



## Town of Hollis

7 Monument Square  
Hollis, NH 03049  
Tel. 465-2209 Fax. 465-3701  
[www.hollisnh.org](http://www.hollisnh.org)

### **HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**March 21, 2023 – 7:00 PM Meeting - Town Hall Meeting Room**

**MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING BOARD:** Bill Moseley, Chair; Doug Cleveland, Vice Chair; Chet Rogers; Julie Mook; Benjamin Ming; Virginia Mills; David Petry, Ex-Officio for the Selectmen; Alternate Members: Richard Hardy; Jeff Peters; Mike Leavitt.

**STAFF:** Kevin Anderson, Town Planner & Environmental Coordinator; Mark Fougere, Planning Consultant.

**1. CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 PM.** D. Petry led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Moseley stated that at this meeting the voting members will be all the Regular members of the Board.

**2. ELECTIONS:**

Chair – R. Hardy nominated B. Moseley, seconded by V. Mills. B. Moseley abstained; nomination passed and B. Moseley elected Chair.

Vice Chair – J. Peters nominated D. Cleveland, seconded by J. Mook. D. Cleveland abstained; nomination passed and D. Cleveland elected Vice Chair.

**3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:**

February 21, 2023: **Motion to approve** – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by B. Ming; J. Peters abstained. Motion passed.

**4. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:**

- a. Agenda Additions and Deletions: none.
- b. Committee Reports: none.
- c. Staff Reports: K. Anderson stated that there are three items he would like to bring up.

The first item is the NRPC. There is a vacancy for the Town of Hollis for an NRPC commissioner, who would be elected to a four-year term. This position is nominated by the Planning Board, and appointed by the Select Board. The Planning Staff will advertise for applications for the position online.

D. Cleveland asked for a short synopsis of what the position entails; K. Anderson responded that basically the commissioner will be a liaison with the NRPC, helping to deal with issues and concerns the NRPC may have regarding the Town of Hollis, and vice-versa. There will be a detailed description of the position included with the online post.

Second, K. Anderson gave a quick update on the Master Plan. He is working with Town Hall support staff to determine the best way to post monthly questions for Town residents' response.

The final item is in regard to Lorenzo's Lane. K. Anderson would like to ask the Planning Board to entertain allowing the Chair to sign the final plans for the Lorenzo's Lane extension. The case is about 13 months old now, and has been tied up at the State level. He has been in touch with the Applicant's consultant; the Wetlands Bureau and Fish and Game are satisfied. The outstanding item holding up the plan is an AOT permit, which is pending.

D. Petry stated that he believes we should wait until we have the document from the State approving it, due to various situations going on. He asked if all other Board conditions for the plan have been met, and K. Anderson responded that all of the Town's conditions have been met; everything on the plan has been addressed. K. Anderson further confirmed that this is no longer under the jurisdiction of the Conservation Commission. D. Petry stated that the correct way to handle this is to follow procedure, and wait for an approved copy to come back.

K. Anderson explained that the plan is just for a driveway wetlands crossing. The Board did a site walk at the time of review. The driveway would have 700 square feet of impact. The final plan indicates a four-foot diameter culvert. He cannot say why this has been held up for over a year.

The Board's general consensus was to wait to sign the plans.

d. Regional Impact: none.

## 5. SIGNATURE OF PLANS: None.

## 6. CASES:

- a. **File PB2023:001– Design Review:** Proposed consolidation of 5 lots totaling 18.43 acres to be re-subdivided into a 5-lot residential subdivision. The proposed minor subdivision will be accessed off a new 682 linear foot road. Located at the corner of Silver Lake Road and Ames Road, Owners; James R. Seely, James V. Prieto & Silver Lake Flea Market LLC., Applicant: Purple Elephant Development LLC., Map 46 Lots 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10, zoned Agricultural and Business & Residential and Agricultural. **Continued Board Discussion.**

K. Anderson stated that the consultant on this case is requesting extra time to address the comments from the Board. They did relocate the proposed road away from facing abutters' houses.

The Board's site walk is being postponed until 5pm April 18, prior to the Planning Board's meeting that evening.

