



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, July 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, James Connelly – Alternate, Steve Gerrato - Alternate

Members Absent: David Moore

Staff Present: Mark Fougere - Consultant

Chair Gerome opened the Planning Board meeting at 7:00 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, 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; Vice Chair Winsor chaired this portion of the meeting. S. Gerrato and J. Connelly were asked to join the Board.

Joe Coronati, Jones and Beach Engineers and representing Green & Company and John O'Neal, addressed the Board. They have received the commitment to serve letter from the City of Portsmouth for water.

A plan was provided that showed the tree lines throughout the site. Trees along the border as well as approximately half the buffer trees will remain. Trees will be added to the buffer area and throughout the development. There will be street trees and landscaping in front of each home. J. Coronati pointed out which trees would remain. Landscape plans can be found on sheets L-1 and L-2 in the plan set dated 07.10.15, and includes the type of trees to be planted. M. Fougere noted that at the end of the short cul-de-sac there is a pit the Town uses for storage and suggested their landscape architect "beef up" that edge. J. Coronati stated they were going to approach the Town about stabilizing that area; J. McDevitt suggested they meet with the Board of Selectmen.

Vice Chair opened the meeting to public comment regarding landscaping. There being none, he closed the public session and returned to the Board.

MOTION: *C. Hussey moved to grant the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations Section 4.3 – Data Required, Subsection 4.3.1(d): Existing Conditions plan of the site showing existing natural features including watercourses and water bodies, wetlands, trees and other significant vegetation, topographic features and any other features which should be considered in the site design process. Existing trees*

over 6" in caliper at 4' above the existing ground elevation must be shown on the existing conditions plan. The landscape design must indicate which of existing trees meeting the stated minimum size requirement will be removed during the development. Second – S. Baker; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

The highway access plan for Post Road was discussed. They recently had a meeting on site with Jim Hewitt from DOT District VI. J. Hewitt was agreeable with the crosswalks on Post Road, but don't plan to do any repainting. J. Hewitt and the Town Engineer felt there should be a walkway through the park area to Park Avenue; a small flush area of asphalt is shown in the grass area of the park. This would allow easier access for someone walking across the park or being pushed in a wheelchair. To warn drivers of the crosswalk, there will be a LED embedded sign which runs off a small solar panel located at the top. It will be a bright yellow, push button sign and located on either side of the crosswalk.

Traffic calming on Post Road was discussed with J. Hewitt. The speed in that area is already posted fairly low due to the school; he was not willing to consider traffic calming measures: their goal was to move traffic not slow it down.

The gate on the Post Road side will be on a pedestal on either side of the proposed entrance and will reach out half way across the road; there will be a bar on both sides. Residents and emergency services will have a clicker to access the gate. The gate is on a battery back-up in case of a power failure and can be opened manually. C. Hussey was concerned about towns responding mutual aid accessing the development; the gate is siren-activated. The Board stated information about the gate should be keyed to the plan (model number, etc.).

The proposed location of the gate is parallel with the abutter's garage at U2, 28. J. Coronati asked the Board if the gate could be moved up 40' off the travel lane, at least two car lengths. The deceleration lane is 10' wide; someone turning into the entrance in error could back out into the deceleration lane on Post Road.

There were comparative traffic counts done with a similar ARH development in Dover; there was only one entrance. The counts were done over a 2 ½ hour period, on two days, from 7:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. The total on the first day was 22 trips leaving and five entering. The second day there was 26 exiting and eight entering. Although there were 13 fewer units, the results were similar to the traffic study for the Greenland ARH.

C. Hussey suggested raised crosswalks be used to slow down the traffic through the development rather than a gated entrance. R. Green responded that the road would be privately owned and insured; it may not be a good idea. The proposed deceleration lane is 10' wide and 100' long from the white line (not the edge of pavement), with a 10:1 taper. J. Connelly was concerned that two car lengths may not be enough for the gate, and suggested a "bump out" for turning around. J. Coronati responded that there was only 40' available. It was also suggested a "no parking" sign be posted near the deceleration lane.

