



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, May 15, 2014 – 7:00 p.m. – Town Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Chair Stu Gerome, Chip Hussey, David Moore, Paul Sanderson, Selectmen's Rep Mo Sodini, Steve Gerrato - Alternate

Late Arrival: Rich Winsor

Staff Present: Dylan Smith – RPC Circuit Rider

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: 01 Bayside Road [Map R17, 3]
Owner: MMC Greenland, LLC
Applicant: MJS Engineering, PC
The owner and applicant are proposing to construct an additional 30' x 140' self-storage building adjacent to the existing storage buildings.

The applicant requested a continuance to the public hearing on Thursday, June 19, 2014.

MOTION: *M. Sodini moved to accept the request for a continuance of 01 Bayside Road to the public hearing on Thursday, June 19, 2014. Second – S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED*

2. Subdivision of Land: 319 Winnicut Road [Map R5, 3]
Owner: Patricia Johnson Revocable Trust
Applicant: Parkersville LLC
The owner and applicant are proposing a five lot residential subdivision development with an estimated 400' of roadway on approximately 15 acres of land.

Chair Gerome recused himself from this portion of the hearing, appointing P. Sanderson as Acting Chair. C. Smith, Beals Associates and representing the applicant, introduced himself to the Board. C. Smith addressed the minor outstanding items from the Town Engineer (copy on file). He distributed a Stormwater Management/BMP Operation & Maintenance to the Board, which referred to the final comment regarding the conditions of the Conditional Use Permit for the minor buffering impacts.

Item 4 – Location of Existing Utilities: Everything that could be found was shown. An exhaustive search of the Town's records was done, and an as-built couldn't be found; they were able to get a plan from PSNH. The underground power comes in from the opposite side of Vardon Lane; the transformer box adjacent to the proposed development is the end of the utilities. There is a sweep to the junction box across the street. They don't anticipate any problems with the pipe installation, etc.

Item 11 – All Existing Utilities Along Vardon Lane: Item 11 addresses the same issues as stated above; revised plans will be submitted to the Town Engineer within the next few days.

Item 12 – Roadside Grading: This was corrected in Plan View; the cross section has been updated and swales reshaped.

Item 13 – Connecting to Existing Utility Services: They were told by PSNH that utilities would be from the existing transformer to the north on Vardon Lane.

Item 19 – Drainage Easement for Bio-Retention Basin: C. Smith has spoken to the Town Engineer to confirm that he was looking for the Plan View scale to be larger. A 20 scale Plan View blow-up will be added underneath the typical section on the Detail Sheet.

Item 21 – Stop Sign Location: The scale of the symbol for the sign was approximately 15' in width; that has been corrected and reduced to 36". It is shown 6' off pavement and as close to the intersection as practical. It's now in conformance with MUTCD standards.

Item 25 – Bio-Retention Area to Seasonal High Water Table: The issue has been addressed and discussed with the Town Engineer. This is reflected in the revised plans and will be shown in the 20 scale Plan View.

Item 31 – Maintenance of Drainage Easements: Two remote swales were created at the rear of Lots A & B. These will be utilized to collect clean run off from the lots, diverting it away from the abutting parcels and keeping it on the locus parcel until it gets to the wetlands; the Town Engineer was in agreement. C. Smith stated that maintenance for a treatment swale should be annual inspections for debris and mowing during the summer, and the responsibility of the homeowner. Easements with 10' wide access down the property lines have been provided, allowing the Town to maintain them if necessary. The bio-retention pond, which is taking roadway run off and treating the roadway surface stormwater, is within the purview of the Town. If the Board is agreeable, C. Smith will notify the Town Engineer.

Item 32 – Building Envelope: These have been trimmed.

Item 33 – Subdivision Plan to Registry of Deeds: This has been done.

Item 34 – Construction Cost Estimate for Bonding: C. Smith provided to the Board; will be submitted to the Town Engineer with revised plans.

