

## HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

November 21st, 2017

“Final”

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Rick Hardy, Chet Rogers, Alternate; Jeff Peters; and Ben Ming

**ABSENT:** Brian Stelmack & Dan Turcott; Alternate Bill Moseley; and David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen

**STAFF PRESENT:** Wendy Trimble, Assistant Planner

**STAFF ABSENT:** Mark Fougere, Town Planner

### 1. CALL TO ORDER:

C. Hoffman, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7 pm. J. Peters was appointed to vote on behalf of B. Stelmack. B. Ming was appointed to vote on behalf of D. Turcott.

### 2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

D. Cleveland made a motion to approve Planning Board Minutes October 17<sup>th</sup> 2017 as amended. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none opposed. B. Ming abstained.

### 3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

- a. Agenda additions and deletions – none.
- b. Committee Reports – none
- c. Staff Report – none
- d. Regional Impact – none

### 4. Signature of Plan:

**5. PB2017-021:** Proposed Final Review site plan application for the construction of a 52 unit “Housing for Older Persons” development on a 30.8 acre site, Applicant/owner Raisanen Homes, Inc., Map 45-50, Silver Lake Road, Zoned R&A Residential Agriculture. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**

W. Trimble explained this is a 30.8 acre property approved in 2009 for a 10 lot HOSPD subdivision; this project has never proceeded except for material removal needed in order to construct the proposed road. The purpose of this final site plan is to depict a development in conformance with section XXI: Housing for Older Persons of the Hollis Zoning Ordinance with a density of two (2) bedroom housing units per net tract acre. The density calculations have been submitted, and the total open space requirement as per these calculations is 12.32 acres. A total of 52 units are proposed along with a clubhouse.

The landscaping proposed along the site’s entrance will not change from the previous approval. However, a maintenance and bonding plan must be in place in accordance with Subdivision Regulations Section IV.3 and Section IV.8 A maintenance plan is needed to outline procedures to ensure the proposed landscaping becomes well established. Grading is proposed within the 35 foot setback in two areas on the site, along homes 5-8 on the south side (adjoining residential abutters) and homes 25-28 adjoining town owned land. Grading along lots 5-8 should be reviewed.

The applicant would like to clear cut the main development area prior to undertaking test pits for the proposed septic systems. The board needed to discuss this at this meeting. A side walk is planned around the site and ends at the proposed clubhouse; the sidewalk does not extend down the entrance road to NH 122.

NHDES has preliminary approved the proposed community well. Outreach to abutter within 1000 feet of the well has occurred, with four agreeing to the water test and two refusing. Of the four who agreed to the test, two of the abutters lie to the north and two lie to the south.

W. Trimble listed the following as issues to be discussed.

- The Board's engineer has reviewed the drainage analysis and will have a report for the meeting.
- The landscaping plan will need to be updated to adhere to new maintenance and bonding requirements.
- To preserve the buffer along the south side of the side, grading should be removed.
- The project will require state subdivision approval along with a NHDES alteration of terrain permit.
- The State NHDES has authorized a water quantity test to proceed and results should be available to the Board for the meeting.
- The applicant would like to proceed to clear the development area of trees so that test pits can be undertaken. If this is completed, a clear view of the south side buffer could be made and evaluated to determine if additional plantings are necessary. The test pit details and findings must be added to the plan.

Chad Brannan, Civil Engineer to Fieldstone Land Consultants, approached the podium and is joined tonight with Richard Raisanen, Raisanen Homes Elite LLC and Bruce Lewis, Lewis Engineering, seeking approval of a project on parcel Map 45 Lot 50 Silver Lake Road, as presented by W. Trimble. In his summary is confirmed that the parcel totals 30.86 acres with approximately 507.5 linear feet of frontage along Silver Lake Road. The previously approved subdivision was impacted by the decline in the market over the past few years and then the recent change in the elderly housing ordinance, section XXI it was clear that the town and local boards acknowledged there was a need for this style housing. They have been before the board on a number of occasions representing this project in various phases, both conceptual and design, and now they bring the final application. They believe this property is a great location for elderly housing development such as it is uniquely situated by being abutted by three properties that are owned by the town. The closest abutting residential home is approximately 300 feet, and there is also an elevation difference of 84 feet. He added that the development would also be substantially buffered from Silver Lake Road. The closest unit would be 780 feet from Silver Lake Road and there is also an approximate elevation difference of 54 feet. The 2009 subdivision review for the 10 lot open space development, consisted of significant review in design of the front end of this project. This included extensive landscaping, design and review. The proposal before the

