

Town of Greenfield
Planning Board
Preliminary Meeting Minutes
Recoded by Michelle Hall
March 9, 2020

Members Attending: Mason Parker, Neal Brown, George Rainier, Robert Marshall, Ben Hale, Rob Walling

6:30 pm MParker called meeting to order and went over tonight's agenda.

MParker read minutes from the last meeting. Amendments are as follows.

Line # 7 change to 'Mason Parker and Neal Brown'

Line # 30 add 'septic' after well

Line # 34 change 'anyone for' to 'anyone in favor'

Line # 37 change 'in place' to 'representing'

Line # 53 change to 'Roger Lessard, Chair of the Conservation Commission,'

Line # 57 add 'Western Part' after 'County'

Line # 64 add 'soils' after 'Colton'

Line # 67 change 'are all' to 'contain' and 'or' to 'and are'

GRainier motioned to accept minutes as amended. **Seconded by NBrown. Motion passed 6-0-0.**

6:45 pm Announcements

MParker explained that there is an open position on the planning board, someone has reached out to **RMarshall** about joining.

7:00 pm Public Hearing – LLA – Lots R10-13 and R10-13-1, Chrisenton

MParker asked for **Virginia Chrisenton** to present her plans for a lot line adjustment to the public.

VChrisenton explained that she would like to change the lot line of her two lots. **MParker** asked **VChrisenton** what the reason is for the LLA. **VChrisenton** explained that they would like for both properties to access the right of way road. **VChrisenton** explained that the new road frontage would be about 680'. **MParker** asked why the new proposed line wasn't straight. **VChrisenton** explained that it followed the natural land features as the land slopes.

MParker opened the public part of this hearing and went over the rules for this hearing. **NBrown** and **MHall** confirmed that tonight's public hearing was noticed to all abutters and properly posted to town website, town hall, post office and in the newspaper.

MParker asked for anyone in favor or opposed to this proposal to speak. There wasn't anyone from the public attending this hearing. **MParker** stated that the public part of this hearing is closed and the planning board has entered deliberations.

RWalling asked If there is a right of way for the utility poles. **VChrisenton** stated that there is not.

VChrisenton explained that she had talked with the Martus' about this proposal.

The planning board went over Letter P, Section 6 of the Subdivision Regulations. The consensus of the planning board is that though the new lots are a bit unusually shaped, this lot line adjustment follows

these regulations. **MParker** motioned to approve this application for a lot line adjustment. **Seconded by BHale. Motion passed 6-0-0.** The planning board thanked **VChrisenton** for her time.

7:20 pm PCC – Lot VI-9 – Cilley

MParker asked for **Ray Cilley** to explain what he would like to do. **RCilley** explained that he would like to change the use of his property, on Forest Road, from an automotive garage back to a blacksmith shop. **RCilley** explained that he has a master blacksmith who will teach classes, of roughly 6 people, in one part of the building. He would also like to have a small retail area, selling forged items. This will not be mass production whatsoever. Parking would be in the municipal parking next door to the building until a permanent solution is created. He bought the abutting property and had water tested which shows it is adequate enough to supply both properties. **RCilley** explained that Mike Bordon informed him there is no requirement for a sprinkler system, however, there does need to be smoke detectors and fire extinguishers on site. **RCilley** explained that Comprehensive Environmental Inc. (CEI), Southwest Regional Planning Commission (SWRPC) and the Brownsfield program are all involved with this and working together. **RCilley** explained that he built a temporary bridge to access the rear of the building and has been working with Fieldstone Land Consultants and the NHDES to make a more permanent solution. Fieldstone Land Consultants are designing a headwall on the pond side with 2 18" culverts which will run perpendicular to Route 136, to maintain the existing drainage from the property. **MParker** asked if there was ever an approval for an automobile shop. **RCilley** explained that this property became an automobile shop in the early 1900's, which was before zoning. **MParker** explained that the next step would be a site plan review as there is a new use and new owner to the property. **RMarshall** was in favor of having a site plan review because there is no record of one ever happening at this property. He also was concerned about the ground water protection area, which this is in. **RCilley** has a commitment from the SWRPC to help come up with a plan to correct the existing water contaminants. The planning board recommended **RCilley** complete a site plan review as soon as possible and thanked him for his time.

8:00 pm Public Hearing – Lot R7-2 – East Road Major Subdivision

RWalling recused himself from this public hearing as he is an abutter. **MParker** called public hearing to order. **NBrown** and **MHall** confirmed that tonight's public hearing was noticed to all abutters and properly posted to town website, town hall, post office and in the newspaper. **MParker** went over the reason for re-opening this public hearing. **MParker** asked for **Chris Guida** of Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC to present the proposal. **CGuida** went over the proposal pointing out the well, septic, house and lot locations. He explained that the old easement for a guide wire on pole #4, which does not touch this property and is no longer active. He explained that there is a fair amount of wet lands on this property, mainly to the rear of the property. **CGuida** explained that the concerning property line has been resolved and the updated plan will be submitted upon approval.

MParker opened the public portion of this public hearing and went over the rules.

MParker asked for anyone in favor of this proposal to speak.

MParker asked for anyone opposed to this proposal to speak.

Jim Trenz- 682 Forest Rd, stated that it looks as though there are more wetlands on one map than this map. **CGuida** explained that the maps on the county soil survey is in greater scale, making it look different, and follows typical soils. **CGuida** explained that the water table is not too high for a septic. The sands and gravel for the Colton Soils are much lower in the ground. The sand is not too loose for a

foundation, you would want them to be out of the water table which is why they were looking for the homes to be built on the higher ground so that you have proper drainage away from the house. **CGuida** states that the Colton Soil is actually great for drainage. They will be following state requirements which is usually 4' from the water table. JTrenz is still concerned with one lot being close to the wet lands. **Si Little** - . is wondering about the buffer zones and wondering if the planning board has requested driveway profiles for lots. **MParker** explained that a site walk took place February 24th and this was a concern that was addressed. **CGuida** explained that Mike Borden did attend the test pit digs and was not concerned about the proposed driveways at that time. **MParker** asked for anyone else with questions or concerns to speak. **MParker** closed the public part of this hearing and the planning board is now in deliberations. **GRainier** explained that he is still having a problem with the soil on this property. He thinks that some of the lots should be combined as it would give plenty of room for houses and septic to be safely installed. **GRainier** explained that the plats should state that these lots are not completely buildable. There is not any site-specific soil tests on the parent parcel. **RMarshall** stated that he would defer to the state requirements for the soil and septic and such. He might like to see driveway profiles on lots 1, 2 and 3. **CGuida** addressed the soil concerns. He said that the state does know about this soil, however, there are some soils on the backside that are worse. He is ok with a driveway profile and agrees to add. **RMarshall** explained that the land owner has the right to do with his property what he wants with his property. He doesn't see a difference between making the applicant correct the changes or to make them come back. He recommends giving a conditional approval. **CGuida** explained the updated plats will show driveway profiles, notes about the possible issues with the building. **CGuida** explains that when new deeds are created that it usually says 'as shown on', which would show this. When a subdivision is created and lots are sold off, the realtor will have all of the plans to show. Ledge is a lot harder to get rid of than sand. This book reference was created for farmers and is not as severe as the book reads. **RMarshall motioned** to continue deliberations at the next meeting, 3/23/20 at 7 pm, providing that **CGuida** provide driveway profiles for Lots 7-2-1, 7-2-2, 7-2-3, 7-2-6. **Seconded by BHale. Motion passed 5-0-1.**

9:00 pm MParker motioned to adjourn. Seconded by GRainier. Motion passed 6-0-0.