



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, December 16, 2021 – 6:30 p.m. – Town Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Bob Dion, Stu Gerome, Steve Gerrato, John McDevitt, David Moore, Steve Smith (Selectmen's Rep), Frank Catapano (Alternate)

Members Absent: Catie Medeiros

Staff Present: Mark Fougere

Co-Chair Gerrato opened the Planning Board public hearing at 6:30 p.m. He announced a quorum was present and the meeting was being recorded.

1. Projects of Regional Impact

There were no projects of regional impact to discuss.

2. Subdivision of Land: 529 Portsmouth Avenue (Map U5, 9 – Commercial A Zone)
Owner/Applicant: Granite State Pioneer Group, LLC
The owner/applicant is proposing to convert the existing duplex into a condex.

The applicant requested a continuance to the meeting on Thursday, January 20, 2022.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to continue the Subdivision of Land, 529 Portsmouth Avenue, to the public hearing on Thursday, January 20, 2022. Second – S. Smith; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

J. McDevitt noted that this application has been continued for a number of months. He recommended the application be withdrawn until the applicant is ready to return to the Board. S. Gerrato suggested a regulation be written regarding the length of time an application can be continued.

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to withdraw the application for 529 Portsmouth Avenue. Second – F. Catapano; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

A letter will be sent to the applicant informing him that his application has been withdrawn by the Planning Board. He may resubmit his application and notify abutters once he has solid plans.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

3. Site Plan Review, Conditional Use Permit: 309 Portsmouth Avenue (Map R21, 65 – RCIM Mixed-Use District)
Owner/Applicant: SKA Properties 11, LLC – Sheree K. Allen
The owner/applicant is proposing to add a parking display area ancillary to the existing automobile dealership.

The applicant requested a continuance to the meeting on Thursday, January 20, 2022.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to continue the Site Plan Review, Conditional Use Permit, 309 Portsmouth Avenue, to the public hearing on Thursday, January 20, 2022. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor.
MOTION CARRIED

4. Site Plan Review, Boundary Line Adjustment, Voluntary Merger, Conditional Use Permit
Address: Off Tower Place/Maple Drive; Vicinity of Magnolia Lane, Sunnyside Drive (R7, 3 – Zones: Residential, Wetlands Conservation, Aquifer Protection)
Owners: Community Congregational Church (R7, 3), Homewood Farm Realty Trust (R8, 16), Philbrick-Vickery Tower (R8, 17), Elaine Grover (Easement - R7, 61), Margaret Bell (Easement -R7, 61), Linda McGurin (Easement - R7, 57), Rebecca Eastman (Easement – R7, 57)
Applicant: Joseph Falzone
The owners and applicant are proposing an age-restricted development: 47 units, club house, and approximately 3,100 ft. of new road.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to continue the Site Plan Review, Boundary Line Adjustment, Voluntary Merger, and Conditional Use Permit for Off Tower Place/Maple Drive, Vicinity of Magnolia Lane, Sunnyside Drive to the public hearing on Thursday, January 20, 2022. Second – B. Dion; all in favor.
MOTION CARRIED

5. Site Plan Review: 150 Bayside Road (R17, 21)
Owners: Peter Endres and Claudia Bartolini
Applicant: Peter Endres – Endres Brothers, LLC dba Bird Dog Cider Co.
The owners and applicant are proposing a Cottage Industry that involves the production and retail sales of packaged alcoholic hard apple cider.

Peter Endres, co-owner, addressed the Board. Also present was Claudia Bartolini, co-owner. They purchased the property approximately two years ago. Their goal is to run an apple orchard and to incorporate cider production into the farm business. Improvements have been made to the 1950's dairy barn, which is where the cider production will be housed as well as the tasting room and sales. P. Endres is licensed with the Federal Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau and New Hampshire Liquor Commission. The New Hampshire license is a wine manufacturer's license because he is fermenting fruit.

