

Town of Greenville, New Hampshire
Planning Board
Minutes
Thursday, June 15, 2023

The Greenville Planning Board met on **Thursday, June 15, 2023** at the Mascenic SAU 87 Cafeteria, 16 School Street, Greenville, NH 03048.

In attendance were: Chairman Michael Sadowski, Vice Chairman Scott Tenney, BOS Ex-officio Margaret Bickford, Members Kelle O'Keefe and Tim Kearney, Town Counsel Atty. Biron Bedard, Planning Board Administrative Assistant Carrie Traffic, and Town Administrator Tara Sousa.

Chairman Sadowski introduced the Board and reviewed the agenda. He noted the large audience and discussed the rules and procedures of the Board for the public hearing.

Public Hearing for Site Plan Application for 21 Chamberlain Street LLC- Georges Realty LLC, determined to be a matter of potential regional impact

Chairman Sadowski asked David Eckman, of Eckman Engineering, if he had received the letter from the Souhegan River Local Advisory Committee (SoRLAC), and Mr. Eckman answered that he had, noting that there was some "heavy lifting" to be done in response to those comments. Chairman Sadowski asked if they had received any response from DES, and Mr. Eckman stated that he had not, and explained that he did not anticipate anything until the Shoreland Permit application was submitted. Mr. Eckman noted that they also had Steve Keach's comments, which they were addressing. Mr. Eckman presented the proposal for the renovation of the Chamberlin St. mill building into a 28-day rehabilitation center, with the anticipated name "George's Rehabilitation Center". He explained that it is largely a renovation of the existing building, with some parking and drainage modifications. Mr. Eckman indicated that they had gotten through most but not all of Steve Keach's comments, many of which were construction details, and noted that 2 comments were directed at the Board regarding the timing of the Shoreland permit and the sewer discharge permit, and whether those needed to be obtained before, or as a condition of approval. Mr. Eckman discussed that his firm had resent requests for comments to all town department. He noted that SoRLAC requested a full stormwater management plan, and questioned if the Board wanted that done, as the building is existing. He explained that the project is designed with leaching catch basins to infiltrate the water, and Mr. Keach requested additional construction notes about the material classification. Mr. Eckman expressed that they were still in the phase of addressing questions presented to them, and Chairman Sadowski relayed his expectation that there would be a formal presentation of the full project for the benefit of the public in attendance. Mr. Eckman discussed the need to provide an acceptable solution for the required offsite parking.

Atty. Craig Donais stated that the applicant has an arrangement with the church property (32 Mill St.) for 20 spaces, with a 10-year agreement, with a possible extension to twenty years. He stated they also had a real estate purchase agreement to acquire 4 Mill St., which would yield 20-30 additional spaces. Wil George explained that the property currently has a garage and hair salon, with 2 different levels.

Chairman Sadowski asked how far that property is from the project site, and Mr. George's answered "walking distance." Chairman Sadowski asked if there are walkways, and Mr. Donais answered what is in town now. Mr. Donais noted the Board's previously expressed concerns about permanency of the parking arrangement, and counted approximately 55 spaces between onsite, 4 Mill, and the church. Kelle O'Keefe asked Town Administrator Tara Sousa about environmental concerns at the 4 Mill St. property, and Mrs. Sousa confirmed that the Town receives reports related to ongoing environmental monitoring at that location. Mr. George's relayed that the seller did disclose information regarding a closed underground tank. Atty. Donais discussed that any required monitoring would continue until no longer required by DES, and any development of the site would require permits and approvals. He noted the purchase agreement is contingent on the project obtaining Planning Board approval, and expressed their willingness to provide proof of that acquisition as a condition of the approval. Chairman Sadowski asked what happens if the leased property is sold. Atty. Donais stated that given the length of the lease, it would be able to be recorded at the Registry of Deeds, and would be binding on future owners of the property. Atty. Donais explained that an option to extend could also be enduring, if required conditions are met.

