



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, June 17, 2021 – 6:30 p.m. – Virtual via Zoom

Members Present: Bob Dion, Steve Gerrato, Steve Smith (Selectmen's Rep), Frank Catapano (Alternate)

Members Absent: Stu Gerome, John McDevitt, Catie Medeiros, David Moore

Staff Present: Mark Fougere, Consultant (Remote)

Co-Chair Gerrato opened the Planning Board public hearing at 6:40 p.m. He announced a quorum was present and the meeting was being held virtually through Zoom and recorded by audio.

Attendance of Planning Board members was taken by roll call: B. Dion – present, S. Smith – present, F. Catapano – present, S. Gerrato – present.

1. Projects of Regional Impact

There were no projects of regional impact to discuss.

2. Subdivision of Land, Conditional Use Permit: 177 Winnicut Road (R10, 12A-2)

Owner: Brian and Maria Beck

Applicant: 177 Winnicut Road LLC

The owner and applicant are proposing a seven-lot subdivision and a public road.

Christopher Berry, Berry Surveying and Engineering, updated the Board on 177 Winnicut Road. They were granted a continuance in May to the June meeting. Eric Weinrieb, Altus Engineering, questioned the stormwater gravel wetlands at the front of the site, which consumed a large area of the first lot of the subdivision. C. Berry and the applicant met with Altus Engineering to discuss alternatives, which included breaking the stormwater system into two systems and modify the design to a rain garden which will decrease the amount of footprint and have less impact to the lots. Altus was unable to review the revisions from Berry Surveying (May 12, 2021) in time for the May meeting. Altus has reviewed the most recent plans submitted.

S. Gerrato asked C. Berry if they would like to continue with the hearing or postpone discussion to the July meeting. C. Berry and the applicant opted to continue.

C. Berry reviewed the waiver requests and Conditional Use Permit with the Board (copy of all waiver and Conditional Use Permit requests and justifications are included in the applicant's file). Waiver 1: Maximum road grade of 3% within 75 ft. of an intersection per Table I – Roadway Design Criteria. Waiver 2: Require guardrail for slopes greater than 4 ft. vertical change per section 4.5.1F of the Greenland Subdivision Regulations. Waiver 3: Requiring a centerline radius of 200 ft. would cause the applicant to construct a road that would be overdesigned per the roadway design criteria. Waiver 4:

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Minimum driveway culvert of 18 in. RCP per Addendum A.4.B.8 of the Greenland Subdivision Regulations. Waiver 5: Maximum side slopes of 4 to 1 for 4 ft. or less per 4.5.1.F of the Greenland Subdivision Regulations. Conditional Use Permit: Regulations in the Zoning Ordinance do not call for earth disturbance within the 50 ft. wetland setback.

C. Berry also reviewed the comments from Altus Engineering dated June 07, 2021 (copy on file). Viability of Lot 1: C. Berry stated they have proved the lot is highly developable. Community Mailbox: The applicant has contacted the Post Office and discussed the location of the community mailbox. The mailboxes can be installed at the residences. C. Berry questioned if a shelter was needed for the community mailbox at the entrance. Drainage Infrastructure: The HOA will be responsible for maintaining the drainage infrastructure not under the pavement; a copy of the HOA documents will need to be reviewed.

S. Gerrato read into the record a statement from the Altus Engineering review dated June 07, 2021: "The Board should decide if the designer is meeting the spirit of the ordinance having a lot with a significant portion of the upland area encumbered". S. Gerrato referred to Zoning Ordinance Article VII: Aquifer Protection District, Section 7.5 – Conditional Uses, Subsection 7.5.3, Item A. He continued that they were 'messing up our wetlands'. C. Berry responded they were proposing crossings onto the developable land. It was noted by F. Catapano that this project is not in the Aquifer Protection District.

B. Dion questioned if there was any other location for the roadway. C. Berry responded that the roadway was discussed many times. They were instructed by the Board to move the roadway. It was determined this location would have the least impact on the wetlands and was the safest for sight distance in both directions. C. Berry reiterated they were permitted to cross wetlands to gain access to their property.