Item 35 – Class IV Concrete Pipe: Availability was confirmed with Scituate Concrete; documentation was provided to the Board.

Item 36 – Presentation Plan with Wetland Buffer Impacts Depicted: The Board was given a plan depicting the revisions as well as hatch and color of minor buffer impacts with associated grading.

Item 37 – Criteria for Conditional Use Permit to Impact Wetland Buffer: C. Smith reviewed the criteria; a copy is on file.

C. Smith told the Board he was in receipt of a letter from the abutters. Referring to their request for screening, the applicant is willing to provide it along the buffer. It may not be to the requested density, due to cost. However, the applicant is looking into permanent and evergreen vegetation at a more reasonable cost that should provide adequate screening.

The applicant has requested that Lot A, with the driveway directly off Vardon Lane, be issued a building permit prior to bonding the roadway. Acting Chair Sanderson responded that normal practice has been that building permits are not issued until a bond is posted for road construction. He continued that road construction isn't necessary to move forward with that lot. It was the consensus of the Board that the normal procedure be waived; if approved, a building permit for Lot A may be given prior to posting financial security for the construction of the proposed road.

D. Smith mentioned trees on the proposed road. C. Smith pointed out that they are included on the proposed plan and profile sheet. Shade trees will be placed at 75' intervals (approximately) along the proposed right-of-way. C. Smith referred them to Sheet 4 of 7 – Proposed Street Trees, which lists the proposed species of the five trees to be planted. They're hoping to keep some of the trees on the property.

D. Smith requested C. Smith further address the proposed buffer for the abutter. C. Smith stated that they were hoping to place tree line from the end of the drainage swale back and in keeping with the sketch done by the abutters (250' was not guaranteed).

Acting Chair Sanderson stated for the record that the Board had been discussing a letter received from Mr. and Mrs. Betournay, dated May 2014, indicating their continuing concerns:

- Safety concerns;
- Adequate screening;
- Hours of operation.

Acting Chair Sanderson opened the hearing to public comments. Mr. Betournay, abutter: Stated he appreciated the Board keeping their concerns in mind. In addition, he appreciated the applicants response and willingness to address those concerns. Mr. Gerome, Vardon Lane abutter: Asked that the area where the buffer was going to be planted be identified on the plan. He further requested that the area between the stone wall (starting on Winnicut Road, continuing onto Vardon Lane and entrance to Hickory Lane) and Town road be designated as a no cut area; C. Smith agreed that could be done. Both corners that front Vardon Lane are going to be newly monumented. There won't be a problem marking that out prior to construction. C. Smith pointed out that on Sheet 3 of 7 there is a note regarding trees to be preserved to the extent possible during construction. A note to mark the area prior to construction will be made, and a notation will be added to the plan.

There being no further comments, Acting Chair Sanderson closed the public hearing and returned to the Board for discussion. The application has been accepted as complete, there have been public hearings, comments have been heard from all interested parties, and any outstanding engineering issues have been addressed. D. Smith noted that the Conditional Use Permit was still outstanding.

MOTION: *M. Sodini moved to approve the Wetlands Conditional Use Permit, Section 18.6.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, for the proposed subdivision on Hickory Lane as requested by Beals Associates in a letter dated May 12, 2014. Second – D. Moore; five in favor, one abstain (R. Winsor). MOTION CARRIED*

A letter was received from the Fire Chief regarding the location of the cistern. His letter, dated May 12, 2014, indicated he reviewed the latest plans submitted by Beals Associates; he had no issues with the location of the cistern.