Mr. Eckman showed photos of the property, explaining the unusual nature of the 2 lots which connect over the separate hydro facility, and noted Mr. Keach's recommendation that the lots be merged. He again discussed SoRLAC's request that a full drainage study be done, and on behalf of the applicant asked if the Board wanted such a study on an existing building. He discussed the foundation being on bedrock, and the mill being in good condition for its age, except for an addition which will be removed. He discussed the need for the shoreland permit, and control of water in this intensely impervious area.

Chairman Sadowski asked for the presentation to address the operations of the proposed business, so that residents can better understand. Mr. Eckman reiterated that it is a 28-day program, and noting that there is a shortage of these facilities in New Hampshire. Atty. Donais answered that it will be a residential care facility regulated by the State. He explained that patients will voluntarily check in, and after the 28 days, will be "clean" and depart the facility. He explained that patients can leave, but that they will not have cars there, as the parking is designated for staff and the brief drop and pick-up by a family member or friend. Atty. Donais stated that google maps indicates that 4 Mill St. is a 4-minute walk. Chairman Sadowski asked for further detail about day-to-day operations. Atty. Donais explained that the State regulations will dictate specifics such as staffing ratios and space required.

Chris Foster, management consultant for the project, relayed his background which included involvement in over 50 facilities, and that he currently oversees 19 nationwide. He stated his focus is quality, safety, and wellbeing of staff and patients. He explained the State regulates them under HEP-A26, which covers everything from admissions/discharge, required trainings, emergency preparedness, etc. He indicated they would be joint-commission accredited, which is the highest standard of health care accreditation, which goes through a rigorous inspection every 2 years. Staff will be qualified professionals, including licensed therapists, clinicians, counselors, doctors, nurse practitioners, nurses, behavioral health techs, recovery support specialists, case managers, and administrative support personnel, equating to 50-60 positions working in this area. Average length of stay is 20 days, based on medical necessity, and a standard of care that is residential tier 2 and tier 3 as defined by the State, providing from a "3.7 limited withdrawal management" to a "3.5 residential clinically-managed care."

He explained that after their stay, clients receive a continuum of care to put them in places where they will succeed. He discussed that there is an abundance of out-patient care, such as sober-living facilities, after being stabilized at an inpatient facility, and expressed that the sober house facilities he owns are the cleanest properties in the community, and his members are required to do community service. He noted the patients in the proposed facility would not be doing community service, because they will be getting well. He discussed that he sits on the licensing Board for LADACs (Licensed Alcohol and Drug Counselors), and that the State is trying to increase that workforce. Regarding emergency preparedness, their regulations state that a patient, in order to stay with them, must be able to evacuate. Though not licensed, he explained that he is license-eligible, and instead took the administrative role, and that he would be involved with the project for a minimum of a year. He noted he himself was 14-years sober, and an ivy league graduate. He expressed that some but not all will make it, and that the use of public services was equivalent to or less than skilled nursing facilities, brain-injury facilities, etc., and are mitigated by the high competency level of their staffing.

Chairman Sadowski referenced their write-up as indicating 28 employees, and Mr. Foster indicated that that was not correct. Atty. Donais clarified that 28 employees is the maximum per shift. Ms. O'Keefe asked if they could break down the number of employees per shift. Mr. Foster explained that staffing is dependent on census, and would include additional contract service providers and nurses as the census increases. Chairman Sadowski asked if there is overlap in the shifts. Mr. Foster answered that the 3 shifts are typically 7 to 3, 3 to 11, 11 to 7, but that nurses work 7 to 7. He explained that a 30-minute overlap occurs with a "huddle" of a small number of staff, maximum 4, putting the peak number of employees parked at 32. Ms. O'Keefe asked for details about staffing on each of the three shifts, which Mr. Foster provided.

