

Planning Board
Town of Greenfield
Approved Meeting Minutes
Recorded by Janice Pack
February 26, 2018

Members Attending: Paul Renaud, Ken Paulsen, Robert Marshall, Andre Wood, Kathleen Carpenter

Public Attending: Robert Wachenfeld, Chad Branon from Fieldstone Consultants, Tammie J. Blanchette, Gary Russell, Karen Russell, Kathy Seigars, Steven Seigars, Carol Irvin, Karen Day, Roger Lessard, Neal Brown

Meeting Opened: The meeting was called to order by PRenaud at 6:09 PM.

Minutes: The Minutes from the meeting of February 12, 2018 were read by PRenaud. Changes were made:

Line 63: change "migration" to "mitigation"

Line 125: change "option" to "opinion"

Line 170: change "landscaping" to "revised"

KPaulsen motioned to accept the minutes as amended. AWood seconded and all were in favor. (4-0, 1 abstention) Motion passed.

Mail

1. The Accounts Payables folder with an invoice from Upton & Hatfield, LLP
2. A flyer from Southwest Region Planning Commission regarding the Winter Meeting to be held at Scores Sports Bar & Grille in Keene on March 12, 2018 from 4:30 to 6:30
3. The Winter Newsletter from NH DES Drinking Water & Groundwater Bureau
4. 3 sets revised plats and one binder containing Engineering Response Letter and Stormwater Management Report for PB 2018-01 Blanchette Self Storage Facility

Other Business – PRenaud discussed the status of the Planning Board membership for the coming year.

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

KCarpenter was recused.

At 6:30 PM the Public Hearing was officially reopened.

The Board began by asking CBranon to speak about the revisions that had been made. The revised plan set includes a retaining wall to reduce the wetland's impact. They also include a very small retaining wall on the other side to further reduce the wetland impact.

Regarding the comment in Meridian's review letter about the kind of pipe used, they have addressed that in the revised documents, and included the grate type and sump for the mini catch basin.

48 CBranchon showed where they have modified and resubmitted the Stormwater Management
49 Report. The details of the catch basin have also been modified to 4' by 4' creating a decrease in
50 the peak rates and volumes of runoff.

51
52 They have submitted a plan and profile exhibit sheet, and a lighting plan showing that there will
53 be no light pollution. Plan Sheet PP-1 is a plan profile showing the center line grade through the
54 project. This shows the modification to the driveway as well, including the 30' wide paved
55 apron. The applicant would be willing to pave the existing driveway on the south side of the site
56 if that proved to be necessary.

57
58 The cross sections were provided on another drawing showing how the site will set from the
59 road and giving another perspective.

60
61 KPausen questioned the 24' drive going into a 20' drive, asking why the 4' difference. CBranchon
62 said the 24' was the main thorough fare, and the 20' drive was secondary. KPausen asked if the
63 lighting proposed was the same as he had seen in Peterborough. CBranchon said if it was the
64 newer building he had looked at, it would be the same. KPausen questioned where the stumps
65 were going to be buried, and CBranchon pointed the area out on the drawing, in the snow storage
66 area.

67
68 KPausen asked if they needed to install the erosion blankets, were the kind that would dissolve
69 over time? CBranchon said they would break down over time, but would certainly remain long
70 enough to establish vegetation.

71
72 The Greenfield Conservation Commission submitted a letter dated February 26, 2018 listing 3
73 reasons why they do not support the design plans for the self-service storage unit business on
74 parcel R1-29 as presented to the Planning Board on February 19th, 2018. PRenaud read the
75 letter to all present; copies were made and the original will be put in the case file. Their first
76 reason was Wetlands impact, stating that if the new slope became unstable and introduced
77 sediment to Alexander Brook, it could affect the water quality of the brook and potentially that
78 of Otter Lake. The second reason indicated the Commission is concerned about the potential
79 threats associated with any type of toxic spill that may occur on the site. While clients may be
80 prohibited from storing toxic substance in the units, this would be hard to enforce. Third, they
81 are concerned with the proposed changes to the landscape.

82
83 They listed 5 recommendations that they would like the Planning Board to consider:

- 84 1. Minimize impacts on water systems
85 2. Ensure the stability of slopes
86 3. Require landscaping plans that minimize impacts
87 4. Minimize the potential introduction of toxic substances
88 5. Ask the applicant to make edits to the plan notes

89
90 PRenaud then shared his conversation with Frank from the DOT regarding driveway access; they
91 were concerned that they were going to be using the DOT's driveway access but PRenaud let
92 them know that the proposed business would be using the driveway on the northern side.

