

**Town of Greenville
Planning Board**

Minutes – March 10, 2022

Call to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Hall Meeting Room, 46 Main Street, Greenville, NH. Present: Chairman Michael Sadowski, Vice-chair Miles Horsley, Member Scott Tenney, and BOS Ex-officio Tara Sousa.

Chairman Sadowski reviewed the agenda. He explained that the originally noticed Completeness Review and Subdivision Application for Mr. Ames could not be held due to abutters' noticing issues with the Post Office. Mrs. Sousa noted that most of the notices were returned as undeliverable, despite having accurate addresses. She stated that the Town would be requesting a refund for the postage cost, and that the applicant would not be charge again.

Conceptual of Proposed Ames Subdivision

Mike Ploof, of Fieldstone Land Consultants presented a conceptual design for the subdivision of a Map 2 Lot 35, located at 27 Columbian Ave, consisting of 7.4 acres, with 234 feet of frontage. He explained the proposal would subdivide the parcel into 4 conventional lots and extend Columbian Ave. He reviewed 3 proposed lots, and the 4th being the site of the existing home, with frontages ranging from 150 to 162 feet, using the new frontage created by the extension of Columbian Ave. He pointed out that the 3 lots would be served by a common driveway. Chairman Sadowski confirmed the intent of the shared driveway would be a private way, not town-maintained.

Mr. Ploof discussed the three wetland impacts, explaining that the project was designed to minimize wetland impact. Mr. Horsley asked what percentage of the lot was is wetlands, and Mr. Ploof estimated it to be 30%. Mr. Horsley asked about the area proposed to be added to Columbian Ave, which Mr. Ploof explained would be a turn-around for fire apparatus and the like. He confirmed that the frontage created by the turn-around was part of the proposed frontage for one of the lots. Mr. Tenney asked about the noted prior Zoning Hearing, and Chairman Sadowski explained that a variance had been sought for a cluster development of 7 units, and that variance was denied. Mr. Tenney asked if the Fire Department had been consulted about the common driveway, and if it would be a named private way in accordance with E911 standards. He expressed concerns about the proposed location of the hammerhead far back from the end of the public ROW. Chairman Sadowski commented that the Town's ordinance requires that lots be compact and reasonable, and expressed that 2 of the lots did not meet that definition. Mr. Ploof discussed the reasonableness being the limiting of the wetland impact, an compactness being the compression of the lots' usable area. Mrs. Sousa questioned the difference in specifications from the proposed private drive rather than an extension of a Town road. Mr. Ploof answered that the driveway was 14 feet wide and the road was 24 feet wide. Mr. Tenney asked if the wetlands permit had been filed, and Mr. Ploof answered that it had not. Chairman Sadowski expressed that he issue of compactness was similar to another recent proposal, which was denied by the ZBA. Mr. Ploof confirmed that the intent is to connect to Town water and sewer. Mr. Horsley questioned if a variance from the frontage requirement could be sought to avoid the unusual lot shapes. Mr. Tenney

expressed his opinion that he did not object to the design, given the constraints of the lot. Plowing and snow storage was discussed.

Chairman Sadowski noted the requirement of certification from the Tax Collector that the taxes are paid, and that any lienholders be certified by an attorney. The process for road acceptance was discussed. Mr. Horsley discussed his concerns about the frontage calculation including the hammerhead. Mr. Tenney was adamant that the hammerhead would constitute frontage. Chairman Sadowski questioned if this is the "best" design. Mr. Ploof expressed that it was a good design, and that the Board's feedback would be considered. Mr. Tenney questioned if gravity feed could be achieved for the sewer, and Mr. Ploof indicated it could. Mr. Horsley questioned if it was possible to do a cul-de-sac. Chairman Sadowski reviewed section 6, which discussed substantial conformity and hardship. Mrs. Sousa questioned where the "line" is, as far as the ability to achieve return on investment and hardship, suggesting that a variance could be sought to mimic existing lot size and frontage for the subdivision of the existing home, and that 2 additional compact and reasonable lots could be achieved rather than the 3 proposed. Mr. Ploof suggested that the hammerhead could be moved further into the extended portion of the road. Chairman Sadowski noted the regulation that requires rights-of-way be no less than 50 feet, the reasonableness of which was discussed given the 33 foot ROW of the existing Columbian Ave. Mr. Ploof discussed the increased impact if a longer extension of the road were considered to achieve the cul-de-sac design. Mr. Tenney expressed support for the redesign of the hammerhead. Mr. Horsley advocated for a more "traditional" design. Chairman Sadowski thanked Mr. Ploof and Mr. Ames for the presentation.