P. Endres anticipates selling cider to local restaurants and shops; retail sales on the premises will be a key part of the business. Cider will be sold in 750ml bottles, and potentially, growlers. P. Endres is currently outsourcing apples from his father's farm in New York; he has ordered 525 trees and will be planting in the spring. The Cottage Industry he has applied for will allow him to sell product. P. Endres stated he feels he meets the requirements of a Cottage Industry and reviewed those for the Board.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Under P. Endres' New Hampshire license, tastings are allowed. Tastings are limited to 2-ounce tastings per label or one 5-ounce tasting with a second 5-ounce tasting possible with food; food is not planned at this time. P. Endres emphasized that tastings are strictly limited and this will not be a bar.

P. Endres noted they are keen on being good neighbors. They plan to live in Greenland for a long time. Their goal is to build the business as an attraction within the community. He has met with several of their neighbors hoping to address their questions and concerns.

M. Fougere explained that the waiver request in the Site Plan Review requires an engineered drawing by a surveyor or engineer. A waiver has been requested because there is no new construction. The existing structures on the property will be used. It is a 45-acre property and the building is well off the road. There is a parking area next to the barn. A waiver of the full Site Plan requirement is requested.

Debbie Beck, 524 Bayside Road: Questioned the use the applicant was applying for under Cottage I or II. She did not understand where it was allowed under Cottage I and II. She felt he was asking for a door to be opened for a major retail operation eventually. Board members responded he was applying for a Cottage Industry and it was very limited. D. Beck responded that a Cottage Industry provides a service. M. Fougere explained he did not see it anywhere in the definition that the proposed use was not allowed. There was no Cottage Industry I and II; it is only Cottage Industry. The definition is 'an occupation or business activity' and is very broad. There was a discussion of alcohol. If a brewery was being proposed, it would not be allowed; it is not a brewery. J. McDevitt noted the applicant met the criteria for a Cottage Industry. M. Fougere stated that the applicant was requesting a Cottage Industry because there are no trees on the property. The goal is to produce on site. When that happens, they will move from a Cottage Industry to agricultural use, which is allowed in that zone.

MOTION: S. Smith moved to grant the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section IV – Application Procedure and Requirements, Subsection 4.2 – Formal Application Review Process. Second – D. Moore; six in favor, one opposed (B. Dion). MOTION CARRIED

B. Dion clarified that he was not opposed to the business. He was opposed to how the Board was doing what it was doing. The waiver request covered the entirety of Subsection 4.2; it should not. It should cover Section 4.2.2 only. P. Endres stated there were a variety of drawings required. B. Dion explained he did not want the applicant to have to provide a survey. B. Dion suggested limiting the waiver to Section 4.2.2 and require the remainder of Section 4.2. P. Endres explained the intent of the waiver request dealt with the engineering and drawings. B. Dion did not have a problem with that request; the Board should have been more specific when granting the waiver to exactly what P. Endres wanted.

J. McDevitt noted that he had a concern with a small Cottage Industry paying the fees required in Section 4.2.3. That was his reason for approving the request with a blanket waiver.

MOTION: S. Gerome moved to accept the application for 150 Bayside Road (R17, 21) as complete. Second – D. Moore; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

B. Dion: P. Endres noted the drawing depicted the arrangement of the downstairs; there is a loft space that was not shown. P. Endres pointed out the small retail space. There is a main garage door entrance and parking area. He also pointed out the production area, noting it was not fully built out. P. Endres noted which area would be used for the Cottage Industry. There are currently four tanks. Cleaning tanks was discussed. There is a drainage system in the barn from when it was built in the 1950's; it is functioning and being utilized. An oxygen cleanser

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

and water are used to clean the tanks. A food-grade sanitizer is used in a very limited amount; it is a bio-safe organic product (Star San). A small quantity is used during the last part of cleaning the tank. B. Dion was concerned about what happens as the business grows and there are additional tanks, more Star San would be going into the waste products. P. Endres stated that to clean one tank, a 5-gallon bucket is used for the last step in the process; 1-ounce of Star San is put into the 5-gallon bucket. To clean the tanks this year, P. Endres stated he would use under 10-ounces of Star San. He felt what he has now is adequate as the quantities increase; he will look into it further if the Board has concerns. B. Dion asked P. Endres to 'keep it on his radar'. B. Dion was not concerned now; more Star San would be used as the business grew. P. Endres stated there is a leach field that was developed as part of the original construction of the barn. B. Dion did not want quantities of acid put into the soil in the future.

