



**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, April 21, 2022 – 6:30 p.m. – Greenland School

Members Present: Bob Dion, Stu Gerome, Steve Gerrato, Catie Medeiros, David Moore, Rich Winsor (Selectmen's Rep), Frank Catapano (Alternate)

Members Absent: John McDevitt

Staff Present: Mark Fougere

D. Moore opened the Planning Board public hearing at 6:30 p.m. He announced a quorum was present and the meeting was being recorded.

1. Projects of Regional Impact

There were no projects of regional impact to discuss.

2. Site Plan Review, Boundary Line Adjustment, Voluntary Merger, Conditional Use Permit

**Address:** Off Tower Place/Maple Drive; Vicinity of Magnolia Lane, Sunnyside Drive  
(R7, 3 – Zones: Residential, Wetlands Conservation, Aquifer Protection)

**Owners:** Community Congregational Church (R7, 3), Homewood Farm Realty Trust (R8, 16), Philbrick-Vickery Tower (R8, 17), Elaine Grover (Easement - R7, 61), Margaret Bell (Easement -R7, 61), Linda McGurin (Easement - R7, 57), Rebecca Eastman (Easement – R7, 57)

**Applicant:** Joseph Falzone

The owners and applicant are proposing an age-restricted development: 47 units, club house, and approximately 3,100 ft. of new road.

F. Catapano and S. Gerome recused themselves from this portion of the meeting.

Tim Phoenix, Attorney with Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormley & Roberts and representing the applicant, addressed the Board. Also present were Joseph Falzone, applicant, and Attorney John Kuzinevich, Co-Counsel. Attorney Phoenix introduced the following: Frank Manter, representing the parcel owned by the Church; Paul and Carol Sanderson, property owners; Bob Kasone, owner of a tower lot. The Project Team includes: Beals Associates; Doucet Survey; Brendan Quigley, Gove Environmental; Steve Pernaw, Pernaw and Company - Traffic Engineer; Steve Shope, Exeter Environmental; Matt Magnusson, Seacoast Economics; Jeff Hyland – Ironwood Landscape Architecture; Gove Group; Granite State Analytical.

Attorney Phoenix updated the Board. Altus Engineering completed an independent engineering review of the project which included plans and documents. The Board and applicant received a copy of the report (copy on file). Attorney Phoenix stated they were in the process of responding to comments from Altus Engineering. Attorney Phoenix submitted information to the Board addressing the fiscal

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

impact of an age-restricted housing (ARH) development. ARH developments are cash positive because there are no children and there would be no impact on the school system.

In their review, Altus Engineering questioned the septic loading. Attorney Phoenix reviewed the State requirements and rules with assistance from Christian Smith, Beals and Associates. The proposed 125 gallons per day (GPD) is permissible in an age restricted housing development as long as the occupancy remains at two per dwelling unit. A notation has been made in the Declaration of Condominium (copy on file).

Chief Laurent, Greenland Police Department, has submitted a review of the plans (copy on file). Attorney Phoenix stated that Chief Laurent felt that 'the development was laid out well with appropriately placed streets, homes and recreational areas'. Chief Laurent noted that there are two points of egress, which is ideal. Chief Laurent noted the traffic count done in Bramber Valley and that there are different peak hours for ARH developments, helping to reduce the peak during normal peak hours. Chief Laurent also noted that the level of service (LOS) at intersections has not increased. In addition, since the pandemic many people are working from home and will continue to work from home. Chief Laurent did not feel that speed would be impacted.

An analysis (copy on file) of the proposed ARH was compared to the surrounding development as well as the density provided in the Ordinance and the needs in Greenland. Their analysis included the Maple Drive and Sunnyside Drive subdivisions; they determined that the combined units equal 1 unit per acre (63 units). The proposed ARH development is 50 units. By the density calculations in the Zoning Ordinance, 51 units would be allowed on 60.3 acres. According to the information provided by the applicant, 4.5% of housing is for 55+. Attorney Phoenix stated that the proposed development is reasonable in size and scope as well as need.

R. Winsor: Questioned the relevance of the Greenland Housing Stock for 55 and older provided to the Board. Attorney Phoenix responded that it demonstrated the need for additional 55 and older housing in Greenland.

