



Town of Hollis

7 Monument Square
Hollis, NH 03049
Tel. 465-2209 Fax. 465-3701
www.hollisnh.org

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 20, 2023 – 7:00 PM Meeting - Town Hall Meeting Room

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

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

ABSENT: J. Peters.

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

B. Moseley stated that at this meeting, M. Leavitt will be voting in place of J. Peters.

V. Mills stated that at this meeting, she will be recusing on the Conceptual Review, File PB2023:010. B. Moseley stated that R. Hardy will be voting in place of V. Mills on that case.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

May 16, 2023: **Motion to approve** – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by V. Mills; B. Ming abstained. Motion passed.

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

- a. Agenda Additions and Deletions: K. Anderson stated that we have a Plan Signature addition, of the Chamberlin subdivision, PB2022:013. They have met all the criteria listed in the Board's letter of approval.
- b. Committee Reports: none.
- c. Staff Reports: K. Anderson stated that we have a General Board Discussion item. There has been consideration regarding commenting on agenda items, as laid out in the Planning Board Rules of Procedure. For ongoing applications, comment is to be received 13 days before the Planning Board meeting. This is not giving the public much time to comment on the agenda. Previously, the timeframe had been six days prior to the meeting. The change had been so that the Planner at the time could process the incoming correspondence and information; K. Anderson would not have a problem with revising the timeframe back to six days rather than 13.

B. Moseley stated that to be consistent, and to provide everyone with an opportunity to give input, he does not see a problem with making agenda comment due a uniform six days prior to the Planning Board meeting.

The Board was in general agreement. By procedure, there will be a formal vote at the Board's next meeting, after the proposed changes have been posted on the Town's website.

d. Regional Impact: none.

4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS:

- a. **PB2022:016 – CFC Development**, Ladd Lane – Orde gravel pit. K. Anderson stated that the Applicant has met all of the Board's criteria, and that everything has been addressed.

Motion to approve signature – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.

- b. **PB2023:005 – Lot line adjustment**, 3 Johns Way – Dana Rasmussen. K. Anderson stated the Applicant has met all of the Board's criteria, including meeting at the site and discussing the landscaping changes which the Board had talked about.

Motion to approve signature – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

- c. **PB2022:013 – Chamberlin subdivision** – Witches Spring Road. K. Anderson stated that the Applicant has met all of the Board's criteria.

Motion to approve signature – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

5. CASES:

- a. **File PB2023:008 – Scenic Road Tree Trimming**: Flagg Road, Merrill Lane, North Pepperell Road, Richardson Road, Ridge Road, Van Dyke Road, Worcester Road. Applicant: Eversource Energy. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

K. Anderson stated that this application is in regard to routine maintenance along the power lines for the roads cited. There are a couple dozen trees that need to be taken down. This is accordance with RSA 231:158, which deals with Scenic Roads. Trees within the right of way need to come before the Planning Board to be discussed prior to being cut down. Eversource has listed some specifications which call for the removal of brush, and limbs less than four inches in diameter, which are within eight to ten feet of the conductors. Larger trees can be removed.

M. Fougere stated that as this is not a formal application, but a Public Hearing as required by statute, there does not need to be a Board vote to accept the application.

Applicant: Alison Marcotte, Utility Arborist for Eversource Energy. Stated that Eversource trims every four to five years, and this area is up for that routine tree trimming. There are about 17 trees within the Town right of way that are either dead or dying, which they would like to remove so that they are no longer a hazard to the road and/or the power lines.

97 B. Moseley asked what the Applicant's policy is on how low the stump is cut; A. Marcotte responded
98 that they go as low as they possibly can – to the ground level, when possible.
99

100 B. Moseley asked when the Applicant anticipates being able to clear all the debris after the operation.
101 A. Marcotte responded that when they do the removal they chip all the brush, and within a day or two
102 there should be a log truck following behind to remove any logs that are left behind.
103

104 B. Moseley stated that, from past experience, when a person has an issue with this cutting, and tries to
105 call Eversource, they are given a general number; it has taken upwards of an hour and a half for them to
106 speak with someone who can actually help them. For the record, he would like the Applicant to provide
107 a point of contact with a direct line in case anyone in Town has an issue – so that they can get right
108 through to someone who can help them. A. Marcotte replied that they do have that point of contact to
109 provide, but that it is good to go through Eversource so that there is a ticket in regard to the call so that
110 it can be followed up by a supervisor. She provided her own office number, Alison Marcotte, 603-634-
111 3289.
112

113 B. Moseley asked if it was correct that Eversource needs to inform residents that they will be cutting on
114 their properties. A. Marcotte confirmed that that is correct. They send out a mailer 45 days in advance
115 of the operation, so residents have 45 days to respond.
116

117 D. Cleveland stated that there have been cases in the past when residents either were not notified, or did
118 not receive notice, when tree branch trimming was done in opposition to the property owners' wishes.
119 That caused some significant issues. He wanted to impress on Eversource, and on Nelson Tree, which
120 will be doing the actual work, that they need to personally contact the property owners, and make sure
121 to get permission to cut any trees, branches, or so on, so that there aren't any surprises later on.
122

123 A. Marcotte stated that, in addition to the 45-day mailer for routine tree-trimming, if they need to
124 remove a tree, they do knock on the property owner's door and leave a door-hanger informing them of
125 that fact.
126

127 J. Mook asked whether, if Eversource does not hear back from a property owner following the 45-day
128 mailer, they assume acceptance and go ahead with the cutting. A. Marcotte replied that her
129 understanding is that, under NH law, it is an implied consent if they do not hear from the homeowners.
130

131 M. Fougere clarified that the application is in regard to trees within the Town right of way, not on
132 residents' properties. If they are going to trim trees that are actually on a resident's property, they have
133 to get that property owner's permission.
134

135 D. Cleveland stated that the point that has to be made is that the Town right of way extends back some
136 feet from the line of the road. While technically in the right of way, they might be very nice trees in the
137 view of the landowner, whose house could be only a short way back. Trimming could still upset
138 landowners.
139

140 D. Petry pointed out that, in such cases, landowners need to know where their property line is.
141

142 Per a question from J. Mook, A. Marcotte confirmed that the trees in question are in fact dead or dying.
143

144 D. Cleveland pointed out, however, that there will be trimming in addition to that tree removal.
145 Sometimes the trimming has been described as butchering a really nice tree, just because the power
146 lines happen to go through the branches – even though the tree may be on Town property.
147

148 A. Marcotte responded that trees and wires don't always mix, and they do try to come to a happy
149 medium.
150

B. Moseley pointed out that they also want to make sure that the mess is cleaned up expeditiously after the operation and not left for four years, which has happened in the past. A. Marcotte confirmed that yes, the debris will be picked up.

Public Hearing.

There were no speakers on this application.

Public Hearing Closed.

No further discussion from the Board.

Motion to approve File PB2023:008 – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by D. Petry; motion passed unanimously.