board tonight maintains all those details on the front end of the project. No changes are being proposed from Silver Lake Road up to station 800. No landscape and drainage are being proposed, however there is a very small change to the road design at around station 600. The old design had an 8% grade transitioning into a 2% grade. The design before the board now is an 8% grade transitioning into a 1.2% grade. A slight modification to the vertical curve in the road and as a result there is a slight change in grading from station 600 to station 800. This project starts from the top of the hill at station 900 where all the modifications are proposed. The units have been positioned to be 30 feet apart. 52 units have been proposed, to fit comfortably around the road, which is just under the 53 units that could have fitted with the density calculations. The development will be served by Cobbett Lane which is 3190 foot private roadway with a dead end length of 1374 feet. Cobbett Lane is proposed to be 22 foot in width, which is the same cross section that was approved previously. It will be serviced by underground electric, phone and cable, on site individual septic systems along with a community well water system. Since the viability of this project is directly connected to the ability to supply ample water, Bruce Lewis of Lewis Engineering was hired by the applicant to handle the design and permitting of the community water system. This project is also contemplating a parking lot and clubhouse, no required by local ordinance, but is welcomed amenity with this styled housing. The clubhouse is 2000 square feet in size, will be utilized by the homeowners for meetings, classes, and events, it will house the communal mail box area, restrooms, and an office space for the homeowners association. The basement area will be utilized for the community water system and mechanics. The plan does also provide an outside area around the clubhouse for outdoor events. At the request of the Planning Board the plans have been revised to include a side walk. This runs along one side of Cobbett Lane and terminates at the clubhouse.

The storm water management for this project will be handled through a series of open and closed drainage systems. The closed drainage systems will have deep sump catch basins and vegetative swales. The first 800 feet of the project is open drainage system and no part of this design has been changed. The previously approved plans and the approval currently through the Alteration of Terrain bureau has an infiltration basin designed at the entrance to the project. There is also a couple of infiltration basins at the ends of the benching along the slopes all part of the previously approved design. A detailed storm water management report was submitted to the town for review by Dennis LaBombard. This report indicates there is a reduction in the rate of run off and also a reduction in the volume of run off. They are mitigating all improvements and all the run offs from this project.

Since this development will be private the proposed roadway and all the associated infrastructure will be the responsibility of the development or the homeowners association and therefore will not become a burden on the town. The design of the project does contemplate some sight lighting, 10 downcast LED lighting, of residential grade, not parking lot design, set up to accent the development to provide lighting for some people walking and driving through the project.

As presented at past meetings, the project offers a variety of units ranging from about 1000 to 2200 square feet in size. All units will be two bedroomed units.

He summarized by adding this project meets and exceeds the requirements as outlined in Section XXI of the Zoning Ordinance, will provide a need in town, will provide housing

diversity in town, and will allow Hollis aging population an opportunity to stay in town and keep the tax revenue in town.

R. Hardy made a motion to accept application PB2017-021. C. Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

C. Roger asked if on street parking will be allowed. Or must is all be on the driveways? C. Brannan said they would anticipate they would all be on driveways, the majority of the units provide for two car garage, and room for two cars parked on the driveway. There is also a car park provided at the clubhouse.

C. Hoffman asked to confirm width of road. C. Brannon said it was 22 feet wide which exceeds the DOT suggested minimums for this size project.

Bruce Lewis from Lewis Engineering PLLC approached the podium. He has been affiliated with the waterworks industry since 1975, and started Lewis Engineering in 1986. They are a specialized civil engineering firm in water supply, water design. This is reflected in projects like this with community water systems, some municipality projects, booster stations, problems solving and design works. He explained the steps involved in this type of public water supply system, that needs to meet all the requirements of NHDES, ground water and drinking water bureau, but it is backed up by the USEPA. A preliminary Well Siting report has been received. The plans show the circle which is the protective radius around the well. You have to protect this area, and have no septic systems, nothing harmful, no drainage basins that hold water. This was sited, located and reviewed by the State and approved. A test well was drilled at the location, to check if there was water there or not, and there was sufficient water in this well. The procedure was then to schedule a 72 hour pump test which is mandated by the State DWGB for all wells of this type of project. This process started November 7<sup>th</sup>, then this was stopped to take in a permanent water supply pump, and this allowed them to set this pump now to avoid anyone coming back, and it is set 400 feet. The overall well is 505 feet deep. It is a 6 inch bedrock well. There is an 8 inch casing. This gives some flexibility if some further work is needed later on. This was a recommendation made to Mr. Raisanen and he thought it was a good idea to do. 26 feet of this casing pipe that is set into solid bedrock and this help ensure that you will never have any infiltration of water into the well, that the only water coming into the well in coming through the fractures down below. The 72 hour test ran from November 14<sup>th</sup> 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>. With a permanent pump, at the proper elevation, monitored 72 hours, and in addition to that four neighboring houses had their wells being monitored, at the same time. These four houses were within 1000 feet of this well location, and they were monitored to determine if there would be any influence from pumping the new project well against the neighborhood wells. This test showed there was no impact, the neighborhood wells were reacting like any normal residential household well. During the test there was more than 77000 gallons of water was pumped out of the ground. During that time, what happens is the level in the well starts at 37 feet below the surface, and when the test ended at 72 hours it had stabilized and the water level was at 230 feet but it had been at 230 feet for twelve hours. This means as it was coming out of the well the surrounding aquifer supplied the equivalent amount of water in, and that is what the state wants to see to be able to approve a well like this. So the 17 gallons per minute is equivalent to 24480 gallons pumped per day. This is what they will be submitting to the state, a permitted production volume, the number you are not allowed to exceed at any one time, maximum. The usual amount will be half of that. A two time's