Matt Magnusson, Seacoast Economics, has been providing economic analysis services primarily in New Hampshire since 2012. There has been very strong growth in the region from 2010-2020; New Hampshire has the second largest increase in growth in New England (4.6%). Rockingham County saw the largest growth at 6.4%. Greenland's population increased 15% over the last decade. There is a housing shortage nationwide. The housing demand in New Hampshire is 3.5% greater than availability. In February 2022, the New Hampshire Association of Realtors stated that in a normal healthy market, the existing inventory would take about six months for houses to sell; currently, it is less than a month.

R. Winsor: How does that compare nationally? M. Magnusson responded that New Hampshire is not necessarily aligned with regional averages, specifically Rockingham County. R. Winsor: That area has been growing at 1.5% higher rate than the region. M. Magnusson commented that the Seacoast area is experiencing a high rate of growth.

Southeastern New Hampshire is experiencing high prices for housing due to limited availability. In 2020 the median home cost was \$425,000; February 2022 Rockingham County had the highest median cost at \$550,000.

In New England, 7% of homes are considered to be age-ready based on information collected by the US Census Bureau. Affordability for seniors is a major concern. Seniors require access to health care and

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

safe housing options. The 55+ population is expected to increase in Rockingham County by approximately 10% between 2020 and 2025. The demand for senior housing is projected to increase based on the current trend. Housing demand in Greenland is driven by demographic changes in Rockingham County. The projected demand for senior housing in Greenland is expected to increase by approximately 100 housing units, with 10% coming from within Greenland.

R. Winsor: 'Affordable' was mentioned several times. He questioned if the proposed project was going to be affordable. M. Magnusson responded that he did not consider the project in that context. He was addressing market demand.

B. Dion: What percentage of demand is under 55? M. Magnusson: The millennial generation is also a factor for housing. He was more focused on the 55+ aspect for this presentation. B. Dion was interested in the number and asked it to be made available.

R. Winsor: Asked what happens to the housing stock in Greenland when the trend ends for senior housing. He felt the demographic profile going forward was important; was the trend going to last forever? M. Magnusson stated this was a short-term forecast. Demographics are a factor. There could be other factors that would affect the economy and net migration. Over the last several years net migration has been a factor. D. Moore noted that over 55 housing is locked in for 90 years. Would there be the population to live in an ARH development in the future?

S. Gerrato: Questioned the average cost of the houses in the ARH development. M. Magnusson: Specific housing costs were not considered when preparing the analysis. C. Medeiros noted that in the proposal submitted to the Board, the average cost was \$650,000 for age-restricted housing. Attorney Phoenix stated that per J. Falzone, these units would be selling in the \$500,000 range. These units will be smaller than those in Bramber Green. Attorney Phoenix added that the price will depend on the supply chain demand and pricing.

Brendan Quigley, Gove Environmental Services and NH Certified Wetland Scientist: Responsible for wetland delineation, soils, and natural resources of the site. B. Quigley explained the colors on the plan. Areas of the plan included: limited disturbance, undisturbed/minimal disturbance, uplands, primary wetland complex associated with the site and extends to Packer Brook and Packer Bog which lies approximately 850 ft. from the nearest unit in the development. There are two areas of vernal pools breeding habitat located between the two islands of uplands (approximately 300 ft. from the development); two smaller ones are located approximately 200 ft. from the dog park.

There are some significant resource areas associated with the property and the design reflects that. Most importantly, the project has maintained an undisturbed buffer along the entire wetlands. Work on the project will be well away from the vernal pools and Packer Bog. The only wetlands impact will be the crossing located off Maple Drive to be used for secondary access. This has been designed for the absolute minimum impact, both in terms of its direct impact and secondary effects. It has been located on a narrow finger of wetlands, not technically on the property, which extends up from the larger complex; an easement has been obtained for access. It is a narrow finger of wetlands and the easiest, most direct route with the least amount of area. The portion of wetland is, in many ways, separate from the main body of the wetland. They are utilizing an area of wetland with the least importance to the overall function.

The crossing design utilizes tall retaining walls, vertical up from the ground rather than a conventional fill profile. There will be less impact at the base. They have kept the physical direct impact of the

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

crossing to 103,000 sq. ft. Rather than a traditional pipe, the crossing will utilize an 8 ft. high x 8 ft. wide pre-cast structure. This is typically used for a much more significant stream or crossing between two large areas of wetland, primarily to maintain connectivity between the two.