F. Catapano discussed the retaining wall mentioned in the Altus Engineering review dated June 07, 2021. C. Berry explained that installing a retaining wall would save 150 sq. ft., at best. The Town would be responsible for maintenance of the retaining wall. The slopes would be steep and there would not be a recoverable slope, and the guardrail would need to be increased. The expense would be increased for a very de minimis amount of wetland. A reasonable alternative would be to set the side slopes at 2 to 1 and install a slightly longer guard rail; save the fill as part of a retaining wall that would not have to be maintained in the future.

F. Catapano requested a letter in writing from the Post Office regarding the mailboxes in the development. If they do not have a letter from the Post Office, he recommended leaving the community mailbox on the plan in the current location. It was noted that the bus stop location was mentioned at a meeting but not necessarily decided upon. F. Catapano did not feel there were enough Board members present to decide on the bus stop.

F. Catapano reviewed the letter from Altus Engineering. Note 9 – Berm for Detention Pond: C. Berry stated that was on the original submission and there were no comments. That berm is no longer necessary. Note 14 – Grading: Refers to Note 31 and a possible Alteration of Terrain permit. F. Catapano noted they were dangerously close to an AOT. C. Berry stated the items Altus Engineering thought may trigger an AOT have been included. Note 15 – Grading Plan Compliant with Section 4.5.F: Waiver included. Note 16 – Invert Elevation: C. Berry stated the comment referred to the grade of the swale. Note 17 – Transformer: This will be corrected. Rain Gardens: Rain gardens will be grass. Note 20 – Drainage Flow in Mailbox Area: Detail will be shown. Note 21 – Proposed Contour at Far End of Cul-de-Sac: Will check the accuracy. Note 23 – Underdrain Outlet for Rain Garden 101: Will check on this. Note 24 – Rain Garden Below Seasonal High-Water Table: C. Berry stated they have considered lining.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Note 25 – Washed Stone Fill in Sump Areas: A flowable fill will be used. Note 27 – Bedding Material: Information is included in construction details. F. Catapano noted that many comments in the review letter from Altus Engineering have been, or will be, resolved.

B. Dion: Altus Engineering cited Lot 2 in Note 2. C. Berry stated that Lot 2 is actually Lot 1 in the development. B. Dion continued with Note 2: 'The Board should decide if the designer is meeting the spirit of the ordinance having a lot with a significant portion of the upland area encumbered'. C. Berry responded it was no longer encumbered with a stormwater system. Responding to a question from B. Dion, C. Berry stated their letter dated May 12, 2021 did not address comments in the Altus Engineering letter dated June 07, 2021.

S. Smith stated C. Berry and the applicant have done an extensive project overhaul; the plans have changed significantly. He felt they had done the best they could with the wetland crossing and the limited amount of capacity that would be mitigated.

S. Gerrato refrained from comments and opened the hearing to public comments. Concerns from neighboring residents included additional traffic on Winnicut Road. F. Catapano noted that Spring Hill Road was a terrible design. The difference between Spring Hill Road and the road in the proposed development was sight distance; Spring Hill Road had little sight distance.

Chip Hussey, 207 Winnicut Road (remote): Concerned about Lot 1 (the first lot on the left) and the well radius. C. Berry noted the location of the well on the plan. C. Hussey noted there was an overlap on the well radius and up against the septic reserve. He commented that the lot was backfilled with clay and questioned the test pit results; they were having problems getting it to pass and there were wetlands due to drainage underneath the road. Responding to a question from F. Catapano about passing test pits on that lot, C. Berry stated they passed and were witnessed by the Town. C. Hussey's other concern was that the back portion of his property would be landlocked, adding this would be the first time, that he was aware of, the Planning Board allowed property to be landlocked. The developer was originally willing to give a right-of-way until C. Hussey said 'no' to the 20-lot subdivision; the developer then revoked the right-of-way. These comments were made for the record. S. Gerrato discussed the existing access and the mills that were located in the rear of the property. C. Berry disagreed, stating there was no right-of-way across the property or right of access on their side of the property onto anyone else's property. The direct abutter was concerned about buffering; C. Berry stated they were not proposing any specific buffering. The developer will work with the abutter on the buffering.

Joe Fedora, 23 Van Etten Drive and member of the Conservation Commission: He questioned the lifespan of the material installed in the treatment areas, particularly because of road salt. C. Berry responded they are now rain garden designs. The homeowner's association will be responsible for maintenance and not the responsibility of the Town.