- b. **File PB2023:006 – Final Review:** Proposed site plan for a 2,508 SF convenience store with a 2-bedroom apartment on the second floor on a 1.58 acre parcel with an existing residential use, 88 Runnells Bridge Road, Owner & Applicant: Runnells Bridge Realty Trust, Map 5 Lot 27, Zoned Commercial. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

K. Anderson stated that the purpose of this plan is to depict the construction of a single 2,508 SF mixed use commercial/residential building. The first floor will contain a convenience store and the second floor will contain a 2-bedroom apartment. The proposal includes a parking lot located to the rear of the building with nine regular parking stalls and one ADA compliant parking stall.

The subject parcel is located on the south side of NH111, across the street from the Hatch convenience Store, and was subdivided circa 1956. The parcel has an existing 1,362 SF single family residence that is vacant and is to be demolished as part of this proposal. The parcel has two narrow disconnected wetlands that run the entire length of the property from north to south. The project proposes a retaining wall between the wetlands located on the western side of the property and the development on the eastern side of the property.

The applicant has secured a zoning variance (Case #ZBA2022-009) to permit the construction of a 2,508 SF mixed use structure convenience store within the 100 ft wetland buffer (Ordinance Section XI.C.3.c). Variance conditions include no storage of gasoline or petroleum products and no onsite food preparation.

K. Anderson further stated that issues he has with the application are:

1. Provide additional check to cover insufficient funds for certified mail, current rate is \$8.10.
2. Provide specification for Turfstone pervious pavers that ensures the system meets the Fire Departments load rating needs. He has now received those specifications, and is ok with them.
3. General note 'M' on sheet C-2 needs to be expanded to include language that the as-built plan is required to quantify total impervious area (maximum 15%). No occupancy permit will be issued until the Planning Department approves the as-built plan.
4. Provide an alternative planting / stabilization plan for the rip rap slope area on the north side of the project site. The alternate needs to ensure slope stabilization.
5. Add parking signs to designate tenant parking spaces.
6. Revise stormwater calculations to show no increase in rate or volume during the 2-year storm event. This is a zoning requirement for the wetland overlay district. As of the meeting, this has been done – it was a very minor increase shown in calculations. This has been taken care of.
7. Wetland placard shall be placed every 50 feet along the limits of disturbance.

K. Anderson stated that as far as he is concerned, the application is complete. All the studies that were submitted were complete.

Motion to accept the application – motioned by V. Mills, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.

Applicant: Jason Hill, Civil Engineer with T.F. Moran, for Runnells Bridge Realty Trust. Stated that he is here with Attorney Tom Hildreth of McLane Middleton, on behalf of the Applicant. Stated that they have met with the Board a few times, from the Conceptual level to the Design Review level, and have made modifications over time. Since the last meeting, they have made some minor changes to the site plan, mostly handling aesthetic comments, as well as some technical comments. Some of the changes include a minor adjustment to the driveway apron to align it better with the Hatch driveway, opposite. They have provided updated perspectives regarding the landscaping plan, showing plantings at the initial phase as well as at the mature phase. They have added some foundation plantings, and shade trees. At the request of and in coordination with the Hollis Fire Department, they are proposing an egress to Pineola Drive, through the rear – this is proposed to be a gated fire access, constructed of a permeable pavement system which will support the Fire Department’s vehicles. Over time, it will grow cells of grass. There were also some tweaks to the stormwater pond and fire cistern, to align them with the new driveway opening. It will be a private fire cistern for the apartment and for the facility in general; the Fire Department will have access to it. They have provided sign detail to the plan set, and addressed technical comments from the Planning Department. Regarding hours of operation, they are proposed to be Monday - Saturday 5am – 10pm, and Sunday 6am - 9pm.

R. Hardy stated that J. Hill has made several comments about how attractive the site is going to be and how it will blend with the community; he has a hard time agreeing with that at all. He does not see many examples of large rip rap stone in Hollis. In general, he does not see how the Applicant thinks this proposal is going to blend with the community. There are better ways to address the slope, visually. Unfortunately, the graphics show what an impact it would be. He would suggest eliminating the rip rap on the lower right hand side, stepping back the slope in another method, and landscaping it.

J. Hill responded that rip rap on the slope was a recommendation of the Planning Department – the slope itself can be vegetated; it was initially proposed to be grass, and they can go back to that if that is the preference of the Board. They could also look into some shrubbery. Stabilization wise, it is a 2:1 slope, and grass would stabilize it. It’s not excessively steep. They had their landscape architect review the area, and were suggested to use either a wildflower-mix grass that would not have to be mowed, or a creeping juniper finish, or possibly bearberry.

R. Hardy stated that arctostaphylos is not common in New England, so, again, it doesn’t fit in Hollis. In regard to the other possibilities, he pointed out that it is a maintenance issue. For an area this extensive, it would be better if there were a few vertical accents in it, such as different types of trees. The previous concept for the area was much better than this one.

K. Anderson stated that it is a 2:1 slope, and it needs to be stabilized. It may be difficult to get grass to grow in the potentially sandy material. He is worried about soil flowing down into the DOT right of way. Vertical accents such as R. Hardy mentioned can work with the stone; they could get rid of the stone, and put in some shrubbery. He is concerned about site stabilization. DOT brought in stone to do their slope, which is also 2:1.

In looking at pictures of the rip rap on the DOT slope, J. Mook agreed that it appears to be a massive amount of stone.

J. Hill stated that if they were to plant grass, some type of loam and seed, he would propose to use a permanent turf reinforcement matting – it’s a rugged, permanent matting that holds the soil and permits

it to vegetate. There are a variety of products they can use to get the grass to grow, and ensure that it is stabilized. This is commonly done.

J. Mook stated that over time things which aren't naturalized, such as wild grass or wildflowers, tend to look pretty crummy – so that doesn't seem to be a long-term attractive solution.

B. Moseley concurred, especially considering that what is currently in the area is pretty much fir trees. White pine, with some hardwood mixed in.

D. Petry agreed with R. Hardy and J. Mook, and stated that the plan needs some work. He understands K. Anderson's concern, but this is too drastic.

K. Anderson mentioned that we hold a site stabilization bond, so it has to be stabilized one way or another.

M. Leavitt asked whether terracing would be of any value in this instance; K. Anderson answered that it could, if it can all remain within the property. Property lines are very tight in this area.

J. Hill commented that there is no room, without steepening the slope, to introduce terracing.

B. Moseley summarized the Board's comments, stating that we need to stabilize the slope, but with more of a mixture of trees involved. J. Hill agreed that they can do that.

R. Hardy asked why they couldn't terrace it 2/3 or half-way down, and plant as part of the terracing – which would soften the upper part, and it wouldn't look as dramatic as currently depicted.

K. Anderson and M. Fougere pointed out that there is the stormwater pond in front of the area, so it is very tight.

J. Hill added that he'd rather not have steeper slopes, to create a bench for terracing.

At the Board's direction, J. Hill agreed that they can remove the stone fill and work with the Planning Department to provide a mixture of trees and low ground cover that would be deemed suitable.

V. Mills asked of what material the guardrail is made; J. Hill replied that generally they're using a timber post with an aluminum beam.