Mr. Tenney asked about the maximum number of beds anticipated based on the State's required ratio of patients to staff. Mr. Foster said he believe it to be 68 beds, and Mr. Georges confirmed. Chairman Sadowski noted that the application indicated 62 beds. Ms. O'Keefe stated Souhegan has 62 beds. Mr. Tenney asked about the number of contract employees. Mr. Foster indicated only doctors and medical specialists who are not required full-time would be contract-employees. Ms. O'Keefe asked about the overnight staffing, as it would impact someone choosing to leave in the middle of the night. Mr. Foster discussed the de-escalation procedures employed, and the security measures like door and window sensors. He confirmed patients are there voluntarily, and can leave if they choose to do so "against medical advice."

Deputy Chief Buttrick asked about the evacuation plan, specifically where 50+ people will gather, and not be in the way of first responders. Mr. Foster noted some possible locations. Atty. Donais discussed that the State licensing would require that an evacuation plan, which would need to be approved by the Town.

Chairman Sadowski expressed concern that the number of proposed beds had increased from conceptual, to application, to the current presentation. The project architect explained that the number of beds is dependent on the available square footage which is dependent on configuration of things like therapy areas, roof access, etc. He indicated the maximum would be 70 beds, but could go down to 66-68, or even lower. Chairman Sadowski showed that the last submitted plan still indicates 62 beds. He

expressed that a 10% increase is concerning. Mr. Foster questioned why that was concerning and Chairman Sadowski expressed that it is about being upfront, and that it has gone from a small facility conceptually, to something requiring more parking and employees. Chairman Sadowski questioned Town Counsel if the application needs to be redone. Atty. Bedard explained that with the formal application indicating 62 beds, and any increases to that amount should provide the opportunity for public comment on any such proposed increase. If they wished to amend their site plan and application, this would be continued until the revision was available for public review and comment. Mr. Eckman discussed that they have not provided revised plans since the submission in March, and that they are compiling all comments to address them in a revision. Atty. Donais expressed his preference to continue to pursue approval of the submitted 62, then come back for an additional 6 via a future amendment, if space and configuration allows. He noted that population will be driven by State regulations.

Chairman Sadowski inquired how many employees would be hired from Greenville. Mr. Foster indicated that would depend on the number of available qualified professionals, but that the staff would be from the here and the surrounding region. Chairman Sadowski, regarding parking, noted that the websites for other facilities do not indicate that visitors aren't allowed and that patients can't drive themselves. Mr. Foster indicated that visitors, if allowed, would be on Sundays, when the staffing is limited. Chairman Sadowski also questioned the parking for loved ones dropping off a patient. Mr. Foster indicated that drop offs are scheduled, but that yes, there might be one or two parked vehicles for drop-offs at one time. Chairman Sadowski questioned why Greenville, and why so many beds in Greenville. Mr. Foster explained that it is the building, and that NH statistically was 2nd in overdoes, but 48th in resources. He further explained that a somewhat remote location is preferred. Chairman Sadowski asked where people would be coming from, and Mr. Foster said from NH and neighboring states, but clarified it would not be a destination facility. Chairman Sadowski expressed concern about the lack of public transportation and ride services in the area. Mrs. O'Keefe discussed concerns about a patient who wishes to leave at 3:00 a.m. Mr. Foster discussed that in those rare instances, patients will call a loved one for a ride. If in a vulnerable stage of treatment, he acknowledged public services, police, ambulance, etc. may be called. Chairman Sadowski questioned how Mr. Foster recommends the Town support this facility without 24-hour police coverage, volunteer fire, and limited ambulance coverage. Mr. Foster indicated that Mr. Georges had discussed a fund to support those resources. Mr. George expressed that the increase in tax revenue for the renovated building would more than offset the costs. Mrs. Bickford inquired about the estimation of revenue in their presentation. Atty. Donais explained that it is an estimation based on the investment in and resulting value of the building. Mrs. Bickford asked if there are any background checks completed on patients. Mr. Foster explained that self-reported pre-assessment is done, and sex offender registry search, but not a national CORI.

