



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, November 18, 2021 – 6:30 p.m. – Town Hall Conference Room

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

Members Absent: Catie Medeiros, Frank Catapano (Alternate)

Staff Present: Mark Fougere

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

1. Projects of Regional Impact

M. Fougere stated one case that could possibly have regional impact will be 563 Breakfast Hill Road when a formal application is submitted. This property borders the Town of Rye; the property in Rye will be involved in this project. The Rye Planning Board will also be involved. Rye abutters will be notified because it spills over onto adjoining property. Rye will notify the Town of Greenland.

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

The applicant requested a continuance to the meeting on Thursday, December 16, 2021.

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to continue the Subdivision of Land, 529 Portsmouth Avenue, to the public hearing on Thursday, December 16, 2021. Second – S. Smith; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

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

The applicant requested a continuance to the meeting on Thursday, December 16, 2021.

MOTION: B. Dion moved to continue the Site Plan Review, Conditional Use Permit, 309 Portsmouth Avenue, to the public hearing on Thursday, December 16, 2021. Second – S. Gerome; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

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

The applicant requested a continuance to the meeting on Thursday, December 16, 2021.

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to continue the Site Plan Review for 597 & 603 Portsmouth Avenue, to the public hearing on Thursday, December 16, 2021. Second – D. Moore; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

5. Boundary Line Adjustment: 776 Post Road (R3, 12 – Residential)
Owner/Applicant: Deborah Johnson
The owner/applicant is proposing to convey 3,709 sq. ft. to the neighbor at 784 Post Road.

The applicant has withdrawn the application. She must go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

6. Design Review: 563 Breakfast Hill Road (R1, 5 – RCIM Overlay District)
Owner: Ciborowski S.A. Nominee Trust
Applicant: Green and Company
The owner and applicant are proposing an age-restricted housing development on a 15-acre parcel of land. Also proposed is a multi-family townhouse along the remaining 3.9 acres. This development will be connected to a larger development in Rye.

Joe Coronati, Jones and Beach Engineers and representing the applicant, and Michael Green, Green and Company, were present. J. Coronati addressed the Board and distributed a color rendering of the property. This is a large property owned by the Ciborowski family. A small piece of the property on Breakfast Hill Road was given to the Town of Greenland many years ago. The majority of the Ciborowski property is located in Rye; 18 acres are in Greenland at the corner of Breakfast Hill Road and Rt. 1. There is a small shopping plaza on the corner; the remainder of the property is wooded. J. Coronati pointed out the wetlands on the Greenland portion of the property. It is mostly uplands; there are trails on the property.

J. Coronati noted that the development would take place in Greenland and Rye. Zoning is different in each town; there will be two different proposals. The Greenland project involves 18 acres and there are split zones: the CA Zone is along Rt. 1 and the Residential Zone in the rear. Plans call for a large residential development with different styles of homes, hitting different price points and clientele. The Rye portion has a multi-family overlay district which allows 40 units on two different parcels (total of 80 units). Current plans for the Greenland side are for an age restricted housing development on the rear of the property in the Residential Zone, and a multi-family townhouse development in the CA Zone. It would be condominium ownership with private roads within a private community.

There is frontage on two roads. An access point is planned across from Airfield Drive in Rye; there is good site distance along Rt. 1. Breakfast Hill Road was more challenging with curves and hills. The best site distance is across from the Bethany Church driveway. A third access point is available on Rt. 1 in Rye; that provides options for phasing and construction.

They were before the Planning Board for discussion purposes. Abutters have been noticed. They are looking at a few options for utilities; test pits have been done. Most of the decent test pits are towards

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

the rear of the property. There is a ridge line through the middle of the parcel that breaks the slope. Rye would like to see a sewer extension; it was on their warrant last year to bring sewer to Washington Road, and it did not pass. They are discussing proposing the warrant again for March 2022. The proposed sewer line would go to the North Hampton town line. It may be a design challenge.

S. Gerrato opened the hearing to public comments. Laura Byergo, Conservation Commission Chairman: Asked if there were plans to allow people to continue to use the trails on the Rye side. J. Coronati responded that he has not walked all the trails, but the ones he has been on are in the middle of the site. J. Coronati pointed out the development and open space areas on the Rye side. Berry Brook runs through the middle and the rail trail is on the rear.

