

Planning Board Minutes 10/06/2014

Planning Board
Preliminary Meeting Minutes –
Recorded by Sharon Rossi
October 6, 2014

Members present: RMarshall, PRenaud, KO'Connell, SFox, SChicoine, AHeck (alternate for JFletcher)

7:00 P.M. Minutes:

PRenaud began reading the September 22, 2014 minutes. Several spelling, punctuation and replacement of words were done. No substantive changes were made. KO'Connell motioned to accept the minutes as amended.

PRenaud seconded. Vote unanimous in favor.

7:11 p.m. New Business:

RMarshall asked the Board to look over the proposed budget for 2015. He suggested the legal/professional line remain the same. The Master Plan Update is being reduced by \$1,000 and the rest of the proposed budget is to remain the same as 2014. The preliminary budget has to be turned in on 10/9 and any changes can be made later.

KOConnell asked how much money has been spent in the legal line. RMarshall said the total amount used so far is \$1,020.16 but it doesn't include the costs of last weekend's event. The \$7000 budget includes a legal review of our site plan application which will cost about \$1000. RMarshall asked for recommendations from the Board on any changes they see. RMarshall will be submitting this proposed budget on Thursday to APatt. The budget meeting with Selectmen to discuss the budget will be November 12.

The Site Plan review notification change voted at the September 22, 2014 public hearing has been changed. Administrative changes have been made to the fee structure, namely the advertising change from '\$50' to 'as incurred' and the 'consultant fee' to 'as incurred.'

7:25 P.M. Mail Received:

- A SWRPC Fall Meeting invitation for October 21, 2014.
- A memo from Community Development Finance Authority re: Availability of CD Building Planning Grants Fund, Application Deadline, Friday, October 31
- Copy of Check received for a one room refund from Jack Daniels Motor Inn - #13106 in the amount of \$162.41

RMarshall commented that he is going to send out Thank You notes to businesses that donated to the charrette and to Jack Daniels Inn for the refund.

7:30 P.M. Allrose Public Hearing

RMarshall open the public hearing advising the audience that this was a hearing for a site plan review for Allrose Farm. He asked if any members of the Board needed to dis-qualify themselves from this hearing – none did.

RMarshall advised of the rules of protocol. The public hearing notice was posted in Monadnock Ledger, the town website, the Post office bulletin board and certified notices were sent to the abutters. Attorney JReimers and CBranon, Fieldstone Land Consultant, will be the presenters for this application.

He suggested that representatives for the applicant would introduce the application and the Board would then determine if the application was sufficiently complete to invoke jurisdiction. He would then ask the representatives to formally present the proposal. Following their presentation, he would then seek public input. He requested that in the interest of clarity in the minutes, he would have the supporters speak first followed by those in opposition.

JReimer, representing MPerron, introduced the application. He requested that the Planning Board make a final approval of the site plan application tonight. He said the site plan review application meets all three criteria. It is a hotel with a capacity of 22 guests, a use permitted in the General Residence district. MPerron hired my firm and CBranon after she withdrew her initial application. She has worked with Greenfield's building inspector and commissioned Fieldstone Land Consultants to design new septic system. The town approved the design last week and it has been submitted to the state. She has added exterior lighting and a second outside stairway and emergency exit signs. Most of guests will be there for family weddings and will patronize local businesses and caterers.

She is following conservation and preservation guidelines to provide a balanced protection of natural and historical resources. Her business will be in an historic building. Piscataquog Land Conservancy (PLC) holds the conservation easement around her property. We discussed with the PLC the septic system that will be close to their property and they are OK with it. We have contacted the Monadnock Conservancy and they are not concerned. We submit that this proposal is in compliance with the Site Plan Review regulation.

7:37 P.M. Site Plan Review Checklist

A check was received in the amount of \$222.00 to cover the costs of the application. RMarshall asked the Board members to go through the checklist. RMarshall started going through the application line by line and asked members to identify items on the plat as they correspond with the checklist. He said the applicant is requesting 3 different waivers which will be address later by CBranon.

