
Planning Board Minutes 06/27/2016

Planning Board

Town of Greenfield

Meeting Minutes

Recorded by Janice Pack

June 27, 2016

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

Meeting Opened: 7:00 PM

Minutes: The minutes of June 13th were read by PRenaud. Several changes were made. It was noted that one of the changes was a substantive change on Line 64: Waiver granted for existing and approved grades for Section VIII.A.14. They are on the original site plan approval and have no bearing on this application. AMoon asked if future Minutes could have headers and page numbers. A motion to accept the minutes was made by RMarshall, and seconded by AMoon. All were in favor.

Mail:

An additional certified mail receipt card from the Harvester Market case

Response from the Town of Bennington regarding the Paradise driveway

A receipt from Peter Davenport's payment

A note from Catherine Shaw stating that Peter Davenport has withdrawn his site plan application.

The Harvester Market self-storage facility deliberation was slated on the Agenda for 7:30 PM. However, PDavenport has voluntarily withdrawn his application due to costs involved in sprinkling the building.

RMarshall was recused for the **discussion on the Paradise property and the letter of comment.**

The letter from Denise French, Administrator, Town of Bennington dated June 10th was read by PRenaud. The letter stated that the Bennington Planning Board and Board of Selectmen have discussed the concept of Greenfield issuing a Building Permit to John and Brenda Paradise for a dwelling that lies on the Greenfield/Bennington border, with access to the property from Bennington's Class V Dodge Road. Their requirements were stated in the letter and is shown below:

- Bennington's 30' side-setback requirement be honored
- An improved vehicle turn-around be located on the Greenfield side of the town line large enough for Bennington highway equipment and emergency service vehicles to safely navigate
- The property owners must provide an Agreement and Release document which will address the issue of road maintenance and liability while providing a waiver of municipal responsibility
- Upon receipt of an acceptable Agreement and Release, the Town of Bennington intends to provide written documentation of their willingness to be the primary responder for fire, police and medical services to this Greenfield residence.

The Board discussed the points from the letter and the facts from earlier discussions, including Section III Zoning H Rural Ag 2 Lot area requirements, Typical front setback of 100' and Setback requirements will be in proportion. The lot in question is 2.1 acres (52.5% of the expected 4 acre minimum lot size for this District) so side setback would be 26.3' (52.5% of the normal 50' side setback) but in no case will setbacks be less than 30' which matches Bennington's requirement. It was also

found that the minimum road frontage was 350' but we decided it was grandfathered, as in 1959 the requirement was 100'. There was a discrepancy in the quit claim deed because it was listed as 7 acres, but in actuality it is 2.1 acres. From the OEP handbook, any discrepancy in a deed is beyond the scope of the Planning Board. We are only concerned if this meets the statutes. This lot is registered in the town property database to this owner, John and Brenda Paradise. PRenaud has spoken to the Paradise's, and he feels that they are going to move forward and try and comply with all of the items in that letter. The main access to get to this property will be from the other town (Class V road). The letter states that the Town of Bennington will have no problem allowing this as long as the requirements are met.

AMoon drafted a letter in response to the Town of Bennington letter, which will be our Comment to the Select Board. A copy of this letter is attached. AWood asked if the Board was comfortable with the letter. AMoon read the letter again, and after a few adjustments were made, AMoon made a motion to accept the letter. JFletcher seconded, and all voting were in favor.

PRenaud asked if the Select Board was meeting next week. RMarshall confirmed that it was, on the 7th, and again on the 19th. PRenaud said he would not be able to attend on the 7th, but could on the 19th. RMarshall said it would be good for him to be there, just to answer any questions. PRenaud will let Aaron Patt know so that he can put him on the agenda.

It was noted that the Planning Board has referred the applicant to the ZBA. The Board discussed if we should advise JParadise to apply for his variance now, but RMarshall said that he thought JParadise should go to the Select Board first to see if they will issue him a building permit. PRenaud said he would ask JParadise to attend the Select Board meeting with him.

RMarshall unrecused himself at this time.

Old Business - Regarding the Master Plan, RMarshall said that the Master Plan Table of Contents needs to be updated and there are several things missing, including 5 chapters. RMarshall and PRenaud discussed what might be missing and why. Additional revisions still need to be made. PRenaud said that the Future Land Use Chapter was only 4 - 1/2 pages long, so he hoped to just read it at a meeting and perhaps make the changes ourselves. The Implementation for Future Land Use is also something that we should be doing, and not contracting out. PRenaud thinks that we should go through it ourselves first to see what is realistic. We need to have a method or process for monitoring the implementation. The Conservation Commission is going to do a Natural Resources inventory, which should be part of the Master Plan, in PRenaud's opinion. He was thinking that we could split the budget with ConComm on the Natural Resources inventory. The State is pushing alternative energy plans so perhaps we should consider what we want to do on that, too. PRenaud will share the presentation he received on that last year with the Board via email.

