



PLANNING BOARD

Town of Greenland • Greenland, NH 03840
575 Portsmouth Avenue • PO Box 100
Phone: 603.431.7111 • Fax: 603.430.3761
Website: greenland-nh.com

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

Thursday, April 16, 2015 – 7:00 p.m. – Town Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Chair Stu Gerome, Scott Baker, Courtney Homer, Chip Hussey, Rich Winsor, John McDevitt - Selectmen's Rep, Steve Gerrato - Alternate

Members Absent: Dave Moore

Staff Present: Mark Fougere - Consultant

Chair Gerome opened the Planning Board meeting at 7:07 p.m. A roll call was taken by the Chair; he announced a quorum was present and the meeting was being recorded.

1. Site Plan Review Modification: 1533 Greenland Road [R21, 55 & 55A]
Owner: Clan Murphy Limited Partnership
Applicant: Richard Landry, Thurloe Kensington Development
The owner and applicant are proposing modifications to a site plan approved in September 2014. The Tractor Supply layout on Lot B will be modified to move the location of the outdoor display area and the building, resulting in minor adjustments to the site layout. In addition, the retail/restaurant building on Lot A will be reduced from 8,000 sq. ft. to 7,200 sq. ft.

Ken Mavrogeorge, Tighe & Bond and representing the applicant, addressed the Board. The project was approved in September 2014. They were before the Board in March 2015 for minor modifications to the site plan. The most notable modification to the plan was swapping the outdoor display area of The Tractor Supply Store and the building itself. In addition, the building pads on the retail lot have been reduced.

Comments from the Town Engineer were addressed; Board members were given a response letter in their packets (copy on file). The applicant provided pictures of the fencing that was being proposed for Tractor Supply. Aluminum fencing would be used on the front of the outdoor display area, transitioning to the black vinyl fencing at some point on the side.

Rich Landry addressed the Board to discuss the fencing. There will be stone pillars with ornamental fencing along the front. There will be ornamental fencing approximately mid-way down the side (without the pillars), continuing to the back where it will change to black wrapped chain link fence. The fence will be 8' high all the way around and the stone pillars will be higher. Additional trees have been included for more visual screening: two in the front, one on the side. The total screening is approximately 20%.

M. Fougere stated that the outstanding issues had been addressed: technical issues that Altus Engineering had, clarifying the cross-hatched area on the side of the building, the fence detail, and signage for snow storage and the wetland buffer. The one remaining area of concern was the height of the outdoor storage area. There is a note on the last plan approved by the Board in September 2014:

within 20' of the fence materials can be stored up to 2' higher than the fence; further than 20' away storage can be 5' above the fence. That note contradicted the discussion at the March meeting where the Board felt it had to be no higher than the fence. S. Gerrato stated he was disappointed the storage area was being moved and was concerned about safety when tractors were being driven around.

Many Board members were concerned about the level of screening and visibility; a higher level of screening was discussed a length. The fence height will be increased to 10'; storage within the fence cannot exceed 10', another decorative post will be added on the side, and an opaque windscreen will be attached to the back of the fencing along the front and down the side, ending parallel to the coffee shop. The outdoor storage area is now narrower by 12'. The applicant requested a 4'x12'x30' storage area in the rear right hand side of the building to stack materials. There will be demarcation to mark that storage area.

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the site plan modification for the proposed commercial development at 1533 Greenland Road [Map R21, Lots 55 and 55A, in accordance with the plan by Tighe & Bond, dated April 25, 2014, last revised April 03, 2015, with the following conditions. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

- A detailed description of the fence on the plan;
- The fence is to include one to two additional posts to extend to the furthest point of the outlet from the coffee shop;
- There will be sufficient opaque screening behind the fence;
- A Landscape Construction Bond Estimate is provided and that the developer bond the landscaping for an amount equal to 20% of the cost of the plantings in accordance with the Site Plan Review Regulations;
- Sheets C-3 and C-4 be recorded at the Registry of Deeds; a note to be added to the plans that references the remaining plan sheets will not be recorded;
- The developer is proposing to install an ornamental fence to screen the outdoor display area; the limits of the fenced-in area and construction detail are to be incorporated into the plan set;
- The final permit numbers and dates are to be added to the plan set;
- The storage area closest to the building on the east side towards the back of the lot will be an area of 4'x30'x12', and will be permitted to exceed the 10' height for storage up to a total height of 12'; the area will be clearly marked on the ground as to the limits of the area and the demarcation of the building for the allowable height;
- The fence surrounding the exterior of the building may be up to 10' in height;
- Storage within the fence will not exceed the height of the fence except where noted above.
- All waivers, Conditional Use Permits, Conditions of Approval, Conditions Preceding (prior to final signing of mylar and recording of plans), Unique to the Site Plan Application, and Conditions Subsequent, granted on September 18, 2014, apply.