**Motion to schedule the Planning Board site walk for File PB2023:001 at 5pm, April 18 –** motioned by V. Mills, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed unanimously.

**Motion to continue File PB2023:001 to the next Planning Board meeting, April 18 –** motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

- 98  
99  
100 b. **File PB2023:002 – Design Review:** Proposed site plan for a 2,508 SF convenience store with a 2-  
101 bedroom apartment on the second floor on a 1.58 acre parcel with an existing residential use, 88  
102 Runnells Bridge Road, Owner & Applicant: Runnells Bridge Realty Trust, Map 5 Lot 27, Zoned  
103 Commercial. **Continued Board Discussion.**  
104

105 K. Anderson summarized that the plan is mixed-use, commercial and residential, with an apartment  
106 on the second story. The case was first before the Board at their February 21 meeting. The first  
107 round of Staff comments have been satisfactorily addressed. A second memo of Staff comments on  
108 the plan have been agreed to, but not yet addressed:  
109

- 110 1. Sheet C-2
  - 111 • Add note to plan set referencing Zoning Ordinance section IV.E If, *“prior to the*  
112 *issuance of a Building Permit, an applicant intends to disturb a site, then a Notice of*  
113 *Site Development shall be required.”*
- 114 2. Sheet C-4
  - 115 • Add note that there shall be no construction access from the private Pineola Drive.
  - 116 • Add note no snow dumping or snow storage in the wetland.
  - 117 • Can snow be stored on top of cistern?
- 118 3. Sheet C-5
  - 119 • Hollis has a 100’ well radius, revise location of septic and/or well to bring into  
120 compliance, note all abutter wells if the radius is within the lot.
  - 121 • Change station numbering of retaining wall to differ from driveway centerline  
122 stationing.
  - 123 • Add spot shots along the wetland at the toe of the retaining wall to ensure grading  
124 will stay out of the jurisdictional wetland area.
  - 125 • Add spot shots along the NE property line where the swale is proposed to ensure  
126 grading will remain on the subject lot and not extend onto the abutting lot.
  - 127 • Recommend erosion stone on the 2:1 slope located near the North corner of the  
128 property. Stone should continue into the existing slope stabilization stone within the  
129 right-of-way.
  - 130 • Check entrance grading 190.5 contour. Fix text wipeouts throughout plan sheet.
- 131 4. Sheet C-7
  - 132 • Verify ADA accessibility at the south corner of the building. A proposed bollard in  
133 the sidewalk restricts the width of the accessible path.
- 134 5. Sheet C-8
  - 135 • Parking spaces are proposed in front of the cistern suction and fill lines. Verify  
136 cistern intent (private/public) and will there be a need to fill cistern during emergency  
137 fire scenarios?
  - 138 • Will the cistern be H-20 load capable? Snow storage and vehicles remain a concern.
- 139 6. Sheet C-9
  - 140 • Label the vernal pool.
  - 141 • Add a note that the Town of Hollis requires a 3-year landscaping bond.
- 142 7. Sheet C-11
  - 143 • Add the word “temporary” to the stockpile area note.
- 144 8. Sheet C-12
  - 145 • Complete the values in the disturbed area note on sheet.
  - 146 • Show the designated concrete washout area on sheet C-11 as referenced in spill  
147 prevention notes.
- 148 9. Sheet C-14
  - 149 • Revise driveway section to reflect 22’ driveway width.
- 150 10. C-20

- Fix dimension labels, elevations and station numbers.
  - Revise guardrail dimension 4.1', this should measure from back of wall to back of guardrail to comply with guardrail detail.
11. C-22
- The backfill detail notes the top of tank shall be 4' below finish grade, 3.5' is depicted on the detail.
  - Confirm with FD the cistern intent, private or public accessible.

The Applicant has issued a visual impact concept.

B. Moseley pointed out that the Applicant needs to include the Zoning Board of Adjustment comments, as well.

B. Moseley asked if Staff had comments on drainage; K. Anderson responded that he has reviewed the Drainage Report, and it is consistent with professional design. It will treat the stormwater with a typical design, and satisfactorily address stormwater and runoff from the site. There is a small portion of runoff that would be directed toward the entrance, and out toward Route 111; he has asked the Applicant to look into that and see if there is any potential for treatment or mitigation of that runoff. He believes that the treatment of stormwater depicted on the plan is in compliance with industry standards.