Conditions of Approval:

- No building permit shall be issued until the mylar is signed, with the exception of Lot A.
- Any and all state and/or federal permits shall be obtained and made part of the file.
- Any and all fees due the Town of Greenland and its consultants must be paid before the mylar is signed and recorded.
- Boundary monumentation must be included in construction cost estimate.
- A road construction security and inspection agreement must be completed with the Town of Greenland before the mylar is signed and recorded.
- The Town Engineer can agree to minor road plan adjustments in the field. All such agreements are to be reported to the Planning Board. All other changes must be referred to the Planning Board with the proper request and revised plans.
- The applicant must provide the Town of Greenland with "as built" plans for the construction of the roadway, all drainage facilities and utilities prior to the release of the road construction security and inspection agreement.
- For the duration of the roadway construction phase of the project, the applicant shall be required to maintain construction warning signs notifying motorists of construction in progress. This must be coordinated with the Greenland Police Department.
- A pre-construction meeting must be held with the Building Inspector prior to any building permits being issued.
- A post-construction meeting must be held with the Building Inspector prior to any occupancy permits being issued.
- The Town Engineer, paid for by the applicant, must inspect the installation of erosion and sedimentation control measures, septic or sewer system installations and stormwater drainage systems to ensure compliance with the approved plan.
- A stamped Certificate of Monumentation must be received prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
- Any variances or waivers must keyed to the final plan:
 - o Greenland Subdivision Regulations: Road Design and Construction Specifications to allow a 22' pavement width where 24' is required.
 - o Greenland Subdivision Regulations to allow the recordable plan view to be accepted at a scale of 1" = 50' where a scale of not more than 1" = 40' is required.
 - o Greenland Subdivision Regulations Section 2.2.3, allowing the subdivision application to proceed without the mandatory design review.
- No changes to the approved plan(s) can be made without appearing before the Planning Board.
- The mylar must include a note requiring that street numbers for new houses be assigned by the appropriate Town of Greenland official, and must be visible from the road.
- Erosion control measures must be in place and maintained throughout the duration of the project construction.
- The applicant must submit a final full plan set (22"x34") and an 11"x17" plan copy as part of the Planning Board File.
- The applicant must submit a digital copy (CD ROM or thumb drive) of the final full plan set as part of the Planning Board file.
- Unique to the Subdivision Application: Language regarding the responsibility for the drainage easement(s) and maintenance of the drainage easement(s) at the cost of the landowner(s), must be approved by the Town Attorney.
- Unique to the Subdivision Application: Vegetation in the Town's right-of-way on Vardon Lane shall be preserved; applicant shall erect signage during construction to provide notice of such.

- Unique to the Subdivision Application: Prior to transfer of ownership and before an Occupancy Permit is issued, the owners of Lots A & B (the area where the wide variable width right-of way exists) must be shown the monumentation and frontage due to the no cut area.
- Unique to the Subdivision Application: Percolation tests be conducted on Lots C and D, to meet standard of less than 60 minutes per inch.
- Unique to the Subdivision Application: Vegetated buffering shall be set forth on the revised and final plans to provide screening for the benefit of the Betournay family; the exact nature of the vegetated buffering shall be noted on the final plans.

S. Gerrato was concerned about the cracks on the edge of the road at Vardon Lane and suggested that liquid tar be put down to prevent water from getting underneath the road. He felt Town road specifications may need to be revised. S. Gerrato requested that “real” perk tests be done on Lots C and D, and requested the results of those tests.

The letter from the Betournay’s was discussed. Screening was addressed earlier in the meeting. It was noted that the 10’ access easement was added in the event the homeowners were not maintaining the swale. As stated at the April public hearing by Mr. Catapano, providing a permanent easement across the front of the parcel would not be possible. The School Board and the bus company should be contacted by the Betournay’s. Use of the proposed easement, as suggested by S. Gerrato, would be a liability issue as it is a drainage swale. C. Smith stated that the Betournay’s would have to deal with the property owner.

Hours of operation for construction was also discussed. As stated by C. Hussey, the Town’s noise ordinance would address that issue.