Public Hearing.

Abutter: Helena Briggs, 100 Runnells Bridge Road, aka 5 Pineola Drive. Asked about the proposed emergency access on Pineola Drive. M. Fougere clarified that that access will be for the Fire Department, in case of emergency, and for the ability to turn around; it will not be for the public. It will be gated and locked.

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. Asked if there are any waivers on this application. B. Moseley stated that no, there are no waivers. J. Garruba stated that he went down after the deadline for submittal to review the stormwater report, and it sounds as if there may have been a revision to that, submitted after the deadline – is that correct? K. Anderson confirmed that that is correct. J. Garruba stated that he therefore reviewed the wrong report, and he would ask that the Public Hearing remain open so that he may review the correct report and present his comments at the next meeting. B. Moseley responded that J. Garruba is always welcome to send in comments via a letter; Staff will review his letter, and send it on to the Board. J. Garruba stated that his due process will be reduced if he can't review that plan. B. Moseley reiterated that J. Garruba may send in a letter.

J. Garruba stated that Section IX of the Zoning Ordinance, General Provisions, describes impermeable surfaces, and specifically defines them in saying “Impermeable surfaces shall include buildings, paved and unpaved vehicular access and parking areas, and any other area generally incapable of percolating water at a rate comparable to dry uncompacted ground.” So, the language is clear – there is no judgment to be exercised by the Planning Board, here. Anything that’s vehicular access is defined in the Zoning Ordinance as impermeable surface, and a big point of the Design Review of this project was to make sure that we keep this to 15% – so that’s obviously over 15%, and he does not think that it should continue with that, unless it meets the requirements or gets a variance – there is a process for that. As far as the truck turn-around, the site can be reconfigured to accommodate a truck turn-around, and it doesn’t need to go to Pineola Drive. So, it’s obvious; even the Applicant’s engineer indicated that those are not permeable. And our definition is clear, so there’s not much question here.

Applicant rebuttal: Jason Hill, Civil Engineer with T.F. Moran, for Runnells Bridge Realty Trust.

Stated that the drainage report change, as stated previously, was very minor, and had no effect on the conclusions or the design of any of the stormwater systems. There was no change to the stormwater systems, other than the addition of a catch basin; it didn’t change any of the best-management practices, or any of the design components. As to the impervious coverage, by “unpaved driveway” the assumption is compacted gravel, a surface that was designed to not penetrate water, whereas they have a system here, designed, via its open cells with storage and drainage material underneath, to be a pervious system, which is approved under State projects. Although this is not a State project, it is a porous system. The calculations show that that area would be considered pervious, and not subject to the coverage requirements in the Zoning Ordinance. It has been designed and engineered in accordance with the LID practices for infiltration, which means that all of the water, including the water that lands on the pre-cast pavement, will infiltrate via those permeable cells into the grass and into the ground, and not run off. Therefore, it is not impervious.

Public Hearing Closed.

K. Anderson stated that, regarding the emergency access way, it is designed as pervious system. It is designed in accordance with standard practices, acceptable practices, and it is designed such that water that hits it will be infiltrated. It is a pervious system. He suggested that the definition in the Zoning Ordinance be re-read, with an emphasis on “incapable of percolating”. This system is capable of percolating. It is an incorrect interpretation of our Ordinance by the individual who made the comment. The whole purpose of this system is that is designed to percolate – to infiltrate.

B. Moseley stated that the biggest challenge he currently sees for this application is the landscaping.

D. Petry asked if there is a red-lined report, showing the changes from what was submitted, to what was re-submitted recently. J. Hill indicated that there was not one right now. D. Petry stated that that we need to take into account the comments made by R. Hardy and other Board members, and come back with a plan.

B. Moseley also pointed out that we need to make sure that the drainage information is made available, as appropriate.

Motion to table File PB2023:006 until the next Planning Board meeting, July 18 – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D. Petry; motion passed unanimously.

- c. **File PB2023:007 – Final 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.

Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.

K. Anderson stated that this is the final application. The Applicant has gone through and made a majority of the revisions.

D. Petry asked if the plan was submitted without waivers; the answer was yes.

Motion to accept the application – motioned by V. Mills, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.

Applicant: Pete Madsen, Project Engineer at Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Bedford, NH, for Purple Elephant Development LLC. Stated that he is here today looking for application acceptance. To provide a brief project update, he stated that the last time he met with the Board was two months ago for the site walk, and subsequent meeting. There are four issues that were covered at the site walk which he'd like to address, the first of which is the disturbance of the wetland buffer. The second is the traffic study; the third is the visual impact study; the fourth is the waivers.

D. Petry pointed out that P. Madsen had just said that there were no waivers on the application. P. Madsen said that yes, he didn't know if that made it through, but he'd discuss it after his other points. There were two waivers on the subdivision application.

D. Petry stated that the Board had just voted to accept the application, when P. Madsen had informed them that it had been submitted without waivers. B. Moseley concurred.

P. Madsen said that the first waiver is for the location of existing leach fields within 200 feet of the site, and the other is for existing wells.

D. Petry stated that the Board's standard practice is that a plan must be submitted without waivers. An applicant may submit an alternate plan, but we need to see one without waivers. He asked how much it would change the plan if the Applicant did not get those waivers; P. Madsen replied that it wouldn't change it much at all. D. Petry and B. Moseley stated that he therefore needs to submit the plan without waivers, and the Board needs to see it. P. Madsen agreed.

B. Moseley suggested that the Board could postpone the Public Hearing because we don't have a full plan; M. Fougere stated that the fact that there are things missing doesn't mean the Board can't hold a Public Hearing. There is more than enough in the current application for the Board to make an informed decision.

R. Hardy stated that he had another concern, dating from the site walk and Board meeting, which he doesn't think had been addressed – P. Madsen had mentioned four items, but actually there were five. Discussed at the site walk and subsequent meeting was the environmental impact to Witches Spring Brook. He did not see anything regarding that in this application.

P. Madsen responded that absolutely, he has e-mail correspondence with the DES, and he believes also Fish and Game. That was received after they had submitted their information package. He believes that the Planning Staff was copied on the messages, but he can forward it.

B. Moseley stated that he also had listed an action item regarding Fish and Game input.

R. Hardy stated that from this aspect as well, he couldn't see how the application was complete.

B. Moseley asked Staff if they did have Fish and Game input; K. Anderson replied that he has some correspondence, but nothing that has been formally submitted. It was generally confirmed that that is still an action item.

P. Madsen, going back to the issues that he listed above, handed around a packet regarding restoration to the wetland buffer, with before-and-after photos. There was an issue in which brush had been piled into the buffer; that has been taken care of – there has been correspondence between the Applicant and the State, documenting that; Planning Staff was copied on the e-mails, and DES has signed off on that work. He apologized, stating that he had thought Fish and Game were included when they were not – they will get them in the loop, and have that information for the Board at the application's next hearing.