194 safety factor is applied. Half of this is 12240 gallons per day. By design standards for this  
195 particular project the amount of water that was required was 10600 gallons per design  
196 standard. With his experience with similar projects in the past, B. Lewis stated with water  
197 metered readings, when this is fully built out and all 52 units are occupied, the average day  
198 there will be less than 8000 gallons a day. He had looked at a range, based on water meter  
199 ratings, not an estimate, it would run anywhere from 6000 – 8000 gallons per day for this  
200 many units. Some of this is due to the demographics and current plumbing code. There is  
201 also a pumping room in the basement of the clubhouse. Now this test has been done and it  
202 shows everything performed very well, near the end of the test, water quality samples were  
203 taken, and these samples are being analyzed for the same parameters that the City of  
204 Nashua has to analyze their water, a full safe drinking water act. When these results come  
205 back they will be combined with the pumping test data, and the results from the neighbor's  
206 wells, to go to the state for review and confirmation that everything lines up. If it comes  
207 back and anything has to be treated in the water that will get incorporated into the final  
208 engineering design, which will include all the components of the pump house and the water  
209 distribution system. At the end this water system will become a public water supply and be  
210 assigned a seven digit code by the State of New Hampshire, it will be monitored by the State  
211 of New Hampshire going forward through time, one of the provisions is the Association will  
212 be required and will retain a licensed water system operating from the state of new  
213 Hampshire.

214  
215 C. Rogers asked about the storage tanks. B. Lewis explained there will be two storage tanks  
216 under the clubhouse. This is a good efficient use of space. C. Rogers asked if there was  
217 going to be a backup generator for the pumping system. B. Lewis answered not at this time.  
218 This is because the fire protection component is by cisterns. C. Rogers was more concerned  
219 about 52 houses not having water when the power is out.

220  
221 D. Cleveland asked if there will be sprinklers in the homes. Chad Brannon answered no.

222  
223 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

224  
225 Barry Johnson, 66-2 Truell Road Hollis approached the podium. He asked the Board that  
226 their role as a Planning Board, is it a case that if a proposal comes for a development, and  
227 they meet all the rules and regulations, are they obliged to approve. Or can they ask for  
228 changes i.e. in the number of houses. C. Hoffman replied if they meet the ordinance and do  
229 not require any waivers then yes they would be obliged. B. Johnson then added that  
230 abutters concerns are somewhat moot. C. Hoffman said no but it would depend on the  
231 seriousness of their concern and they would investigate. His concern is his well water and  
232 the test was done in November when no one was running irrigation systems so he is  
233 concerned what impact that would have. Then also he has 20 years of data in his house that  
234 proves his well is good and he never has had a problem with it. Now there has been a 72  
235 hour test done, and his was one of the wells tested. He went back to a previous meeting  
236 when he said that David Petry raised a valid point that maybe there could be some financial  
237 fund put aside by the developer that could be used to ensure the abutters if their wells dried  
238 up then something could be done about it that would not affect the abutters. He said he was  
239 just looking for reassurances as longtime residents that if the board approves this  
240 development then their home life is not negatively impacted.

241

242 Bruce Lewis approached the podium again to address these questions. He spoke first about  
243 the projections for water level. So even though this was a 72 hour water test, the amount of  
244 water extracted during that time is multiple times more than what would normally be  
245 extracted on a day to day basis. One of the things the state has them do is a computation  
246 analysis that goes to the end of the 72 hours, and then projects where the water level will be  
247 in the well 180 days later. This equation is used by many people. And in this particular  
248 case, the well level had gone from 37 feet and for the last 12 hours it pretty much capped at  
249 230 feet. But during the projection out to 180 days, that only said that the well would go  
250 down by that calculation, to 260 feet so that was not a highly projected drop. The well  
251 would support a lot. As this is a public water supply the association will be required on a  
252 regular basis to turn in water use reports, on a very regular basis. So if for some reason the  
253 water use became very high or was being over used the state would come down and take  
254 administrative actions to correct that.

255

256 R. Hardy asked if the developer had asked for the irrigation to be factored in for the lawns  
257 and more importantly the landscape area at the entrance to the development. B. Lewis  
258 suggested that there is a budget of water that can be used, and the developer and landscaper  
259 will need to stay within that budget of water. Plants can be chosen that maybe need less  
260 watering.

261

262 C. Brannon approached the podium. He stated they do understand the bonding  
263 requirements of the landscaping and the watering for that landscaping is intended to be  
264 done by tanker trucks. If there is an ability to utilize some water on site and this can be  
265 done it will be. It will not be an irrigation system on the front of site landscaped area, just  
266 potentially around the homes and lawns.