MOTION: C. Hussey moved to approve the Subdivision of Land at 319 Winnicut Road (Map R5, 3) in accordance with the Conditions of Approval, utilizing the standard language and modified as described. Second - D. Moore; five in favor, one abstain (R. Winsor). **MOTION CARRIED**

Chair Gerome rejoined the meeting.

3. Site Plan Review: 559 Portsmouth Avenue [Map U5, 12]
 Owner: Feminist Health Center
 Applicant: Linda Griebisch, Executive Director
The owner and applicant are proposing to demolish the existing 1.5 story rear addition (426 sq. ft.), attached deck, ramps and walkway. It will be replaced with a 2 story addition (676 sq. ft.), attached deck, ramp and walkway. The proposed addition will increase the existing footprint by 250 sq. ft.

Charlie Tucker, Attorney – Donahue, Tucker and Ciandella and representing the Feminist Health Center, addressed the Board. Also present were Linda Griebisch – Executive Director, Mark Batchelder - Ambit Engineering, and Don Cook – builder.

L. Griebisch addressed the Board, explaining the primary considerations and concerns of expanding their facilities. The addition will be used primarily as office space. The facility will be handicap accessible; it is not currently. Energy efficiency was also a concern; the existing addition is on stilts without a foundation or basement. She continued that it should improve their work efficiency; the new addition will allow for individual work space. She didn’t expect to see a large increase in patients; parking was not expected to be a problem.

M. Batchelder reviewed the work scope of the project. The rear addition will be demolished and rebuilt with decks, ramps and a walkway. The footprint of the proposed addition is approximately 250 sq. ft. larger. Dimensional and parking requirements have been updated according to the Zoning Ordinance. Landscaping required due to construction will be the loam and seeding to match the existing grass.

D. Smith's concerns were reviewed (copy on file) by M. Batchelder.

- A. Sizes of the specific tank and distribution box have been noted. Water usage data was also provided.
- B. Lighting is attached to the building, and no additional exterior parking lot lighting is planned. There is a flood light on the peak of the building as well as at the entrance and exit. There will be a series of can lights under the awning that shine down.
- C. Dumpsters located on the property have never been screened. M. Batchelder pointed out the existing natural vegetation acts as a screen.
- D. There is currently limited landscaping includes a garden, which will be moved. Any areas affected by the construction will be loamed and reseeded.
- E. Architectural plans were given to the Board.
- F. Waiver requests were reviewed (on file).

MOTION: M. Sodini moved to accept the application for 559 Portsmouth Avenue (Map U5, 12) as complete. Second – P. Sanderson; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

S. Gerrato noted that the septic system appeared to be a typical 1986 design, built above the existing grade. It also appears adequately built and located in front of the property, away from construction.

Outdoor lighting and security was a concern for P. Sanderson. He asked if the Police Department had reviewed the lighting plan for security purposes. R. Winsor requested existing fixtures, types and wattage be keyed to the plan, including the can lights on the awning.

The general consensus of the Board was that the addition was architecturally suited to the existing building. The addition will be painted.

Chair Gerome opened the hearing to public comments. There being none, Chair Gerome closed the public hearing and returned to the Board for discussion. S. Gerrato requested screening along the Town Office side of the building. C. Hussey suggested checking with the Police Chief: it may have been removed for security purposes. S. Gerrato withdrew his request.

The main concern of the Board members was lighting and security. R. Winsor didn't see a need to change the existing, which appeared to be adequate. However, he requested existing fixtures, types and wattage be keyed to the plan for accountability, including the can lights on the awning, in case there was an issue in the future. The floodlight on the sign should also be keyed to the plan; he added that the owner should consider down-shielded lighting. Chair Gerome further suggested that the Police Chief review the lighting.