In addition to the efforts to minimize the impact physically and directly, the Conditional Use criteria also requires that there are certain wetland functions to be considered and evaluated due to the impact. Three primary functions are wildlife habitat, flood storage/capacity, and water quality. The structure meets all applicable standards. The standard of .25 meters is exceeded at .38 meters. It is encouraged to make the crossing at least 6 ft. high for wildlife that would be able to utilize something not as high. They are exceeding the recommended 6 ft. The crossing is located approximately 30 ft. downstream and they are not expecting much use by wildlife.

Flood Storage: They are not in the flood plain; there is a very small stream. Its primary role, with respect to flood storage, is that of a conduit. They have provided a structure that will not hinder the flow in any way. It is oversized for that purpose. The hydraulic modeling submitted for the stormwater study indicates it is three times larger for volume than required for a 100-year storm. They do not expect flood issues to be associated with this.

Water Quality: It is more difficult to associate water quality and the potential for water quality impact with this type of crossing. The most significant aspect of the project is the maintenance of the buffer throughout the whole site. The stormwater management will compensate for a very small buffer and impact on either side of the roadway. There is very minimum, if any, chance that the crossing will be a negative impact to the wetlands.

A box culvert was initially proposed for the crossing. It is beneficial for wetland crossings to have a natural bottom; this crossing will incorporate a natural bottom and will be more favorable to wildlife. B. Quigley did not have a sketch of the open bottom. It is a fairly basic concept and is 8 ft. high. It is a much larger crossing structure than is normally provided for this type of crossing. It is related to wildlife, but more accurately this type of structure would be required for more high value resources or more potentially impactful locations. On State and municipal levels, these type of crossings are preferred because of potential impacts.

B. Dion: Responding to a question from B. Dion, B. Quigley stated that the 8 ft. x 8 ft. box culvert is 50 ft. long. B. Quigley noted the direction of the water flow. The culvert at the head of the ravine is not the primary flow. It is a groundwater discharge area. The water is flowing up. There are undisturbed uplands as well as an area of minimal disturbance (trails).

S. Gerrato: Questioned if the 8 ft. walls would be in the wetlands. B. Quigley responded that the crossing will be in the wetlands. Retaining walls will be built in the wetlands and filled between them to support the berm. B. Quigley noted they would be higher than 8 ft. There will be curbs on the crossing to contain the runoff. A bridge would release road surface runoff into the wetlands; the road will have a closed drainage system.

C. Medeiros: Requested more information about the stormwater management plan and maintaining the buffers. B. Quigley responded that he could not expertly address stormwater management. With the wetland and buffer impacts being limited and the resource area being relatively significant, he felt one of the most important aspects of the design is that it stays out of the buffer. They were not asking to put houses, units, or other elements of the project close to the buffers; the buffers will remain in an undisturbed state.

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Jeff Hyland, Ironwood Landscape Architecture: Slides of the landscape design were shown. Three different varieties of trees were planned for the ridgeline: primarily White Pine, some Oak, and a little bit of American Beech. The ridge line is approximately 10 ft. to 11 ft. above the Magnolia Lane elevation; this is a significant grade change. They are preserving the ridgeline as an instantaneous buffer primarily because of the grade change. The development area is actually on a plateau.

J. Hyland noted it is a significantly large parcel: 67.5 acres; a little more than 20 acres that will be developed. 90 street trees are proposed. They are planning eight different varieties. Evergreen trees are targeted for areas in the existing buffer that are not as dense. Some evergreen trees are planned within the development.

Landscaping within the development was discussed. They understand that one of the goals is to create neighborhoods that are walkable and promote activity. There will be sidewalks within the entire development. All streets and sidewalks will have shade from street trees. There will also be a trail system within the site; some portions of the trail exist and some will be connected. A few additional trails are being proposed that connect to the existing trails. They are trying to promote the neighborhood and a nice living experience for those planning to live there as well as a nice addition to the larger neighborhoods of Magnolia Lane, Maple Drive and Sunnyside Drive.