267

268 D. Cleveland asked the depth of the pump and B. Lewis stated it was set at 400 feet.

269

270 Cathy Coe, 11 Toddy Lane approached the podium. Her concern is that there is no  
271 sprinklers in any of the homes. And the road is only 22ft wide, and if there was a problem  
272 and one of Chief Towne fire trucks was up there other residents would not be able to vacate  
273 quickly as the road would be blocked by fire trucks. At least if there was sprinklers in the  
274 homes the fire would be put out a lot quicker. She stated that 1% or 2% of fires are  
275 extinguished by sprinkler systems in the home and it would make more sense.

276

277 Sherry Wyskiel, Wheeler Road came in support of the development. She is looking to  
278 downsize and be able to stay in Hollis. There is nothing around that is suitable. She asked  
279 if any of the units would have handicapped access and the developer said he could build the  
280 unit to whatever specifications she wanted. She asked how they are going too heated. He  
281 added forced hot air by propane.

282

283 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

284

285 D. LaBombard approached the podium. He had submitted a report and stated he needed  
286 more time to fully review. Tonight a number of his questions had been answered. He  
287 stated that everything appeared thorough. As it is a private road, he asked the board what  
288 construction standards if any do they want. At the moment the proposed thickness of  
289 gravel is less than a town road. He wants the board to have a discussion on this, maybe not  
290 tonight, but we have had a couple of projects like this before. He had heard rumors in

291 previous conversations that there was a snow storage issue. With short distances between  
292 houses, and short driveways especially on the side with the side walk, when they park in the  
293 driveway and not in the garage they will at least partially block the sidewalk. Is that a  
294 concern? Now would be the time to address it. He needs to go through the underground  
295 utilities design. If it was a town road, there would be cut and fill waivers needed. He only  
296 found one spot that was more than a 4 foot cut and less than 150 feet long so he feels they  
297 do not need a waiver to that regulation. He wanted to touch on storm drainage. The overall  
298 concept appears to be good, if they use a well-drained soil, they are using infiltration basins,  
299 his preliminary review of the calculations shows no more rate or volume is leaving the site  
300 than there is now, and he needs to double check the numbers but he does not see any  
301 problems at the moment. They have not changed anything in the first 800 feet which is  
302 normally where you find problems as it is such a narrow strip that runs down to Silver Lake  
303 Road.

304  
305 R. Hardy asked if D. LaBombard would have this reviewed by the next meeting. He hopes  
306 to but he has had scheduling conflicts. D. Cleveland asked where all the utilities lines were  
307 going. D. LaBombard stated that they are in the road. C. Brannon added the underground  
308 electricity is run adjacent to the roadway, under the sidewalk or shoulder, at a depth of  
309 about 3 feet, others will be in the roadway. He added there are a few driveway lengths that  
310 are just shy of 20 feet long on the sidewalk side, this was not intended. The design of those  
311 houses with the garages jutting out caused this so a few amendments will be done to rectify  
312 this by pushing the units back about a foot. All driveways will be 20 feet long and there will  
313 be no conflicts with the sidewalks. He also address the concern of snow storage stating that  
314 there is adequate space between the driveways for snow storage. The homeowners will not  
315 be responsible for clearing their own driveways either that will be dealt with as part of the  
316 maintenance plan. He would like some feedback from the Planning Board relative to the  
317 road construction standards that was raised.

318  
319 C. Brannon stated that they would like to discuss tonight with the Board, the need to clear  
320 cut to be able to start the test pits for the septic designs for each property. C. Rogers asked  
321 why are they proposing individual septic systems, would it not be better to share a septic  
322 between two units. C. Brannon said it was maintenance and selling feature that people  
323 prefer to have their own septic system.

324  
325 B. Ming asked if the water level was going to be measured at the same rate as the water  
326 quality. B. Lewis got up to answer this question, he said the State of New Hampshire does  
327 not require that your community well have the level monitored on a regular basis, but it  
328 does require the reporting of how much water is being used on a regular basis. Depending  
329 on the time of year, the water level in the well may go up and down a bit, and this reminded  
330 him of Mr. Johnson's comment that this was November, when you are talking about  
331 bedrock wells, the time when you are seeing the least amount of water is in early fall until  
332 this time of year, because it takes a certain amount of time for the summertime drought  
333 with dry conditions to effect the underlying bedrock. This is not actually a bad time for the  
334 pumping test relative to making sure you are doing it at a conservative time. B. Ming asked  
335 if 260 was the 180 day projection. B. Lewis agreed and explained that was running at 17  
336 gallons per minute the whole time and the well pump is set deeper than that. The State  
337 require it to be set deeper than the 180 day to be safe and it was his call to be a little more  
338 conservative. B. Ming asked what level B. Lewis would get concerned. B. Lewis said 390.  
339

R. Hardy asked about the bedrock well. B. Lewis explained that when the well driller starts the well they are putting a steel casing down into the overburden, so there is 37 feet of overburden before you get bedrock. So as they drill into the bedrock you put in an additional 26 feet of casings so there is a total of 50 feet used.