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to grant the waiver for Site Plan Review Regulations Section 4.3.1 (b), and not require a Certified Wetlands Scientist stamp. Second – S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to grant the waiver for Site Plan Review Regulations Section 4.3.1 (k): given the limited scope, the soils map will not be a requirement. Second – S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to grant the waiver for Site Plan Review Regulations Section 4.3.2 (f): given the limited scope, a storm drainage plan will not be a requirement. S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to deny the waiver for Site Plan Review Regulations Section 4.3.2 (i) – Outdoor Lighting Plan: existing lighting and any new lighting to be installed must be keyed to the plan and reviewed by the Police Chief; any new lighting must be down-shielded. S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to grant the waiver for Site Plan Review Regulations Section 4.3.2 (m): given the limited scope, a traffic impact analysis will not be a requirement. S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the Site Plan for 559 Portsmouth Avenue (Map U5, 12) with the following conditions, contingent upon acceptable review by the Police Chief. Second – S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

- No building permit shall be issued until the mylar is signed.
- Any and all State and/or federal permits shall be obtained and made part of the file.
- Existing lighting and any new lighting to be installed must be keyed to the plan and reviewed by the Police Chief; any new lighting must be down-shielded.
- No occupancy permit shall be issued until such time as the requirements of the fire protection system have been installed, tested and accepted in accordance with the Site Plan Review Regulations.
- A pre-construction meeting must be held with the Building Inspector prior to any building permits being issued.
- Any variances or waivers must be keyed to the final plan.
- No changes to the approved plan(s) can be made without appearing before the Planning Board.
- The applicant must submit a final full plan set (22"x34") and an 11"x17" plan copy as part of the Planning Board File.
- The applicant must submit a digital copy (CD ROM or thumb drive) of the final full plan set as part of the Planning Board file.

P. Sanderson suggested the plan be recorded at the Registry of Deeds for future reference.

4. Site Plan Review: 330 Portsmouth Avenue [Map R21, 10]
Owners/Applicants: David Phreaner & Lisa Rothermich
The owners/applicants are proposing to convert the existing barn into living quarters on a slightly expanded footprint, and restore the current living quarters to four wellness center practitioner offices. This will require increased parking for staff and clients as well as a new septic system.

D. Phreaner and L. Rothermich addressed the Board, explaining that there was a fire at their residence last summer. The previous owners were Beacon Health; it has been maintained as a wellness center since they purchased the property.

D. Phreaner reviewed their plan and D. Smith's comments (copy on file). Not being familiar with procedures, D. Phreaner was aware there were outstanding issues after reading the comments. Tom Brouillette prepared the plans for this project.

- A. The applicant was unaware of the requirements, and this will be corrected.
- B. There is a Wetland Scientist stamp on the submitted plans.
- C. The applicant believes there is over 50% open space lot coverage.

- D. The septic design has been approved by the State. It will be an aerating designed system.
- E. There is a handicap ramp to and from the building; that will be made more explicit on the final plan.
- F. Parking was discussed. The applicant calculated 2700 sq. ft. of office space, which they believed would be nine parking spaces; there are currently more than nine. Their proposal includes adding more wellness practitioners in the main building and additional parking would be needed for staff and patients. They feel a total of 18 spaces will be needed. Their personal vehicles would be parked in the proposed garage, freeing up two spaces; the large maple tree and grassy area will yield three spaces; parking spaces will be added to the end of the driveway. A waiver for parking space size will be requested. An additional waiver will be requested for the size of the travel way. D. Phreaner told the Board the only way to meet the 22' wide requirement would be to substantially alter the classic character of the building.
- G. There is currently lighting for the parking area on the corner of the barn that is proposed to be removed. They are proposing to add a light on the corner of the second floor of the main building and two lights on the garage. Three lights should compensate for light that will be lost. All lighting will meet requirements and be down-shielded.
- H. The applicant does not intend for any parking in the wetlands setback area. A parking space was added in error when the plans were drawn; this will be removed from the final plan.
- I. Plans will be reviewed by the Fire Chief.
- J. Snow storage is on the far front edge of the parking spaces, with minimal storage in the rear. It will be included on the final plan.
- K. Wellness Centers don't develop much solid waste; there are two barrels in the shed.
- L. Architectural plans have been submitted. The design of the proposed barn will resemble the barn that is being removed as closely as possible. It will be clapboard style façade and pale yellow in color.