Chairman Sadowski invited public comment. Kathleen Valliere, Greenville Tax Collector, asked how these services are paid for, if the patient doesn't have insurance. Mr. Foster discussed Medicaid expansion in the State, as well a sliding scale. He explained that they will generally take medically and clinically appropriate patients, regardless of insurance, with substance use disorder, not mental health, as the primary diagnosis.

Chairman Sadowski corrected a procedural error, asking for abutters in favor of the proposal, then abutters opposed. No one identified as an abutter.

Mrs. Valliere questioned if they would provide door-to-door transfer. Mr. Foster discussed various types of discharge, such as to home, but that 90% of clients step down to a lower level of care, such as a sober living house. She asked how many patients in a room, and Mr. Foster answered that the regulations allow 2 in 120 sq ft. She commented that many addicts are not cured in 28 days. She asked if they would utilize traveling nurses, and Mr. Foster indicated they would not. She asked if counselors will be recovering addicts, and Mr. Foster indicated yes, in some instances, where the recovering person obtains the proper certification/licensing, and is a trained professional. She asked if he would personally visit the facility, and Mr. Foster stated yes, it would be "his baby", and he would not hire people who do not operate in the way that he does. He discussed that his other facilities in New Hampshire have a "good neighbor policy". He explained that if they can only get X number of employees, they could only serve X number of clients. Mrs. Valliere stated that she feels they have a lot of good in the facility itself, but that she has seen failures, and that's what she's worried about.

Marshall Buttrick, of 240 Adams Hill Road, read his comments into the record (attached). Atty. Donais responded regarding the issue of parking, discussing the proposed leased spaces as well as the ability to acquire the previously discussed property on Mill St., which is a 4-minute walk. Regarding the unmaintained sidewalks in winter, he noted that this is already an issue for residents in town, and is an operational issue that could be addressed. He suggested that a shuttle could drive employees between the lot and facility. Mr. Eckman stated that Mr. George obtained a copy of the church site plan and confirmed that there were extra available spaces. Mr. Buttrick expressed concern at this statement, as he had requested a copy of the site plan from the Town, and it could not be located. Mr. Georges discussed that there was an additional 6 acres of unused space at that site, and they would not be using any of the already-allocated parking spaces. He commented that with the Mill Street property acquisition, they might not need any leased parking. Mr. Tenney suggested any proposed parking should be drawn out. Chairman Sadowski asked if the Board could receive copies of the contingent purchase & sale agreement. Ms. O'Keefe asked about the determined number of spaces. Mr. Georges discussed the potential for 2 levels of parking at that site. Mrs. O'Keefe noted an easement on that property, which Mr. Georges did not expect would affect their use. Mr. Buttrick expressed concern that the changing plan without written documentation is difficult to provide comment on. He also discussed that the spaces for the church property are not delineated with paint, so the whole thing is "nebulous".

Mr. Buttrick continued to read his written comments, which focused on environmental issues. Mr. Eckman discussed the infiltration basins as part of the stormwater design. Chairman Sadowski referenced the comments from SORLAC, and Mr. Eckman agreed that the Stormwater Management plan was not complete. He indicated they were addressing Steve Keach's request for greater detail on the materials used, and he anticipated the shoreland protection permit would require a full storm water plan. He inquired if the Board would want that first, or as a condition of approval. He indicated they could do test pits. Regarding concerns about runoff from the dumpster pad, he indicated they would be relocating the dumpster. Mr. Buttrick asked if run off from Chamberlin Street would be going into the proposed basins. Mr. Eckman agreed water would likely get to the basins, and suggested that curbing could direct the water down the street.