P. Endres noted that the entire property is under a conservation easement with The Nature Conservancy. There are restrictions under the easement that he must comply with. P. Endres stated that Star San is commonly used across several food-grade production facilities, cideries, etc. J. McDevitt commented that everyone in the area is on wells and he would be interested in more information as the business grows.

Responding to a question from B. Dion, P. Endres stated he is trucking in cider. At this time, he has no intention of pressing on site. P. Endres explained cider is brought in by truck in totes; a tote is 275-gallons and weighs approximately 2,500 pounds. Delivery would be made by a box truck or tractor-trailer two to three times a year.

J. McDevitt: Questioned the number of apple trees P. Endres expected to plant. P. Endres felt he could support his business with five acres of trees (800 to 1,000 trees per acre). He plans to plant high-density trees similar to dwarf apple trees on a trellis. Total trees: approximately 5,000 trees that are 10 ft. tall. It would be more similar to a vineyard than a traditional apple orchard. P. Endres does not plan any type of irrigation at this time. The conservation easement with The Nature Conservancy does allow agriculture; however, crops must be grown certified organic. The Nature Conservancy has developed a program for the property that involves only certified organic agriculture.

D. Moore: Questioned the use of pesticides and fertilizer. P. Endres responded that he was not saying no pesticides; they have to be certified organic. He does not plan to use fertilizer.

S. Gerome: Future growth will require a full site plan and review, including septic.

S. Smith: In favor of the proposed use and felt it was a good plan.

D. Moore: Questioned supplying restaurants and retail. P. Endres stated there will be a wholesale aspect to what is done and he will be delivering, not using trucks.

S. Gerrato opened the hearing to public comments. Bob Grodan, 272 Bayside Road: Concerned about traffic. Felt the project was a great idea. The leach field under the barn should be looked at to make sure it is working properly. B. Grodan was also concerned about the water table; everyone in the area is on wells. Questioned if P. Endres would have to come back to the

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Planning Board if he expanded his business. P. Endres stated he does not plan to press apples on site and there will not be any mash.

Several abutters spoke in favor of the project and what it will do for the community and agriculture. D. Beck, Bayside Road: Stated it was not agriculture, it was a hay farm being transferred into an orchard (she was fine with that). She was concerned it would become a party farm or wedding destination. It is a residential zone and agriculture is allowed; it is not agriculture. You cannot sell something you are not producing on site. The Planning Board was allowing the Cottage Industry. Another door was being opened to other situations that will cause traffic and noisy neighborhoods. It is a beautiful farm that is protected by easements and is not something that is necessary.

S. Gerrato closed the public hearing and returned to the Board for further discussion. F. Catapano agreed with abutters: there would not be an increase in traffic. Currently it was not an agricultural use; once trees were planted on-site, P. Endres would be in compliance with the Ordinance. Personally, he was in favor of the project. S. Gerrato stated he was concerned with the leach field and the acid. He would like it checked and perk tests done to see if it leaks. There was a discussion about the culvert at 150 Bayside Road. P. Endres will check the culvert.