There is a significant variety of trees, primarily those native to New England. Trees were selected for a variety of benefits: fall color, seasonal, etc. Street trees were selected based on urban tolerance, salt tolerance, heat tolerance, etc., as well as pests that are invading the region.

The grade change along the ridgeline was illustrated. The two entrances were shown. It was noted that the entrances are the first 'welcome mat' for the residents and visitors. There was a need to create visual buffering along the entrance on Magnolia Lane. The entrance off Maple Drive has significant existing restrictions due to the environment; there does not need to be much augmenting of that entrance. They will be working with nature, adding a few trees at the Maple Drive entrance. Illustrations of the entry way at Magnolia Lane were shown; there were no guarantees, but it was the goal. Visually, they tried to represent the trees that would be planted.

D. Moore: Questioned the number of trees being removed from the whole site. J. Hyland responded it was fully forested with sizable trees. D. Moore: Does the amount of trees being replaced come close to the density requirements for the number of trees on the site and size? J. Hyland: Yes, they have exceeded a bit. They are 40 ft. on center for the most part with all the trees. He thought they were going to be 2 ½-inch to 3-inch caliper. In addition, there will be a significant number of shrubs.

J. Hyland stated the top of the ridgeline was primarily white pine. R. Winsor: Questioned if there would be a stand of white pine behind the development. It was a mix, primarily because of the gravel ridge. White pines like to grow on that type of ridgeline. White pines are located across the top of the ridge. R. Winsor was concerned that the white pine would not survive well if everything behind it was stripped. He wanted to know how those risks could be mitigated going forward. J. Hyland responded that the proposal was to leave it natural. The white pines exist on the top of the ridge. There is a variety going down the slope: scrubby oak, black cherry, smaller white pines; there is a lot of vegetation going down the slope. Coming from the north on the back side there is a depth to the white pine. It will not be one row of white pine but a natural stand, approximately 100 ft. wide. M. Fougere stated that the staff had a similar concern, adding what is left will be unknown until after the cutting is done. He suggested a mitigation package that included looking at the area after the cutting was done to see if it was really evident that the remaining thin pines may not survive a nor'easter. It may be possible to have them

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

removed while the cutters were still on site and replace them with something appropriate. J. Hyland noted that there is an aesthetic side; the most unattractive side will be the cut side facing the development. The more attractive side will be untouched (south facing). There will basically be no change to the existing view.

B. Dion: All the trees being removed in the natural forest are protecting the stand of white pine. J. Hyland responded that is why you do not want to leave a 10 ft. wide sloth in place, there has to be some mass—there is strength in numbers. That is why they are preserving a significantly wide buffer strip (approximately 100 ft. wide). M. Fougere asked the age of the vegetation on the entrance drawings. J. Hyland stated they usually project 25 years.

S. Gerrato noted that the Planning Board Engineer did not like 141 things about the project (copy on file). S. Gerrato pointed out that the Planning Board Engineer was concerned about grading and the runoff towards Magnolia Lane. J. Hyland responded that he was not a civil engineer and could not speak to that. Attorney Phoenix stated that they were in the process of responding to the report from Altus Engineering; the civil engineers would respond to that concern. S. Gerrato noted that was something the Board would not tolerate.

Attorney Phoenix recommended a site walk be scheduled. It would help answer some of the questions about the white pine stand, the location of the wetland crossing, etc. Attorney Phoenix asked when the peer reviews would be available; M. Fougere will contact the consultants doing the peer reviews for traffic and hydro. Payment authorizing the peer reviews was received recently.

R. Winsor: Although he admired their efforts to keep the project moving forward, he thought they may have the ‘cart before the horse’. Particularly when it involved density. There are maximum density calculations and those are subject to review of the Conditional Use Permit (CUP). He was struck by the density and the impact to the surrounding neighborhood and safety. R. Winsor was not at ease with that, given the response from the community. He felt it may not be necessarily suitable as proposed. He would like to get some of those things out of the way before they spent more money.