S. Gerrato returned to the Board for discussion. S. Gerome: Were they considering the CA Zone for mixed use? M. Fougere stated there were three different zoning provisions that could apply to this property: multi-family is allowed by Special Exception, which would require going to the ZBA for approval of the project especially considering the density and then back to the Planning Board; the alternative would be the Overlay District, which would be a Conditional Use Permit at the Planning Board and not the ZBA. The goals of the Overlay District would have to be adhered to; one of the primary purposes of that district was the extension of utilities (water and sewer), allowing for mixed use, encouraging work force housing (the Town's newly adopted Work Force Housing Ordinance would apply). If the Overlay District is chosen, there is no density.

B. Dion: Questioned the diversity of housing options and price range. J. Coronati stated it would be impossible to discuss; the units may not be built for two years. M. Fougere noted that work force housing would be \$423,000 max. J. Coronati explained that townhouses were typically for younger professionals; families and older people are not your typical owners of townhouses. The age restricted units will be similar to Bramber Valley. The houses on the Rye side were still to be determined but will be condo units.

J. McDevitt: Concerned about the proximity to the Coakley Landfill. There was ledge on the property that would require blasting. J. Coronati stated it was not too close to Coakley and downstream of the Coakley area. He continued that Rye and Greenland had concerns about nitrate levels with septic and a hydrogeologic study would be required. J. Coronati was sure that study would be done if septic systems were used. They were hoping to have sewer but certainly have water; there is a water connection on Rt. 1. J. McDevitt noted there is a water connection (Rye water) behind the Bethany Church to the Seavey Way development. J. Coronati acknowledged there is ledge on the property and would be looking at studies. J. McDevitt suggested they look at the possibility of work force housing in the CA Zone.

D. Moore: It would be nice to see some mixed use in that area. This project would be a good candidate for mixed use.

S. Smith: Noted that the area around the Breakfast Hill monument has cultural significance. S. Smith also had concerns about the proximity to Coakley and the water. Blasting may open up cracks and no one knows where the water will flow. The wildlife habitat was a concern; that was a huge wildlife area. He questioned fire suppression, adding that hydrants would be put in if water lines were run. Mixed use in that area would be good. S. Smith stated that he 'balked' at the density. Greenland is a small town, and he did not think the density would work and the project could be scaled back. J. Coronati stated that if the development was on septic, it would probably be scaled back.

B. Dion: Questioned if the layout assumed sewage. J. Coronati responded it does for the CA density of the townhouses. They would like to do sewer.

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

D. Moore: Questioned how the amount of ledge would impact putting in septic. J. Coronati responded it would complicate things. They would have to work with a hydrologist, there would be big mounds, a hydrologic study would be done, and there would be fairly serious pre-treatment before it got to the leach field.

S. Smith: Would it be easier to connect from the end of Berry Farm Lane to the proposed age restricted development? J. Coronati stated the tricky part was the wetland area in that vicinity. Due to the location of the wetland, they would be in the buffer on the Greenland side. In addition, residents on Berry Farm Lane would not be happy.

J. McDevitt: Did not have as much of a problem with the density. He would like a traffic study done on the impact on Breakfast Hill Road and Post Road (151) through the Town. M. Fougere added that DOT would want that done.

M. Fougere: Due to the sensitivity of water in that area, coming up Breakfast Hill Road with water to Berry Farm Lane would be good. Don't snake through the back; come out on a public road, up the street, have it stop there. Water on Breakfast Hill Road heading towards the golf course would be good.

S. Gerrato: Had the same concerns as other Board members, adding they definitely should not blast and disturb all the Coakley bloom. It needed to be avoided. S. Gerrato questioned the 36 ft. wide road; J. Coronati stated it was not the whole road, just the entrance. There would be a left turn/right turn lane and then an entrance.

S. Gerrato opened the hearing to public comments. Pamela Gove, Berry Farm Lane: She had a great number of concerns about the project: blasting of ledge and the water in that area; her property is in a wet area at the end of Berry Farm Lane. There is a great abundance of wildlife in that area. Traffic was a concern. Concerned about Berry Brook. Affordable housing. The swale on Berry Farm Lane that was put in to prevent flooding.