2. Site Plan Review: 75 Bramber Valley Drive [Map U7, 10]
3. Conditional Use Permit: 75 Bramber Valley Drive [Map U7, 10]
Owner: Edward H. Fillmore, Jade Realty Corporation
Applicant: Richard Green, Green & Company
The owner and applicant are proposing an Age Restricted Housing project consisting of 73 single-family condominium units. All proposed roadways will be privately owned and maintained with access to Post Road, which will be gated.

Chair Gerome recused himself, deferring to Vice Chair Winsor.

Joe Coronati, Jones and Beach Engineers and representing the applicant, addressed the Board. Also present were Steve Pernaw (Stephen Pernaw & Company), Amy Doherty and Jim Wieck (GZA GeoEnvironmental), and Richard Green (Green & Company).

J. Coronati brought the Board up-to-date on events since the March 19th meeting. They met with the Police Chief, Building Inspector and Planning Consultant regarding traffic concerns, including the possible connection to Vernita Drive and additional traffic on Portsmouth Avenue due to access from Post Road being emergency only. Slopes and grades from Bramber Valley Drive to Vernita Drive were reviewed; there is approximately a 10' elevation change. J. Coronati stated that the slope change was too much to overcome: it's a short connection with a lot of grade change. The Post Road connection may become a key card gated access, allowing residents to exit onto Post Road. With key card access, it would not become a cut-through. The Police Chief approved of that plan because it would alleviate some of her traffic concerns on Portsmouth Avenue. Emergency services would have the same key card access as residents. It was decided that the access to Vernita, due to grades, would no longer be needed.

The sidewalk from Post Road to the Library was discussed at length and a several times during the meeting. From Post Road to the Library it's approximately 1,200' of sidewalk; the development will have approximately 6,200' of sidewalk. An additional 1,500' of sidewalk will connect to the Portsmouth Avenue sidewalk.

S. Pernaw presented the traffic study to the Board, which included Portsmouth Avenue as the only point of access. There are approximately 20,000 vehicles per week on Rt. 33; the morning peak is 7:15 to 8:15 (1,775 vehicles), and the evening is 4:30 to 5:30 (1,900 vehicles). The study included traffic expected to be generated by Tractor Supply Company.

Based on ITD data, the projected number of trips from the development during peak hours is expected to be 16 in the morning and 20 during the evening. With Post Road as an access point, traffic should be reduced on Portsmouth Avenue. The impact on Rt. 33 is projected at less than 1%. After further discussion, S. Pernaw stated the development did not require any additional offsite improvements.

J. McDevitt asked M. Fougere his opinion of the traffic study. M. Fougere's response was that it was very thorough. Removing the teenage driving factor, the number of trips is greatly reduced. The entrance is onto an intersection that is overloaded during a two hour period; access to Post Road will help. Vice Chair Winsor asked about vehicle stacking at the Post Office and Rt. 33 during peak hours. S. Pernaw responded that the analysis stated eight vehicles (95th percentile queue), with more in the morning than evening. He continued that the net increase from the development over a one hour period would be minimal. If the development wasn't age restricted but 73 single family homes, the evening peak hour generation would go from 20 to 73. The peak hour for an age restricted development does not coincide with that of Rt. 33. ITD data, based on ARH developments of 65 and older, suggests that peak hours are from 9 a.m. to 10 a.m. or 10 a.m. to 11 a.m. S. Pernaw added that you could double the number of vehicles, and nothing would change. Vice Chair Winsor was not convinced about the projected number of trips during peak hours from a 73 unit subdivision. Vice Chair Winsor asked the Board for their thoughts on doing an independent traffic study; the general consensus was that because the numbers were so low, an independent study was not needed. C. Hussey stated that he couldn't support the project without the connection to Vernita Drive. Vice Chair Winsor was concerned about the traffic impact on Post Road; traffic calming would be needed.

Vice Chair Winsor opened the meeting to public comments regarding traffic. A member of the audience asked the car length from the gate to Post Road and if the same data would be used for a secondary

traffic study. J. Coronati responded that the gate would be parallel to the abutter's garage; when vehicles were entering they would not be in front of the house. They wanted the gate close enough to the road so vehicles could pull in if there was an issue, but not in the road where they might block the driveway. There will not be an area to turn around on the Post Road side of the gate; signage will be on both sides of the gate. They are submitting to DOT for the Post Road access, and a deceleration lane will be required; one has been designed up the side of Post Road. If someone needed to back up, they could do that in the deceleration lane.

J. McDevitt stated that he was not a fan of the sidewalks. He cited safety reasons for students crossing to the Maloney fields. He continued that the Library may not be there in the future. S. Gerrato pointed out that the Town would be responsible for sidewalk maintenance. The Board was in agreement with J. McDevitt and would prefer the money be used for traffic calming at the Post Road access. M. Fougere commented that there would be value in having sidewalks continue from the Post Road access gate to Post Road. J. Coronati noted it was gated access with low traffic; the last 300' should not be an issue without a sidewalk.