R. Winsor asked if a viable conventional yield plan was done for the property. Attorney Phoenix responded it was not a requirement. Attorney Phoenix understood the comment and concern. On behalf of his client, he felt a full review of the density should not be done until the peer reviews were done to see the effect on traffic, hydrogeology, etc. That was when an informed decision might be made on the density. The point up to this meeting was that they complied with the mathematical formulas for what the area permits. R. Winsor responded that he was okay with waiting to have the discussion later on. His objective was that he did not want them spending money if there were changes. It was based on more than just a hydrogeological study and traffic. There are two critical words in the conditions of the CUP: suitability and density. Suitability is a little more ambiguous than just ‘hey, there is a number’ and that is it. It has to fit the community as does the traffic—everything has to fit together. R. Winsor was part of the original design and formation of that particular Ordinance and was very familiar with the spirit of the Ordinance.

Attorney Phoenix appreciated R. Winsor’s concern. He continued that their position now was that the project was suitable, they met the density, there is a need and there was almost the exact density as the neighborhood. He respected if R. Winsor felt differently and asked what he suggested. They were looking for more information that is not from their side but from independent reviewers. R. Winsor suggested they look at the adjacent property. He stated he would go back to a conventional yield plan and ask, ‘what was the property then’. If they were to do a conventional subdivision, what was the

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

realistic number of homes that could viably be put on the property? R. Winsor noted that looking at it, there was a significant amount of wetlands that would restrict that heavily. There were 29 acres of upland. A conventional subdivision in the Zoning Ordinance would state that 75% of that has to be contiguous upland for a lot at 1.38 acres. Doing the math quickly, the number drops the number down into the 30's. The load on the property is being increased compared to what it would be if it was left to a natural subdivision. R. Winsor continued that was how he would base his judgement on the density: what would that property have been suitable for in a traditional subdivision. He was not saying that age-restricted had anything to do with it—it was the number of homes. The property could support a conventional subdivision of 20 to 25 homes; that could be boosted slightly with age restricted, which was a benefit. R. Winsor added that he would not feel comfortable just because they could be fit there. He noted it was a maximum calculation not *the* calculation. Those are the subjective pieces of the Conditional Use Permit—suitability and density. Those are the key critical pieces that need to be addressed.

Attorney Phoenix responded that they believe they have addressed it and are still in the process of addressing it. The Conditional Use Permit application has been submitted with supporting documents. They did not feel it was appropriate to argue the point until the remainder of the information was available from their experts and lawyers, and the Board itself and their peer reviews. Attorney Phoenix was unaware of a requirement for the yield plan. Unless they are told differently, they will move forward with what they are doing and see where it goes with the Board.

R. Winsor stated that he did not want to see them spend money and he was perfectly happy waiting for further discussion. He encouraged them to look at the Conditional Use Permit and understand that density is at the discretion of the Board. Attorney Phoenix: There is discretion and then there is what is reasonable discretion. He appreciated the comments and the position and it gives them the opportunity to go in a different direction now rather than later. Speaking on behalf of his co-counsel and the developer, they are proceeding as submitted. R. Winsor stated he wanted it on record that the Board was not spending his money frivolously. He would prefer to have the discussion sooner rather than later. On Attorney Phoenix's advice they would like to continue with the application. Attorney Phoenix: As of today, based on where they have been and where they are, it was just being raised now. They will certainly talk about it going forward and have a formal response next time.

Attorney Kuzinevich clarified that they thought there was a fundamental disagreement here. This is not a subjectively governed criteria. The Board's evaluation has to be a reasonable and objective phase. There is some judgement the Board is allowed as long as it is reasonable and can be supported by objective. Traffic, drainage, etc. play a very large part. Attorney Kuzinevich wanted to make sure the Board appreciated their position and it was not just subjectivity. R. Winsor stated he understood and his whole point of the discussion was that he *hated* seeing money spent and did not want to do that. He was more than happy to listen to what they had to say but wanted them to be aware there was more to that subject than just the traffic and the hydro. To their point, it was reasonable; but there was a balance in between. He respected that balance.

Attorney Kuzinevich stated as an observer he has noticed a balancing tension happening. There was talk of lowering density. Usually, the effect is an increase in price. Earlier in the meeting there was a discussion about affordability. R. Winsor stated the discussion about affordability stemmed from the analysis of the marketplace.

Attorney Phoenix asked if there was a consensus about a site walk.