D. Phreaner stated that it was his understanding the Commercial A district may have a village-like look and feel. His intent was for his buildings to have the same qualities of those who know it as the Hussey Farm. In summary, he told the Board they are changing locations and moving the residence back, and having some offices return to the second floor. The use is not changing nor is the style; landscaping would be continuous with the existing.

Chair Gerome asked for clarification on what was being removed and what was remaining. D. Phreaner stated that the barn was going to be removed and rebuilt, and a small section would be added on the back corner. L. Rothermich added that the barn was being removed to meet code requiring a foundation or pad; there is none now. They can't build without tearing it down and adding a foundation. They're proposing to build a two-story residence where the barn was located. The office space will be in the main building, similar to Beacon Health. The existing ramp will need to be rebuilt to meet ADA requirements. C. Hussey asked about handicap parking, which will require a larger space. It should be located near the ramp, if possible. L. Rothermich reviewed the proposed building plans with the Board. The main building will be office space only. S. Gerrato suggested that when doing the planning, as much concrete as possible be shown; the foundation of the main building will be matched. There will be a slab under the workshop and garage. Elevation plans were also reviewed.

P. Sanderson was concerned with parking. The proposed additional parking was discussed as was the current parking, which is asphalt. The proposed parking was planned as asphalt; P. Sanderson pointed out that adding more asphalt may kill the tree they were trying to protect, which they agreed was a possibility. P. Sanderson suggested using permeable pavement or constructing an area where they could put down geo-cel. Rather than constructing with asphalt, a sub-based would be used and then plastic honeycomb shaped tubes would be added to drain the water. He suggested looking into those

types of materials to improve the permeability and reduce runoff. P. Sanderson continued that they should try to be more creative on the parking and use a more permeable surface; the lowest cost alternative may be geo-cel.

The number of parking spaces needed was discussed. If the proposed offices upstairs are filled, 18 parking spots may be needed; L. Rothermich added that maximum use would require 24 parking spaces, but felt that would be unlikely. M. Sodini added that emergency access may be a problem: there isn't much room between the parking spaces and building. L. Rothermich mentioned they would like to move the parking spaces forward approximately 3'.

MOTION: *M. Sodini moved to accept the application for 330 Portsmouth Avenue (Map R21, 10) as complete. Second – S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED*

Items the Board felt needed to be addressed included: open space calculations, parking, outdoor lighting, and ADA compliance; screening of the parking lot was also suggested, with a review by the Police Chief.

MOTION: *P. Sanderson moved to continue 330 Portsmouth Avenue to the public hearing on Thursday, June 19, 2014. The plan must be separated into existing conditions and a proposed site review plan that could be recorded at the Registry of Deeds. Adjustments to parking, open space calculations, ADA compliance and outdoor lighting must also be addressed.*

DISCUSSION: In addition to the items listed, R. Winsor requested that wetlands be delineated on the revised plans as well as all setbacks. Chair Gerome requested that materials be identified on the exterior elevations—Hardy plank, corner boards, etc. as well as the parking area.

MOTION: *P. Sanderson moved to continue 330 Portsmouth Avenue to the public hearing on Thursday, June 19, 2014. The plan must be separated into existing conditions and a proposed site review plan that could be recorded at the Registry of Deeds. Adjustments to parking, open space calculations, ADA compliance and outdoor lighting must also be addressed. Second – R. Winsor; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED*

Chair Gerome opened the meeting to public comments. Marlene Hayes, owner and officer of the Greenwood Condo Association: Speaking with a number of owners, one of their main concerns was some kind of living barrier between the properties. Her concern was with the two garage lights and their location. Chair Gerome responded that screening had been discussed; the applicant had stated that down-shielded lighting would be used. There being no further comments, Chair Gerome closed the public hearing.