In regard to Fire Department access, K. Anderson stated that the Fire Chief still has some concerns about mobility of vehicles, but will wait until the plans are more finalized for further comment.

Applicant: Jason Hill, Civil Engineer with T.F. Moran, for Runnells Bridge Realty Trust. Agreed with K. Anderson's summary of where the plan stands currently. Stated that they have made some changes to address the Staff and Planning Board comments last month. Specifically, they have added a barrier above the wetlands in addition to the guardrail that they had already proposed, to act as a snow screen. Although they are not proposing snow storage in that area, it would prevent snow from being plowed over the edge. The barrier would consist of an evergreen (juniper) hedge that will mature to 6-7 feet tall. They have also provided a series of prospective views of the proposed finished construction. They have added some foundation plantings, as well as some cedar/spruce screening to the north of the site. J. Hill concurred that they agree with the additional Staff comments, and can easily accommodate those changes. The fire cistern is a buried cistern, which is a function of the life safety code requirements for the building, mainly because there is a second-story apartment. They are providing a 30,000 gallon underground fiberglass cistern, which is a standard commercial cistern with suction and fill nozzles. This will supply fire suppression for the sprinkler system, as well as for the Fire Department's hose. The Fire Chief has a copy of the turning movement plans, and the Applicant will be expecting their comments. The Applicant is also trying to wrap things up with the DOT; they do not have a driveway permit issued yet, but they have responded to DOT comments and don't anticipate any issues.

B. Moseley and D. Petry pointed out that the Applicant's depictions of the completed site show tree plantings that have matured, and won't look like that for 5-10 years. D. Petry stated that the Applicant should present images that show the site as it will look when first constructed. J. Hill agreed to supplement what he has presented with an as-built rendition.

J. Peters asked if the Applicant was planning on clear-cutting the lot and then re-planting, as it is heavily forested in the front right now. J. Hill responded that the area in question is on a slope that will need to be cut back for a detention pond and visibility from the street. They are proposing a street tree to mitigate that.

V. Mills pointed out that the Applicant had not specified a parking spot or spots that would be designated for tenant parking; if she lived there, she wouldn't want to have to park far away. K.

Anderson responded that we have relatively loose parking requirements in Hollis – we do not have a lot of commercial development. The current proposed parking plan meets our ordinance, however it would make sense to have a dedicated parking spot for the tenants. J. Hill added that they are not opposed to specifying a tenant parking space, though the tenant will be managing the store and they didn't want to restrict tenant parking to any specific location. The Applicant has a few stores in the area that are operated without any parking restrictions, and have had no issues.

Per a question from J. Peters, K. Anderson stated that the Fire Department has not issued a formal response to the plans as yet.

Per a question from B. Moseley, J. Hill confirmed that the plan outlines nine regular parking spots, plus one handicapped parking spot. B. Moseley asked if the proposed parking layout could potentially impede fire apparatus from reaching the cistern. J. Hill responded that the lines from the cistern will be accessible to fire apparatus, and they do not foresee any issues.

Per a question from R. Hardy, J. Hill clarified that mission arborvitae is to be planted behind the building, to the north – to the left of the building, in the depiction presented. The mature height of the seagreen juniper bushes will be 6-7 feet. The trees in front will be small at first: a nursery stock level. They can mature to 50 feet or higher. R. Hardy stated that the juniper is more likely to grow to 24-36 inches, not 6-7 feet. J. Hill responded that they can have their landscape architect look into that, and provide an answer. If the proposed plantings are not appropriate, they can be substituted. B. Moseley agreed that that would be a good idea, as the purpose of the plantings in that area is to help protect the wetlands below from contamination. M. Fougere found a reference stating that seagreen juniper typically grows 4-6 feet high, and 6-8 feet wide.

V. Mills asked, since the specifications are so tight at 14.99% impervious, what would happen if the as-built comes in at 16 or 17%? M. Fougere responded that in that case they would not get a C.O. V. Mills asked what the remedy would be for that. M. Fougere answered that they would either have to get a variance, or they would have to remove impervious area.