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to approve the Site Plan Review for Cottage Industry at 150 Bayside Road per Greenland Zoning Ordinance Article III – Establishment of Districts and Uses, Section 3.7 – Supplemental Use Provisions, Subsection 3.7.1 – Cottage Industry, with the following conditions: The Cottage Industry will comply with the use restrictions in Subsection 3.7.1C; the applicant will not exceed the vehicle regulations as listed in Subsection 3.7.1D; there will be no parking within a paved portion of the street or public right-of-way; business activities will be conducted completely within an accessory structure (existing barn) located on the same property by a resident of the dwelling; business activities will be subordinate to the residential use, and will occupy less than 1,000 sq. ft. of the barn; no more than two people can travel to the site at the same time or similar times; no more than three people can be conducting activity at the location at the same time; there will be no modifications to the residential structure or any outbuilding that is not customary for such a structure in the neighborhood or zone as a result of the Cottage Industry; the Cottage Industry will not produce offensive dust, electrical interference, fumes, lights, noise, odor, smoke, refuse matter or other environmental contaminants; there will be no materials or products stored outside that are visible from the street or any abutting residential property; and the applicant must obtain an occupancy/use permit from the Building Inspector prior to commencement of the Cottage Industry use. Second – S. Smith; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

- | |
|---|
| <p>6. Site Plan Review: 597 & 603 Portsmouth Avenue (U6, 1 & U6, 3 – Commercial A Zone)
Owner: 603 Seacoast Residential and Commercial Development
Applicant: One Home Builders LLC
The owner and applicant are proposing a 6,500 square foot two story commercial building with associated parking, underground utilities, municipal water, and on-site septic disposal.</p> |
|---|

S. Gerome and F. Catapano recused themselves from this portion of the meeting.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Christian Smith, Beals Associates and representing the owner and applicant, addressed the Board. They were looking for input from the Board in order to resolve some of the concerns mentioned in the Altus Engineering letter. C. Smith reviewed the letter with the Board.

C. Smith felt the most important item dealt with determination of the Aquifer Protection Zone boundary; Altus Engineering deferred to the Planning Board. Greenland's official aquifer map shows the two properties completely outside of the Aquifer Protection Zone and agrees with UNH's Grant website. When the map was entered into the Town's GIS system it was shifted slightly. The on-site soil testing does not indicate aquifer soils. D. Moore questioned why this was being discussed when two sources indicated the property was not in the Aquifer Protection Zone. C. Smith responded that Altus Engineering deferred to the Planning Board. Maps shown by C. Smith were prepared by Rockingham Planning Commission, NH Office of Energy and Planning, DOT, and NH Granite.

Altus Engineering agreed the test pit results indicated the soils were not aquifer soils but was looking for direction from the Planning Board and that they agreed it was not aquifer soil. M. Fougere noted that the original aquifer map is based on US GPS data from 1988; all the aquifers in the State were done at that time. Two sources indicated it was not in the Aquifer Protection Zone. The consensus of the Board was that properties were not in the Aquifer Protection Zone.

Item 9 – 50-foot structural setback to the wetlands: Man-made wetlands do not have a setback. Gove Environmental Services looked at the wetlands; it is a ditch that runs almost parallel to Bramber Valley Drive, and it appears to be man-made. M. Fougere and the Board agreed it was a man-made ditch.

Item 10 – Conditional use approval required to accessways, drainage and utilities in the 50-foot wetland buffer: See 'Item 9' above.

Item 11 g – Show size and type of existing mains: C. Smith has contacted Portsmouth Water Department but has not received the information. They will continue to research.

Item 13 a – Show spot grades where slopes are less than 5%: Spot grades were added where it was less than 5%. Altus recommended additional spot grades be added to all pavement corners. Beals Associates has updated the plans.

Item 13 b – Show type and size of proposed utilities: The information was added to the plan. The utility will determine the size of the conduit for electrical and communications. The water service should be resolved with information from Portsmouth Water Department.

Item 13 d – Show proposed lighting: Site lighting is proposed to be limited to building mounted dark sky compliant wall packs. Altus would like parking lot illumination shown and proposed fixtures specified. F. Catapano may install one or two lamp posts. Lamp posts will be specified on the plan. All lighting will be night sky compliant, downward shielded; cones of illumination will be added. M. Fougere noted that the Ordinance requires a lighting plan.

Item 13 e – Boundary monuments added to the south property line and monument along the north property line replaced: Beals has added the requested information to the sheet.