J. McDevitt suggested signage be placed in the area on the Post Road side of the gate rather than continue the sidewalk. M. Fougere suggested striping the road where the sidewalk ends to Post Road, saving 5' of width. Vice Chair Winsor felt it would be a heavily used sidewalk to Remembrance Park. R. Green suggested a "no thru" sign rather than a decorative sign; people may try to use that entrance if they saw a decorative sign.

Landscaping along the sidewalks near the Post Road access was briefly discussed. There was discussion about planting arborvitaes. It was suggested planting deer resistant vegetation may be the better option. The developer was willing to plant on the abutter's property if they were in agreement.

J. Coronati noted that there is a 25' landscape buffer around the property according to the ARH Ordinance. They can't comply with the landscape buffer in areas where there is a road and the land is not 50' wide. The Town Engineer suggested they would need to go to the ZBA; they requested direction from the Board. After further discussion, J. McDevitt suggested that the Town Attorney give the Board his opinion. M. Fougere will contact the Town Attorney.

J. Coronati commented that the regulations have been updated on several occasions. Their concern was which ordinance they complied with; the original application was heard in November 2014. Regulations prior to 2014 would be used. M. Fougere clarified that they would need a waiver from a road width of 24' to 22'; the 1% slope is okay.

The hydrogeological presentation was done by J. Wieck. A copy of the report is on file. The proposed development is located well within the aquifer protection zone; regulations require an evaluation of nitrate loading be performed.

Eleven borings with monitoring wells were installed at the site. Although there is some sand and gravel, it's largely similar to a marine clay type of silty material. The sequence of the site is sand, marine clay and glacial till. J. Wieck commented that some portions of the aquifer protection district may be incorrectly mapped; clays and silts are not considered aquifer materials. M. Fougere clarified an earlier question about the depth of the wells, which range from 10' to 54'.

Samples were collected for analysis of nitrate. The concentration of nitrate was found to be quite high, which could be attributed to the fertilizer used on the golf course; they anticipate levels to drop over the years. Nitrate concentrations in groundwater are typically well under 1mg per liter.

44 three bedroom units and 29 two bedroom units are proposed. J. Wieck pointed out the proposed locations of the units with conventional septic systems and those having advance treatment systems. S. Gerrato suggested all units have the advance treatment systems. J. Wieck responded that with their simulations they were trying to meet the requirements, and the cost is significant. J. McDevitt suggested that an independent review of the GZA report be done to confirm their findings; the Board was in agreement.

Vice Chair Winsor opened the meeting to public comments. Tally Westerberg, 15 Holly Lane: Agreed with S. Gerrato and felt the Planning Board should consider requiring advance systems in all houses in the development.

M. Fougere told the Board that with the GZA report the application was complete and could be accepted.

MOTION: C. Hussey moved to accept the application as complete for the age restricted housing development at 75 Bramber Valley Drive [Map U7, 10]. Second – S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

J. Coronati told the Board that a plan and profile had been done for the connection to Vernita Drive. It will be submitted for the next meeting for Board review. The Town Engineer and Police Chief will be asked to comment on the Vernita Drive connection for the next meeting. The Police Chief will also be asked to review the new plans with the Post Road access point and submit a written report for the next meeting.

Vice Chair Winsor summarized that the Board had given them feedback on traffic calming and the sidewalks at the Post Road access; the landscaping and buffer zone question would be sent to the Town Attorney for clarification; they would need to meet with the Town Engineer regarding his concerns; the hydrogeological study will be sent for independent review. J. Coronati told the Board that the locations of the two bedroom and three units would be included on the plans for the next meeting. Asked if nitrogen systems possibly sitting empty over the winter would be a problem, J. Coronati responded they would have to look into that.

MOTION: C. Homer moved to continue the age restricted housing development at 75 Bramber Valley Drive [Map U7, 10] to the meeting on Thursday, May 21, 2015. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

S. Gerome returned to the meeting as Chair.

4. TIF District and CIP Joint Work Session: Date to be Selected

The proposed date of the work session with the Board of Selectmen is Monday, June 01, 2015. J. McDevitt will suggest that date to the Selectmen. There was a brief discussion regarding the CIP; meetings will start in late summer. Chair Gerome suggested including road maintenance as part of the CIP. M. Fougere stated that there are engineering companies that will do an analysis of roads and submit a plan for what's needed, including an estimated cost and priority.

5. Appointment of Alternate

Continued to the work session on Thursday, May 07, 2015.

6. Topics for Work Session: Thursday, May 07, 2015

Chair Gerome asked the Board for any revisions to the Ordinance. Approval sheets were revised and will be available at work session for Board review.

7. Approval of Minutes: Thursday, March 19, 2015 and Thursday, April 02, 2015

Continued to the work session on Thursday, May 07, 2015.

8. Other Business

There was no other business to be discussed.

9. Adjournment

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to adjourn at 9:32 p.m. Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. ***MOTION CARRIED***

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, May 07, 2015 – 7:00 p.m., Work Session, Town Hall Conference Room

Respectfully Submitted: Charlotte Hussey, Secretary to the Boards

Approved: Thursday, May 21, 2015