



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 MEETING

Thursday, May 21, 2020 – 6:30 p.m. – Virtual via Zoom

Members Present: Frank Catapano, Stu Gerome, Steve Gerrato, John McDevitt, Catie Medeiros, David Moore, Bob Dion (Alternate), Steve Smith (Selectmen's Rep)
Staff Present: Mark Fougere - Consultant

Chair McDevitt opened the Planning Board public hearing at 6:37 p.m. A roll call was taken by the Chair; he announced a quorum was present and the meeting was being held virtually through Zoom and recorded by audio. A checklist to ensure meetings are compliant with the Right-to-Know Law during the State of Emergency was read into the record by Chair McDevitt.

Attendance of Planning Board members was taken by roll call: F. Catapano – aye; S. Gerome – aye; S. Gerrato – aye; J. McDevitt – aye; C. Medeiros – aye; D. Moore – aye; B. Dion – aye; S. Smith – aye.

- | |
|---|
| <p>1. Design Review: 177 Winnicut Road (Map R10, 12A)
Owners: Brian & Maria Beck
Applicant: 177 Winnicut Road, LLC
The owners and applicant are proposing a 19-unit age restricted housing development on approximately 16.7 acres.</p> |
|---|

Christopher Berry, Project Engineer - Berry Surveying & Engineering, addressed the Board. Also present with C. Berry were Troy Thibodeau and Brian Beck. They were proposing to develop 177 Winnicut Road into an age-restricted housing development according to the Town of Greenland's ordinance. They were before the Planning Board in February 2020 for a Preliminary Conceptual Review. C. Berry reviewed the revisions made to those plans.

The proposed roadway was originally further towards the north, into the wetlands and off-center of Meaghan Way. Also proposed were 21 units. DOT requested that the road be moved back across from Meaghan Way, causing a couple of units to be removed. The amount of infrastructure has been reduced; the top of the cul-de-sac is approximately in the same location. The gravel wetland at the front of the site is approximately in the same location. The infiltration basin to the south side of the road, opposite the gravel wetland, has changed in shape but has remained in generally the same location. The large rain garden at the back of the cul-de-sac remains the same.

C. Berry stated enough engineering detail was provided in the plan set to know that the design is generally solid from a stormwater standpoint. They are able to meet treatment volumes and peaks and volumes for the project site discharging to the Winnicut River. The location of the well has changed: rather than being at the back of the site and requiring an easement from the abutting landowner, the

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

well is now located at the front of the site in the open field. They are in the process of receiving approval from DES to drill the well in order to do the required groundwater analysis to do the flow tests; they have hired Mindy Messner, professional geologist. They are hoping to have the technical information available for the plan submission phase.

The Board received a traffic analysis at the meeting in February. The number of trips coming and going from the site during peak hours is de minimis: the original analysis indicated five to six trips in the morning and afternoon. Since they have reduced the number of units to 18, the number of trips would drop slightly. The analysis will be updated with the plan set.

They have also filed with Fish and Game relating to the Winnicut River and the project site as well as the Division of Historical Resources. Victoria Bunker, archaeologist, has been hired to review the site and respond to the Division of Historical Resources.

At the February meeting, they discussed using an aeration system to reduce the amount of nitrogen entering the effluent disposal field. They have committed to using a system available for that function and it has been designed and implemented into the project plan. Given the sensitivity and proximity of the Winnicut River, it has been proposed that the aeration system be used while keeping the effluent disposal field the standard size as part of the NHDES submission; there will be an extra layer of protection reducing nitrogen of the actual field.

Chief Laurent, Greenland Police Department, has reviewed the project (copy on file). C. Berry stated they agreed that the road being aligned with Meaghan Way was superior to the original proposal and felt they were in support. The applicant was working with Chief Cresta, Greenland Fire Department. Fire suppression systems in the homes are being proposed rather than a cistern on site based on the well production. The Fire Department did not wish to have a cistern on Winnicut Road as part of the project.