Mr. Buttrick read his comments regarding safety and local resources. Atty. Donais discussed an inquiry to the Town Manager where a 35-bed facility has been in operation for 6 years, who indicated the calls for service ranged from 1 every other month to perhaps 2 calls per month. He discussed further feedback from the Fire Chief there that many of said calls were not true 911 emergencies, but staffing and training issues. Atty. Donais stated that Antrim House was the only facility looked at for comparison, as it was the largest in a rural area. Regarding the noted traffic concerns, Mr. Eckman stated they could bring a traffic engineer to talk about those issues. Chairman Sadowski referenced their traffic engineer's written comments as being very limited. Mr. Tenney discussed concerns about the path from the Mill Street parking in winter, and suggested something in writing, such as a note on the plan, was needed to solidify their plan to address that issue.

Henri Vaillancourt, of 91 Mill Street, expressed that people who oppose this facility are being characterized as "not in my backyard" people. He felt that a facility such as this does not belong in any residential neighborhood, and especially not in the smallest community in NH, with no 24/7 emergency services, no parking, etc. He suggested the facility was better suited for an urban commercial/industrial area, with adequate parking and 24/7 services, where the impact would be negligible. He noted that the number of Greenville residents likely to be treated at the facility would be small compared to the capacity, and the impact on the Town assuming responsibility for an outside population would be great. He expressed that Greenville needs development with a positive impact, and discussed that the facility would dissuade buyers/renters. He felt Greenville would regret approving such a proposal.

Andrew Mackey, of 39 Rousseau Heights, stated that he walked from the parking lot of the Chamberlin Mill area and noted that the railing of the bridge blocked the view. He questioned where people could safely cross. Under the Site Plan Regulations, it is stated that if a proposal would reduce the value of surrounding properties, or does not add to the attractiveness of the Town, the Planning Board should not approve it. He suggested that changing shifts at 11 p.m. would not be good.

Sherri Moreau, of 16 pleasant St., asked if there are outdoor spaces for breaks, smoking, etc. within the property. Mr. Eckman discussed the area proposed with landscaping and benches, as well as an existing outdoor courtyard inside the building. She asked if this would be a non-smoking facility. Mr. Foster noted that the State does not have an opinion on that, and they had not made a determination, but if allowed, it would be in designated areas.

Charles Buttrick, of 365 Adams Hill Road, as a resident, questioned if there would be any effort on the part of the owners to reduce the education tax portion of their assessment, given that they would not be sending any students to our schools. He noted there is a facility in Town which gets such a reduction.

Wendy Leger, Chief at Souhegan Valley Ambulance Service, expressed concern about the placement of their large ambulance at the facility. Secondly, she questioned if there would be stairway access only to the second floor. And thirdly, she expressed concern about patients in various stages of detox being able to self-evacuate. Chairman Sadowski asked how many towns SVAS supports and how many ambulances they have. She answered that they serve 2 towns, Greenville and New Ipswich, with 2 ambulances and 15 EMTs, full time 8 to 4 during the week, and everything else is on-call.

Chairman Sadowski had 3 written statements, which Atty. Bedard indicated could be provided to the applicants and made available to the public rather than being read into the record. Chairman Sadowski agreed to scan and forward those to Atty. Donais. Atty. Bedard asked if the Board would be accepting additional written comments, and Chairman Sadowski indicated they would. Mr. Eckman noted that he had email town departments, requesting comment by July 12th. Atty. Bedard suggested that the applicant provide a list of conditions that they would be agreeable to, and Atty. Donais agreed. Atty. Bedard suggested that requesting the Stormwater Management Plan would address a number of outstanding questions. The time needed for the applicant to address the questions and public comments was discussed. Atty. Bedard expressed that it would be appropriate to provide another public comment period once the revised plan is submitted. The Board agreed to July 12 as the deadline for written public comments. Mr. Eckman indicated he would need until August to address the comments. The Board requested that the applicant's updated submission be provided 7 days before the meeting. Mr. Georges requested a meeting date other than the Board's regularly scheduled date, which would be August 10, 2023. The Board agreed to August 17, 2023, which would require submission of materials by August 10th. Mrs. Sousa noted that an application could be received requiring the Board to meet on August 10th also, but if no applications are received, the Chair could cancel and only meet on the 17th. **Motion by Mr. Tenney, 2nd by Ms. O'Keefe, to recess the public hearing to August 17, 2023, at 7:00 p.m. at the Mascenic SAU building, 16 School St., Greenville.**
Motion carried with 4 in favor, none opposed.