J. Coronati addressed some of P. Gove's concerns: All developments of this size must do wildlife habitat studies. NH Fish & Game looks at wildlife on every development over 2.5 acres in size. A traffic study will be done. The Board's concern regarding ledge has been noted and will be addressed. Many of those items will be reviewed during the application process. J. Coronati was sure there would be a site walk. He noted that this will not be a quick process. Due diligence will be done by the Town. Abutter's will be involved as much as they want to be. M. Fougere noted that if blasting had to be done, the Board could require a blasting plan, which is a very detailed document that gets into the location of the ledge and the extent of removal, the depth, the limits on the charge that has to be in place, what were the off-site impacts, were any charges close to homes, there needs to be a pre-blast survey, there could be a requirement for off-site well analysis, etc.

S. Gerrato closed the public hearing and returned to the Board. There being no further comments from the Board, J. Coronati noted they were finished with their presentation and unsure when they would return.

7. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: B. Dion moved to approve the minutes of Thursday, November 04, 2021. Second – D. Moore. Five in favor, one abstained (S. Smith). MOTION CARRIED

DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

8. Approval of Invoices

MOTION: S. Smith moved to approve the payment of the invoice from Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella in the amount of \$240.50 from the Planning Board Town Budget. Second – S. Gerome; all in favor.
MOTION CARRIED

9. Other Business

S. Gerrato and S. Smith attended the recent GACIT hearing. S. Gerrato commented that it was disappointing and there was a two-minute time limit. S. Smith spoke about the Master Plan; S. Gerrato spoke about the bridge (using two lanes going left in the morning and two lanes going east in the evening). He felt that was the easiest way to move traffic. B. Dion attended the virtual meeting and spoke for five minutes.

S. Smith sent a letter to William Watson, NHDOT. The Board received a copy of the joint letter from Fish & Game and NHDES to William Watson (copy on file). They were in support of replacing the Winnicut River Bridge on Rt. 33 and that it be considered for addition to the Draft 2023-2032 Ten Year Plan.

S. Smith noted that another big concern was the water line, which has been left out of the conservation. There was a discussion about putting in a water line from the corner of Riverside Drive, across the bridge and to Winnicut Road and the corner of Bayside Road. NH Senator Sherman felt there was funding available for that type of project. It has been submitted to Altus Engineering for their opinion. Chief Cresta was concerned that the original dry hydrant does not work and has never worked. They can no longer draft from the river.

M. Fougere noted that the funding from the Transportation Bill will help move a lot of projects forward. B. Dion discussed a Stratham project that will go from the Winnicut Road/Bayside Road intersection to the former Great Bay Community College. It will be striped into three lanes so there is a center left turn lane. The plan is to do the project in 2023; it is on the books and funding is there. J. McDevitt noted that the choke point was the Winnicut River Bridge.

The Board also received a copy of an email from Attorney Somers regarding family relationship issues and Planning Board cases (copy on file).

10. Topics for Work Session: Thursday, December 02, 2021

M. Fougere will have a draft Impact Fee Ordinance for Board review at the work session. There will be a draft amendment to the Age Restricted Housing Ordinance to include affordable housing. The Board will also review an amendment to multi-family in the CA Zone from a Special Exception to a Conditional Use Permit.

It was noted that 150 Bayside Road may be added to the public hearing. J. McDevitt noted that there is a dip across from 150 Bayside Road that may need a guardrail. S. Smith will look into it.

M. Fougere will follow-up with J. Coronati (563 Breakfast Hill Road) on the December meeting. Tonight's meeting was for discussion purposes only; they have a lot of work to do before coming back.

Tower Place has submitted their application for the public hearing on Thursday, December 16th. The Preliminary Conceptual meeting was pretty controversial; it was suggested that the meeting be moved to a larger venue.

11. Adjournment

MOTION: J. McDevitt moved to adjourn at 7:40 p.m. Second – B. Dion; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, December 02, 2021 – 6:30 p.m., Town Hall Conference Room

Submitted By: Charlotte Hussey, Administrative Assistant