Item 14 – All required permits should be listed on the plan: Altus would like the EPA, NOI and SWPP listed as required permits on the plan.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Item 15 – Plans should show pedestrian access, areas for loading and emergency and fire vehicle access: Altus recommended the plans be reviewed by the Planning Board, Police and Fire to determine if more structured pedestrian access is warranted. C. Smith explained sidewalks with an ADA compliant tip down are proposed as well as crosswalks at both entrance locations. M. Fougere: Does the Board see the need for a crosswalk from the sidewalk on Bramber Valley Drive to the site? The consensus of the Board was there should be a painted crosswalk.

Item 17 – Vegetated screening required for the residential property to the south: Altus requested that the plans specify the type and quantity of plants added to the plan. C. Smith stated that plantings have been added to supplement the existing tree cover. The applicant is in discussion with the abutter regarding plantings and vegetation management. They had discussed a 6 ft. vinyl fence and removing some of the pines.

Item 18 – Plans need to demonstrate compliance with requirements for trees on the commercial site: Based on the Ordinance requirements, there are 212 existing trees plus trees that will be planted. A buffer is required between a commercial and residential property. The applicant and abutter are working together on the buffer (see Item 17). M. Fougere is working on amending this requirement. He felt it was unclear based on the grading plan how many trees will remain. M. Fougere recommended a waiver for the number of required trees.

Item 20 – Plans need to depict snow storage; it needs to be outside of the APZ: C. Smith stated it has been confirmed that the site is not in the APZ. C. Smith noted the snow storage area on the plan would be between the trees. F. Catapano understands that landscaping damaged due to snow removal will need to be repaired. F. Catapano stated that his snowplowing contractor notifies him when snow has reached capacity on site, and it will be removed; they have snow storage off site.

Item 21 – Detail ADA accessibility; accessible parking spaces should be located more closely to the center of the building: C. Smith pointed out the handicapped access; details are included on the Detail Sheet. F. Catapano noted that handicap parking may have to be shifted slightly; Altus wanted it towards the center of the building. M. Fougere noted that the septic plan shows handicap parking at the end of the building; it has been corrected.

Item 22 – Noise study: There are no speakers proposed in the drive-thru areas. This will be noted on the plan.

Item 28 – Provide architectural floor plans: The applicant is in the process of working with prospective tenants and completing architectural drawings.

Item 29 – Traffic circulation, parking access and egress is poor with cars queued at one end of the drive-thru: Altus recommended the applicant rethink vehicle parking and circulation. The applicant has reviewed the layout with the traffic engineer. They feel the current layout is the safest to provide adequate queueing and to keep the pass-thru aisle clear of vehicle conflict. M. Fougere did not feel it was a concern for this site. The consensus of the Board was that the traffic engineer did not have to meet with them.

Item 30 – Strip mall developments are discouraged in favor of L- or U-shaped buildings: C. Smith stated that an L-shaped building would create more parking problems. This is not a strip mall.

Items 31 and 32– The Board should consider a performance guarantee (bond) and performance surety (bond) for maintenance of the site: C. Smith stated this is private site plan; a full-on site plan bond

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

seems unnecessary. A reclamation bond could be used for landscaping if the site was not developed. M. Fougere noted that a landscape bond is required; a site bond is discretionary. B. Dion clarified that the amount of the bond is discretionary and could be adjusted for what is being done. M. Fougere added that the 'Planning Board may require' and it was done on a case-by-case basis. S. Gerrato did not feel a bond was necessary. The consensus of the Board was that a bond was not necessary other than the required landscape bond.

Item 39 – Show existing catch basin at the northwest corner of the site will continuer to collect stormwater behind the curb: C. Smith pointed out the existing location of the catch basin. They are proposing to jog the curbing and leave the basin in its current location. Altus is recommending they straighten out the curbing and move the catch basin. F. Catapano suggested removing the cobblestones, repaving that section, and adding a line. The extra room for someone turning in would be beneficial. The purpose of the indentation is to keep the water running against the curb, getting it to the catch basin (similar to a funnel). Altus' concern was that it would get clogged by snow. C. Smith commented that if it was clogged by snow, it was not raining. When it was warm enough, the snow would melt into the catch basin grate. M. Fougere asked if the catch basin would have to be moved or if the grate should be widened. C. Smith responded that it was too far from the granite curb and would have to be moved and a section of pipe cut and brought up flush with the granite curbing. After discussion about the location of the catch basin, the consensus of the Board was to leave it as is.