C. Hoffman asked if anyone had anything to ask about them doing the clearing so they can do the test pits.

R. Hardy asked about lot 6, 7 and 8. When we spoke a couple of months ago about the setback for the buffer, the vegetative buffer, he is not sure about the distance behind these lots if they are talking about substantial grading. He asked if the tree line was right on the line. The initial presentation showed a buffer of at least 35 feet. C. Brannon stated he believed the building setback was 35 feet and doesn't recall showing a buffer of 35 feet. But when the site is graded and the backyard area is provided there is a slope in the area behind units 6, 7 and 8, and the resulting buffer is about 20 feet from the limit of disturbance to the property line. Technically there is no requirement distance wise, for buffering in the regulation, it just says adequate buffering from the project to the adjacent uses, and there is significant buffering from these units to the closest residential properties, approximately 20 feet is what will be left after the grading shown on the plan. R. Hardy asked if they were proposing any walls. C. Brannon said they were not proposing any walls. C. Brannon said once the slope is graded back, Mother Nature will vegetate in, and that a vegetative slope would be better for a resident and there would be no benefit for a retaining wall, which could present a liability. R. Hardy would like to see a note on the plan that assures this.

D. Cleveland asked with regard to the clearing, if there happened to be any nice maples, could they be saved. R. Raisanen stated it would depend where they are, and if they was a lot of root disturbance around them or not. R. Hardy asked if they would have this done ready for the next meeting. C. Brannon said he cannot speak for the schedules of others, but they would intend to cut and have the test pits carried out as soon as they can.

R. Hardy made a motion to authorize the applicant for PB2017-021 permission to clear cut the main development area for the housing as shown on the plan and a note be added to the plan for the area of lot 6, 7 and 8 stating that the embankment will be allowed to revegetate as part of the approval. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none opposed.

D. Cleveland made a motion to continue PB2017-021 to December 19<sup>th</sup> 2017 Planning Board Meeting. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none opposed.

**6. PB2017-019:** Proposed minor site plan amendment to occupy 540 sq. ft. of an existing industrial building for a screen printing embroidery business, Applicant Mavericks Stitch and Screen, Owner Thomas Walton, 265B Proctor Hill Road, Map 9 Lot 133, Zoned Industrial. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing**

W. Trimble explained the applicant is proposing to sub-lease 540 square feet of an existing 5,000 square foot building for a stitch and silk screen operation. The business will operate M – F, 9 am to 5 pm. The business provides printing and embroidery services and employees three people. Ample parking is available for the proposed use.

388 J. Peters made a motion to accept the application. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none  
389 opposed.

390  
391 Nathan Moreau, Owner and operator of Maverick Stitch and Screen. He explained he  
392 currently has a joint business in Amherst where he does screen printing. He is currently  
393 looking to build out a space in 265 Proctor Hill Road, as an enlarged facility for his  
394 business. The size will allow him to run his screen printing facility with enough room for all  
395 his equipment. The building itself has a garage door which will allow him to open and work  
396 without actually being outside. A lot of his vinyl work on vehicles is done outdoors and this  
397 is a problem in the winter.

398  
399 J. Peters asked about the screen printing products and any hazardous waste. N. Moreau  
400 explained that the inks do not enter the water system. All screens get reclaimed, and during  
401 this process the screens go into a separation tank, where particulates settle then the settled  
402 particulates are collected once it congeals, and then thrown away in the trash.

403  
404 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

405  
406 T. Dufresne, 17 Pound Road, approached the podium to speak on behalf of the Conservation  
407 Commission. He asked if there was a spill containment being proposed. N. Moreau replied  
408 that anything that would spill is heavy and would not travel and is cleaned up with a citrus  
409 and soya based cleaning products.

410  
411 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

412  
413 W. Trimble stated the conditions would be the applicant would supply four copies of the  
414 final site plan.

415  
416 J. Peters made a motion to approve application PB2017-019 and to waive the 30 day  
417 procedure of signing the plan with conditions as listed. C. Rogers seconded. All in favor  
418 none opposed.

419  
420

421 **7. PB2017-020:** Proposed minor subdivision of an existing 11.6 acre lot into two lots, 19  
422 Flagg Road, Applicant/owner Richard J. & Mary Snell, Map 7 Lot 45, Zoned RA  
423 Residential-Agriculture. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing**

424

425 W. Trimble explained this project involves the subdivision of an existing 11.67 acre lot into  
426 two lots, a 3 acre front lot and an 8.57 acre back lot. A new driveway will be installed which  
427 will cross over a wetland area with a proposed 18 foot wide bridge. The applicant received a  
428 variance to allow 85 square feet of the Building Box to lie within the wetland buffer. State  
429 subdivision approval has been obtained. Given the proposed work near wetlands, the plans  
430 have been sent to the Conservation Commission for input.

