic backup at the Bayside Road/Rt. 33 light. He would like the analysis to be during the week, between 4 pm and 5 pm, and how far the backup on Bayside Road/Rt. 33 would be. **R. Winsor** suggested a police detail even though there are limited events. Police could be at the entrance of the property on Bayside Road as well as at Rt. 33, and the police would control the intersections.

**C. Berry** clarified it would be a one-day event three times a year. **P. Endres:** This will be a much smaller farm than other pick your own orchards in the area. He has 900 dwarf trees planted. They plan to implement a reservation system to book times to visit the farm. **F. Catapano:** Recommended paving the mouth of the driveway at Bayside Road. **S. Toth:** How many people could be scheduled in a block using the reservation system? **P. Endres** stated it would depend on the number of trees available to pick and the capacity of parking. Responding to **S. Toth's** question, **P. Endres** stated reservations for the tasting room were not as important. He expected 20 to 30 people in the tasting room at the same time; the pick your own could be more. **R. Winsor:** The reservation system should be detailed on the site plan and part of the approval. **J. McDevitt:** Clarified the major events would be held during the spring, summer, and fall.

**S. Toth:** Questioned parking on Bayside Road. **C. Berry:** They were not proposing parking on Bayside Road. **S. Toth** was concerned about overflow parking on Bayside Road. **C. Berry:** They have discussed parking attendants; if there is not enough parking, customers will have to leave the site. There will not be any parking on Bayside Road. **S. Toth:** Suggested 'no parking' signs along that section of Bayside Road; **S. Smith** stated it would be a Selectmen's purview. The Selectmen's preference would be no parking on Bayside Road. **M. Fougere:** There is a process, and it must come from the Selectmen.

**P. Endres,** responding to **S. Toth,** stated they were making strictly cider. **S. Toth** questioned the amount of off-gassing of ethanol that was involved with cider production. **P. Endres** explained there is zero; it is not applicable to what they were producing. Approximately 30 gallons of water was used to clean the tanks, which is done once a year. The cleaning process was explained; there is very little waste.

**P. Endres,** responding to **J. McDevitt,** pointed out the location for the events. The best location would be beside the silos; there is a large lawn area that connects into the barn. **J. McDevitt:** Was concerned



## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

about noise. C. Berry: The nearest neighbor is approximately 900 feet. Details regarding the proposed events and hours of operation were found on Page 3 of the plans (copy on file).

There were no further discussions from the Board; B. Dion opened the meeting to public comments regarding noise concerns. **Cynthia Armstrong**, 136 Bayside Road: Direct abutter; noise has never been an issue and P. Endres would handle if there was a problem. **Steve Vance**, 180 Bayside Road: Noise has never been an issue; P. Endres would handle if there was a problem. 250 people was more than expected and there may be some things that need to be discussed. S. Vance did not see any issues. **Anne Derzon**, 200 Bayside Road: They feel the same way and have enjoyed the events. Noise has never been an issue. There is very open communication.

B. Dion opened public comments to any questions. **Kirk Stone**, 126 Bayside Road: He has no concerns and traffic will be well taken care of; they have not experienced problems with noise. **Amy Bruno**, 47 Bayside Road: If 50 people left the events at the same time that were held three times a year, the light would keep them in front of their road; they had no concerns. **Ross Armstrong**, 134 Bayside Road: Had no traffic concerns. **Deborah Beck**: Questioned if the tasting room was still limited to two people because of the Cottage Industry approval. **B. Dion** noted that was currently in effect but would change. **D. Beck**: For three events per year, that would be a Selectmen's issue for a special permit. Were they required to have food with liquor sales? Was concerned they would be setting a precedent. She felt there was a lot to consider and voiced her concerns to the Board. **J. McDevitt**: Asked M. Fougere to explain the State statute regarding agritourism. **M. Fougere**: Noted New Hampshire was a very pro-farming state. The definition of a farm was very extensive. He referred to RSA 672:1 – Declaration of Purpose. **J. McDevitt**: At least 35% of the product would be from that property and confirmed by P. Endres.

C. Berry: Noted that P. Endres had a license to distribute cider and have a tasting room on site. He has a Beverage Manufacturing License. C. Berry stated that they live there and have two children. He revised his plans based on activity the P. Endres and C. Bartolini felt was too close to their home. **B. Dion**: The liquor license is regulated by an office at the State level. P. Endres explained that his license is designed for people who want to operate a tasting room; it is not a bar. He does not have a full license. They serve two 16 ounce pours to each customer and he has discretion. The food can be snacks. The alcoholic content of the cider is 6% to 8%. **D. Moore**: Questioned food at events; P. Endres responded that they would still be limited to two pours. They were proposing food trucks at their events. The type of events was discussed: private and community gatherings.

**Tom Gibney**, 352 Bayside Road: Noted that traffic has been backed up in front of his house to Stratham Lane. **J. McDevitt** noted the Board has been very vigorous in trying to have a corridor study done on Rt. 33 and the Winnicut River Bridge. He commented that he was happy with the application and supported what was being done; however, they had to consider the safety issue. **S. Vance** suggested a stop sign at the end of the driveway at the proposed project site. C. Berry had added one at that location and removed it at P. Endres' request; he did not want it to look like a commercial endeavor. They intend to have an attendant present for larger events. **F. Catapano** suggested a temporary stop sign to be put out during events.