Conceptual for 21 Chamberlin and 17 Mill Street

David Eckman, of Eckman Engineering, introduced himself and Wil Georges, of Georges Realty. Also present were Josh Hammel, of Solid Roots Construction as G.C.; Kurt Lauer, Architect; and Keenan, Owner; and Carl Manning of Eckman. Mr. Eckman provided copies of the plan to the Board. Mr. Lauer indicated the proposal for the mill located just down the street is primarily residential, with the first floor, which was below grade on the street side, but open on the river side, would be used for indoor parking and storage units for the tenants, as well as laundry, housekeeping, and perhaps a small fitness center for tenant use (no public). Mr. Horsley questioned the distance above the water to the useable space. It was estimated to be 30-40 feet. Chairman Sadowski questioned how many apartments. Mr. Lauer answered there would be 17 units over 2 floors. Mr. Lauer explained that per International Building Code, the bottom floor is not a basement, because more than half of it is at or above grade. Chairman Sadowski questioned the indoor parking premise, and Mr. Eckman noted that issues achieving enough parking was an important topic of discussion for the evening. Chairman Sadowski asked about a rental office, and Mr. Georges answered that they could locate one on the ground level by eliminating some storage space. Chairman Sadowski asked what is currently in the building and Mr. Eckman answered that it was currently storage. Chairman Sadowski invited comment from Marshall Buttrick, of 2??? Adams Hill Road, who noted the 3 individual segments of the property, which included the Mill Street portion, the Chamberlin Street portion, and the hydro-electric component, which included an unapproved residential unit, which he was unsure whether that was currently occupied. Mr. Eckman explained that the two buildings are connected by an area that goes over the hydro entrance. Mr. Lauer confirmed that there is no access between the proposed apartment and the hydro facility. Mr. Eckman

discussed the noted shoreland protection boundary. He also noted that the white concrete block addition would be demolished. Mr. Horsley asked if they had considered commercial use of the building, or if that did not provide sufficient revenue. Mr. Eckman answered that they had considered commercial storage for a portion of the 1st floor. Mr. Georges questioned if the Town would prefer it to be commercial. Mr. Horsley expressed that for the tax base, commercial would probably be preferred. Chairman Sadowski expressed that residential is allowed if it meets the requirements. Mrs. Sousa relayed that there would be a facet of the community that would not find this proposal in keeping with the spirit of the ordinances. Chairman Sadowski asked the anticipated rental cost range. Mr. Georges stated that the units would be under fair market, with the 2 bedroom units being \$1400 and the one bedroom being \$1300. It was answered that the one bedrooms units would be from 500 to 800+ sq. feet, and the 2 bedrooms units would be as much as 1200 or 1300 sq. feet. Mrs. Sousa expressed that her preference would be a proposal that maintains the spirit of the ordinance, but also did not want to see a beautiful historic building crumble for lack of viable use. Mr. Lauer and Mr. Hammel discussed the water infiltration and damage to the building requiring urgent action. Mr. Eckman discussed that they have 19 parking spaces outside and 5 inside, for a total of 24 spaces, and that the proposed 17 apartments would require a total of 34 spaces. He noted that they have inquired about remote parking across the street. The presenters questioned if a variance for, perhaps, one space per unit for the single units would generally be supported. The varied need for parking for different commercial uses was discussed. Mr. Lauer guessed that they would need zoning relief no matter what use was proposed. Mr. Georges discussed designing the building as a medical rehabilitation center, stating that the patients would be transported to and from, therefore only requiring parking for staff. He noted this would create jobs and keep the building commercial. Mr. Tenney questioned if the demographics would support such a use, and the presenters believed it would as people often travel to less populated areas for this type of treatment. Mr. Georges noted that there is federal grant money for this type of development. He felt that this second option would be preferable from an economic impact perspective, reducing the impact on school taxes, etc. It was clarified that the concept was a drug/alcohol rehab facility. Chairman Sadowski expressed that he would want to see this concept on paper to compare with the residential proposal. Mr. Eckman questioned the availability of public sewer and water capacity. It was discussed that the Selectmen are the Commissioners of those services. Mrs. Sousa discussed her belief that there is available capacity, but that a number of conceptual plans have been presented, and if all came to fruition, the available capacity might be exhausted. Mr. Eckman questioned if there were any concerns about parking spaces backing onto Chamberlin St. Mrs. Sousa expressed concern about the tightness of the intersection at Chamberlin and Mill.

