

**Planning Board**  
Town of Greenfield  
Preliminary Meeting Minutes  
Recorded by Janice Pack  
February 12, 2018

**Members Attending:** Paul Renaud, Ken Paulsen, Robert Marshall, Andre Wood, Angelique Moon

**Public Attending:** Robert Wachenfeld, Karen Russell, Michael Borden, John Hopkins, Carol Irvin, Karen Day, Neal Brown, Roger Lessard, Dave Blanchette, Tammie Blanchette, Chad Branon

**Meeting Opened:** The meeting was called to order by PRenaud at 6:05 PM.

**Minutes:** The Minutes from the meeting of January 29, 2018 were read by PRenaud. Changes were made:

Line 8: add "Andre Wood" to Members Attending

Line 39: add Bart's last name – Mayer

Line 43: revise to read "PRenaud made a couple of changes to the Planning Board Annual Report for the Town Report to reflect the changes made to the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments after the first Public Hearing."

Line 84: change "7:1" to "VII:I of the Site Plan Review regulations"

Line 95: change "30" " to "30' " (inches to feet)

Line 96: change "175" to "175' "

Line 101: insert "of the cuts and fill" after "impact" and change "2976' " to "2976 square feet"

Line 133: change "meeting" to "hearing"

Line 136: insert "PM" after "3:00"

KPaulsen motioned to accept the minutes as amended. AMoon seconded and all were in favor. Motion passed.

The Minutes from the Site Walk held on February 8, 2018 were read by PRenaud. A change was made for clarification on Line 21: insert "including 2 large trees near the main entrance" after "vegetation" PRenaud motioned to accept the minutes as amended. AMoon seconded and all were in favor except AWood who abstained. Motion passed.

**Mail**

The Accounts Payables folder with an invoice from Monadnock Ledger-Transcript for \$205 for noticing the second Public Hearing for the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments and the Public Hearing for Blanchette Self Storage Facility

The January flyer from Southwest Region Planning Commission

A certified letter addressed to Benjamin C. Reynolds which was unclaimed (Blanchette Self Storage Public Hearing)

PRenaud gave Tammie Blanchette a receipt for the checks that had been presented at the last meeting.

**6:35 PM**

PRenaud explained that we have received the report from Meridian Land Services rather than Dawn Tuomala. DTuomala would be willing to review for us but is simply too busy with other endeavors to do so at this time. PRenaud presented Meridian's invoice in the amount of \$1150. CBranon said that they

49 were not aware that there would be an invoice presented for payment tonight, or that we had changed  
50 our consultant. He submitted his personal check for payment.

51  
52 PRenaud advised the Board that the Zoning Board of Adjustment had approved the variances and the  
53 special exception for the Blanchette Self Storage Facility. The applicant is requesting a waiver to section  
54 VII:I of the Site Plan Review, the Landscape Plan. PRenaud read from Meridian's letter dated 2/8/18; a  
55 copy of which is in the file.

56  
57 CBranon addressed the Board. Speaking to the letter received from Meridian, he said there were  
58 several errors. Compensatory mitigation is not a requirement for this size wetlands permit; they are not  
59 impacting the stream itself. The second item is that Meridian is recommending that a retaining wall be  
60 included, and CBranon said that they had offered that at the Zoning Board meeting. He detailed the  
61 pipe that they were intending to use and agreed to incorporate more detail into the plan set.

62  
63 PRenaud asked what the plan would be if the State found that compensatory migration was required  
64 and CBranon said that since this is a State regulation, they would like to deal with that at the State level.

65  
66 AMoon asked "what would be due diligence at the State level?" CBranon said that if there was a  
67 mitigation component, and a mitigation plan that needed to be put in place, it would be discovered  
68 during the State permitting process. Again, he said that they are confident that they don't meet those  
69 criteria. He explained the process for permitting, and processes for wetland mitigation, upland  
70 regulation, and said that this project only falls in the minor impact category.

71  
72 KPausen asked if the only retaining wall proposed was the one in the back by the DOT property, what  
73 kind of fill would be put in that would stay without a retaining wall in the front. CBranon said the silt  
74 fence control fabric would be laid out like a security blanket to address any erosion. He said the silt  
75 fence was supposed to be inspected after any 1/4" of rainfall, so there would be logs kept on  
76 maintenance. KPausen asked who was responsible for the inspections and CBranon said ultimately the  
77 owner, but probably the contractor would do the inspections.

78  
79 **At 7:17 PM the Public Hearing was officially reopened.**

80 **Public Hearing continued for Site Plan Review: Self-Storage Facility – 295 Sawmill Road**  
81 **(Tax Map R1, Lot 29)**

82  
83 MBorden said that he feels this is a very good proposal for the area it's in, with very little impact and no  
84 septic. AMoon asked for his opinion on Fire and Life Safety requirements. MBorden feels that their plan  
85 for access meets the Fire Department's needs for getting equipment through. He said that because it is  
86 not a mixed-use occupancy, there is no requirement for sprinklers.