J. McDevitt was concerned about the gate on the Post Road side. The purpose of the gated entrance was to prevent through traffic. A lengthy discussion about the gated access followed. It was suggested that the gate be at the Portsmouth Avenue side near the club house. J. McDevitt felt the crosswalks on the Post Road side were a good idea but cautioned about putting sidewalks through Remembrance Park; he will talk to the Board of Selectmen.

M. Fougere reviewed traffic numbers on Portsmouth Avenue: 11 cars exiting and a handful entering. On the Post Road side there were two leaving and one entering during peak hours. If doubled, those numbers were almost identical to the Dover numbers.

The consensus of Board was that the gated entrance on the Portsmouth Avenue side would be a better solution and would take care of many concerns.

J. Coronati presented the Board with several options for the Vernita connection. C. Hussey stated that because it was after the time limit and not reviewed by the Town Engineer, it should not be discussed. J. Coronati assured the Board that it would be reviewed by the Town Engineer; however, they were looking for a decision on the connection.

J. Coronati told the Board that the current owner wanted some protection on the commercial lot and the request for a Variance from the ZBA was denied. The applicants have had discussions with the owner about purchasing the commercial lot as well as the lot owned by his wife, which is wooded and has frontage on Bramber Valley Road. It is also a buildable lot on a private road. It is not part of the current application. If the applicants purchase those parcels, they will return to the Board with a Phase II plan for seven additional ARH homes, eliminating the commercial use. J. Coronati continued that if the road is made public, the land would no longer be contiguous with the golf course property and is less than 15 acres. According to the Zoning Ordinance, they would be prohibited from age restricted housing on those lots.

There was a lengthy discussion about the connection, and whether the road should be left private or made public. J. Coronati reviewed several options for the Vernita connection. All site work is manageable, and the intent was to get an answer from the Board on what was preferred. M. Fougere explained the process of transferring the deed to make the road public. The first straw vote: C. Hussey – public; S. Baker – public; R. Winsor – unsure; J. McDevitt – unsure; C. Homer – public; S. Gerrato – private; J. Connelly – public (four - public, one – private, two - unsure).

Vice Chair Winsor opened the meeting to public comments regarding the road. Tom Clark, 2 Bramber Valley Road: Would like to see the road become public. He maintained the road over the past winter, and it was difficult due to the snow. Trucks were in and out of the commercial property a couple times during the day. The area between the metal building and his land is wet. The Post Office access is dangerous and the connection would be an asset to the area.

There being no other comments, Vice Chair Winsor closed the public hearing and returned to the Board. After further lengthy discussion on public vs. private, another straw vote was taken: C. Hussey – public; S. Baker – public; R. Winsor – private; J. McDevitt – private; C. Homer – public; S. Gerrato – private; J. Connelly – private (three - public, four - private). R. Green clarified that the Board was going against the advice of the Town Engineer and leaving the road private. Vice Chair Winsor responded that based on the last straw vote, there was a high likelihood that the private road would be accepted if formally voted on at this meeting. J. Coronati added that anything happening on the other lots would be a separate application for Phase II.

James Wieck, Senior Project Manager for GZA GeoEnvironmental, addressed the Board. Added to their model was the discharge from the club house at 400 gpd. Also adjusted was the number of subsurface disposal systems. They are proposing that 47 units would have the advance treatment systems and 27 units would not. They do not exceed the 10 mg/l nitrate level at the property boundary as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

S. Gerrato questioned the perk test data done at 2 minutes, stating in past years that was not a buildable lot. Did the enviro-systems negate the 2 minute rate? J. Wieck responded that it was not part of the work they did to address the requirements of the aquifer protection district.

The report (copy on file) before the Board was similar to the original. J. Wieck added that the difference was the addition of the club house, things that were moved due to the water line and the number of enviro-septic systems. He continued that in an idealized world, as much treatment technology as possible would be used to reduce the amount of nitrate being discharged. Installing enviro-septic systems on all units would be a significant investment based on the cost. The current proposal meets the requirements of the aquifer protection district.