Minutes

Motion by Ms. O'Keefe, 2nd by Mr. Tenney, to accept the minutes of May 11, 2023.
Motion carried with 4 in favor, none opposed.


Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Tenney, 2nd by Ms. O'Keefe, to adjourn at 9:20 p.m.
Motion carried with 4 in favor, none opposed.

Respectfully Submitted,
Tara Sousa, Town Administrator

APPROVED BY:

Greenville Planning Board



Michael Sadowski, Chairman

Scott Tenney, Vice Chairman

Margaret Bickford, BOS Ex-Officio

Kelle O'Keefe

Tim Kearney

Attachments:

(Written public comments received)

Letter from Marshall Buttrick, 240 Adams Hill Road

Letter from Tom Hawkins, Greenville Depot

To the Greenville Planning Board:

I write in support of the Planning Board's approval of the plan by Georges Realty, LLC and McKenan Properties to develop a Substance Use Disorder Treatment Facility at 21 Chamberlin Street in Greenville.

I recognize that such a plan represents a profound change of use for the property and that such change might invite resistance by some members of the community and perhaps those living in its immediate neighborhood. I understand that the presence of such a facility will put additional strain on town services. But I think that this application presents an opportunity for Greenville to begin progress toward a serious revitalization of the downtown.

Many local residents have expressed a desire for Greenville's downtown area to be, once again, a vital and thriving neighborhood – with professional offices, retail shops and food establishments. That desire is expressed in the Greenville Master Plan and in the 2017 Charrette Survey conducted by the University of New Hampshire. But sadly, as most are aware, today there is very limited activity in the downtown district, save the Post Office, a couple motorcycle shops, a laundromat, a service station, a hair salon, a vintage collectables shoppe, and one restaurant. The Get-and-Go is closed. The Post Office Block is empty. The pizza shop and accompanying market is abandoned. The Prescott Grain Store building, once an antiques mall, is vacant. The Old Brick Inn is idle. There are three burned out lots on Main Street. These several, now unused properties, continue to weather and degrade, giving the downtown district a less than attractive appearance.

There have been sporadic attempts by individuals to bring new business activities of these properties. But, to date, none have been successful. Why must this be?

Downtown Greenville sits at the crossroads of natural and man-made features that could, and should be major assets in support of growth and vitality in our community. There is a wonderful and powerful river running through the village. It could, and should be celebrated with parks and trails and a museum in one of the many empty spaces throughout the village. There is an abandoned railroad line that once crossed the Souhegan on the longest and tallest trestle in the state, and terminated at the downtown. Today that rail line is part of the Southern New Hampshire Rail Trail System. Oh, if that rail trail could be, once again, extended to the downtown! There is NH Route 45 delivering 3000 cars a day through the downtown district. There are the many empty storefronts along the Main Street waiting for some vision and energy.

And then, there is the mill building at 21 Chamberlin Street. It has become, over the last 30 years, the depository for outdated electronic equipment, defunct computer parts, and sundry stuff – to the extent that there is no useable space remaining in the facility. During that time, its flat roof has leaked and several major beams supporting the floors have rotted and sagged, and now need replacement. But, in spite of its deteriorated condition, the building remains a beautiful piece of architecture worthy of restoration. To do this restoration and rehabilitation will require serious funding and there are few willing or capable of taking such a project on. Only a venture like the one presented to the Planning Board by Georges Realty and McKenan Properties stands a chance of success. Thus far, it appears that the applicant has approached this project in a deliberate and serious way – employing an engineering firm at the outset to evaluate the structural condition of the building, its parking challenges, its utilization of town utilities – hiring an architect to draft a working design that preserves the building's historic architecture while transforming its use to that of a modern-day medical center – and involving medical personnel in laying out a vital and appropriate professional facility.