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

S. Gerrato had three areas he wanted to discuss at this meeting: wetlands and buffer, runoff to Magnolia Lane (he was not pleased with what was happening in those areas) and travelling through the neighborhood which was the worst part of it. Referring to Bramber Valley, S. Gerrato continued that development is accessed by two State roads. There is a development off 177 Winnicut Road that is also accessed off a State road. The development off Breakfast Hill Road is accessed off a State road. This proposed development is accessed through a neighborhood road, and that is the biggest problem. Attorney Phoenix noted that is the subject of a traffic report and peer review of the traffic report. He also noted that the Subdivision Regulations require a development to provide access to land out back and the land behind for future development. There is constructive knowledge that if someone is in a neighborhood where there is undeveloped land behind it, someday that might be developed. The way to get to it was through a neighborhood. They recognize they have a responsibility to the adjacent neighborhood and all three of those streets. They intend to meet that responsibility and are in the process of documenting that now. S. Gerrato stated many times developers leave that land because it is undesirable.

M. Fougere read a letter into the record (copy on file) from J. McDevitt, Vice Chair, who was unable to attend the meeting. R. Winsor suggested waiting for another cycle before doing the site walk.

D. Moore opened the hearing to public comments. Shawn McColough, 54 Sunnyside Drive, had received a certified letter regarding well testing in the area. He thought discussions regarding the project had just started. The well testing was scheduled to start in May. M. Fougere explained that as part of the analysis, there would be on-site wells to supply water to the proposed homes. The State requires well testing to determine the cone of influence of the well. They have to do a major draw-down to see what is happening. One of the ways to evaluate is to assess the potential impact on abutter's wells. There are monitoring devices they can install in the wells to see if it moves. It is part of the analysis that the Board will want to know as well as NH Department of Environmental Services. S. McColough stated he was led to believe that this would take several months. Wells will have to be drilled and this is a two-hour test. M. Fougere noted that the wells are already in. R. Winsor reiterated that there is no subdivision going in; this was just testing. This is very important for residents in the area. No approvals have been made. The Board has a lot of questions. R. Winsor continued that they wanted to have a community well; at the last meeting residents were concerned about the impact on their water. The State will require them to state if there is an impact on water and wells. This is part of the requirement before they can get an approval. To have that well, they need to establish that it is not impacting the perimeter. S. McColough requested that a rendition of the entrance on the Maple Drive side be shown. He also did not appreciate that the wetlands were not shown. It was not their lot, but it was their obligation to show the public where the wetlands exist where they want to put the bridge across. R. Winsor requested that the applicant show the wetlands on the plan to help people understand the impact of what is happening on the other piece. J. Falzone stated that they cannot access other people's property without permission. The wetlands have been shown. M. Fougere clarified that they were requesting the plan be colored so the wetlands can be seen.

Rob Holt, 70 Magnolia Lane: Asked at what point the Conservation Commission's recommendations were entered into the Planning Board minutes. In July 2021 the Planning Board recommended the Conservation Commission review the project. S. Gerrato stated he contacted the Conservation Commission with his concern that they reviewed the project before the wetlands were discovered and before the applicant got his easements. S. Gerrato continued that the Conservation Commission was better than the Planning Board for wetlands. R. Holt read a portion of the Conservation Commission minutes from August 15, 2021, that B. Lajoie and the summer intern looked at the Tower Place wetland delineation markings and that there could be a closer look with a site walk. R. Holt asked if the

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Conservation Commission had done a site walk and who had the recommendations of the Conservation Commission on file? S. Gerrato stated the engineer had walked the site. R. Winsor stated the Board could take action to follow up with the Conservation Commission. S. Gerrato explained that the Conservation Commission is appointed by the Board of Selectmen. The Selectmen are responsible for clean drinking water. R. Holt mentioned that S. Gerrato had stated during a Planning Board meeting that the wetlands should be taken away from the Planning Board and given to the Conservation Commission.

M. Fougere noted that from a procedure standpoint and to bring people up to speed on what is happening, the Planning Board has received a formal application. There was not a formal application in August 2021. As part of the application, there will be a dredge and fill application submitted to the State (NHDES). That permit will be commented on by the Commission and will activate the project. They will most likely go out to the site. They will make a recommendation to the Planning Board and the State. R. Holt continued his questions about the Conservation Commission and their initial recommendation to the State. R. Winsor attempted to explain the definition of 'application' and that there are different phases. There is an initial review, which does not mean there is an application. The Conservation Commission will not review everything based on an initial review. They do not review until there is a formal application. A formal application is when it comes to the Planning Board and the Board accepts the application. That happened at the very last meeting and starts the process forward. Until the last meeting, there was nothing for the Conservation Commission to review. It was discussed because it was a pending application that could be out there.