93
94 PRenaud read the email comment from the Code Enforcement Officer, Michael Borden.
95 PRenaud had asked if hazardous materials were stored in one of the buildings and there was a

96 spill, was the design sufficient to contain it. MBorden said that he didn't feel it would be any
97 different than any other rental property in the Groundwater Protection District except that on a
98 private piece of property, the Code Enforcement Officer has no authority to go on the property,
99 but on this lot, he would be able to inspect it at will. It is understood that there will be a
100 contract that prohibits the storage of hazardous material, but it is difficult to know what actually
101 will be stored inside the units.

102
103 CBranon addressed the letter from the Conservation Commission; saying that after the last
104 meeting he had a conversation with Fieldstone's Wetlands Specialist to be sure that he wasn't
105 missing anything. They feel confident it is a minor wetlands permit and will not require any
106 mitigation. He is happy to add the name of Alexander Brook to the plans. He feels that with the
107 revised plans, he has already addressed a lot of the Commission's concerns. He does not feel
108 that the brook will run at a higher level than it does today or that the site will have any
109 detrimental impact on the brook as the design has been carefully planned to minimize the
110 impact. The waiver they are asking for is just where it concerns planting trees. The landscape
111 plan has been designed for long term stability. He understands the concerns that hazardous
112 materials raise but feels this is a good use for the Groundwater Protection District. They are not
113 proposing outdoor storage or uses. There will be contracts in place to offer protection.

114
115 Addressing the 5 recommendations, CBranon said that they have cut the wetland impact
116 substantially since the first meeting by addressing the concerns presented. The stability of the
117 slopes has been built into the plan set. The applicant has shown himself to be very responsive in
118 addressing erosion control.

119
120 The discussion was opened up to the public present, and Clrvin asked for the total impact on the
121 wetlands. CBranon said 1251 square feet is the total. She said that she remembered from the
122 Zoning Board Meeting that the interior of the units was adjustable, and wanted to know how
123 wide the widest would be. CBranon said 10'. PRenaud asked for clarification that the walls
124 could be movable after the units were built and CBranon said Yes. CBranon said that normally
125 you do not adjust them after the buildings are erected because of the doors, but you could. The
126 interior walls are all metal.

127
128 Hearing no further questions or discussion, PRenaud closed the Public Hearing. He told those
129 present that meant that no further questions or comments would be taken as the Planning
130 Board would begin deliberation. He asked the Board if, with the changes in the plans, they felt
131 the need to send anything off to a technical consultant. The Board decided they were
132 comfortable with the explanations received and that all concerns had been addressed. KPaulsen
133 said they had addressed the construction concerns.

134
135 Regarding the waiver request for the landscaping plan, PRenaud read the letter from the
136 applicant. They are asking for relief from Section VII:I, screening from adjacent properties
137 specifically in a residential area. They believe that a formal landscaping plan should not be
138 required because a lot of the development on site is situated away from Sawmill Road. They are
139 maintaining quite a bit of vegetation and forested wetlands that will be allowed to grow
140 naturally over the years. The surrounding properties don't seem to have much green space at
141 all. There is one residence right across the street from the center of the project but a lot of the
142 vegetation will remain between that residence and the buildings.

143

144 RMarshall thanked the Conservation Commission for the attention that they had paid to this
 145 project. As far as the landscape plan, RMarshall referred to the aerial plan provided and said
 146 that he thought it flowed quite well from a heavily developed area (New England Forest
 147 Products and American Steel) into the State Park area, and he felt we should grant the waiver.
 148 He feels this whole project is a great use of the property. AWood feels that their existing plan
 149 already includes landscaping. CBranon clarified that they don't feel the landscaping plan is
 150 applicable, but that they do feel their design does meet the spirit and intent of the ordinance.
 151 **RMarshall motioned to waive the landscaping plan identified in Section VII:I of the Site Plan**
 152 **Review Regulations. KPaulsen seconded it.** Discussion: There is only one residential property
 153 adjacent to the site, and the existing trees already serve to shield the site; no additional
 154 shielding would be necessary. AWood stated that the site's existing vegetation meets the spirit
 155 and intent of the ordinance and doesn't require additional landscaping. Call the Question: All in
 156 favor 4-0. **The Motion passes and the waiver is granted.**

157
 158 Regarding the lighting plan, KPaulsen asked for more information. CBranon went over the
 159 lighting profile showing that at the edge of the pavement, the light level would be zero. There is
 160 a different fixture on the maintenance building because of the 2 parking spaces. AWood said
 161 that he was comfortable with the lighting plan.