Laura Byergo, 16 Caswell Drive and Conservation Commission Chairman: Clarified that the changes have occurred since the last time she saw the information. L. Byergo requested that the rain gardens be pointed out on the plan. C. Berry explained they were able to separate the original system into two systems and save some of the buffers to the wetlands. He also explained the front of the site and that the back of the site was converted into a rain garden which removed the need for a large gravel wetland. All the treatment will take place in the center and explained how it would work. L. Byergo was pleased with the changes; it was encouraging they were able to think that through and make the changes. She discussed rain gardens and offered to have a speaker talk to the Planning Board about making rain gardens successful even when they are neglected.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

There being no further comments, S. Gerrato closed the public hearing and returned to the Board for discussion. M. Fougere stated the developer was making progress towards addressing the issues raised by Altus Engineering. He did not have a problem with the new design and thought a graded side slope rather than a retaining wall was a good idea. The Town would have to maintain a retaining wall; M. Fougere suggested not doing a retaining wall. The Board moved forward with approvals of waivers.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to grant the waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section IV, Subsection 4.4.2, Item H (minimum centerline radius of 200 ft. to 150 ft.), to the plan presented by Berry Surveying & Engineering, dated 02.24.2021, Revision #2 dated 05.12.2021, File No. DB2018-052. Second – B. Dion; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to grant the waiver from Subdivision Regulations Table I - Road Way Design (maximum road grade of 3% within 75 ft of an intersection to 4% with 75% of an intersection), to the plan presented by Berry Surveying & Engineering, dated 02.24.2021, Revision #2 dated 05.12.2021, File No. DB2018-052. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to grant the waiver from Subdivision Regulations Addendum A, Subsection IV – Construction Specifications, Item B. 8 (minimum driveway culvert of 18 in. RCP to 15 in. HDPE driveway culverts), to the plan presented by Berry Surveying & Engineering, dated 02.24.2021, Revision #2 dated 05.12.2021, File No. DB2018-052. Second – B. Dion; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

The waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section IV, Subsection 4.5.1, Item F (requiring guardrails) was discussed. M. Fougere did not have a problem with the request. F. Catapano recommended continuing the waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section IV, Subsection 4.5.1, Item F (requiring guardrails), to the next meeting. Further clarification was needed.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to grant the waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section IV, Subsection 4.5.1, Item F (maximum side slopes of 4 to 1), to the plan presented by Berry Surveying & Engineering, dated 02.24.2021, Revision #2 dated 05.12.2021, File No. DB2018-052. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to approve the applicant's request for a Conditional Use Permit for 177 Winnicut Road (Map R10, Lot 12A-2), in accordance with the plan presented by Berry Surveying & Engineering, dated 02.24.2021, Revision #2 dated 05.12.2021, File No. DB2018-052. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – no. Three in favor, one against (S. Gerrato). MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to continue the Subdivision of Land at 177 Winnicut Road to the public hearing on Thursday, July 15, 2021. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

Septic systems will be reviewed by the Building Inspector.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

3. Subdivision of Land and Site Plan Review: 410 Portsmouth Avenue (U4, 17)
Owner/Applicant: 410 Portsmouth Avenue, LLC (Jason Lajeunesse)
The owner/applicant is proposing a multi-family site plan with ten 2-bedroom residential condominium units.

Due to the lack of a full Board, the owner/applicant requested a continuance to the July meeting.

MOTION: S. Smith moved to continue the Subdivision of Land and Site Plan Review of 410 Portsmouth Avenue to the public hearing on Thursday, July 15, 2021. Second – F. Catapano; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

4. Subdivision of Land/Conditional Use Permit: 624 Post Road (R3, 18A)
Owner: Jarib Sanderson Family Trust
Applicant: David Sanderson
The owner and applicant are proposing to subdivide Lot R3, 18A (11 acres) into two single-family residential lots with a shared driveway.