The second item was the traffic study. P. Madsen stated that their office prepared and submitted a traffic study, looking at the ITE and NHDOT traffic data. This was submitted to both the Board and the NHDOT. It shows a 1.2% increase to traffic on Silver Lake Road, which is considered negligible. NHDOT has reviewed this, they have reviewed the project, they didn't mention anything about the traffic study; they were ok with the Applicant's findings.

The third item was the visual impact study. P. Madsen stated that they reached out to terrain land services [Terrain Planning & Design, LLC], who gave them a visual impact study included in the packet. P. Madsen stated that it shows a nice row of street trees along Silver Lake Road, also some behind and at the entrance way to the proposed new road. There is also included a line of white pines, he believes, to create a buffer to the abutting property to the north. He mentioned that Staff had also been looking for a landscape plan – the Applicants were sent a landscape plan at the same time as the visual impact study, but rather than give the Board a whole new plan set after they had already submitted they decided to wait and send it with the next plan submission. It is in-house, and will be included in the next plan set.

P. Madsen stated that the last item was the waivers; as above, they are looking for a waiver for location of existing leach fields within 200 feet of the site, and location of existing wells within 200 feet of the site.

As an update on permits, P. Madsen stated that the project requires two State permits prior to construction – a subdivision approval from NHDES has been submitted, and comments have been received and are being addressed; and an NHDOT driveway permit. P. Madsen received an e-mail from Brian at the State this morning; he had three little comments, which should be fairly easy to address. P. Madsen noted that one of the items in the Staff Report for this file was in regard to the utility pole at the entrance being relocated, as it's a little tight on the pavement line – that was actually not one of DOT's comments, but he will reach out to Brian to see how he would like to handle it. P. Madsen would prefer to leave the pole where it is, if possible; if not possible, they'll move it.

One more comment on the Staff report he wanted to mention is that Staff was looking for confirmation from the Fire Department that the cistern met the requirements, the easement for the cistern met the requirements, and the turn-around met the requirements. P. Madsen will reach out to the Fire Chief to confirm that those are all acceptable; he believes that they should be.

B. Moseley stated that his concern is that there are some pretty big holes. They don't have the Fish and Game input, and landscaping is still open.

V. Mills asked whether the test pits had been witnessed; K. Anderson stated that they were witnessed by Tom Mercurio.

B. Moseley asked what R. Hardy's thoughts are, regarding the landscaping. R. Hardy said that we will have to see the plan; it was mentioned that there were going to be a lot of white pines, which will need water, next to one of the abutters. When we see that plan, we'll evaluate it.

Public Hearing.

473 Abutter: Leo Cormier, 451 Silver Lake Road. Stated that he'd start with the violation of the wetlands,
474 where they filled them in. He met with K. Anderson, who told him that the Applicant was going
475 through the State. He told K. Anderson that they're not putting any erosion control in place; K.
476 Anderson had responded that yes, they are, and he saw it himself. L. Cormier doesn't understand how
477 someone would go in to do a cleanup, put in erosion control, bury it eight inches down, place hay bales
478 there with two stakes in each hay bale, go work for four hours, and then take that all back out. That's a
479 violation. There is not a state, town, or city, let alone the Federal government, that would allow you to
480 work with an excavator in the wetlands without any type of erosion control. They might have pushed
481 some brush out, but the trash is another issue. He knows where the trash came from, now – the last day
482 of the Flea Market, they cleaned the entire area, and had in piles all the stuff that vendors dumped: that
483 went to the bottom. They have left it on the bottom, saying that it would do more damage to remove it.
484 Well, the damage was done when they used bulldozers to fill that area in. The wildlife living there at
485 the moment was buried alive. In addition, they ruined the vegetation for the other wildlife. Now
486 they've gone back and planted grass, without digging everything out – which wouldn't do damage: you
487 dig it out, put it in a truck, and what's left is clean. However, they have planted grass. There is a New
488 England conservation mix that should be used on the slopes, along with wetland plants. This needs to
489 be addressed. They can't leave that stuff in there. We have an ordinance in this Town, and you cannot
490 fill the wetlands in.

491
492 As L. Cormier was going over the allotted speaking time, B. Moseley invited him to put his comments
493 into a letter to the Board and they will make sure that it gets distributed.
494

495 Abutter: Janine Byron, 5 Ames Road. Stated that she was a concerned when, a few years ago, someone
496 was evicted from one of the homes in the area. They demolished/re-did his apartment, took some of the
497 construction debris, threw it to the side of where they had had a dumpster, particularly when the
498 dumpster was pulled out, and have been covering it with brush. She has a brook that runs from her
499 property under a culvert, to come out right in that spot. Beyond that, it's all wetlands. She has not seen
500 that cleaned up at all.

501
502 B. Moseley stated that the Board will make sure they take a look at that.
503

504 Abutter: Eric Thompson, 455 Silver Lake Road. Stated that he would like to echo the comments made
505 by L. Cormier. E. Thompson has a 10-year-old kid who is always out in the woods, playing around.
506 There is a ton of trash on the north side of this property – the entire back side of the property. It looks
507 like there has been trash out there for 20 years, over which they simply pushed a bunch of brush. At
508 this point, he thinks that they may have pushed it so far back that it's not still on their property. In
509 doing a site walk, a look should be taken an extra 10 or 20 feet around the north end of the property.
510 There are bicycles, stumps from when they clear-cut a section of the property, just general trash and
511 debris which they just continuously shove further and further back off the property.
512

513 Abutter: Doug Nye, 77 Federal Hill Road. Asked whether the site walk would be continued, so that we
514 can rectify some of the existing problems that are still haunting the property and residents in the area.
515

516 B. Moseley stated that Staff will be making sure that things are made the way they should be. Staff
517 goes out on a frequent basis, to make sure that projects progress the way they should. We have a
518 Town Staff, with engineers who go out and inspect.
519

520 K. Anderson noted that trash was comment mentioned a number of times. As part of the application, a
521 condition of approval is that the trash all needs to be picked up. He does not think it's worth the effort
522 to identify every single spot on the entire property; it simply all needs to be cleaned up. They
523 understand that there is trash out there, and all have seen it on the Board's site walk. It's going to get
524 cleaned up as part of this application. It's going to be a condition of approval.
525

526 Dave Parry, 3 West Hollis Road. Stated that he is here to talk about Witches Spring Brook. There are
527 hundreds, probably thousands of streams in New Hampshire. Twelve of them are designated by the NH
528 Fish and Game Department as part of the Wild Brook Trout Management program. Only barbless
529 hooks may be used, it's catch-and-release only, the season is closed during breeding, and there is no
530 stocking ever done. Witches Spring is one of these amazing fisheries, which are characterized by cold,
531 clean water with riparian zones that protect the stream from human intrusion and impact. John Magee,
532 NH Fish and Game Fisheries Habitat Research and Management Programs Coordinator, with whom D.
533 Parry has been talking about Witches Spring Brook, indicated to him that one of the measures of a trout
534 stream is biomass. Witches Spring Brook has 90kg per hectare, similar to pounds per acre, of water. J.
535 Magee said that it's very unusual to have that kind of density; it may be the best wild brook trout stream
536 in the State of New Hampshire. That said, and knowing the fragile nature of a stream like Witches
537 Spring Brook, D. Parry has some questions about the project. The first is about cold water, and
538 ensuring that cold water continues through springs and the water table, and that wells in this project,
539 and possibly other projects, don't impact that cold water feed that makes this stream possible. What
540 measures are being taken to prevent superheated water off of pavement? Pesticides and herbicides,
541 could also negatively affect the stream. Preserving the riparian zone around the stream to mitigate
542 some of those things is important, as is erosion control, to make sure that none of that impacts this gem
543 in NH. He hopes that the things that are going to protect that stream are included in this plan and future
544 plans.