As one indication of the intent of the applicant, I share this. I had the opportunity to speak with the architect about the approach to the design of the exterior of the building, specifically concerning the replacement of its 12-over-12 windows. All need to be updated to current thermal standards. This effort, done properly, will be costly and could be subject to some cost cutting by replacing the period 12-lite-over-12-lite windows with single pane sash, as is often done in rehabs of old mill buildings. The architect assured me that the windows to be installed would be 12-over-12. This ensures the preservation of the building's architecture, and serves as a visual asset to the Town of Greenville and the immediate neighborhood. One only needs to make note of the windows at the Ronald A. Philbrick Elderly Housing Mill Building on Main Street to observe how such an "update" can be done cheaply, while sacrificing the architectural aesthetics of the building. At the Elderly Housing Mill Building, the original windows were completely removed, the window openings filled in with sheet goods painted brown, and smaller "replacement" window units were installed, thereby dramatically changing the historic appearance of that old mill building. It does not present as well as it could to passing downtown traffic. So . . . I see an opportunity here to save this mill and to give this community a piece of architecture of which to be proud.

Now, I understand there is the concern about this facility being a drug rehabilitation center that is not a locked facility -- where patients are self-admitted and self-discharged -- basically at the facility by their own will. And there is concern that our police department is not full-time and our ambulance service is shared with other communities. Currently, the property to be transformed to a Substance Use Disorder Treatment Facility is valued at about \$200,000, according to tax records. I would suspect that, after restoration, rehabilitation and reassessment, the property would be worth considerably more, and subject to considerably greater tax assessment by the town. Is it not the time for Greenville to consider full-time, round-the-clock police coverage? That day must come, if Greenville is to progress into the future.

I feel strongly that the applicant presents this board with an opportunity to move Greenville forward. I challenge the Planning Board to have vision, to be forward thinking, to initiate the revitalization of Downtown Greenville by setting this venture on its way. Let's bring this going-concern to 21 Mill Street, with its professional employees and professional activities. Who knows? With this rehab center in full operation, Marcus P's may find its hostess turning away restaurant customers due to lack of table space !!

Let's do this !!

Respectfully,

Tom Hawkins
The Greenville Depot

Site Plan Application
21 Chamberlin Street – Georges Realty LLC

To the Greenville Planning Board,

I write to express concerns regarding parking, environmental and resource issues with the site plan proposed by 21 Chamberlin Street – Georges Realty LLC.

Parking

On the current plan 10 spaces are shown for on-site parking. The applicant proposes leasing 20 spaces (Attachment C-1 of the application) at the Chamberlin Mill property (32 Mill Street Tax Map 6 Lot 52 and/or Tax Map 6 Lot 57-1) to satisfy parking needs. The proposal to lease spaces at the Chamberlin Mill site does not address the parking as there are not enough parking spaces there to satisfy the need for parking spaces. This issue was discussed at the December 7, 2022 planning board meeting and according to the minutes of that meeting “Mr. Eckman agreed to check the requirements of the church's site plan to make sure that the lease isn't violating those requirements.” (A copy of the minutes of the December 7, 2022 meeting are attached.) I am unaware of any follow through on this by the applicant.

The owners of the Chamberlin Mill site appeared before the Planning Board on July 9, 2020 for a site plan application hearing to use a portion of that building for a “place of assembly”. The minutes of that hearing indicate the following:

Chairman White “asked what the applicant was proposing for parking needs. Ms. Helmig stated that they are proposing to have 61 parking spaces in the lower back lot ...”

Fire Chief Charles Buttrick “questioned whether the applicant was allocating all 61 parking spaces to the Church and what is allocated for others.

Chairman White replied “correct”. Fire Chief Buttrick expressed concern

about the number of parking spaces allocated to the Church only and used an example of having a funeral held and having over 150 people show up and have a lack of spaces available.”

I have attached a copy of the July 9, 2020 planning board minutes and a copy of the proposed parking that was submitted at that hearing.