162
 163 RMarshall suggested we move on to the Site Plan Review checklist, and the Board went through
 164 the 16 questions under Section III. General Standards and Requirements:

- 165
166 1. Is the proposed use permitted in the zoning district? If not, has a zoning variance been
167 granted? *Yes, the ZBA granted this on 1/31/18*
- 168 2. Is the site located in the Groundwater Protection District? *Yes* If so, is the use
169 permitted? *TBD*
- 170 3. Are the vehicular access points adequate in number, size, location and design? *Yes*
- 171 4. Is there adequate all season safe sight distance in both directions from each proposed
172 access point? *Yes*
- 173 5. Are all access points located so as to avoid possible turning movement conflict with
174 other existing drives or intersections? *Yes*
- 175 6. If required, has state approval been granted for new access onto state highways?
176 *Pending*
- 177 7. Is all road frontage other than access points curbed or otherwise blocked to vehicular
178 entry? *Yes*
- 179 8. Is there sufficient separation between vehicular and pedestrian traffic? *N/A*
- 180 9. Is the internal traffic pattern safe and adequate for the type of use proposed? *Yes*
- 181 10. Does the number of parking spaces shown comply with the regulations? *Yes, N/A*
- 182 11. Do emergency vehicles have easy, unimpeded access to all buildings with adequate
183 turnaround space? *Yes*
- 184 12. Are the locations and sizes of all parking spaces, loading zones and driveways adequate
185 for the proposed uses? *Yes*
- 186 13. Is the arrangement of parking areas safe and convenient? *Yes*
- 187 14. Is adequate provision made for service vehicles? *Yes*
- 188 15. Are areas provided for snow piling without impeding traffic circulation or affecting
189 safety? *Yes*

190 16. Other considerations? *Retaining wall, stormwater run-off and erosion control were*
 191 *named, and CBranon spoke to the 3 concerns, once more detailing the proposed*
 192 *elements of the project and pointing out where they have been addressed in the plans.*
 193

194 MBorden asked if Fieldstone was going to be overseeing the site work and CBranon said that
 195 they had been retained to do that. MBorden went over the construction of the retaining wall
 196 with CBranon.
 197

198 AWood touched on the subject of possible leaks again, and CBranon said that the neighboring
 199 sites have trucks that run on and off of the properties every day and create far more potential
 200 for fluid leaks.
 201

202 PRenaud asked if the Board felt confident in their knowledge to make a decision. All indicated
 203 that they did.
 204

205 If the Conservation Commission does not sign off on the permit, they do have a 14-day window
 206 to have this addressed at the state level. PRenaud asked if the Board was comfortable with
 207 doing a conditional approval. RMarshall spoke about the 5 recommendations in the
 208 Conservation Commission's letter, and said he felt that these concerns had been addressed.
 209 Again, he praised the Conservation Commission for their research and their input.
 210

211 PRenaud asked if the Board felt confident that the liability was on the owner and not on the
 212 town. RMarshall said we had done due diligence and considered all of the comments that had
 213 been made.
 214

215 Returning to #2 of the checklist and the use of the site being permitted, **RMarshall moved to**
 216 **approve the conditional use permit for a regulated use in the Groundwater Protection District.**
 217 **KPaulsen seconded. All were in favor (4-0) Motion passed.**
 218

219 **RMarshall moved that we approve the application of the Blanchette's self-storage facility**
 220 **contingent upon**

- 221 1. Receipt of the State DES Wetlands permit
- 222 2. DOT driveway permit
- 223 3. Adding the name of the brook into the notes and plans
- 224 4. Add stump dump location

225 **KPaulsen seconded. All were in favor (4-0) Motion passed.**
 226

227 **PRenaud moved to adjourn this meeting, and KPaulsen seconded. All were in favor. Motion**
 228 **passed.**
 229

230 **The meeting adjourned at 9:13 PM.**