RMarshall said there is a letter attached to the application empowering CBranon to speak for MPerron concerning the plat.

KO'Connell asked if there is test pit data available? CBranon said that the town has a copy on file. The profile shows the breakdown on the soil and MBorden has approved it.

The first waiver pertains to Section 7 G-- storm water drainage plan requirement. CBranon said the proposed changes on the property will not change the drainage and no adverse impact on driveways or drainage system will occur.

Second waiver pertains to Section 7 I --Landscaping- The current landscaping is well maintained and no changes are planned.

Third waiver pertains to Section 7 J --Lighting plan requirement – There are building mounted lights that have been added to barn to illuminate parking area and no light pollution will occur.

RMarshall asked the board if the application was complete enough to invoke jurisdiction. KO'Connell motioned to accept application as presented. SFox seconded. Vote in unanimous favor.

CBranon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, began the formal introduction of the application. He found that the site can support this activity with minimal improvements in alterations. The only land alternation pertains to the new septic system on the north side of the barn. The parking area is in conformance with town regulations. Fifty-one spaces can be located in the parking area and that doesn't take into account of the existing paved driveway. Drainage on the property is virtually unchanged. There is no change in patterns, no additional impervious areas and therefore minimal impact to the site. The total property is 22.8 acres with over 20.2 acres in open space. The land around the existing buildings, landscaping, septic area and parking area consists of 2.6 acres. We are showing all the improvements in that area, so no impacts will occur on the other areas. For the new septic design, a silt fence, and best management practices will be in place. The fire supply protection will be the existing fire pond on the property.

The biggest task here was in locating the existing improvements on the property. There are few proposed changes on this property.

Drainage requirement - This waiver request is for the storm water management plan. We would typically prepare a storm water plan, but as there is no change in the water shed area and no change to land coverage, we are requesting the waiver.

Landscape waiver – It is my understanding that several Board members have viewed the area and have seen how nicely it is landscaped. This property is surrounded by conservation land and this project requires no landscape changes.

Lightning waiver- Currently there are wall mounted lights which are downcast light fixtures. Given the approximate location of the lights, they will not cause any light pollution. We are not proposing any new fixtures at this time. This is why we are requesting the waiver.

8:06 P. M. Audience Support of this application

SPennoyer discussed with Monadnock Conservancy's Emily Hagen and it looks like the area for the septic system is fine. You should contact her first to confirm no change. As a citizen I am in favor of this proposal. I've seen this property during the day. The lighting is good and Michele has put a lot into the property already. She has an easement on the property and has allowed trail riders on her property. I hear and see nothing that raises a concern with me. This provides a way to put money into the property, and it is the idea of private enterprise and providing the growth that the Master Plan is looking for. It will help the inn and the store. I would add that I believe that you as a Board are providing her a SPR approval and would have a mechanism in place that, if she sells the property, would require new owners come before Board for review. Also the Board should have some language in SPR approval about noise limits.

SAtherton said, I'm not an immediate abutter or neighbor, but this is a great idea. I believe in the spring that there was a proposal to beautify the town, and I feel that this is going to be a benefit to the town. I realize that this business is only bringing people in for weddings, but will help bring more income to our town. The only concern I have is the traffic, but that will come to the town soon as we grow.

MPaulsen said I am all for this. I've ridden my horses on the property, which is in the middle of nowhere. My place is about a mile away, and I can't hear any noise from the property. The personnel using the property, caterers, and tent suppliers will all provide income for people in this area and isn't degrading the town. It is so beneficial to all.

JMoller said I live beyond MPerron's place and it is a delight to see what is going on at her house. I didn't notice a lot of disturbance from her location. The neighbors further up the road do fireworks for every holiday which is noisy. There is someone on the other side of the hill and music can be heard, but that goes off at midnight. This is something different that will create a lasting memory as weddings do. You have to be ready to expand things and you have to be ready to try new things. She has met all requirements in the Site Plan Review.