The Board took a short recess.

5. Site Plan Review, Conditional Use Permit: 1533 Greenland Road [Map R21, 55 & 55A]
Owner: Clan Murphy Limited Partnership
Applicant: Richard Landry, Thurloe Kensington Development
The owner and applicant are proposing construction of approximately 29,800 sq. ft. of commercial space, including retail space and drive-thru restaurant. The proposed project will disturb approximately 8 acres.

Addressing the Board was Ken Mavrogeorge, Tighe & Bond, engineer for the applicant. Also present were Rich Landry and their Traffic Engineer, Steve Pernaw. They were seeking Planning Board approval

of the site plan and a Conditional Use Permit for the proposed development at 1533 Greenland Road. The property is adjacent to Travel America. K. Mavrogeorge reminded the Board they were at the February 2014 meeting for a conceptual review that included development at the rear of the property; the plan has been revised to develop only the front half of the property. There is no plan at this time to develop the rear portion. They have heard comments from the Zoning Board, Circuit Rider and Building Inspector regarding the layout of the site. Changes have been made to the plan to address those concerns.

The project is approximately 29,800 sq. ft. of commercial development, including three buildings. One building will be Tractor Supply, another a drive-thru restaurant, and a retail/restaurant building. The project will impact the 75' buffer, and a Conditional Use Permit has been requested. The Zoning Board has granted a variance for the impact. In addition, this is a high traffic area, and a traffic impact study has been prepared and submitted with the application. A driveway permit from DOT is pending.

K. Mavrogeorge deferred to S. Pernaw to address any traffic concerns. S. Pernaw explained the traffic study that was done in January 2014 (copy on file). The study was done one weekday morning and afternoon during peak hours, and on a Saturday. Their concern was not the number of cars, but the rate of traffic flow on an hour to hour basis. Projections were done at the request of NHDOT for 2015 and 2025. An analysis was also done to see if a traffic light was warranted. S. Pernaw explained that section of the study to the Board; his response: it's a State highway and it's their decision if a traffic light is warranted. His concern was the proximity of Ocean Road to the proposed development; a traffic light shouldn't be put in unless it's absolutely necessary. He recommended keeping it under "stop sign" control. It's suggested to the applicant in the report that if making improvements to widening a section of the road, put conduit under Rt. 33 now for the future.

After discussing wait times to exit the development, R. Winsor asked how they could bring their service level up, S. Pernaw responded traffic signals would have to be added when they were warranted. He continued that Level Service F was not a criteria for signals; MUTCD is used to determine if the criteria for a signal is met.

S. Pernaw explained their recommendations in graphic form. In addition to those on the chart, they recommended widening the entrance slightly to make it easier for tractor trailers, putting conduit under Rt. 33 and adding illumination for night time travel. S. Pernaw also discussed sight distance, which is important for all intersections. The bottom line conclusion was that the sight distance for the proposed driveway was more than adequate.

S. Pernaw continued that DOT was in the process of reviewing the study. It was his understanding that the study was also being reviewed by an outside firm at the request of the Planning Board. D. Smith added that it will also be reviewed by Dave Walker, RPC.

Chair Gerome commented that it was disconcerting to see half the site being proposed and an analysis being done. R. Landry explained that in January 2014, they were planning to complete the entire site. After going to the ZBA, they were denied variances due to the wetlands. A proposed use for the rear, which was truck related, was turned down by the ZBA. The proposed uses for the rear of the property are no longer viable, so now they are focused on the developing the front portion. The traffic analysis was based on 19,000 sq. ft. of retail use in the back in addition to auto parts and service of 10,000 sq. ft. R. Landry continued that even if the back portion were to be developed in the future, they would not be able to build as many square feet as originally planned which would be less than the traffic study.