Paige Libbey, Jones & Beach Engineers and representing the owner and applicant, addressed the Board. They were requesting a minor subdivision as well as a Conditional Use Permit. P. Libbey explained one lot would be a backlot with the required amount of frontage. Both lots will be residential and meet all zoning. The backlot will be just under 4 acres; the front lot along Post Road will be just under 2 acres. The remaining acreage will be merged with the farm property. There will be a shared driveway along the 50 ft. right-of-way to the back lot. The driveway meets DOT requirements for sight distance. Both lots will have septic and wells. Test pits have been done on both lots.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to accept the application for the Subdivision of Land and Conditional Use Permit for 624 Post Road (Map R3, 18A) as complete. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

Responding to a question from S. Gerrato, P. Libbey stated they have researched the property and it is not in conservation. She pointed out on the plan the curb cut, which is located on the northern most part of the property. There is an existing loop driveway for the adjacent property, which was subdivided off in 2001. There is a gravel driveway (noted on the plan) as well as two curb cuts off the middle lot.

F. Catapano questioned why the driveways were not split on the property line. P. Libbey explained they could put it further forward but were not sure where the property owner wanted to locate the driveway. In addition, test pits were done in the front in case the house was built further back. P. Libbey noted the regulations are contradictory: in one section it states 20 ft., in another it is 50 ft. A waiver has been requested from the 20 ft. to 50 ft. Increasing to 50 ft. will allow for some of the trees to remain along the driveway as a buffer to the adjacent property. S. Smith agreed with the increase to 50 ft., adding there should be an easement to the cemetery on the property. F. Catapano noted there is an RSA stating there must be an easement allowing access to cemeteries. It was suggested an easement be put on the driveway down the property line to the location of the cemetery as shown on the plan. P. Libbey stated their surveyors could not locate the cemetery or its history. The only recorded location of the cemetery is on the Town's tax map. If a cemetery is located, an easement will be provided. P. Libbey stated the RSA requires a 25 ft. setback if there is any evidence of a cemetery. B. Dion clarified that being recorded on the tax map is evidence of a possible cemetery; P. Libbey agreed.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

S. Gerrato opened the hearing to public comments. Tim and Kathy Fisher, 15 Spruce Lane: Their property is adjacent to 624 Post Road. T. Fisher stated he was okay with the plan but wanted to be able to work with the property owner. T. Fisher built his house facing what he thought was conservation land. He noted headlights would shine into his house with the proposed driveway in that location. T. Fisher questioned why they did not locate the driveway along the opposite property line. P. Libbey responded that Post Road is a State road and DOT requires 400 ft. of sight distance, adding that there is not much sight distance due to the curve and would not be safe. T. Fisher questioned the distance between the proposed driveway and the property line. P. Libbey responded it was approximately 25 ft. noting they made the right-of-way as wide as they could in order to keep some of the trees. T. Fisher stated that when they moved to Greenland in 2002, there was a headstone in the cemetery on that property. He thought it was approximately 362 ft. from the edge of the road. The headstone is no longer there; S. Gerrato agreed. T. Fisher voiced his concern again about the headlights shining into his house from the proposed driveway. T. Fisher wanted to make sure all the 'i's get dotted and t's crossed'.

Responding to F. Catapano suggestion for an alternative driveway location, P. Libbey explained that DOT allowed a maximum of three driveway cuts on a specific amount of frontage. The middle lot was originally part of the larger lot and has two driveway cuts (a loop driveway), using two of the three. F. Catapano also suggested installing a white vinyl fence along the property line and proposed driveway to block the headlights.

If a cemetery is found in the vicinity of the proposed driveway, they could move the driveway to the new frontage lot on Post Road; the other option is to move the lot line to add more to the backlot. The turn would be sooner and not as sharp. The best location for sight distance is where the proposed driveway is currently located. P. Libbey stated that if they made the front lot smaller, the driveway to the backlot could curve more rather going straight back. A berm was suggested to block the headlights; F. Catapano stated that an 8 ft. vinyl fence would be better for the height. P. Libbey noted that the house on the backlot will sit lower than the houses on Post Road. Responding to S. Gerrato, P. Libbey stated that DOT would not allow a road that did not meet sight distance unless there was no other alternative.

T. Fisher will work with the property owner to locate the cemetery. T. Fisher stated he was trying to protect the best of interests of himself and his neighbor. He would like to have the issue with the headlights shining in his house mitigated. F. Catapano noted that there are quite a few old trees and he would like them saved.

The owner of the proposed backlot stated that he planned to save as many of the trees as possible. They do not plan to remove more trees than necessary. They plan to carry on the legacy of his uncle and be a good neighbor.