87  
88 Clrvin said that the Conservation Commission just had a meeting and took a vote. They do not support  
89 the project with the current information that they have on hand. They feel that the impact is excessive.  
90 They thought a retaining wall for the slope might minimize the amount of impact, and would like to see  
91 it proposed. They stated that since the application is not proposing any type of mitigation, they have  
92 concerns about the applicants' assumptions about the water on the property. The brook is NOT  
93 seasonal; it runs year round. Clrvin said that she had attended the ZBA meeting and was not convinced  
94 that the facts presented were correct in how the brook is fed and where it runs to. She would question  
95 whether or not the culvert should be replaced at the same size or if it should be a little larger. They are  
96 concerned that the new slope they are planning to put in will have its toe in an area that has been wet

97 for a long time. Roger Lessard agreed that he had never seen the brook bed dry. Clrvin said that the  
98 property is in the Groundwater Protection District and wanted to know if any other conditions had been  
99 put on it because of that. PRenaud said they have not gotten to that part yet.

100  
101 CBranch said that the wetland is certainly fed by the brook. The comment made previously specifically  
102 referred to a certain area of the brook. He let the ConCom members know that a retaining wall, 4' to 6',  
103 is still on the table and had been spoken about earlier tonight. Mitigation is only triggered by what's  
104 considered a major wetlands permit. At this point, the project does not trigger mitigation. They are  
105 focusing on the storm water management and how it is handled. Any good design has mitigation  
106 incorporated in it.

107  
108 CBranch said that when it comes to site plan layout, he feels they have put together a concept that has  
109 the least amount of impact for this site. If the ConCom does not support this project, they would have  
110 to file it as a minor wetland impact and proceed; the state will approve it without the ConCom's  
111 signature.

112  
113 AMoon asked about the size of the culvert proposed. CBranch said they are confident it will be  
114 adequate.

115  
116 Clrvin asked if the applicant did not need access all around the building for Building A, and particularly  
117 the eastern side, would the slope still need to be built up as much and the wetland impacted as much.  
118 CBranch said that the proposal included access on all sides of the 3 buildings. RLessard asked if the  
119 18,000 square foot number was the minimum to make the project viable, and CBranch said that was  
120 correct.

121  
122 Clrvin asked for the information in the Technical Consultant's Report, and PRenaud read it out loud.  
123 RWachenfeld asked if the retaining wall in the front was built, would it cause any adverse effects, like  
124 water running off onto the road. CBranch said it would not. AMoon asked the ConCom if the retaining  
125 wall were added, would it change their opinion. RLessard said that the addition of the wall would  
126 improve their opinion of the project. Clrvin said the Commission would feel better with a project that  
127 had no impact, but they would like to see the retaining wall option plans.

128  
129 The Board decided how to further proceed, whether to adjourn the hearing again or to close it. Hearing  
130 no further discussion, PRenaud said we could adjourn the hearing and continue it at our next regularly  
131 scheduled Planning Board meeting. **AMoon moved that we adjourn the Public Hearing and continue it**  
132 **at our next meeting on February 26, 2018 at 6:30 PM. AWood seconded the motion. All were in favor**  
133 **(5-0); motion passed.**

134  
135 CBranch said that they will address the items in the technical consultant's letter. AMoon made a  
136 motion to have the applicant revise the plan with the recommendations from the technical consultant.  
137 AWood seconded it; all were in favor, motion passed. (5-0)

138  
139 The Board discussed the lighting plan and the fact that the lights would be on all of the time. CBranch  
140 said they were confident that, given the low level lighting, there would be no light pollution. He said if  
141 there was a concern, they would submit a point-by-point plan. DBlanchette said a handful of lights  
142 would be on all the time. He said you could drive by the self storage facility in Peterborough to see  
143 what it will look like; they are very subtle.

144

AWood requested 3 cross sections of the plan, one specifically showing the retaining wall and the slope.

PRenaud questioned the paved aprons, 30' wide for the first 25'. CBranon said it's not something that is needed for this use; he said DOT would most likely not allow a 30' width at that site. There was a discussion on this, and it was noted that the Code Enforcement Officer did not have concerns but PRenaud will speak to him further.

PRenaud asked about the sign, and CBranon said at some future date there will be a sign permit applied for.

Regarding the Groundwater Protection Ordinance, Section 13, since there is a potential risk that something may be stored here that is potentially hazardous, this needs to be discussed. The business owner has a liability so it is in his best interests that enforcement be done through the contracts with his customers.

It was pointed out that all inactive wells on the property will need to be covered. CBranon said that was in the plans. AMoon said she didn't see any direct note about the wells being sealed.

The storm water protection plan was discussed, and the Board wondered if they felt comfortable approving a conditional use permit. PRenaud wanted to be sure that the public had a chance to comment. RMarshall said that based on our conversations here tonight, the Board was in agreement that this project appears to be in compliance with the Groundwater Protection Ordinance, with the exception of the well, and all agreed.

Regarding the waiver request for the landscaping plan, AWood asked that we defer this until we receive the landscaping plans. CBranon will submit the plans via paper and PDF on the Thursday before the next meeting.

PRenaud moved to adjourn this meeting, and AWood seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed.

**The meeting adjourned at 9:40 PM.**