431

432 D. Cleveland made a motion to accept application PB2017-020 and J. Peters seconded. All  
433 in favor none opposed.

434

435 R. Haight, Meridian Land Services, approached the podium. He explained that in August  
436 2017 he had given a presentation of this plan to the Conservation Commission before taking

437 it to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to seek a variance for the building box. At that time  
438 the lots where about 5 acres each in size, and this variance request was for 890 square feet  
439 intrusion into the wetland buffer that was then denied. This was reconfigured to an  
440 intrusion of 85 square feet with a 3 acre lot and an 8.57 acre lot. The driveway that was  
441 shown for the first presentation is still in the same place as it is the narrowest place to cross  
442 the wetlands that are there and they are intending to put a bridge there and not a culvert.  
443 They are staying out of the wetlands entirely. The variance for 85 square feet was granted  
444 and state subdivision approval was submitted for the subdivision of the front lot and this  
445 also has been granted. He explained the wetland areas to the Planning Board from the plan.  
446 He explained they are proposing to put the driveway into the field across the narrowest part  
447 of the wetland buffer, stay as close to the lot line, and meet the maximum driveway grade, to  
448 get to the building site at the back. There is also a couple of catchment areas, to catch the  
449 water before it runs off the hill, and therefore it is treated before it goes into the wetland.

450

451 C. Hoffman asked how much of a disturbance in the wetland buffer will occur due to the  
452 driveway. R. Haight explained it will be 19,600 square feet disturbance, and this was the  
453 same that was presented to the Conservation Commission in August. It was labelled on the  
454 first plan. C. Hoffman is concerned about the 19,600 square feet disturbance and stated  
455 that the Conservation Commission needs to look at this more closely. She questioned that  
456 he does not need a wetland permit for the bridge because it is not being placed in the water.  
457 R. Haight agreed, they are not excavating, or filling in any of the wetlands, they are staying  
458 outside of the wetlands, and they are putting in footings and then small retaining walls with  
459 a concrete plank placed on top.

460

461 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

462

463 Tom Dufresne and Jonathon Bureau from Hollis Conservation Commission approached the  
464 podium. T. Dufresne explained they saw the plan in August and they saw the driveway and  
465 understood there was major impact in the buffer. The second time it came back to the  
466 Conservation Commission the impact was reduced, there was some confusion due to the  
467 map change and they did not discuss the buffer which was an oversight on the commission  
468 behalf and he apologized. They voted to approve the disturbance in the building box to 85  
469 square feet 7:1 with one abstention. They did not get a letter written in time. The  
470 commission overlooked the disturbance in the buffer. He does not want this to set any form  
471 of precedent as the 100 foot wetland buffer was voted at town meeting, and it is important  
472 to everyone as we are all on wells. Jonathan Bureau stated that 19,600 square feet is equal  
473 to nearly half an acre. It is spread out. He questioned most of the impact, and R. Haight  
474 said that the most impact will be putting in the drainage, to control and treat the water prior  
475 to reaching the wetland. T. Dufresne wants the wetland buffer impact to be considered. J.  
476 Bureau agreed.

477

478 C. Hoffman suggested we ask D. LaBombard to take a look at the plans, condition the  
479 application to have Reggie Ouellette to do regular inspections during the construction  
480 process and the Conservation Commission does need to put something in writing to the  
481 Board as part of our ordinance. A site walk should be scheduled also. R. Hardy asked if the  
482 Conservation would request a vegetation plan, T. Dufresne said they have not specified  
483 anything in the past but they have asked that it be revegetated. R. Hardy suggested that  
484 maybe we could mitigate the Conservation vote by asking for engineer to suggest some  
485 planting, to help with regrowth and wild life. R. Haight suggested it was going to be loamed

486 and grassed, to stabilize and let Mother Nature do her work. R. Hardy said specific plants  
487 can still be requested.

488  
489 Paul Allen, 7 Flagg Road approached the podium. He is an abutter directly opposite the  
490 proposed site. He asked for clarification of the clear cut area. R. Haight explained. He  
491 asked if he can come to the site walk. C. Hoffman explained he is welcome to attend but will  
492 not be able to ask questions or comment, but he can email the staff at Town Hall.

493  
494 Joseph Connelly, 14 Sawmill Road, approached the podium. He is a member of the  
495 Conservation Commission. He is interested in how the change in square feet came about  
496 for the building box and how that changed the votes of the ZBA. In his opinion the answer  
497 should be zero square feet impact and that these rules are in place for a reason and  
498 therefore variances should be avoided always.

499  
500 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing. D. LaBombard will review the plans and let us know  
501 his thoughts.