545
546 Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. Stated that he thinks that there was a visual impact study that was
547 presented. The deadline for new applications is 29 days, the Monday before the meeting, and it sounds
548 like that visual impact study wasn't submitted on time. With that in mind, people come out here to
549 voice their opinion in a Public Hearing, and unless all of the information is here, he thinks it's important
550 to hold the Public Hearing open at the next meeting. Some of this is coming in after the deadline, and
551 some of it is new information. On a new application, he thinks the deadline should be held pretty
552 strictly.

553
554 Applicant rebuttal: Pete Madsen, Project Engineer at Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Bedford, NH, for
555 Purple Elephant Development LLC. Thanked everyone for their input. To address some of the
556 comments, one of the big things he is hearing is that people are concerned with the amount of debris in
557 Witches Brook and in the surrounding wetlands. He had neglected to mention, but on their site
558 preparation plan, he believes it's sheet 5, they did add a note per Staff request and per what he heard at
559 the previous meeting and site walk, that discusses all the debris being cleaned up prior to final approval,
560 and being disposed of in an approved manner. That is also going to be a condition of approval, so he
561 believes that that addresses the issues there. The intention is to clean up the site, obviously. These are
562 being developed for residential single-family homes, single-family lots, so it would be in the
563 Applicant's best interest, the developer's best interest, to clean up the parcels anyway. He does
564 appreciate everyone's concern, and that has been taken into their design approach. In regard to the
565 comments about wetland disturbance, matting was installed; he will attach to the next submittal the full
566 e-mail correspondence between his wetland scientist and members of the State – the wetland scientist
567 actually said "all materials removed were trucked off-site or stored on site in an upland area; graded
568 areas were seeded with a conservation seed mix and mulched with hay". P. Madsen believes that the
569 pictures he sent around reflect that. That has been handled and taken care of to the State's content.
570 Regarding the brook trout and Witches Spring, obviously they will reach out to NH Fish and Game and
571 ensure that that's all taken care of, and that their development is not impacting Witches Brook. A
572 comment was made about stormwater; they have a small-scale infiltration pond on site: all stormwater
573 runoff is directed to that infiltration pond, and then outletted down to the wetlands and to the Brook
574 after it's been treated and stored properly in accordance with all State and local guidelines. They have
575 also developed a full-scale erosion control plan for the contractor to follow during construction.

576
577 **Public Hearing Closed.**
578

D. Petry asked which note on sheet 5 mentions all the trash that is going to be removed. P. Madsen replied that it's more of a call-out, actually. He mis-spoke. D. Petry stated that it needs to be a note. P. Madsen agreed that they will add it as a note. D. Petry asked if the developer understands that this means everything in that wooded area that they own needs to be cleared out – not just buried. P. Madsen responded that sure, they can add more detail to the note.

M. Fougere added that, as seen on the site walk, some of that stuff is not just on the slope but actually in the wetland.

K. Anderson mentioned that he fully expects that when they start pulling some material out, they'll find more material below it. There is no way to quantify or define it, other than to say that all of it has to be removed.

D. Petry stated that he wants it made clear in the notes that this is in regard to trash, as well as material from the process of constructing the lots.

B. Moseley asked whether this was a matter in which Reggie Ouelette would be involved, to check on things. K. Anderson answered that yes, he would be involved. To the extent that this is necessary, it could be a potential daily inspection – which would be carried out in escrow, when the bonding time comes. It was confirmed that we have provisions to make sure that an adequate inspection is made.

D. Petry added that he wants to make sure that it gets done; he's inclined to make it a requirement before the Board approves this plan.

B. Moseley concurred, pointing out that the trash out there was pretty disgusting, particularly so close to a vulnerable wetland.

D. Petry clarified that it needs to be done pre-approval.

The Board was in general agreement.

J. Mook asked how the Board may be comfortable with who is removing this trash, and whether they're removing it in an environmentally safe way rather than making the situation worse. Are there companies that do this in the way that Hollis would want it to be done? B. Moseley confirmed that there are companies which do specialize in this. J. Mook asked whether there is any way we can insist on it.

B. Moseley stated that he would hope that the Applicant would do so, but that it's good to have in the minutes that the Board does insist that they use an adequate company to perform the clean up.

J. Mook pointed out that it sounds like a fragile situation which is going to become more fragile if not handled appropriately.

M. Fougere stated that if the Board desires to have this done before they approve the plan, the Applicant can put together a clean-up plan, to be submitted to Staff, that would include who would be doing the work, how it would be done, etc., and then get it implemented.

D. Petry stated that he thinks we need that. B. Moseley agreed – especially in regard to that area.

J. Mook asked about an environmental impact study; it was shown that at the previous Board meeting on this matter, input from the NH Fish and Game Department was discussed.

The Board in general concurred that a formal comment letter from Fish and Game would be appropriate and is now requested, in light of the numerous comments from abutters and residents.

R. Hardy stated that a letter would give the Board something to comment on; there might be things in the letter on which the Board would want further information.

J. Mook stated that this feels like a different situation, in that there is already a problem around the Brook. That's a different situation than trying to ensure that the development doesn't impose any harm to the Brook. The area has been harmed, and there has been environmental impact. It doesn't feel as if our standard way of going about it would be comfortable.

B. Moseley stated that they bought it, so it is their issue.

P. Madsen agreed that they are more than happy to do as the Board says – they themselves are looking to clean this piece up.

R. Hardy asked whether it would be beneficial to show the wetlands on Lot 15 in relationship to the infiltration pond. He doesn't know whether it's 50 feet away from the property line, or 500 feet. K. Anderson responded that permission would have to be granted by the owner of that property in order to locate any wetlands in the area and show them on the plan. R. Hardy pointed out that the infiltration is right there, and we don't know how close it is to the wetland.

B. Moseley asked Staff about any recommendations as to how to deal with that issue; M. Fougere replied that it is private property, so the owner would have to be contacted to see if he would be willing to grant access for the Applicant and the soil scientist to go out there. B. Moseley said that they have done such a contact before, for a project on Worcester Road.

P. Madsen stated that they did pick up a little extra survey in the area, and showed on the plan where the existing buffer is located. It's a 100-foot wetland buffer, and the infiltration pond is 80 feet away from that buffer – he doesn't know what's out there, but from the information they have, that infiltration pond is in the best location that it can be.