M. Fougere's review was discussed (copy on file). C. Berry stated the most important note was about the flood zone. The applicant is applying for a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) from FEMA. The study by FEMA consists of a complete stormwater analysis of a 100-year storm event of the Winnicut River and a HEC-RAS analysis of the Winnicut River.

M. Fougere stated the site was 15.3 acres; there will be 19 units including the existing single-family home which will be part of the age-restricted development. He noted the site abuts a significant stretch of the Winnicut River. The limited common area is shown around the perimeter of the units; the open space is outside of the LCA. The flood plain covers the existing home and a good portion is parallel to the river. The LOMA process will provide information on the accuracy, or inaccuracy, of the map. Many permits are going to be necessary including wetlands, Conditional Use Permit, review by the Conservation Commission, DOT permit, AOT for erosion control, State subdivision approval, septic, etc. M. Fougere continued that the density of the site needed to be clarified; the calculation includes the existing home. M. Fougere explained the net tract calculation according to Zoning Ordinance. It was his belief that the existing home should be removed; an accurate number should not include the home, its footprint and the driveway or other impervious areas on the property. It would not be consistent with how the ordinance is interpreted. Density also includes bedroom count: five bedrooms per net tract area. Additional landscaping should be looked at carefully, especially along the entrance. The ordinance requires landscaping along the perimeter; it borders the river on two sides. There is no landscaping proposed along the frontage of Winnicut Road. M. Fougere questioned the need for ledge removal.

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Chair McDevitt questioned if the existing structure met the requirements of Section 19.4 – Design and Architectural Specifications - of the Zoning Ordinance. S. Gerome stated that initially he thought there were 17 acres and would meet the standards without the house. C. Berry responded at the last meeting there was a discussion about why the house was not removed but not that it had to be removed. He continued that two acres would be removed by taking the house out of the development; the site would not conform to the Age-Restricted Housing Ordinance. F. Catapano noted that 60,000 sq. ft. needed to be removed, not two acres; M. Fougere responded that 15 acres was needed. They have 15.3 acres with the house. C. Berry stated that in the original plan set the net track calculation was not included.

S. Gerome stated that the LOMA should be one of the first steps in moving forward. C. Berry was quite confident that the line would move. Currently FEMA has the flood line along the top of the slope and through the field, which was not realistic. S. Gerome agreed it would probably be dramatically different, but it did not make sense to review anything without the LOMA. Sending the plan for review by Altus Engineering was discussed. C. Berry wanted to clarify some of the calculations before sending it for review; he felt it would be ready within the next couple of weeks. S. Gerome stated he did a LOMA further up the river and it was dramatically different. M. Fougere stated he requested that the engineer include the existing flood plain line until adjusted.

C. Medeiros felt it was a lot of density, especially abutting the Winnicut River. There were a lot of pending permits; it felt a little rushed that the Board was providing comments. S. Gerrato stated that the Planning Board could make a decision based on reasonable conditions. S. Gerrato noted that there was a tributary running almost through the center of the property to the entrance at the end of the road. C. Berry responded that the HEC-RAS analysis will contemplate what happens in that wetland area when the Winnicut River floods; that will be taken into consideration with the LOMA. S. Gerrato voiced his concern about the existing house being used for frontage for the development. The project invades the wetlands. S. Gerrato was also concerned about sprinklers rather than a cistern due to the possible water supply. He also discussed the well tests; M. Fougere explained it was an involved process. There will be studies on the adjoining properties to make sure the well did not impact their water supply.

S. Smith was concerned with the inclusion of the existing house and that the density calculations may be “off”. He hoped the builder was aware of the fire flow calculations of each unit if he was considering sprinkler systems; an intense amount of engineering was required. S. Smith suggested the builder might want to reconsider a cistern, even if it meant losing a lot.