B. Dion closed the meeting to public comment and returned to the Board for discussion of the waivers. C. Berry reviewed the waivers (copy on file).

B. Dion reopened the public comment for a resident who was overlooked. **Shawn Meehan**, 7 Grove Street: Very much in support of P. Endres and C. Bartolini, their project and entire ecosystem. This will

## **DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

be a tremendous asset for the Town; there are not enough gatherings. The property and its history is unbelievable. He could not think of two better people to take on this responsibility. **D. Beck:** Questioned if approved, it was forever even if the property changed hands. **S. Smith** clarified that it was an agricultural use in a residential zone; it was not a commercial use.

B. Dion closed public comments and returned to the Board.

### **Waiver #1**

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section IV: Application Procedures and Requirements, Subsection 4.2.2 – Exhibits Required at Time of Submission, Item E: High intensity soils information with sewage disposal and lot size calculations. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

### **Waiver #2**

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section IV: Application Procedures and Requirements, Subsection 4.3.1 – Existing Data, Item C: Boundary lines of the site; Item D: Existing Conditions plan of the site showing nature's features; and Item K: Soils map. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

### **Waiver #3**

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section IV: Application Procedures and Requirements, Subsection 4.3.2 – Proposed Plans, Item A: Proposed grades, topographic contours; Item J: Surveyed property lines; Item L: Any other exhibits or data; Item N: Plans drawn to scale. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

### **Waiver #4**

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section IV: Application Procedures and Requirements, Subsection 4.3.2 – Proposed Plans, Item F: Refer to Subdivision Regulations, Section V – Erosion and Sedimentation Control Standards; and Subsection 5.15 – Stormwater Management and Erosion Control: Refer to Subdivision Regulations, Section V – Erosion and Sedimentation Control Standards. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

### **Waiver #5**

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section V: Design and Construction Requirements, Subsection 5.1 – Access Design, Item F: Paved parking areas and drives. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

### **Waiver #6**

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section V: Design and Construction Requirements, Subsection 5.3 – Landscaping and Screening. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

### **Waiver #7**

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section V: Design and Construction Requirements, Subsection 5.8 – Sidewalks. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED



## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

### Waiver #8

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section V: Design and Construction Requirements, Subsection 5.10 – Lighting, Item E: Exterior Lighting Illuminance Levels. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

### Waiver #9

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section V: Design and Construction Requirements, Subsection 5.11.3 – Parking Specifications and Subsection 5.11.4 – Parking Areas and Access Drives. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the Site Plan Review for 150 Bayside Road (Map R17, 21: Residential Zone), according to the plan submitted by Berry Surveying & Engineering, dated September 20, 2023, File Number DB 2023-089, with the following conditions:

- (1) Pave entrance driveway apron 50 feet onto the property.
- (2) Maintain driveway culvert flooding.
- (3) Institute reservation system for apple picking operation; provide details to the Planning Board on how the program will work; details must be included on the plan.
- (4) Note proposed woodland buffer zone on secondary parking lot plan.
- (5) All buildings associated with the operation shall adhere to applicable Fire Code standards.
- (6) A maintenance plan shall be established for the proposed parking lots and noted on the plan.
- (7) Large special events, three per year, shall be limited to the spring, summer, and fall seasons; this note must be included on the plan.
- (8) The owner shall notify the Police Chief for each large event (three) to coordinate safety measures. The Chief shall determine the need for any police details needed at site entrance and/or at the intersection of Bayside & Rt. 33.
- (9) At the driveway entrance to Bayside, a moveable sign shall be posted during large events or apple picking openings noting a stop sign and no right turn. Such signage is only necessary when the property is open to the public.
- (10) Waivers shall be listed on the plan.

**This plan is consistent with the Town's Site Plan Review Regulations and Zoning Ordinance.** Second – D. Moore; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

### 4. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to approve the minutes of Thursday, October 05, 2023. Second – D. Moore; six in favor, two abstain (R. Winsor, F. Catapano). MOTION CARRIED

### 5. Consent Agenda

There were no items for the Consent Agenda.

### 6. Other Business

**Electric Vehicle Charging Regulation:** The proposed EV Charging Regulation was given to Board members. B. Dion recommended it be reviewed for the next meeting.

**GACIT Meeting:** B. Dion is drafting a letter to NHDOT regarding Rt. 33. S. Smith reviewed the GACIT meeting on Tuesday, October 24<sup>th</sup> in Hampstead. He informed Executive Councilor Stevens of what the Board was looking for in the corridor study. Greenland is not on the 10-Year Plan. B. Dion noted that public comment on the 10-Year Plan review opened on Friday, October 27<sup>th</sup> and would be accepted until Friday, November 03<sup>rd</sup>.

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

### 7. Work Session: Thursday, November 02, 2023

Items to be discussed include the CIP (SAU50 Facilities Manager will be at this meeting), Town Center Zone, Zoning Ordinance Amendments, EV Charging Stations, Subdivision Regulations Amendment.

### 8. Adjournment

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to adjourn at 9:30 p.m. Second – F. Catapano; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

NEXT MEETING
--------------

Thursday, November 02, 2023 – 6:30 p.m., Town Hall Conference Room

Submitted By: Charlotte Hussey, Administrative Assistant