

## Planning Board Minutes 07/11/2016

### Planning Board

Town of Greenfield

Preliminary Meeting Minutes

Recorded by Janice Pack

July 11, 2016

**Members Present:** Paul Renaud, Ken Paulsen, Robert Marshall, Angelique Moon, Jim Fletcher, Andre Wood

**Meeting Opened:** 7:04 PM

**Minutes:** The minutes of our previous meeting held on June 27<sup>th</sup> were read by PRenaud.

During the review of the minutes, RMarshall asked if we had a written statement from Peter Davenport withdrawing his site plan application for a self-storage facility at Harvester Market. We did not; there is just an email on file from Catherine Shaw advising us that PDavenport had come in and wanted to withdraw the application. It was agreed that the Board should request something in writing from PDavenport.

RMarshall also questioned #2 of the Bennington's requirements for the Paradise driveway case as to whose land the turn-around would be located on. AWood said he felt the answer was obvious that it would come from the applicant's property. RMarshall said the applicant's property may not have enough room for the turn-around to be located. PRenaud said this would be the Paradise's responsibility, and could be discussed later.

Several corrections were made. Added to line 9 regarding the review of the June 13 minutes was a change to line 64 of the June 13 minutes. The words "waivers requested" were deleted. In its place was added "waiver for existing and proposed grades, Section XVIII.A.14. They are on the original site plan approval, and have no bearing on this application." A motion to accept the minutes as amended was made by RMarshall, seconded by JFletcher, and all were in favor.

### 7:45 PM - Deliberation continued for Allrose Farm Country Weddings

KPaulsen recused himself

Also Attending: Nick Latham from the Ledger-Transcript, Michele Perron and Chris Guida, Certified Wetlands Inspector

CGuida presented the large scale drawing of the lighting plan, explained the intended purpose of the proposed light, and said that it will be more than adequate for safety purposes. RMarshall asked if we were lighting a whole area that didn't include parking, and CGuida said "Yes". RMarshall asked if we could move the lighting structure to include more of the parking area. This was discussed and MPerron felt perhaps moving the light would be a better option. RMarshall said that since the events were to be held April through October, snow plowing would not be an issue. AMoon asked if there were any purpose to lighting the back section, and MPerron said "No". JFletcher asked if it were possible to move it, and AWood also thought it should be moved a bit more down the line of parking spaces. PRenaud also commented that in our ordinance there was only a general statement, not a specific luminance requirement. JFletcher said one of the benefits of having it under the trees was that it would be shielded and less visible from outside the event area. The proposed model was discussed, and CGuida said it could be tweaked just a bit to better meet the placement suggested. PRenaud said the recommended placement would eliminate the possibility of light going onto the road. AWood added "By moving the light closer to the road, it better achieves the safety requirements". JFletcher thought the wall mounts on the barn would provide sufficient light for people getting to their cars.

PRenaud asked "Is this a significant enough change to warrant reopening a public hearing?" While it is unfortunate that the lighting plan was not included in the original plan, PRenaud said that in his opinion, if we are assured that the proposed lighting will not cause glare into oncoming traffic, he doesn't believe we need to reopen the public hearing. AWood said that lighting does impact abutters. JFletcher said that no one seemed to care during the original public

hearing about the requested lighting waiver. PRenaud went to the Site Plan Review Application and the board discussed further whether this proposed plan had significant impact.

RMarshall stated “ the question we’re discussing is whether or not we need to reopen the Public Hearing. If this were proposed in a subdivision, that WOULD require a public hearing, but in this case, this is not some new mega kind of thing in the middle of the village that will affect a lot of people; this is a quiet country road and it will not affect a lot of people.” AWood said unless there was some technicality that would require us to reopen a public hearing, he would rather not. RMarshall moved that the Planning Board has determined that a public hearing is not warranted for a lighting plan. JFletcher seconded.

It was unanimously decided that no, a public hearing is not needed.

RMarshall motioned to approve the lighting plan conditional on it being moved but after discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

PRenaud asked if there was a new septic plan. CGuida explained the existing plan which was originally approved with a 90 day approval. He said “yes that has expired, but it would be no problem to get that reapproved.” PRenaud said that because it was a commercial use, a new septic is required for lodging.