The historic nature of the building was discussed. It was questioned if exemptions from codes might be allowed to maintain historic components. Chairman Sadowski asked Mr. Buttrick if the building was on the historic register. Mr. Buttrick did not believe so, but commented that many residents and the historic society would be concerned if the Mill No 6 sign were painted/removed, and that the Chamberlin Street doors be preserved if possible. The benefit of preserving the character of the Town was discussed. Chairman Sadowski thanked the group for presenting.

Minutes

Mr. Horsley noted a typographical error, and a revision was proposed.

Motion by Mr. Tenney, 2nd by Mr. Horsley, to accept the minutes as corrected.

Motion carried with 4 in favor, none opposed.

Town Report Escrow Accounts

Mr. Buttrick questioned if the accounts noted a GPB in the Town Report contain impact fees, or if they are escrow accounts that should be released. Mrs. Sousa discussed that the Liscotti Development account, which was for the Dollar General project, was the only project that is fully completed. She discussed that she needs to confirm whether or not the funds need to be returned to the original payer, which was the developer, despite the current ownership of the parcel. Mr. Tenney discussed the original purpose of the funds, as having to do with the Blanch Farm Road paving. Mrs. Sousa discussed that they had connected to the sewer pump house there, and that the paving of Blanch Farm Road is now done. She noted that the remaining issue of Greenville Recycling's road acceptance has nothing to do with Dollar General, and there is no reason for the (Liscotti) funds to still be held. The current status of Hemlock Hills was discussed, and that if it changes hands, the funds should be returned, and a new escrow for any needed third-party engineering be funded by the new owner. Mr. Horsley questioned the fire pond work that was required as part of the original project. It was discussed that these funds were not a performance bond and could not be used to complete something the developer had not done. Mrs. Sousa confirmed that the Greenville Recycling account remained active, as there might still be engineering bills associated with the road acceptance. Mr. Buttrick had questions if that property was connected to sewer. The acceptance predated the current board members, but it was noted that Greenville Recycling's engineers would be back before the board in the future for conceptually proposed site plan changes. Greater Waste and Barton's Ridge were discussed as active projects. Mr. Buttrick suggested that the Board annually review the status of open escrow accounts.

Mr. Buttrick discussed considerations for the sewer if the basement level were developed in the previously discussed conceptual plan for the No 6 Mill. He discussed some history of the residential unit associated with the hydro facility. He noted that there had previously been 2 rehab facilities in town.

Motion by Mr. Tenney, 2nd by Mr. Horsley, to adjourn at 8:56 p.m.

Motion carried with 4 in favor, none opposed.

Respectfully submitted,
Tara Sousa, BOS Ex-officio

Approved by:
Greenville Planning Board

Michael Sadowski, Chairman



Miles Horsley, Vice Chair



Scott Tenney



Tara Sousa, BOS Ex-officio