There being no further comments from the public, S. Gerrato closed the public hearing and returned to the Board for discussion.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to grant the waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section IV, Subsection 4.4.1.1, Item C (maximum road width of 20 ft. to 50 ft.), to the plan presented by Jones & Beach Engineering, dated 05.26.2021, Project No. 20529. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: S. Smith moved to approve the applicant's request for a Conditional Use Permit for 624 Post Road (Map R3, 18A), in accordance with the plan presented by Jones & Beach Engineering, dated

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

05.26.2021, Project No. 20529. Second – F. Catapano; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

M. Fougere stated the outstanding issues that should be addressed included: Subdivision Approval from the State, easement documents will need to be generated between the owners for the access and maintenance of the private way, all boundary pins should be set before recording, DOT permit will be needed, a signature block will need to be added to the plan, and Parcel 'A' and Parcel 'B' should be amended to clearly show that they will be merged with Map R3, 17.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to continue the Subdivision of Land and Conditional Use Permit for 624 Post Road to the public hearing on Thursday, July 15, 2021. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

5. Design Review: 4 Tower Place (R7, 3)

Owner: Community Congregational Church

Applicant: Joseph Falzone

The owner and applicant are proposing a 50-unit age restricted development.

Scott Cole, Beals Associates and representing the owner and applicant, addressed the Board. Also present was Brendan Quigley - Gove Environmental Services, Steve Pernaw - Traffic Engineer, and Joseph Falzone - applicant. They were before the Board at the public hearing on Thursday, April 15, 2021, as a Design Review. Based on comments from the Planning Board, revisions were made to the plan. Two preliminary plans were presented to the Board: one with a cul-de-sac and one without a cul-de-sac. The plan showed three different parcels which are owned by the Community Congregational Church, Philbrick-Vickery Tower, and Homewood Farm Realty Trust. The total area of the parcels is 67.5 acres.

S. Cole reviewed the plans with the Board. Units will be approximately 1,400 sq. ft.; they are proposing 48 units. Preliminary calculations have been done on the property, subtracting the wetlands, utility towers and utility easements, steep slopes, wetland buffers and buffer areas. The white boxes indicated on the plan are the towers and will remain. Each design shows approximately 3,000 sq. ft. of road. There are two access points. The original entrance is off Magnolia Drive; the secondary point of access is off Maple Drive.

Safety concerns were addressed. The new entrance would require a minor wetland impact. B. Quigley noted the wetlands on the plan and S. Pernaw did a traffic analysis. Amenities for the project include a clubhouse, a dog walk field, and an existing trail system. There will be a community septic system with two large leach fields and two private community wells.

S. Cole noted the olive green color on the plan was wetlands and pointed out the bog. B. Dion questioned where the traffic would go once it exits onto Maple Drive. S. Pernaw explained there are two ways to exit the proposed subdivision. A lot less traffic will be generated with an age-restricted development than a conventional residential subdivision. S. Pernaw estimated 28 trips during the evening peak hour, 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.; 17 entering the development, 18 leaving the development over a 60 minute period. The level of impact is not big enough to change intersection operations. The traffic counts are down due to COVID-19 but are increasing.

F. Catapano asked if the road would become a Town road; it would remain private. There is 35 ft. between units. F. Catapano requested the next plan include Breakfast Hill Road. S. Cole asked the

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Board their preference: cul-de-sac vs. no cul-de-sac. F. Catapano felt the loop was better for traffic flow. It was more housing units using the roads. There are approximately 21 duplex units on Magnolia Lane/Maple Drive. F. Catapano wanted to make sure the project fit the neighborhood and not overwhelming Magnolia Lane/Maple Drive.

M. Fougere commented on the scale. The units should be checked to make sure they are 35 ft. apart. M. Fougere preferred the loop plan; it would distribute the traffic better. He wanted to see a buffer between the units and the tower right-of-way; some of the units and road are along the edge, leaving them exposed to the tower right-of-way and the highway was on the other side. It would be advantageous for the new owners to have some separation from the tower line and the highway.

S. Smith was concerned with traffic, stating Sunnyside Drive would be impacted more than Maple Drive. People would drive straight across the upper access road, take a right onto Sunnyside Drive and then onto Breakfast Hill Road. He clarified that there were two separate well fields proposed and that the crossing into that roadway section would be a wetland crossing. He agreed with M. Fougere about the houses along the rear of the development that would abut the towers; there was not much separation.