According to the code enforcement officer, the system was inadequate for a B & B. CGuida said there were no actual changes in the plans. AWood said that for the commercial use of the property, the proposed plan must be existing.

PRenaud said he wanted to be very specific to make sure that the applicant knows exactly what needs to be done, and we have a mechanism for these people to notify us when each item has been done.

The Board proceeded to review Section III. General Standards and Requirements of the checklist:

1. Is the proposed use permitted in the zoning district? Yes
2. Is the site located in the Groundwater Protection District? Yes  
If so, is the use permitted? Yes
3. Are the vehicular access points adequate in number, size, location and design? Yes
4. Is there adequate all season safe sight distance in both directions from each proposed access point? Yes
5. Are all access points located so as to avoid possible turning movement conflict with other existing drives or intersections? n/a
6. If required, has state approval been granted for new access onto state highways? Yes
7. Is all road frontage other than access points curbed or otherwise blocked to vehicular entry? Yes
8. Is there sufficient separation between vehicular and pedestrian traffic? Yes
9. Is the internal traffic pattern safe and adequate for the type of use proposed? Yes
10. Does the number of parking spaces shown comply with the regulations? (waiver)
11. Do emergency vehicles have easy, unimpeded access to all buildings with adequate turnaround space? Yes
12. Are the locations and sizes of all parking spaces, loading zones, and driveways adequate for the proposed uses? (waived 2 parking spaces) Yes
13. Is the arrangement of parking areas safe and convenient? Yes
14. Is adequate provision made for service vehicles? Yes
15. Are areas provided for snow piling without impeding traffic circulation or affecting safety? n/a and Yes

Hearing no other considerations, it was determined that the site plan complies with the requirements of the current Site Plan Review Regulations.

PRenaud read through the Special Event Facility Ordinance to be sure all points had been covered. He said he felt that this meets all of the items in this ordinance. AWood said he was comfortable with what was read, too.

**KPaulsen unrecused himself as he needed to leave the meeting.**

The board discussed which items were precedent and which were subsequent to running the business.

These items must be completed for conditional approval:

- The applicant must secure a signed driveway permit from the Greenfield Road Agent upon construction of a paved apron complying with Section V (B)(1) of the Driveway Regulations

or meeting the minimum requirements of 28' wide by 23' deep and 2 1/2" thick as otherwise specified by the Greenfield Road Agent.

- Port-a-potties will be used for events until the new septic system has been completed.
- Compliance with fire safety and permitting - Permit to operate a place of assembly approved by the Greenfield Fire Chief, to be renewed annually
- Conditional upon having a finalized lighting plan approved by the Planning Board that meets the ordinance and provides sufficient luminance to insure parking lot safety.
- In order to provide lodging for 4 to 16 people as part of the event, the following 2 additional conditions must be met:
- complying with fire suppression and egress requirements as in the attached Bulletin from the State Fire Marshal's office on Fire Safety or as further modified by the NFPA.
- securing a current septic approval from the State, and updating the septic as per the plan, and including the physical boundary marker of the Piscataquog Land Conservancy easement
- Subsequent conditions to be met:
- Insofar as tents will be utilized, tents used will be in compliance with IBC Life Safety codes and have required permits as assessed and enforced by the Greenfield code enforcement officer.
- Ongoing compliance with NH Liquor Commission licensing and permitting.
- Ongoing compliance with Town of Greenfield recording and tracking form submission

The septic and fire code conditions pertain solely to the lodging as part of an event.

JFletcher made a motion to grant approval to Allrose Country Wedding's application based on the above conditions being met. AMoon seconded, and all were in favor.

PRenaud will work up a draft of the recording and tracking form. PRenaud advised MPerron what she needed to do for final approval, and advised her that she will receive a letter spelling this out.

The Planning Board congratulated MPerron on her hard work and persistence. RMarshall congratulated the Planning Board on their diligence, and PRenaud for his leadership in seeing the Allrose Country Wedding application through. AMoon motioned to adjourn. AWood seconded. All were in favor.

**Meeting adjourned at 10:22 PM**

**Mail:**

The mail was received and logged by the Recording Clerk, but will be reviewed with the Board at the next meeting.