SLockwood said the site is being beautifully done which is adding value to the neighborhood, whereas the abandoned property further down the road is lowering evaluations. I am in favor of MPerron's business.

JTimmons said I want to address the noise issue, but there isn't really one. The noise from Zephyr Lake is louder.

STimmons said I live beyond SPennoyer and I am in favor of this project.

SMoller said, I am in favor, as resident of Greenfield, of MPerron's improvements. They have made the land look better. I like to drive by when there is a wedding commencing. As for noise and lighting, I have no issue with it. Traffic hasn't been intrusive so far. This is an opportunity that allows a business that doesn't detract from the town.

8:20 P. M. RMarshall read into the record a letter from Piscataquog Land Conservancy which neither endorses nor opposes the application. However the PLC is concerned regarding the septic area immediately abutting the Conservation Easement area. (See letter on file.)

8:29 P. M. Audience Opposition to this application:

Attorney SLittle, representing David and Marilyn Hedstrom, abutters, said the zoning ordinance permits a hotel as primarily housing transient guests. A dictionary definition is a building or commercial establishment where people pay for lodging and stay overnight. This isn't a hotel. There are only 22 people who would be staying. The initial issue is whether this is a hotel or bed and breakfast and the Board shouldn't grant approval. The main residence lies within the 100' setback and there can't be any greater change in that use. This is a major change. The Board shouldn't act on this application until the special exception is obtained. I see this as a zoning issue in which the applicant is proposing a hotel use and this really is a wedding /event venue.

Also the proposed snow storage area along the easterly edge is PLC land and the snow storage area can't be used as they don't have permission to use it.

Under Section 7 F - the parking area requires lanes or stalls with direction arrows and there is no indication of that on the site plan review.

Lighting is approximately 150' from last spot of the parking area and from the mounted wall lights. There should be a demonstration of the effect of proposed lighting and how much lighting will be there for attendees. I don't think, the Board should accept the waiver request for lighting.

The waiver request for drainage should not be considered since location of parking stalls and direction of traffic patterns will require an impervious surface which will impact drainage.

As to the number of employees, the applications says two employees only, but it doesn't include caterers, musicians, florists etc. and there is no table on how the total space of parking is indicated. The 51 spaces aren't sufficient for the calculation of the total parking.

The drainage and parking waivers need calculations to show that what is proposed is adequate. Handicap parking isn't noted and under ADA regulations, it has to be shown.

As to the traffic issue, there will be a slug of traffic in a fairly short order of time exiting East Road and my recollection of East Road and Route 31 is that the intersection doesn't have the best visibility. This is another thing the Board should consider.

This isn't a hotel, this is an event center-a function facility.

PLindstrom said, as a long time Board of the Board of Adjustment, I have misgivings. The zoning ordinance permits the primary use for lodging, not an event center. This is not a hotel. It is an event center and it is not in the spirit of the

intent of the zoning ordinance. It could diminish the value of the surrounding properties. The zoning ordinance needs to be clarified before a vote is taken.

MKavenagh said, I have to go along with SLittle. This doesn't seem to me to be a hotel. I am concerned about "creeping." This could be turned into a mini-events center. Someone could come down in 6 months or 1 year and ask the Board to defend your position that this is a hotel. I checked on the Town website, about parking. What is the real capacity of the parking spaces, and how is that going to be monitored? If you approve of this as a hotel, is it solely weddings, bridal showers, and anniversaries. How are you going to control the use of this property?

MHedstrom, abutter: asked the following questions of the Board:

What provision in the zoning ordinance allows this use? How does this use fit in the definition of our ordinance? If this use is allowed in the General Residence district, why can't anyone rent out this home for 120 people? If so, how does the residential zone protect current residences from commercial operations within their neighborhood? What is the purpose of the residential zone? Hotels and BBs have similar uses as a place to sleep or house people. This is an event center. There is nowhere in the zoning regulations for event center. Greenfield has a very stringent home occupation definition. In closing, you are not a farm just because you say so, or hotel just because you say so. Would you as a Planning Board want this in your back yard? There is a blind spot on East Road as you exit onto Forest Rd.