R. Hardy stated that he would seek out more information. He doesn't know if the Brook turns north there, or not.

P. Madsen agreed that they can reach out to the property owner, and see if he is open to that.

B. Moseley stated that at least they will have made every effort to get the information.

B. Ming asked for clarification as to whether we want to see all the trash removed before we vote on approval, or do we want to see a note? D. Petry answered that we want to see all the trash removed first. His experience from previous projects is that even if we make an approval with conditions, we're chasing it forever – so we need to have it done before.

B. Ming added that even if the Board signs off on it, the Applicant should be required to remove any trash that they find after the Board's approval. B. Moseley and D. Petry concurred.

B. Moseley stated that it goes back to what the Board requires on the Scenic Roads; if you don't deal with it right up front, you end up having a log there for four years.

B. Moseley asked if P. Madsen has a good understanding of what is being required of the Applicant, to which P. Madsen answered affirmatively. B. Moseley added that Staff is available to answer any questions.

Motion to table File PB2023:007 until the next Planning Board meeting, July 18 – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.

RECESS from 8:41pm – 8:51pm.

- d. **File PB2023:010 – Conceptual Review:** Proposed subdivision of 130 acres into 35 single family homes. Owner & Applicant: Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC, Map 17, Lots 5, 8 & 9, Zoned Rural. **Public Hearing.**

RSA 676:4.II.a. Conceptual Review shall be the review of the basic concept of the proposal and suggestions which might be of assistance in resolving problems with meeting requirements during Final Review. Such consultation shall not bind either the applicant or the board and statements made by planning board members shall not be the basis for disqualifying said members or invalidating any action taken.

B. Moseley stated that Conceptual Review is the first step of a major project, in which the Board and public give the Applicant a picture of things to be watching out for, concerns, things to ultimately deliver. After that we move into Design Review, where we really get into the crux of the project and make formal requirements for the Applicant to submit certain studies and such; that will also involve a Public Hearing. The third step is Final Approval of the project, which involves a third Public Hearing.

K. Anderson stated that this is a conceptual application for a major subdivision of parcels Map 17 Lots 5, 8 & 9 with a land area totaling 133.67 acres. The plans submitted depict 35 single family residential houses, one layout is a conventional layout and the second is an open space layout. Both layouts show a road connection between Proctor Hill Road and Deacon Lane. Note, there are two access points off Deacon Lane, the second is off the cul-de-sac.

K. Anderson further stated, as B. Moseley mentioned, that the purpose of the conceptual phase is for the Applicant to introduce the project to the Planning Board and the Board to give general non-binding comments. It introduces the project to the public, lets the public know that the project is coming in, and if they have questions they may contact the Planning Staff. Density, house and road locations will be verified during the Design Review phase. As B. Moseley pointed out, a Conceptual Review is a 10,000-foot view. It gives a general idea of what is going on.

K. Anderson mentioned that, as Staff, he had an opportunity to walk the property; it's a fairly nice property to walk through.

Applicant: Jon Lefebvre from Fieldstone Land Consultants, for Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC. Stated that, as K. Anderson mentioned, the properties involved consist of several lots, Map 17 Lots 5, 8 & 9. The total acreage of the three properties combined is around 134 acres. These properties are located in the Rural zoning district. The minimum conventional requirements for this zone include two acres of area, with 200 feet of frontage. Back lots are allowed; minimum back lot requirements include 20 feet of frontage, with four acres of area. They have submitted two plans for review this evening: one plan consists of a conventional subdivision concept, and the other is a Hollis Open Space Planned Development concept. As mentioned, they could put a road through and use all the land; the secondary means would be as an open space development concept – they could put a lot of the back land into open space, and then have smaller lot sizes. Instead of two-acre lots, they may be proposing one-acre lots with reduced frontage. Both concepts consist of 35 proposed lots. The Hollis Open Space Planned Development concept proposes two roads, noted on the plans as Road A and Road B. The through-road, noted as Road A, is approximately 3500 feet in length. It starts on Proctor Hill Road and ends on Deacon Lane. The spur road, noted as B, is approximately 630 feet in length, and would serve five of the parcels. The open space that would be provided does abut Beaver Brook. This project would consist of approximately 73 acres of land which could be part of open space. If we went the conventional route, the conventional concept would require more road, approximately 3000 more linear feet, and provide no open space. They have brought both concepts to try to get a consensus as to which

one might be more favorable. They have mapped and reviewed both steep slopes and wetlands for the property. Their proposed lots comply with the requirements for acceptable land. Sight distance has been observed and evaluated for the proposed roads. They know that they need to obtain the required driveway permit for Proctor Hill Road as that is a State road, and they will obtain that during the Design Review phase. As this is a Conceptual Review plan, a lot of the technical questions regarding this project will be addressed at Design Review: for instance, profiles, grading, stormwater, any questions regarding abutting properties and stormwater. At that time they will have lot area calculations, proving that their lots comply with the regulations. J. Lefebvre mentioned that K. Anderson had wanted to see an exhibit based upon where the LIDAR survey ends and the Applicant's topographical survey begins; they are happy to provide that when it comes time for Design Review.

J. Lefebvre stated that although they are willing to schedule a site walk, K. Anderson has been on site. A site walk may be more productive in the Design Review phase, once they are able to point out some specific plan items on the ground.

J. Lefebvre noted that they understand and agree that they will providing a site-specific soil survey for this project.

In summary, J. Lefebvre stated that they are looking to propose a 35-lot subdivision, and are interested in feedback from both the Board and public comment.

B. Moseley asked if the Applicant anticipates the need for waivers at this point; J. Lefebvre answered no.

Regarding the site-specific soil survey, J. Lefebvre stated that he thinks it would be beneficial, rather than worry about lot sizing calculations. B. Moseley stated that a site-specific soil survey was one of the things he was going to ask the Board to formally require of the Applicant; since J. Lefebvre has already shown his intention of providing that, at this point we will take him at his word.

For the public, J. Lefebvre explained that a LIDAR survey consists of using light and radar to get ground topography. There are two ways that topographical information can be collected – one is to use LIDAR, the other is to go out on the ground and actually take shots. Both ways are very close. The only time they're really off is if you have dense trees. They have conducted a survey of the property; for preliminary purposes, they have some areas where they have LIDAR topography – but that is not to worry, as, when they go in for their calculations, everything will be proven out.

B. Ming pointed out that on the Applicant's Hollis Open Space Planned Development (HOSPD) plan, there are three lots by themselves to the south, and asked if there is any reason why those lots could not move. On the conventional plan, there are four lots in the same area.

M. Fougere stated that on the conventional plan there are actually five lots in that area, and that Staff has a problem with the lot layouts in that section of the project. The purpose of the conventional plan is to prove out the density; those lots are not reasonably compact, the lots' shape goes to the west and then loops back around to the proposed road, and those lots don't meet the ordinance. Four of those lots need to be redesigned for the Applicant to show that they can get that number of lots there. They're showing 35 lots at this first meeting; that's not necessarily where we're going to end up.

J. Lefebvre stated that they have received those Staff comments, and will take care of that when they get to Design Review.