502  
503 A site walk was arranged for Saturday 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2017 at 9 am. R. Haight was asked to  
504 stake out/flag the center line of the driveway, catch basin, disturbed area. The Conservation  
505 Commission will also be invited to attend the site walk also.

506  
507 C. Rogers made a motion to continue application PB2017-020 until December 19<sup>th</sup> 2017. D.  
508 Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

509  
510

511

512 **8. PB2017-022:** Proposed site plan amendment for a change of use to allow for a dog  
513 training operation within 3,000 square feet of an existing 34,600 square foot building,  
514 Applicant Operation Delta Dog, Inc. Owner Hollis Hampshire, LLC, 19G Clinton Drive,  
515 Map 4 Lot 74, Zoned Industrial. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing**

516

517 W. Trimble explained the applicant is proposing to sub-lease 3,000 square feet of an  
518 existing industrial building for the operation of a dog training site for veterans. Service  
519 dogs are trained and teamed with veterans who suffer from PTSD and Traumatic Brain  
520 Injury. Up to 10 dogs will be housed on site and a fenced in yard is proposed. All training  
521 will occur inside the building. The business will operate M – F, 9 am to 5 pm; three full  
522 time and three part-time employees will work at the facility. The location of the building  
523 lies at the end of end of Clinton Drive, on the eastern side and abuts Moran's Landscaping.

524

525 The applicant obtained a variance from the ZBA on October 26, 2017 for the proposed dog  
526 training use. Two stipulations were attached to the approval: 1. All dogs shall be supervised  
527 at all times while they are outside. 2. No more than 10 dogs shall be housed at the facility at  
528 any one given time.

529

530 J. Peters made a motion to accept application PB2017-022. D. Cleveland seconded. All in  
531 favor none opposed.

532

533 Lauren Burbridge, Executive Director of Operation Delta Dog approached the podium and  
534 explained to the board that Operation Delta Dog is a registered 501c3 organization with a  
535 mission to train service dogs for veterans who suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder  
536 (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) and related challenges. Operation Delta Dog was  
537 incorporated on January 1, 2013 and has since matched over 30 veteran/dog teams. They  
538 are looking to occupy the space at 19G Clinton Drive, as they are at present homebased.  
539 They are ready to grow and be in a space like this in Hollis. The space will be divided up to  
540 allow space for staff and volunteer office space, storage of dog care items and marketing  
541 collateral, veteran/dog training classes, and daily and overnight housing of service dogs-in-  
542 training during their foundation training. The benefits of using the space at 19G Clinton  
543 Drive include veterans will have a consistent, handicapped-accessible location for dog  
544 training and ongoing meetings with their casework and trainer; there will be private  
545 meeting space for initial intake meetings and ongoing evaluation of veterans in the  
546 programs; dogs can be housed in conditions that meet the strictest criteria put forward by  
547 the New Hampshire Department of Agriculture, Assistance Dogs International, and the  
548 Association of Shelter Veterinarians; there will be storage space that can easily  
549 accommodation in-kind donations of dog food and toys the Operation Delta Dog cannot  
550 currently accept due to the lack of space; and there will be more space to house dogs for  
551 their foundation training, meaning Operation Delta Dog can match more veterans and dogs  
552 each year.

553  
554 Operation Delta Dog presently has a staff of three full-time and three part-time employees  
555 for a total of six. It is not open to the public, but is rather used for veteran meetings and  
556 training; standard hours of operation are Monday through Friday 9am – 5pm with  
557 additional coverage for dog care. It is expected that one or more staff members may be on-  
558 site by 7am to supervise the dogs' elimination outside and again be there at 10pm to  
559 supervise the dogs' last elimination of the evening. There is a proposed buildout of a fenced  
560 area no larger than 300 sq feet off the side of the building.

561  
562 Operation Delta Dog will also have 24/7 video and noise monitoring for dogs in foundation  
563 training and will ensure that a detailed emergency and evacuation plan is in place with local  
564 police, fire and building officials. Outdoor lighting will remain as currently installed at 19G  
565 Clinton Drive. Dogs are solely trained indoors and will be supervised by a staff member or  
566 volunteer caretaker at all times when let outside in the fenced area to eliminate. J. Peters  
567 asked about weekend hours. It was stated they would be the same, there is currently three  
568 training staff with additional staffing and volunteers.

569  
570 R. Hardy was all in favor of this application and asked about the noise buffering and how it  
571 would impact abutters. L. Burbridge stated that a trainer or staff will be outside with the  
572 dogs at all times, and monitored at all times and should the dogs start to bark they will be  
573 taken inside. There is inside noise monitor also. That is for peace of mind and care for the  
574 dogs. They have approval for 10 dogs but mostly they will have five. There will be round  
575 the clock care for the dogs. There is extensive health and temperament testing done for  
576 each dog before they are brought in for foundation training.

577  
578 B. Vear approached the podium to answer C. Rogers question on what the other businesses  
579 are there that was attached to this building.

580  
581 Cathy Hoffman opened the public hearing.