MPaulsen asked what zone Allrose Farm is in. Several board members responded, General Residence district.

SPennoyer asked if MPerron or her representatives could respond to some of the questions raised. RMarshall responded that all questions of the presenters will be addressed once they are in the deliberative session.

8:47 P. M. Public portion closed.

Seeing no further requests to speak, RMarshall closed the public portion of the hearing. He advised the audience that the decision on this application will not be made this evening as the Board has other business to attend to. The deliberation on this application will be continued on October 27 at 8:00 p.m. This application will stay on the agenda until a decision is reached.

8:52 GCCC SPR application questions.

Rev DOsgood said as we go forward with changes, we have set a date in November to return for an application submission but, we have 2 questions. First question can we go ahead and do the renovation for the interior for the fellowship hall without further review? The Planning Board said yes, go ahead.

Second question: our designer said we should get a site engineer for the outside work, but as we all know that is expensive. Can we go ahead without a site engineer?

AHeck said you may, but someone could view this as an exception to procedure and say, "well you did it for them why not us?"

RMarshall has a concern about the large impervious surface and slope and drainage on the Slip Road side of the paved parking lot. He said he'd like to see some mitigating designs or different ideas for that runoff area. A site engineer might give you different solutions to mitigate the effects of run-off.

Rev DOsgood said the DPW Supervisor said it could be paved.

PRenaud agreed with RMarshall that the GCCC should have an engineer look for different solutions to that run-off area. Perhaps a consultant could give you some ideas so that you don't have to commission a full site engineer study.

9:03 p.m. Brantwood Camp PCC for SPR

TMoses, Williams Construction, presenting for DWilliams, NPeirce, BGurney, Brantwood Camp board members.

TMoses said we have been engaged by Brantwood Camp, for the past 2 years for projects, most recently, the replacement of a basketball court that is currently in place. In process of seeking a permit, MBorden said it might be appropriate that we come before Planning Board for a Site Plan Review. We are here to seek your guidance to see if we do need a Site Plan Review.

The plat from 1994 shows the basketball court location. The basketball court is in awful shape, is unsafe and needs repair. The court is 80x48. We plan to take out and replace the old court with a concrete basketball court. There is no change the layout. The only difference is that we will be putting up a steel roof over the court. We are not expanding, not adding a building, not changing the road, and the people who will use it will still be the campers. We are making it so that the court can be used more frequently and safely. TMoses met with RMarshall a few weeks ago to get information about the Site Plan Review process and we feel we don't need one.

KO'Connell asked if you are having a steel roof, what type of ground tremors will that structure withstand? DWilliams said a 4' frost wall will be put in when the court is replaced and the steel roof will be engineered to be lagged into that wall. The structure will be engineered to current standards. RMarshall said that since there is no real change to the site layout and use, this seems to be a major improvement,

PRenaud motioned the Board find that Brantwood Camp does not need a Site Plan Review for this project. SFox seconded. Vote SFox, SChicoine, AHeck, PRenaud, affirmative. KO'Connell abstained.

9:18 P. M. Charrette Review:

AHeck asked about the turnout for the dinner. RMarshall said we had 43 people attend the dinner. All leftover food went to the food pantry the next day.

GLiddy, Charrette team chair, did a power point presentation at the end of the session on Saturday outlining their findings. RMarshall presented a brief summary of findings and recommendations to the board. A formal report will be forthcoming. He also said we had a good number of residents attending.

AHeck offered that the Planning Board have a meeting to discuss presenting the charrette's final report and then have a general meeting with the public to offer the results. PRenaud said once we get the final report, the Board should prioritize and then have a public hearing on our recommendations and then at the town meeting present our findings.

PRenaud said the Board needs to check on JHopkins Meadery application as he is under a conditional approval. My concern is hazardous waste removal issue. I would like to know if he has received approval from the State of NH on how he is going to do the waste removal.

10:05 P. M. Adjournment

PRenaud motioned to adjourn. SFox seconded. Vote unanimous in favor.