R. Holt questioned the wetland delineation markers that were set last year. When asked by M. Fougere if he was doubting the wetland markings, R. Holt responded he was doubting the wetland markings. He stated it was noted that area was susceptible to vandalism and questioned if the wetland markings would be in the right spot a year later. M. Fougere stated the project came before the Planning Board last year as a conceptual discussion. M. Fougere pointed out there was only one entrance at that time. The Board noted that the project did not work because there was only one access point. The applicant had to find another access point, evaluate it, and do an analysis. There was another concern about adequate frontage when the application was submitted in the fall, which was a legal issue and took 4 to 5 months to resolve. The application was not able to be legally submitted to the Board until March.

R. Holt commented that he did not have faith in the delineation markings and had less faith in it because a member of the Board directed comments at Tower Place stating that anything having to do with wetlands should go to the Conservation Commission. M. Fougere stated it was something the Board could look at. He has been in the business for 30 years and has known the professionals at Gove Environmental over that time period. From a professional standpoint, you cannot get any better than Gove Environmental and he trusted their work. They also have a stamp. Responding the R. Holt, M. Fougere stated he has not worked with the developer. S. Gerrato noted permission was needed to access property. R. Holt commented that he hoped the Board would walk the property and, by law, invite the abutters. R. Winsor noted that prior to opening public comments, they had discussed walking the site. The decision was made to get through one more round discussing some of the technical details before doing a site walk. There was a continued discussion about the Conservation Commission doing a site walk.

R. Holt asked if the roads were going to be open to the public. It was noted that Bramber Green was private. R. Winsor commented that the Board did not know if a decision had been made if it was going to be gated or not. M. Fougere stated that the roads within the development would be private. One of the access roads will have to be public for access and frontage.

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Cheryl Van Allen, 30 Sunnyside Drive: Questioned how 50 units, 100 people, cumulatively impacted the surrounding neighborhood. She also questioned the density of the project compared to the surrounding neighborhood. C. Van Allen felt the statistics did not support the 55+ issue in Greenland if there was one. It may affect Rockingham County but did not necessarily have a big positive impact on Greenland 55+. C. Van Allen asked if the newly planted shrubs would have an impact on the insects, wildlife, and plant life in the wetlands. She mentioned that trees would be planted to buffer the new community from traffic noise and asked about the existing community and the large number of cars that will increase going by their homes. Who was going to maintain their roads? R. Winsor clarified that the 125 gallons per day that she questioned was actually septic not well. The well testing would establish the impact on well water. C. Van Allen pointed out that well testing would be done now, after the winter melt as opposed to in the summer with potentially drought conditions. R. Winsor stated that the surface water conditions do not impact that deep.

Brian Van Allen, 30 Sunnyside Drive: Asked if they had considered sending out a survey to Greenland residents 55 and over to find out their interest in purchasing a unit in the development. R. Winsor stated that questions needed to be directed to the Board rather than the applicant. He responded to B. Van Allen, stating that they do not need to establish market conditions. The Board will look at the suitability for the Town. B. Van Allen asked what would happen if there was an accident on the bridge. Could gasoline seep into the wetlands. R. Winsor stated that would be an emergency situation and mitigation. That was the reason the Board was so emphatic about a second entrance. R. Winsor assured him the Board would be discussing the bridge over the wetlands.

Pat Miner, 17 Maple Drive: Referring to the density, he stated it was easy to make numbers look good. There was more density. Voiced concerns about Town resources. They were promoting the beautiful neighborhood with sidewalks. What about the neighborhood they had to drive through to get to their neighborhood? Traffic was also a safety issue. Asked about removing trees and the buffer and how the noise from I-95 would be mitigated.