Comments from the Town Engineer had not been received at the time of the meeting; comments from the Circuit Rider were distributed during the meeting (copy on file). The application was complete. D. Smith suggested that the Board may want to discuss the waiver request for parking and size requirements. Architectural renderings should be available at the June meeting.

D. Smith commented on the proposed subdivision (not received at this time) of the Tractor Supply lot and meeting the 50% open space requirement. K. Mavrogeorge responded that it was preliminary and may need to be adjusted. He continued that there were numerous easements on the site, and they were working with the various companies regarding design of the site to meet their requirements. The subdivision application will be submitted separately.

MOTION: *M Sodini moved to accept the application for 1533 Greenland Road (Map R21, 55 & 55A) as complete. Second – R. Winsor; six in favor, one opposed. MOTION CARRIED*

D. Smith noted Item (1) on his comment sheet regarding the applicant waiving the 65 day requirement for Planning Board action once the application is accepted as complete. P. Sanderson suggested continuing it to the next Board meeting and resolving it procedurally at that time.

S. Gerrato informed the applicant and engineer that grease and septic systems were a huge problem. R. Landry told the Board that he had tried to bring sewer into Town through development of the rear parcel. Without the back development, it couldn't happen. He continued that he hasn't given up all hope of sewer in the future.

Chair Gerome opened the meeting to public comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing and returned to the Board. Waiver requests were reviewed; no action was taken.

- 4.3: The Board saw no problems.
- 5.3: Important in the area where work will be done.
- 5.11: Spaces - Won't know until uses are known; lane widths – from an auto-turn perspective, can tractor trailers negotiate safely during all seasons? R. Landry responded that Tractor Supply requires that be shown as well. A fire truck turning plan has been provided in the plan set. R. Landry added that Tractor Supply is similar to an old-school lumber yard set up where customers would actually drive through with their vehicle; there is a gate on each end to pull through. Architectural plans will depict how it's partitioned. There was a concern about the radius on the front corner of the parking lot near the high wall. Calculations were briefly discussed. The retail square footage of the building is 19,100 sq. ft., with an outdoor storage area. R. Landry will provide parking counts from various Tractor Supply stores. He further explained that parking calculations are based on Tractor Supply, but parking could be added in the back. Chair Gerome stated he may like to see a reduction in the number for Tractor Supply, but future use could be a problem; he wouldn't reduce the size or aisle width. K. Mavrogeorge added that the aisle width is larger than the Town requirement because of the turn to get vehicles in. Due to significant wetland buffers and easements, a waiver has been requested for 9'x18' parking spaces. R. Winsor suggested parking be shown in case of a change of use.

MOTION: *M. Sodini moved to continue the application for 1533 Greenland Road to the public hearing on Thursday, June 19, 2014. Second – D. Moore; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED*

K. Mavrogeorge requested the next work session be scheduled as a public hearing date for this project. There was a question of the Town Engineer having enough time to prepare comments. Although DOT will not have responded by June 05, R. Landry felt decisions could be made on waivers and possibly

some architectural renderings being completed. Two septic systems have been designed and are in process on the State level. Also of concern for the applicant and engineer was the 65 day rule. R. Winsor pointed out that comments would be needed from the Town Engineer, the engineer reviewing the traffic study and DOT. The consensus of the Board was to not hold a public hearing during the work session.

6. Approval of Minutes: Thursday, May 01, 2014

Continued to the work session on Thursday, June 05, 2014.

7. Other Business

8. Topics for Work Session: Thursday, June 05, 2014

9. Adjournment

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to adjourn at 10:20 p.m. Second – Chair Jerome; all in favor. **MOTION CARRIED**

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, June 05, 2014 – 7:00 p.m., Town Hall Conference Room, Work Session

Respectfully Submitted: Charlotte Hussey, Secretary to the Boards

Approved: Thursday, June 05, 2014