J. McDevitt: Questioned if the engineer had a problem with the cobblestone on Portsmouth Avenue when making a left-hand turn into the proposed project. Could that be a turning lane? C. Smith responded there could be enough room for a bypass lane; there may not be the full 12 ft. S. Smith added the elbow was only about 6 ft. round. C. Smith stated the engineer located the entrance where vehicles would get by the cobblestones before making the left.

Item 46 – Purpose of the concrete area at the northwest corner of the building: C. Smith explained the concrete pad was for employees to sit outside during the nicer weather. F. Catapano further explained the intent was to give the area a village feel.

Item 52 – Plan needs to be prepared and stamped by a licensed engineer: Because the property is not in the APZ, this item goes away.

Item 53 – The designer needs to show how the hydraulic loading of 2,060 gallons per day was calculated and based on what uses in the building: The septic designer used 458 meals to max out the lot loading of the parcel.

Item 55 – Pavement patch and sidewalk with granite curb detail for the repairs needed on Bramber Valley Drive: Altus requested the detail show a minimum of 4 inches of pavement in the patch (2-inch binder and 2-inch wearing); the gravel base should be a minimum of 16 inches. This has been added as requested.

Item 56 – Provide concrete sidewalk and granite curb details for the new section along Portsmouth Avenue: A vertical granite curb detail has been added in addition to the sidewalk detail.

Item 58 – Details for signs: Sign details and dimensions based on MUTCD have been added.

Item 59 – Further details regarding the granite pad; Altus recommended the installation of bollards; C. Smith explained that Altus was referring to the dumpster pad, which will be precast. There will not be a frost wall or footings.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Item 60 – Water service detail: This has been corrected to show Type K copper.

Item 62 – Seeding mix for bioretention area: A note has been added specifying that the seed mix noted by an asterisk should be used.

Item 64 – Memorandum needs to address traffic circulation, traffic flow, sight distance, etc.: A sight distance evaluation was done by Steve Pernaw. A supplemental memo to the original traffic evaluation has been provided. The Board was satisfied with the information provided.

Item 68 – Proposed gas line is shown on the existing features plan: Has been removed.

Item 69 – Monument shown on south property line: Has been discussed; shown on all sheets but only noted on Sheet 4.

Item 70 – Detail for proposed drop inlet: Detail for the bioretention drop inlet has been added.

Item 71 – Size and type of proposed water line: Will be added based on information from Portsmouth Water Department.

Item 72 – Curbing added to the west side of the paved parking and access for stormwater: Altus felt curbing would be needed in that location to direct the water into the sediment forebay. C. Smith felt it was depicted as super elevated in that location and should not allow any water to run into the green.

Item 73 – Grading appears to extend beyond the property boundaries for the sediment forebay and for the bioretention pond: See 'Item 72' above.

Item 74 – Text over text: These have been corrected.

Item 75 – Installation of perimeter drain: This note has been removed.

Item 76 – Test pit data: The bioretention pond has 9 inches of gravel and 3 inches of pea stone, which is the stone reservoir. It is all wash material and not just gravel. The bioretention media is above that. The DES requirement is that the foot below the filtration media not a foot below the stone reservoir. C. Smith will discuss this with Altus.

Item 77 – Drip edges: C. Smith will recalculate the drip edges between the walkways and the building.

Item 78 – Sediment pond peak stormwater elevation: C. Smith will look at that issue. It is not a difficult fix; the water may be held back too much from getting into the bioretention basin.