It appears that the Chamberlin Mill site does not have additional parking spaces to lease to anyone. What is happening here is a double counting of parking spaces; that is counting a parking space for the place of assembly and simultaneously counting it for this proposal. I think that the owners of the Chamberlin Mill property need to submit an application for a revised site plan for their property if they plan to lease parking places. I also think that the planning board needs to be clear which lot at the Chamberlin Mill site is being proposed for parking. Is it Tax Map 6 Lot 52 or is it Tax Map 6 Lot 57-1?

The applicants want to use leased parking spaces to satisfy the need for parking places. The proposal is for a ten year lease with an option to renew. It does not address what happens when the lease is not renewed. That becomes a major issue for this proposal . I note that on at least one occasion the town has required an easement for the off-site parking spaces (Tax Map 6 Lot 46) to satisfy the parking requirement.

This site plan proposal does not address who sands, salts and/or plows snow from the off-site parking area to Mill Street. At present the town does not plow the Mill Street or Chamberlin Street sidewalks. This proposal would have additional people walking in the street in the winter from the Chamberlin Mill site to the applicant's property.

Environmental Issues

The proposal shows snow storage on a green space (C-1 of the application). The snow placed there would melt and drain directly into the Souhegan River. There is no proposal to retard the direct flow into the river (retention areas). I suggest that the space allocated for snow storage is inadequate to address the snow storage and run-off.

The applicant has indicated that they would be able to have the snow removed and transported to the Chamberlin Mill site. I question whether the Chamberlin Mill site can be used for snow storage without an amended site plan for the Chamberlin Mill site. There has been no indication that there is a proposed lease or easement to allow for snow storage on the Chamberlin Mill site. There is no indication where on the Chamberlin Mill site (There are two parcels) the snow would be stored.

The issue of snow removal and snow storage has changed during this process and needs to be addressed with greater detail.

The exterior lighting issue should be addressed and locations of lights shown on the plans.

The drainage of water from parking spaces should be addressed so that water is not running into the street. Plan C-2 of the application shows drainage flow along the southeast side of Chamberlin Street (northwest side of the subject parcel). The crushed stone inlet protection catch basins need to have explanation. Where does the water that enters the catch basin go? Is the soil at the site able to absorb the amount of runoff going into each of these inlet protection basins? Has the infiltration information requested at the December 7, 2022 planning board meeting been provided?

The application calls for a concrete dumpster pad. Will this be fenced? Will there be run-off of water from the pad?

Resources and Infrastructure

This site plan proposal will have a major impact on Chamberlin Street. Currently parking is allowed on both sides of a narrow street. This proposal will eliminate public parking adjacent to the applicant's building. The traffic volume will increase significantly with the proposed use, creating either an unsafe street or forcing the town to make the street one-way to address the safety issues. The reception area for vehicles bringing patients and or supplies opens onto a corner very close to the intersection of Chamberlin Street and Mill Street which will create a potential safety issue. I recognize that it is an existing use but this proposal increases that use significantly.

The sidewalk on Chamberlin Street is on the opposite side of the street from the applicant's building. That results in persons crossing the street between parked vehicles to access the building. That is a safety issue. Will there be a new crosswalk designated for that area? If so, that reduces the amount of parking available for the residents of Chamberlin Street and for the general public.

Given the nature of the proposed use for the site, ambulance, police, and fire departments will have significant increases in the demand for services. The police and fire departments are not full time departments. The State Police provide coverage when Temple-Greenville police are not available. The fire department relies on mutual aid from adjoining towns. The increased use of these public services may result in significant costs for the town of Greenville.

These are my concerns regarding the proposed site plan.

Marshall A. Buttrick

Marshall A. Buttrick
240 Adams Hill Road
Greenville, NH

ENC

Planning Board Minutes for December 7, 2022

Planning Board Minutes for July 9, 2020

Parking plan submitted at the July 9, 2020 Planning Board Hearing