Danna Truslow, hydrogeologist with Truslow Resource Consulting, was asked by the Board to review the GZA hydrogeological report (copy on file). She has been in contact with GZA, but has concerns with the results of the model. There are plumes of nitrates that stop within 10' to 30' of the property boundary. D. Truslow suggested there are several septic systems that are not advance systems; she marked the locations that she felt should be advanced systems. They are either very close to the boundaries or add to plumes that are very close to the boundaries. To be protective of the resource, she recommended making those advance septic systems. She added that the entire site could be advance systems. The other option would be to keep the monitoring wells at the boundary and do monitoring on a regular basis for nitrate levels. D. Truslow felt the advance systems would be the best option. D. Truslow was asked if reducing the number of bedrooms from three to two was an option. She responded that it would change the amount of potential nitrate.

When asked by Vice Chair Winsor if the applicant would consider enviro-septic systems, J. Wieck responded that the proposed model meets the requirements of the aquifer protection district. D. Truslow suggested an additional 12 units be advanced systems and were three bedroom units. There was further discussion between D. Truslow and J. Wieck regarding the property boundary and the plumes. M. Green reminded those present that the high nitrate level was due to the golf course being fertilized on a regular basis for 20 years. The margin of error and accuracy of reports was discussed by D. Truslow and J. Wieck. The Board asked that both parties meet to resolve the issues before the August meeting. S. Gerrato stated that he has always been in favor of advance systems for the entire site; it has to be safe.

D. Truslow suggested the Board also consider salt usage. Some salt contains impurities, and a recent study indicates there has been an increasing change in water chemistry due to the amount of salt going into public water supplies. Salt levels have been increasing in the Greenland public water supply well. She continued that pervious driveways and parking lots are proposed in the development. With pervious pavement, salt usage could be reduced. Homeowners may not realize they don't need to use as much salt.

J. Coronati asked if the Board had any concerns with seven additional units in Phase II, eliminating the commercial use. Vice Chair Winsor responded that as long as it met the spirit and rules of the Zoning Ordinance it should not be a problem. It will be a separate application and will fall under the new ordinance and regulations. M. Fougere clarified that it will be an amendment to the approved plan as one lot.

C. Hussey stated that the Conservation Commission will be reviewing the project at their meeting on Wednesday, August 12. A list of topics will be sent to J. Coronati. J. McDevitt would like the septic system issue resolved by the August meeting.

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to continue the Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit for 75 Bramber Valley Drive to the meeting on Thursday, August 20, 2015. Second – C. Hussey; all in favor. **MOTION CARRIED**

Chair Gerome rejoined the meeting.

2. Stormwater Grant Timeline

M. Fougere told the Board that Greenland received the stormwater grant and the timeline was reviewed. The final plan must be submitted in April 2016. It will be an amendment to the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations and will not need Town approval. A more specific timeline will need to be established in August 2015.

3. Approval of Invoices

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the payment of invoices as presented (Fougere Planning & Development: \$878.75; Altus Engineering - \$2,755.85). Second – J. McDevitt; all in favor. **MOTION CARRIED**

4. Topics for Work Session: Thursday, August 06, 2015

- CIP: J. McDevitt would like to discuss plans for the CIP at the August meeting. He would like to see involvement by all departments.
- Zoning Ordinance Updates: The Board was reminded that Greenland is now an SB2, and deadlines will change. M. Fougere will have statistics for the Growth Management Ordinance ready for the August work session. He will also be meeting with the Building Inspector regarding his revisions.

5. Approval of Minutes: Thursday, June 25, 2015

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the minutes of Thursday, June 25, 2015. Second – C. Hussey; all in favor. **MOTION CARRIED**

6. Other Business

C. Hussey told the Board that the trails have been started.

7. Adjournment

MOTION: C. Homer moved to adjourn at 9:05 p.m. Second – R. Winsor; all in favor. **MOTION CARRIED**

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, August 06, 2015 – 7:00 p.m., Town Hall Conference Room, Work Session

Respectfully Submitted – Charlotte Hussey, Secretary to the Board

Approved: Thursday, August 06, 2015