Item 79 – Proposed watershed plan: This is located in the drainage study. It does not show the flow paths because they are so short. The typical minimum time of concentration is 6 minutes. When it is direct entry 6 minutes, any other line that could be drawn where the water will flow would be less than that. C. Smith stated it did not make sense to add flow paths; he will discuss this with Altus.

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to continue the Site Plan Review for 597 & 603 Portsmouth Avenue (U6, 1 & U6, 3 – Commercial A Zone) to the public hearing on Thursday, January 20, 2022. Second – B. Dion; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

S. Gerrato opened the hearing to public comments. Tom Clark, Bramber Valley Drive: They have talked to F. Catapano about their concerns. T. Clark recommended talking to the Post Office about the mailbox type and location. A combined unit and location must be approved by the Postmaster in Portsmouth. F. Catapano and C. Smith explained the purpose of the bioretention pond. The parking lot will be conventional pavement. The projected start time would be April or May, depending on when the Planning Board approves the project and the weather. The site work will probably take 30 days to 45 days; projected completion would be five months.

There being no further public comments, S. Gerrato closed the public hearing.

7. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes was continued to the next meeting.

8. Approval of Invoices

There were no invoices to approve.

9. Other Business: Draft Zoning Ordinances

M. Fougere reviewed the draft Zoning Ordinances.

- Amend Article III – Establishments of Districts, Section 3.6 - Table of Uses, Item 10 – Multi-Family in the CA District, from an allowed use by Special Exception to a use by Conditional Use Permit through the Planning Board.
- Amend Article XIX – Age Restricted Housing, to require 20% to be affordable housing. Affordable would be defined as currently in the Ordinance. The Board felt 20% may be too high and agreed on 10%.
- Add Article XXIX - Impact Fees. This will give the Board the authority to calculate impact fees. It does not include sewer and water at this time. It covers roads, police, fire, capital facilities, schools, solid waste, recycling, the Library, etc. It also defines new developments, the creation of a new dwelling unit, conversion of a non-residential use to a dwelling unit, a new non-residential facility, or conversion of a residential to a non-residential use.

B. Dion clarified that this proposed Ordinance does not establish impact fees but rather allows the Board the structure to do it. M. Fougere stated that the Planning Board and Selectmen would establish the fees; it does not go to Town Meeting. Example: If this Ordinance passes in March, M. Fougere could write the fee structure for the Library and the Board could adopt it; it would take effect immediately. Impact fees would not apply to any project currently before the Board or grandfathered.

MOTION: S. Smith moved to forward the proposed adoption and/or amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to public hearing on Thursday, January 06, 2022, as amended. Second – D. Moore; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

At a previous meeting, B. Dion asked M. Fougere to check with RPC about accelerating improvements to Rt. 33. RPC recommended writing a letter to Councilor Janet Stevens and Dot Commissioner Victoria Sheehan about the concerns the Town has with the Rt. 33 Corridor. It was also suggested that Greenland highlight the recent letter from NH Fish & Game and DES about the bridge and fish ladder. That may help leverage the project forward. Preliminarily with the passage of the highway funds, 29 red-listed bridges will be funded through the federal funds and coming off the list. It should move

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

things forward on the 10-year Plan. RPC told M. Fougere that \$125,000 had been added over the last several weeks towards the Rt. 33 bridge design and includes the fish ladder. B. Dion noted that the bridge is not on the 10-year plan. M. Fougere reiterated that those were the suggestions from the RPC. B. Dion will write the letter and send to M. Fougere for review. S. Smith noted that NH State Senator Tom Sherman has also been working on this issue.

B. Dion recommended that the meeting on Thursday, January 20th be moved to a larger venue due to Tower Place being on the agenda.

10. Topics for Work Session: Thursday, January 06, 2022

There will be a public hearing for Zoning Ordinances and a work session on Thursday, January 06, 2022.

11. Adjournment

MOTION: S. Smith moved to adjourn at 8:57 p.m. Second – F. Catapano; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, January 06, 2022 – 6:30 p.m., Town Hall Conference Room

Submitted By: Charlotte Hussey, Administrative Assistant