B. Dion questioned the sizes of the septic systems. C. Berry explained that the systems are sized based on the perc rate on each lot; they may not be different sizes but different shapes based on the lot configuration. The systems will be sized to the standard DES required footprint for a pipe and stone system. The systems at the top of the slope are smaller because the soils and perc rate were better; the soils on the back side of the property are a little worse, the perc rates increase and the system needs to be a little bigger. B. Dion asked the minimum perc rate requirement. C. Berry responded that 60 minutes per inch is the point where the soil is unsuitable for effluent disposal. B. Dion questioned the weekday p.m. hour trips in the traffic study. C. Berry will check on the difference in numbers. B. Dion wanted the water test to happen so the Board knew there were not problems with the abutter’s wells.

Chair McDevitt noted the units were numbered incorrectly. C. Berry stated there were a number of QC/QA items that need to take place in the plan set.

F. Catapano stated he wanted to see the proposed LOMA line on the plan in conjunction with what is already there. He agreed with C. Berry that LOMA’s are normally approved based on real surveying on the site. F. Catapano agreed with the Board that the existing house does not belong as part of the

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

proposed over 55 subdivision; he would be fine with it being a community building. He asked if the applicant was going to clear the tree line along the abutter's property and plant new trees. C. Berry explained that area was sparsely wooded and close to their dwelling. It was an engineer's methodology for planting. Terrain Planning will look at how to plant inside the existing buffer and enhance the area. F. Catapano asked about the slope of the trail between units 14 and 15 connecting down to the existing trail; he thought it was a 'D' or 'E' slope. C. Berry will look at the slope but thought it was steep. F. Catapano commented that it may be a little tough for older residents in an over 55 development. C. Berry responded that in the final design they would likely traverse the slope a little. F. Catapano noted that the septic for unit 19 was not shown on the plan; the general location would be helpful.

Chair McDevitt asked if they were aware there was a firing range across the Winnicut River and if they had considered a sound barrier. He also asked if they had talked to the property owner. C. Berry responded they were aware of the firing range but had not taken the opportunity to talk to them. He will discuss some type of sound barrier with the applicants.

Chair McDevitt opened the hearing to public comments. Leonard Schwab, Winnicut Road, sent an email with concerns (copy on file). One concern was parking: M. Fougere stated that each unit had a garage with a parking area in front of the garage. D. Moore questioned the location of the club house. M. Fougere responded there was none shown; he will check the ordinance to see if that is a requirement. F. Catapano stated an aquifer was protected because it was a good water supply not because someone would run out of water. He did not think 6,000 gallons would impact the aquifer; a hydrogeologic study will indicate that. M. Fougere noted this site was not in the aquifer protection district.

Chip Hussey, Winnicut Road and direct abutter, had several questions: Were they planning to cut all the old growth—the oaks and the hickories. C. Berry responded that it had not been discussed with the developer. C. Hussey continued that 53 trees were being removed and he was looking at screening and keeping things natural. They were proposing 16 plantings according to the drawings; there was no description of what would be planted. He was recommending not planting a single species but rather multiple and increasing the size of the tree noted on the plan. He also asked who would be responsible if trees died. C. Hussey questioned why units 7 and 8 shared a septic system.

Laura Byergo, Conservation Commission Chairman, stated she would like to do a site walk. She noted that on Sheet 9 there was a small area of poorly drained land; was that a vernal pool? C. Berry responded that Cindy Balcius, Wetland Scientist, delineated the site; it does not have the features of a vernal pool. She will document her findings as part of the wetland functions and values analysis for the wetland permit. It was done within the last two months which was the appropriate season. L. Byergo was also concerned about the shared septic system for units 7 and 8. She noted that behind the houses on the river side limited common areas had been designated. She asked how that LCA would be managed—landscaped, planted, etc. C. Berry explained that the LCA was different from the common area. The LCA is generally restricted to the use of the property by the unit owner—it would be a lawn area around the house. The common area would be common to everyone and they would have the ability to use that area. They are working with Fish & Game on restrictions to most of the land: what can and cannot be done in that area. Most importantly to Fish & Game would be that no tree clearing would take place in that area. C. Berry further explained that where they ended the LCA was so that no homeowner would have the right to clear trees outside of their LCA. L. Byergo stated once again that she was very interested in a site walk. Chair McDevitt stated there were issues he would like to see resolved and have the plan reviewed by the Planning Board Engineer before a site walk. He was open to a site walk.