S. Gerrato opened the hearing to public comments. There were many residents from the Maple Drive/Magnolia Lane/Sunnyside Drive neighborhood present and on Zoom. Residents were concerned about the community wells and the draw on their water. S. Gerrato stated a draw-down test could be done to test the impact on the area wells. Paul Sanderson, property owner, assured them that would not be a problem. Traffic was a major concern for residents. They were very vocal about the traffic impact on the roads during construction as well as everyday traffic once the homes were occupied. The applicant has a contract to purchase the duplex with a 'no trespassing' sign on the property. The applicant was asked if there was a plan for the traffic. Another major concern was with the children who play there.

F. Catapano explained to residents several times that this was just the first step and was Design Review for the project. The concept was being presented and they were trying to gather and listen to the various opinions. Towns have certain obligations they have to meet but the condo documents can be more restrictive.

One resident informed the Board that some of the residents in that area were starting a petition and planned to stop the development. Children play and ride bikes in the street and do not have to worry about traffic.

Residents also questioned a sound barrier and landscaping. F. Catapano explained it was a Design Review only and would be a long process. Abutters would be notified and were encouraged to attend every hearing so the Planning Board could hear their opinions. F. Catapano told residents the agendas were posted and if a project were continued, the next date would be announced at the meeting. He reiterated it was a conceptual and that the project may not look as it is presented when finished. There are Town and State regulations that must be followed. The project may be approved in a format similar to what is shown, or it may not.

Joe Fedora, Conservation Commission member, felt there would be a major problem due to Packer Bog. F. Catapano agreed it was a highly sensitive area as well as other issues, and the Planning Board was aware. They will have to meet with the Conservation Commission. The Planning Board will be interested in their opinion and views.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

One caller stated that in addition to the environmental issues and other concerns mentioned, they would be impacting the wildlife and wetlands. They would be affecting the quiet and well-being of the area. It was a gigantic impact on the people in the area.

F. Catapano, responding to a caller concerned with traffic impact, stated that a traffic study has been. Traffic studies are usually 'spot on'. He suggested they review the traffic study and counts for a better understanding. S. Pernaw explained how he arrived at his numbers for the traffic study. S. Gerrato stated the Planning Board would make sure everything was right.

The community well and its impact on the neighborhood was discussed. S. Cole asked the Board which design they preferred. S. Cole explained how the number of units was calculated and that the project covered three properties. Paul Sanderson, property owner of one of the parcels, stated his property was evaluated through a hydrogeological study done by the City of Portsmouth as a possible water source. His property was number three on their list. That area is a tremendous resource for water. That area is also not part of the aquifer on Post Road or connected to the Coakley Landfill. The area has the potential to be source water for this development but also the entire neighborhood.

Responding to a question from a resident about the criteria for a Conditional Use Permit, M. Fougere will give the project engineer guidance on that concern. M. Fougere noted the other age-restricted development in Town was fully occupied. He suggested they may want to put down some traffic counters; there were only two ways in and out of that development. M. Fougere has not seen a large amount of traffic in and out of Bramber Green. That development was much larger than the proposed and may give a better idea of the traffic impact.

S. Gerrato closed the public hearing and returned to the Board for discussion. S. Cole requested the Board decide which design they preferred, which was no cul-de-sac.

5. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: S. Smith moved to approve the minutes of Thursday, June 03, 2021. Second – F. Catapano; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

6. Approval of Invoices

There were no invoices to approve.

7. Other Business

There was a brief discussion about continuing virtual meetings. Board members decided they will not continue with virtual meetings. All comments must be made in person at Planning Board meetings.

MOTION: F. Catapano moved that the Planning Board no longer offer virtual meetings. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

8. Topics for Work Session: Thursday, July 01, 2021

There will not be a work session on Thursday, July 01, 2021. The next meeting will be a public hearing on Thursday, July 15, 2021.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

MOTION: S. Gerrato moved to not have a meeting on Thursday, July 01, 2021. Second: B. Dion; B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

9. Adjournment

MOTION: F. Catapano moved to adjourn at 9:24 p.m. Second – S. Smith; roll call vote: B. Dion – yes, S. Smith – yes, F. Catapano – yes, S. Gerrato – yes. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, July 15, 2021 – 6:30 p.m., Town Hall Conference Room

Submitted By: Charlotte Hussey, Administrative Assistant