Continuing the deliberations for Allrose Farm Country Weddings. 8:32 PM

KPaulsen is recused.

Addressing the road situation and access: PRenaud went out with Neal Beauregard and took a look at the road conditions. NBeauregard commented in writing that he did not see any concern with road wear and tear due to access; however, he wanted to see a paved apron where the road meets the driveway to prevent wear there.

PRenaud said that it was about 28' wide, by 23' deep and 2-1/2" thick which is equivalent to about 50 tons. MBorden said that he thinks it is a reasonable request. Driveway Section V (B)(1) states All driveways for non-residential use 30' wide commencing at 25' pavement shall consist of 3" bituminous pavement. Michelle Perron asked whose requirements she was supposed to follow? RMarshall made a motion that we defer to our road agent, and AMoon seconded it. MBorden said in discussion that NBeauregard took into consideration the actual area. AWood said he

didn't want this motion to prejudice whether or not we go forward. PRenaud asked if we wanted this road apron to be in place before any event, or if perhaps it could be set for next year. The board discussed what to do. PRenaud stated it needed to be a conditional approval. RMarshall withdrew his motion.

RMarshall felt the board was micro managing but PRenaud said in the official conditional letter, the Board needed to state all the details. The Board was in general agreement that they wanted to see the requirements for the paved apron deferred to NBeauregard.

When buildings are protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler installed, Fire department access roads should be not less than 20.' MBorden said that all of his concerns regarding Fire Department access have been satisfied. Even though the width is slightly less than required, he feels that it is good enough.

There have been changes to the Assembly Permit relative to the fact that the 2015 Life Safety Code is going to be adopted on 7/1/16. MPerron's fire protection official found a statement that said the area did not need to be sprinklered unless you had live music and dancing. The Fire Marshal's office may make an appeal to bring that sentence back in. But according to MBorden, MPerron will not need to sprinkle the barn. Tents were still an option. PRenaud asked if her business would be grandfathered, and hoped that it would. Any tent over 120 square feet is subject to the IBC saying that it is subject to the same building codes. MBorden said that the onus is on the tent installer, the one pulling the permit. PRenaud asked what bearing does this have for the Planning Board in considering this? MBorden said he didn't feel it had any bearing; it should be up to the Building Department and the Fire Department. Any tent that gathers more than 50 people needs to get a building permit from the code officer. MBorden referenced the Lancaster tragedy where the circus tent was erected missing over 100 pins. The assembly permit needs to be signed by the fire chief, and filed, and is subject to semiannual inspections. It will be MPerron's responsibility to file the Offsite Caterers Property Owners form for each event.

MBorden said that when MPerron decides that she is going to open the barn, she will get that permit.

PRenaud asked if we need to go over the restrictions on lodging and egresses, and asked what the status of that was. MPerron stated that she has plans for the fire escape that she will submit tomorrow. PRenaud said we need notification that this condition has been satisfied, and that is good enough for us.

Regarding septic, she can bring in port-a-potties. Because this is a commercial use, she will need to have an upgraded septic system for conditional approval if she is going to have lodging. She can use the port-a-potties if she is not going to provide lodging until her system fails, and still be in compliance.

Referring to the conservation easement aspect, PRenaud felt there was a slight concern on the location of the septic, as the back edge bordered on the easement.

PRenaud asked if there should be a physical delineation of the boundary, and suggested that the Piscataquog Land Conservancy (PLC) should be notified.

PRenaud stated that the PLC did need to be notified 45 days in advance for permitting if hiking were going to be allowed.

Speaking of activities, PRenaud listed some that are allowed, and some that are not (such as snowmobiling, and ATVs). MPerron said that she was familiar with that.

AWood said that he does not see how we need to specify this, and PRenaud agrees; he just wanted to be sure it was clear what would or would not be allowed.

PRenaud asked if there were anything else in the Dawn Tuomala report that needed to be addressed. He mentioned our conversation with Brian Giammarino. AWood asked MBorden if there was anything we need to be concerned with regarding access to water in case of need. MBorden said there was a dry hydrant there, but also mentioned that the Fire Department can use whatever body of water it can find.