No one wished to speak so the public hearing was closed.

J. Peters made a motion approve PB2017-022 with the amendment to plans showing correct placement of fence, and to waive the 30 day period for signing the plan. R. Hardy seconded. All in favor none opposed.

## **9. Draft Master Plan Transportation Chapter, Steve Meno NRPC**

Stephen Meno, NRPC presented the Planning Board with a new draft of the transportation chapter. This is the second of three meetings proposed. He has had interim meetings the Highways Safety Committee also. The purpose of this meeting is to get feedback on text and narrative of the chapter. He has also drafted a list of recommendations to help discuss if the planning board is happy with the way it is going. He talked through the layout of the chapter, as an inventory, goals, traffic patterns, length of chapter. The narrative works in this plan is that it is split into three key areas. One is how Hollis plays in a regional aspect. A question was raised as to why there was a sidewalk proposed to go out Proctor Hill Road and Silver Lake Road and why this was proposed. Page 29 is included should in the future our DPW and the town want to add cycle lanes, by calling it out in the Master Plan it can be used as evidence for 10 year plan for state funding. W. Trimble offered the board more time to read the chapter again, send comments via email and then set up a meeting with Stephen Meno and Mark Fougere before final Planning Board Meeting in January. It was also agreed for NRPC to begin work on the Current/Future Land Use Chapter.

## **10. Potential Zoning Amendments:**

### ***1. Industrial Zone: allow for the outside storage of materials associated with the operation of a business, include loam and other earth materials.***

Amend permitted uses by allowing the following: Outside storage of materials associated with the operation of a permitted business. Storage materials may include loam, stone and other earth materials, mulch, and bulk supplies associated with the business. Should we allow processing of materials as a "Special Exception" use? If not, we can state no outside processing permitted.

J. Peters asked where processing is permitted in the Industrial Zone. R. Hardy stated that typically it has been part of the site plan process. J. Peters was questioning why we were stating just industrial zone? C. Hoffman asked if the board agreed that processing would need a special exception no matter where it was being proposed.

B. Ming asked if we were just tackling the question as the paragraph before it is stating something different. He read it that if it's a permitted business in the industrial zone they can store whatever they want in the list. Storage of units will only include? He doesn't like the first sentence as it leaves it all to the business to decide. Further discuss ensued.

R. Hardy stated we would typically deal with our requirements for screening, lighting, etc on a site plan. So should we just be referencing that the applicant has to comply with all those regulations. J. Peters also stated that all outside storage should come through the Planning Board, on a site plan and not a permitted use. R. Hardy suggested that we could say it must comply with site plan review. B. Ming said we could have a list but he preferred R. Hardy suggestion in having everything come to the planning board. And then if it wasn't on the list then they come before us. R. Hardy stated that if it is part of the site plan review that always includes lighting, and hours of operation, so it should be tied to site plan review. W. Trimble summarized the discussion, they said it should be tied to comply with site plan review, with outside processing of materials always as a special exception.

**2. FARM STAND: An Agricultural Enterprise which displays and sells agricultural products raised, produced and processed on the premises, and which may include a Structure(s) used in the operation. All Farm Stands Structures must be set back at least 35 feet from the adjacent Public Road and have adequate off street parking. A Farm Stand shall remain an Agricultural Enterprise and shall not be considered a commercial use, provided that at least 35% of the products sales in dollar volume are attributable to products produced on the farm or farms of the stand owner. Owners of Farm Stands, based upon review by town staff, may be required to obtain site plan review approval from the Planning Board.**

Randall Clark presented the thoughts of the Agricultural Commission and how they are concerned about defining farm stand structure. The general thought was to define farm stand structures and road side farm stands as two separate entities to help avoid the smaller egg stands coming to the Planning Board. He also emphasized the need to avoid over complicating the process for farmers. He will draft his idea for farm structures and the agricultural commission will meet again before our next meeting and they will keep the Planning Board informed.

**3. From Building Dept. - Section XIV Sign Ordinance: Amend Section N. Agriculture Signs to reduce the size of allowed signs from 20 square feet to something smaller, 15 or 10 square feet.**

This has been raised to maybe add dimension requirements to a agricultural sign to avoid large/long variations. D. Petry asked us to ask the Agricultural Commission to get their opinion on this.

Randall Clark said they had also discussed the agricultural signs. They are of the opinion that they do not want to reduce the size from 20 square feet as that was what it has always been, but are considering limiting one of the dimension to 6 feet or 7 feet and the posts should be included within this measurement.

## **Other Business**

W. Trimble stated that D. Turcott, due to high work demands, will become an alternate member of the Planning Board and B. Moseley will become a Regular Member.

676 D. Cleveland made a non-debatable motion to adjourn. R. Hardy seconded. All in  
677 favor none opposed.

678  
679 The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM

680  
681 Respectively submitted by,  
682 Wendy Trimble  
683 Assistant Planner  
684 Town of Hollis, NH