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Charlotte Hussey, Winnicut Road and direct abutter, asked if an irrigation system was planned on each lot and were water treatment systems going to be installed in the houses; that would be an additional draw on the wells in the area. They had run out of water before. C. Berry stated they had not discussed irrigation systems. When a public water supply system is done, there typically needs to be a water conservation plan produced through DES before a well is permitted to be drilled. That will either prohibit or severely restrict the water usage for a sprinkler system. They would not know what type of water treatment system would be required until a well is drilled. If required to treat, there will be a treatment system at the pump house; it would be designed as part of the water system. That would be included in the calculations of the draw down of the well. B. Dion stated that he has seen wells go temporarily dry, it was not pleasant and was his concern; it does happen.

S. Gerome asked if the Board should address the validity of the existing house before a lot of time was spent reviewing the application. Chair McDevitt stated there was an agreement among Board members that the existing house was a potential issue. He continued that if the house was part of the development, it would need to meet the criteria of Article 19; M. Fougere will research further.

Chair McDevitt stated that first and foremost, the mapping of the flood plain needed to be done. Altus Engineering needed to review a full set of plans before moving forward. The applicant needed to look at the vegetated buffer on the property line. They agreed Altus Engineering should review the plans; however, this was Design Review and they did not want to submit plans that were 80% complete. They hoped the Board understood they were taking the opportunity to use Design Review to “fetter out” concerns early and come back to address them fully. C. Berry explained the LOMA process and expects it to take 45 to 60 days once submitted.

D. Moore stated after looking at Section 19.3 in the Zoning Ordinance there may be some issues in the email from L. Schwab that may need to be addressed. M. Fougere will research those concerns further.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to continue Design Review to the public hearing on Thursday, June 18, 2020. Second – S. Gerrato; roll call vote: F. Catapano – yes; S. Gerome – yes; S. Gerrato – yes; J. McDevitt – yes; C. Medeiros – yes; D. Moore – yes; S. Smith – yes. MOTION CARRIED

2. Approval of Invoices

There were no invoices to approve.

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to approve the minutes of Thursday, May 07, 2020. Second – S. Gerrato; roll call vote: F. Catapano – yes; S. Gerome – yes; S. Gerrato – yes; J. McDevitt – yes; C. Medeiros – yes; D. Moore – yes; S. Smith – yes. MOTION CARRIED

4. Items for the Work Session: Thursday, June 04, 2020

M. Fougere is hoping to review a draft of the Facilities Chapter of the Master Plan with the Board. He noted that zoning passed at Town Meeting. S. Gerrato requested a review of the zoning passed at Town Meeting at the work session.

5. Other Business

Henderson Way: M. Fougere emailed D. D. Cook about the concerns of the Board with his project on Henderson Way. D. D. Cook stated he did follow the architectural elevations he showed the Board and one of the duplexes has been angled toward the street. The new Building Inspector started last week; he has been informed of the Board's concerns and will make a site visit. D. Moore stated the duplexes look like other Cook Builders homes. M. Fougere noted that elevations are part of the approval and are on the approved plans. S. Gerome added that the elevations were approved by the Board and are correct, and the duplexes are staggered.

Ciborowski Property on Breakfast Hill Road: Chair McDevitt stated that there was a "No Trespassing" sign posted on the Ciborowski property and the mountain bike trail was blocked off. The Board was informed that the property owner was concerned about liability on the trail. S. Gerome stated that the Rye portion was being developed and the Greenland side may possibly be developed.

6. Adjournment

MOTION: S. Gerome moved to adjourn at 7:49 p.m. Second – F. Catapano; roll call vote: F. Catapano – yes; S. Gerome – yes; J. McDevitt – yes; C. Medeiros – yes; D. Moore – yes; S. Smith – yes (S. Gerrato was disconnected from the meeting). MOTION CARRIED

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, June 04, 2020 – To be Announced

Submitted By: Charlotte Hussey, Administrative Assistant