K. Anderson added that, in reviewing the Subdivision Regulations, two driveways on a shared drive is allowed by right; three requires a waiver – so some shifting will have to be done.

794 B. Ming stated that the main reason he brought up the point above is that that is the closest part of the
795 parcel to the road, and asked whether that area is particularly visible from Proctor Hill Road. K.
796 Anderson replied that he would say that no, it isn't – Lot 17-3 has a house with a large garage that will
797 block visibility behind it, and Lot 17-4 is largely heavily wooded.
798

799 B. Moseley noted that on the Staff Report for this case the Applicant's representative is listed as Chad
800 Branon. J. Lefebvre said that yes; he is here tonight on C. Branon's behalf while the latter is on
801 vacation. C. Branon is likely to be before the Board at future meetings on this project.
802

803 R. Hardy asked whether driveway lengths were approved this past spring for 100-foot setbacks in the
804 Rural zone. K. Anderson replied that yes; the front-yard setbacks are 100 feet, and this conventional
805 plan complies with that requirement.
806

807 J. Lefebvre stated that he believes there is a typo on Lot 13, in which one setback line was not applied –
808 but the room is there.
809

810 In response to R. Hardy, it was confirmed that a HOSPD design has separate setback requirements.
811

812 M. Leavitt asked if there are any issues with septics and wells on the HOSPD layout, given that that the
813 lot sizes are smaller. J. Lefebvre replied that there are not any issues to their knowledge at this time.
814

815 K. Anderson added that the Applicant will need to prove the lots with septics. If it turns out that they
816 can't get the density shown on the plan, then they have to come back to the Planning Board to revise it.
817

818 M. Fougere added that there haven't been any test pits done yet, and that is among the next big pieces
819 of information that will be needed.
820

821 B. Moseley stated that, as the Applicant pointed out, it might behoove the Board to wait to do a site
822 walk until more information is presented.
823

824 K. Anderson pointed out that test pits will also help indicate the location of ledge, which will lead to
825 another conversation at future meetings.
826

827 D. Petry stated that, the way the two plans are currently laid out, he actually prefers the conventional
828 one. He thinks the HOSPD design is too congested – it doesn't look right. He also wonders, based on
829 our requirements, whether the Applicant can really get 35 lots even in a conventional layout.
830

831 D. Cleveland concurred with D. Petry's remarks.
832

833 J. Mook also concurred, while pointing out that this plan does include the 100 foot setback that the
834 Town voted in this spring. That reduces the number of houses along the main road, which feels more
835 like rural character. In addition, Beaver Brook pretty much surrounds this property – it seems as if the
836 common land wouldn't have the same advantages that it has in some other settings. The Board might
837 discuss access to Beaver Brook at some point in this application; their trails about the property lines. B.
838 Moseley agreed that trails, and trail access, are going to be an important part of this overall project.
839

840 D. Cleveland stated that if there are any trails on this property, the Board would like to see them
841 identified.
842

843 B. Moseley asked if the Applicant anticipated any massive changes to the topography; J. Lefebvre
844 answered no. B. Moseley added that if they did, he would push for a 3-dimensional rendering of before
845 and after so that they could get an appreciation of what those topographical changes would be. A
846 schematic is desired, should they find the need for a big elevation change.
847

848 M. Fougere mentioned that the steepest road is going to be by Rt. 133 – that is where the most dramatic
849 grade-change will occur.

850
851 For the Board’s consideration, K. Anderson asked whether, given the proximity to Beaver Brook, some
852 of the more prominent features within Beaver Brook should be shown on this plan. The wildlife pond
853 is very adjacent to the area, and some questions and comments will likely be focused on that fact.

854
855 J. Lefebvre responded that they could overlay a map; K. Anderson and B. Moseley agreed that that
856 would be helpful, to show the proximity.

857
858 B. Ming stated that he would like to see a HOSPD on the property, while acknowledging that this
859 project is still in its early stages. He agrees that the current HOSPD plan looks tight, but reiterated M.
860 Fougere’s point that it’s on a large scale.

861
862 J. Lefebvre stated that they have had some early talks with Beaver Brook about whether it would be
863 desirable for them to take over the open space, were the HOSPD plan to be developed, but there aren’t
864 any answers at this point.

865
866 M. Fougere clarified that options in the ordinance include the open space being given to the Town in a
867 deed; it could be given to a conservation group; or it could be owned by an association of all the
868 property owners, in fee.

869
870 M. Fougere mentioned that this property actually has two access points on Deacon Lane: one is where
871 the entrance is being shown, and there have been some trees removed there; at the very end of the road,
872 though, there is another right of way. Back in the day, the Planning Board requested that right of way
873 in the back of the property. That is not being used, or proposed to be used, but there is that other strip
874 of property. J. Lefebvre stated that they are aware of that, and that it has its own tax map lot number.

875
876 R. Hardy stated that he open to both designs, but as they do some test pits that will tell the story.

877
878 **Public Hearing.**

879
880 Abutter: Jim Usseglio, 44 Deacon Lane. Stated that there is some history to this land – there was
881 another proposed development about 20 years ago, and it would be helpful to review those minutes
882 from 2003 - 2006 because, he believes, a lot of the issues that are likely to come up were already talked
883 about, formalized, and memorialized at that time. The Planning Board weighed in on that proposal, as
884 did the Zoning Board, the Conservation Commission, Beaver Brook, the Police Chief, and the Fire
885 Chief. There were a lot of interested parties, and it never went forward – he believes because of safety
886 issues regarding Deacon Lane, as well as because of conservation issues. He stated that, for those who
887 live on Deacon Lane, it’s a pretty dangerous road. It’s very steep, and winding. There are about 20-25
888 houses on Deacon Lane already. He does not think that there should be any more houses coming off
889 Deacon Lane, let alone 35. That would be a total of 60 houses coming down Deacon Lane – plus there
890 would be a short cut from Proctor Hill Road to Deacon Lane or Rocky Pond Road. Deacon Lane
891 simply cannot handle that type of traffic. If you just drive the road, you’ll see. To have 60 houses, plus
892 a short cut – to him, that would be totally irresponsible. He suggested that there be something like the
893 HOSPD design, in which the new development could be concentrated on Proctor Hill Road. There
894 would be a distinct neighborhood: you’d have the Proctor Hill Road neighborhood, you’d have the
895 Deacon Lane neighborhood, and, as best you could, Beaver Brook, all apart from each other. He
896 suggested swapping the five houses on the HOSPD design that are near the Deacon Lane entrance point
897 to the open space in the left hand corner of the plan – that could then be completely open space on the
898 right hand side, and there would be no need for the proposed road to come onto Deacon Lane.