Moving on to traffic diversion and road signs: is it necessary to approach the DOT to put up warning signs asking people to slow down? MPerron said she was going

to get the easel style signs to put up before events. PRenaud said we would need to look at our sign ordinance, and may need to revisit that. He asked if the Board felt it was sufficient to put out signs the day of each event. AWood said he didn't mind that the signs were temporary and JFletcher said he thinks the temporary signs are the way to go. The Board spoke about diverting the traffic down to New Boston Road, and whether or not it was realistic. If there were someone directing traffic out that way, then there may need to be someone else even further down so that people didn't get lost. PRenaud said perhaps having an officer at the intersection, depending on the character of the event, may be an option. PRenaud said that should be put on the form. PRenaud said in his opinion, the biggest concerns were safety and traffic. The Board said that having the process in place for traffic control will alleviate some of the concern. MPerron will work with, and comply with, the Greenfield Police Department by filling out the form and providing notice of each event, including the type of event.

JFletcher asked for clarification – was MPerron going to offer lodging as a B & B?

MPerron said no, only as part of the wedding event.

Going to the waivers, the first waiver discussed was for lighting plan requirements Section VII (J). The waiver stated that the proposal will not consist of adding any additional lighting elements. MBorden said that he had to be concerned with people not only getting to their vehicles safely but also exiting the building safely. MPerron stated that she had a lighting plan drawn up as she felt it would benefit her. She then withdrew her waiver. PRenaud asked if the Board accepted this. MBorden stated that MPerron could get a consultant in to determine whether or not a lighting plan was sufficient, but mostly the lighting plan just needed to be effective. JFletcher said that it is important for the public to know about the lighting plan. AWood asked if it were a minor change, could we forgo a public hearing? AMoon said that if in MBorden's professional opinion it was a minor change, that would be sufficient.

MBorden said the proposal was for 2 down lights, and he didn't know exactly the statistics of the lights so could not say. MPerron was asked to update the plat to show the lighting. It was decided that for the next meeting, we would like to see a large scale of the proposed lighting, including specifications.

Section VII (I), Landscaping Plan Requirements. As this proposal does not consist of the construction of any new facilities that would warrant landscaping, a waiver is requested that a landscaping plan should not be required. Requirements for granting waivers states that the waiver would not be contrary to specific circumstances to the site RSA 674:44 III(e)(1) and (2). The board discussed whether or not screening from use from adjacent residences applied, but since there were no current residences immediately adjacent from the front or the side, no line of sight, and sufficient screening already exists, AWood motioned to grant the waiver. This was seconded by RMarshall, and all were in favor.

Drainage Section VII(G) This waiver request pertains to the drainage requirements, which are all geared toward a paved surface. PRenaud moved that we waive this because with the exception of the proposed apron, there are no paved surfaces.

RMarshall seconded and all were in favor.

Section VII (F.3) General Standards and Requirements. This waiver request pertains to the requirement that each parking spaces be clearly marked. MPerron is looking for a waiver as the spaces are in grass and they want to maintain the character of the event facility. The intent is to have a minimal amount of traffic jams. The Board felt that if MPerron had parking lot attendants to address the flow, it would maintain the rural character and accomplish the purpose. RMarshall moved to grant the waiver. JFletcher opened discussion regarding the hiring of the attendants, and whether they would be there only to park cars, or to assist those leaving as well. It was decided that would need to be determined by the type of event and expected turn out. JFletcher seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Section VII (F.1) This waiver request pertains to the requirement that each automobile parking space shall not be less than 200 square feet and not less than 10

feet wide. In addition, adequate interior driveways shall be provided to connect each parking space with the public right of way. Based on the facts that:

- the parking spots are unconventional and there were only 2 proposed spaces that did not have direct unfettered access, and
- changing the actual spots in question (two) would pose a hardship and would not have significant impact in relation to the entirety of the plan

JFletcher made a motion to grant the waiver, and AMoon seconded it. All were in favor.

As the Board cannot proceed without seeing the lighting plan, we will **continue this deliberation to 7:30 PM on July 11th**.

Ken Paulsen was unrecused at 10:54 PM.

PRenaud brought up the topics he wanted to discuss at future meetings, and asked if there was anything additional to discuss at this time. Hearing none, AMoon made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by AWood. All were in favor.

The Meeting was adjourned at 10:59 PM.

These are the Amended and Approved Meeting Minutes.