

**Planning Board**  
Town of Greenfield  
Approved Meeting Minutes  
Recorded by Janice Pack  
April 23, 2018

**Members Attending:** Kathleen Carpenter, Robert Wachenfeld, Ken Paulsen, Robert Marshall

**Meeting Opened:** The meeting was called to order by KCarpenter at 6:00 PM. It was noted that KPaulsen will be a Voting Member tonight.

**Minutes:** The Minutes from the meeting of April 9, 2018 were read by RWachenfeld.

**RMarshall motioned to accept the minutes as written. RWachenfeld seconded and all were in favor (4-0). Motion passed.**

**Mail**

The statement from Meridian for \$1,150 which was paid by Chad Branon of Fieldstone Land Consultants as part of the Blanchette Public Hearing. *This was Approved & returned to Catherine Shaw.*

Copies of the tax cards R9-29, R9-36 and R9-30 relevant to tonight's Public Hearing (provided for the Board's use by Catherine Shaw)

**Other Business** – RWachenfeld received a message from Margaret Byrnes which he read to the Board regarding the definition of quorum and whether or not we should amend our definition. She said that since our Planning Board is intended to have 7 members, we should have 4 members present to have a quorum. If we were to change our structure to have 5 members rather than 7, that would need to go before the Town for a vote.

Mike Borden did submit a Business Permit and application draft, and RWachenfeld will be meeting with him tomorrow at 4:00 PM to go over the form and application with him.

**Public Hearing for a Lot Line Adjustment for H & H Investments, LLC**

Payment in the amount of \$341.25 was received (check #70452) and KCarpenter ascertained that the hearing had been properly noticed.

Dennis McKenney presented the proposal detailing the owner's desire to adjust the lot lines. He noted that a change in acreage to the benefit of Greenfield would result as the plan involved a town boundary line. He said that they had asked the Selectmen for the lots to be unmerged as they had been involuntarily merged; that was granted. He showed a plat of the properties as they are now, and the desired way the properties would look after a lot line adjustment. KCarpenter asked about the frontage on Coach Road, which is a Class VI road. The width of the proposed R9-30 would be about 200' on the north end and 220' on the south end; at it's narrowest it would be about 150'. This would create a lot that would be nonbuildable, although he noted that there is a cabin currently on the property.

RMarshall asked where DMcKenney had found the original town boundary line; he had discovered it in a charter document that involved an exchange of property with Lyndeborough. He believes he has given a copy of this to Aaron Patt. KCarpenter asked if this could possibly pose an issue for Lyndeborough; DMcKenney did not believe it would.

Leo V. Hand (R9-31), an abutter, asked if they were creating a nonbuildable lot. DMcKenney said he would not agree with that as there was already a building on it. LHand asked if he knew what the owner's intentions were; and DMcKenney said he wasn't privy to the landowner's intentions but could put LHand in touch with him. LHand was concerned that the landowner may want to cut timber or something that may reduce his own property's value. Cathy Cunningham (LHand's daughter) said that the way the lot lines are now, it prevents anyone from getting to the top of the mountain but moving that line would open it up and as a Class VI road she is concerned about that. DMcKenney said that a Class VI road is a public road; whereas Old Coach Lane is a private right of way. LHand said that they know the road as Holden Road Extension; DMcKenney confirmed that it is the same road.

RMarshall asked about the 3 iron rods shown on the plat. DMcKenney said there are 2 about 40' apart; this dimension was found in plans that go back to the 1970s. There is a 40' wide right of way, or easement, on R9-30.

Dan Laguerre, abutter, owns property on both sides of Coach Road. He asked if this was a hearing regarding a subdivision; KCarpenter confirmed that the application was for a lot line adjustment. He is concerned that there may be a subdivision planned in the future, and he is very much against this. He has paid for upgrading Coach Road. He noted that R9-30 is more or less a cliff with a steep drop off and wanted to know what was planned as a result of the proposed lot line adjustment.

Greg Nadeau, an abutter (R9-36-1), is also concerned about the transparency here as he, too, feels that he and the other abutters present should be privy to the plans for this property. He commented on the single lane bridge there and the water level.

RMarshall reminded him that we were not here tonight to discuss the plans for the land, only to decide if the lot line adjustment was in keeping with the character of the town and met the zoning ordinances.

LHand asked for confirmation that the owner already has access through Old Coach Road. GNadeau asked for confirmation of the lots that had been involuntarily merged. There was further discussion on the lots and their earlier owners. In the original deed, there were 3 separate parcels.

**At 7:27 PM KCarpenter closed the Public Hearing and called for a 5-minute break before the Planning Board entered into deliberative session.**

KCarpenter read to the Board what the authority to determine a lot line adjustment included per RSA 674:1, RSA 674:35, RSA 676:4 and RSA 676:4 I (e). The Board then proceeded to go through the Subdivision Application Checklist. There were 3 waivers requested.

**RMarshall moved that we have sufficient information to invoke jurisdiction. KPaulsen seconded. All were in favor; motion passed (4-0).**

KCarpenter asked DMcKenney why he was asking for a waiver on Item 4 where a locus plan was requested. He answered that it would've been really small, and he felt there were enough details to pinpoint the area. KPaulsen said he was comfortable with what was presented. RMarshall said he'd like to see a locus plan because it shows the intersection of the town boundaries but he would not hold the plan up for that reason. There was also discussion on the actual name of the road where the access easement was.

97 A waiver was requested for Item 14, USGS contour lines. **KCarpenter motioned that a waiver be**  
98 **granted since there was no building proposed; RMarshall seconded. All were in favor; motion passed**  
99 **(4-0).**

100  
101 A waiver was requested for Item 15, soil data. **KCarpenter motioned that since there was no building**  
102 **proposed, the waiver be granted; RMarshall seconded. All were in favor; motion passed (4-0).**

103  
104 **RWachenfeld motioned that we conditionally approve the Lot Line Adjustment based on 2 conditions:**

105 **1. Requesting a locus be added to the plat**

106 **2. Requesting a reference that tied in Coach Lane and Holden Road's names**

107 **RMarshall seconded the motion. Discussion ensued to be sure that this met the regulations. Call the**  
108 **Question: All were in favor, motion passed (4-0).**

109  
110 This ended the Public Hearing, and the Planning Board resumed regular business.

111  
112 The next meeting will be held upstairs on May 14<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 PM.

113  
114 RMarshall said that KCarpenter did an outstanding job with her first Public Hearing. He mentioned that  
115 next time we may want to visit the application first, as if the Board was to find that they did not have  
116 enough information to invoke jurisdiction, there would be no Public Hearing.

117  
118 **RWachenfeld moved to adjourn this meeting, and RMarshall seconded. All were in favor (4-0).**

119 **Motion passed.**

120  
121 **The meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.**