J. Hill stated that they have removed snow storage from the rear of the parking lot in the latest set of plans. There will be snow storage next to the parking area, but that will not be over the cistern – which is going to be relocated about ten feet to the right, behind the dumpster. The cistern connections will also be closer to the parking lot. J. Peters asked how deep that snow storage area would be, and J. Hill said that it's approximately five feet wide. J. Peters stated that that is not much area. K. Anderson pointed out that notes can be added to the plan to the effect that snow may be removed from the site and properly disposed of. M. Fougere added that there is plenty of room on the site for snow, including the location of the former house.

D. Cleveland stated that if the Applicant addresses all of Staff's concerns, and they have already addressed many issues, with what has been discussed tonight the Applicant is probably ready to continue on from Design Review.

J. Peters pointed out that we need to hear back from the Fire Department, as well.

B. Moseley asked if D. Cleveland's point is that they can move to the Final Application stage if they deal with the administration issues, as well as get a rendering from the Fire Chief. The administration issues include Staff's comments, as well as the as-built landscaping visual, a professional opinion on the specifications for the shrubs along the guardrail, and the Fire Chief's comments regarding accessibility.

B. Moseley asked if there would be any bonding on the application; K. Anderson replied that there is a three-year landscaping bond. M. Fougere added that there will be some site restoration bonding, and consideration of drainage and erosion control, which is typical.

B. Moseley asked to confirm that there are no waivers anticipated for this project. J. Hill confirmed that there are no anticipated waiver requests.

B. Moseley stated that for the case to move to the Application stage, they would need the Fire Chief's information first – and the administrative concerns would have to be addressed at the first subsequent Board meeting. There could be no lingering issues from Design Review. If the Applicant needs to take a couple of months to get everything in order, that is ok. J. Hill confirmed.

B. Ming stated that he is behind potentially moving the case on to the Application stage, as long as all of the administrative details are taken care of.

D. Petry asked about the Applicant's depiction of the sign in front of the property; we do have a Sign Ordinance, with which they would have to comply. Is the depiction simply to give an indication of the size of the sign? J. Hill confirmed that yes, that was the case, and stated that at the time of Application they will submit a scaled, formalized sign plan.

M. Leavitt stated that he was in agreement with the Board's general comments; everything they have asked for seems reasonable.

K. Anderson asked whether there were times of year that would have peak usage for the convenience store, such that the parking lot would be full and potentially overflowing into the State right of way. J. Hill responded that convenience stores generally operate on a diurnal curve, with peak usage AM, PM, and Saturday. They are not proposing to have seasonal variation differing from any other convenience store.

K. Anderson stated that a note should be added to the plan that there is to be no parking allowed in the State right of way, which is Route 111. Parking is restricted to the parking spaces on the plan.

D. Petry also requested that the Applicant submit proposed hours of operation for the Board to review.

J. Mook asked if it was typical to have only ten parking spots for a convenience store of this size. J. Hill responded that the Applicant's other stores do have similar parking lot allowances. K. Anderson added that our regulations say that this proposed parking is sufficient.

C. Rogers recused himself from this case, noting that he might have a business relationship with an owner of a parcel under consideration. B. Moseley appointed R. Hardy to vote in place of C. Rogers.

**Motion to move File PB2023:002 to the Application stage** – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by D. Petry; motion passed with J. Mook, D. Petry, D. Cleveland, B. Moseley, R. Hardy, V. Mills, B. Ming in favor, and C. Rogers recused.

## **7. OTHER BUSINESS:** none.

B. Moseley pointed out that the Town's Volunteer Recognition Breakfast will be on Saturday April 8<sup>th</sup> from 8-10am. It is a nice event, and all Town volunteers are encouraged to attend.

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

312 **Motion to adjourn at 7:58pm** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed  
313 unanimously.  
314

315  
316 Respectfully submitted,  
317 Aurelia Perry,  
318 Recording Secretary.  
319

320 NOTE: Any person with a disability who wishes to attend this public meeting and who needs to be provided with reasonable  
321 accommodation, please call the Town Hall (465-2209) at least 72 hours in advance so that arrangements can be made.