Rick Semerjian, 9 Magnolia Lane: Noted that he read the Master Plan. Three major problems the abutters on Magnolia Lane had were addressed in the Master Plan: water, traffic and over development. He took issue with the traffic report; it was a fantasy and manipulated statistics. What would traffic be like on Breakfast Hill Road during construction. It was noted in the Master Plan that Breakfast Hill Road and Post Road was one of the worst intersections. He also mentioned the elevation and runoff. Most of the things addressed in the Master Plan were completely opposite of impact of the development.

David Bellantone, 107 Breakfast Hill Road: It was important that residents were able to address their concerns. He thought one of the things the Board was charged with was the nature of the community residents lived in and to preserve that. A gated community does not do that. What does this development do for the Town of Greenland? What is the benefit to the people of this community? He would like to see how the development benefits the community as a whole.

D. Moore closed public comments and returned to the Board. R. Winsor recommended reviewing J. McDevitt's comments and the density as well. The peer reviews and report from the Planning Board Engineer were mentioned. B. Dion felt there were too many houses too close together. They were not meeting the requirements of Section 19.3-P, which was mentioned in J. McDevitt's letter. He asked the applicant to review it and explain how their development fit the requirements. B. Dion was not comfortable with it because they were not maximizing the privacy of the dwelling units as required. He wanted them to address all the concerns. B. Dion was also concerned about the water and traffic. If the project was approved, it would make a fundamental major change to the living conditions for the

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

residents and children in the adjacent subdivision. C. Medeiros agreed with B. Dion and there was a lot that needed to be addressed with the project. Density was an issue but there were several different types of buildings in the development; she felt it should be more cohesive. S. Gerrato agreed traffic was a problem. D. Moore was also concerned about the density. Just because you can maximize the number of houses on a property does not necessarily mean you always should. B. Dion stated that the density allowance according to the Ordinance takes all the property and puts housing units on only 20%. He did not think that was the intent of the Ordinance. Everything was compressed into a small area and it may be working against everybody.

M. Fougere will contact the consultants doing the peer reviews for an update. He will also request the consultants be at the next public hearing. The hydro may take longer. When asked by R. Winsor if the applicant wanted the next hearing contingent on the traffic review, Attorney Phoenix responded they planned to have a formal response to the comments from Altus Engineering.

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to continue the Site Plan Review, Boundary Line Adjustment, Voluntary Merger, and Conditional Use Permit for Off Tower Place/Maple Drive, Vicinity of Magnolia Lane, Sunnyside Drive to the public hearing on Thursday, May 19, 2022. The meeting will be held in the School MPR, if it is available. Second – S. Gerrato; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

F. Catapano and S. Gerome rejoined the Board.

### 3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: R. Winsor moved to approve the minutes of Thursday, April 07, 2022. Second – S. Gerome; six in favor, one abstained (C. Medeiros). MOTION CARRIED

### 4. Approval of Invoices

There were no invoices to approve.

### 5. Other Business

Members were asked to bring their Ordinance books to the work session on Thursday, May 05, 2022, to be updated.

F. Catapano noted that all kinds of housing are needed, not just age restricted. He was not against age restricted housing. This was an opportune time to look at the Age Restricted Housing (ARH) Ordinance more closely. M. Fougere stated it was on the list. F. Catapano continued that the ARH Ordinance was developed due to the tax benefits. He noted that huge densities were given for ARH developments because of the economic impact. It does bring in more tax revenue than single family housing. Greenland has a population that is older than many towns. R. Winsor stated you needed to be hyper-vigilant about statistics because they can be manipulated. S. Gerome noted that the number 1 statistic that no one picked up on at this meeting was that New Hampshire is the oldest state in the Union. F. Catapano commented what was needed was more affordable housing. D. Moore commented that the biggest problem with the Ordinance was that the Board allowed too much density. F. Catapano suggested that the Planning Board Attorney attend a meeting to talk to the Board. M. Fougere will arrange a conference call.

## DRAFT: SUBJECT TO CHANGE

### 6. Topics for Work Session: Thursday, May 05, 2022

Goals will continue to be discussed.

### 7. Adjournment

MOTION: S. Gerome moved to adjourn at 9:00 p.m. Second – R. Winsor; all in favor. MOTION CARRIED

NEXT MEETING
--------------

Thursday, May 05, 2022 – 6:30 p.m., Town Hall Conference Room

Submitted By: Charlotte Hussey, Administrative Assistant