899
900 Abutter: Mark Johnson, 34 Deacon Lane. Stated that he wanted to reiterate the same point made by J.
901 Usseglio. Deacon Lane is a cul-de-sac with 20 houses. They all bought into the neighborhood, whether

a year ago or 30 years ago, with the understanding that it's a quiet cul-de-sac. This proposal would potentially add 35 houses, accessed through Deacon Lane. He sees that there is another proposed access via Proctor Hill Road, but if you look at the map the quickest route to Hollis center is by Deacon Lane. This would have a huge impact on the neighborhood. He hopes that the Board can address this concern; one way would be to make the entrance to Deacon Lane emergency-only, gated or signed, to prevent normal access to Deacon Lane. He stated that he walked the property under consideration, which is beautiful, but that he was surprised when he came out on Proctor Hill Road: there is a steep slope down into Proctor Hill Road, and where the intersection is there is an 8% gradient with a curve which was the site of a fatal accident about 15 years ago. It's very dangerous. It is difficult to understand how the State of NH would approve an intersection there. He understands that there may be site requirements which the Applicant technically meets, but it does seem as if the State could potentially reject the proposal as that is a very dangerous corner. If they don't have that intersection, what would be the alternate plan?

Donna Duffy, 83 Deacon Lane. Asked where the entrance onto Deacon Lane would be, and what house would be nearest to it. D. Petry answered that it would be at the far end, toward where the cul-de-sac is. D. Duffy stated that her home is at the top, by the cul-de-sac. She stated that the Town owned 50 feet of property there, when the subdivision was going to happen 20 years ago. Asked who owns the property accessing Deacon Lane where they are digging now; the answer was that the builder owns it. She asked what will the wildlife impact will be, what this proposal would do to the aquifer, and stated that you've got Beaver Brook and all the animals – they're going to be moved around. The deer are everywhere in her area; she can't keep a plant alive. Right now there are 18-wheelers coming up and around the cul-de-sac because they can't get in via the other access. They had their road paved three years ago, and asked whether the Town would have it paved again.

Marianne Tenore, 79 Deacon Lane. Asked how the spur right of way mentioned by M. Fougere is planned to be used. M. Fougere responded that it is not going to be used at all; he just wanted to point out that it is there.

Ed Carballo, 26 Deacon Lane. Stated that he and his wife bought their property two years ago. They bought it specifically because of all the wonderful open land around them. They found out about this meeting only a few hours prior to its start, via a posting, and they are disappointed. They have young children, their immediate neighbors have young children, and, if you look on the map, theirs is probably the only property on Deacon Lane that is surrounded on three sides by the land in question. They are now hearing, from their neighbors, that this was attempted 20 years ago. In the clearing that has been done in the last two weeks, they've seen deer, bears, opossums, groundhogs, everything running for their lives onto their property. He is additionally concerned in that Deacon Lane has no sidewalks – so with the additional homes that will be gaining access via Deacon Lane, he is worried about little kids. The last thing he needs is 60 more cars going up and down the street, when there is no sidewalk for his children. The safety factor and the environmental impact are his main concerns. They walk out to the trails at Beaver Brook, and he can show that they basically surround the entire property. He stated that they were Hollis residents 27 years ago; he is a Federal employee, and when he got his last promotion they chose to move back to Hollis. Welcome to Hollis, with 60 houses they didn't think would be there.

Tom Burton, 16 Deacon Lane. Stated that he is an abutter to the whole development. His woodlot abuts their development from Deacon Lane all the way out to Rt. 130. It's a very steep grade going up through the woods. From what he can see on his property, there are about three different tributaries that come down, that are natural run-off from the hill; one of his main concerns is run-off from other people's property impacting the brook which runs through his property – that is part of Beaver Brook's environment. There are beaver dams and lodges all along that area.

Joe Aubin, 59 Deacon Lane. Stated that he wanted to echo a lot of the same concerns that other residents have voiced, as well as mention the water status. A few people have had to re-drill wells in

the past few years in that neighborhood, so he imagines that adding a significant number of homes trying access the same aquifer could have a significant impact. Also, the gradient both on Rt. 130 and coming off this development means that there would be a steep entrance in both places – so he imagines that that would be pretty dangerous. In theory, if he were a person living in this proposed new development, he believes he would primarily choose Deacon Lane to try to exit it – that is a traffic concern. He has two small kids, and they have been trying to keep them further from the road with all the trucks pulling around pretty quickly, full of logs, coming up and around the loop toward the top. That has been a serious concern, thinking about the number of years of construction, of big trucks coming around that loop. They visit people down the hill, which is usually a pretty casual walk, but it's already been impacted – so it would certainly be a concern with all the additional traffic. It would be interesting to see not only a traffic study, but also the environmental impact.

Dave Stauble, 75 Deacon Lane. Pointed out that the projected outlet where, in he thinks it was 2006, Nick Jennings died, is a treacherous hill. He doesn't see it as a likely place for construction trucks, logging trucks, to want to exit this development, with such a treacherous grade. That leaves Deacon Lane, which is very ill-prepared for that kind of traffic. His two children are going to be starting to use the bus, which does not come up the street at all: all the children have to walk to the end of the street. He echoes all the concerns of the other residents of the area – he is very concerned about this proposal, and hopes that the residents are heard.

Robert Pack, 57 Deacon Lane. Stated that his neighbors have covered most everything, but that he wanted to be on the record – the aquifer is a very astute concern; the wells out there are quite good. Also, in terms of access via Deacon Lane, the visibility is not great. There is a lot of concern for safety along Deacon Lane.

Applicant rebuttal: Jon Lefebvre from Fieldstone Land Consultants, for Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC. Stated that he has taken note of all the residents' concerns tonight. His purpose in coming here tonight was to hear their concerns before they prepared either the HOSPD or the conventional subdivision plan. It's very preliminary to answer a lot of the questions; obviously, they will get into knowing where the aquifer is, they will have a better understanding of the grades and how they play a role in any of the roads or entrances. If traffic is an issue that comes up, obviously that will be addressed as well, as part of the application. It was nice to hear from all who spoke, and to get their feedback and concerns for the project.

Public Hearing Closed.

B. Moseley stated that there is a lot of stuff to be sorted out regarding this application, but that that is why we have a Conceptual Review.

M. Fougere concurred with B. Moseley's idea that the Board postpone any site walk until the plan has more meat on it – until we get some more information, more detail about soils, grading, have another hearing, and then do a site walk. The site walk would be part of the Design Review process.

J. Mook stated that she knows that the school bus does not go up Deacon Lane, and she questions whether a bus would be able to enter this new development from Proctor Hill Road. That's a lot of children to be on the end of Rocky Pond Road. Is there something we can request to better understand how that issue would be dealt with?

M. Fougere responded that with a project of this size, they will be reaching out to the School Department – that will absolutely be on the list. K. Anderson added that he knows they do not pick up kids at their houses on cul-de-sacs, but the proposal is for a through-road, so that changes that scenario.

D. Petry pointed out that it has to be a through-road because our regulations require it to be a through-road off a cul-de-sac. That's the only reason that there is an entrance to Proctor Hill Road.

J. Mook stated that that entrance is critical to the situation; D. Petry stated that it's also a requirement – but he agrees with a lot of the comments indicating that it's not going to get used that much. They're all going to go to the Deacon Lane end, because it's shorter.

D. Petry cited the Subdivision Regulations Section IV.7 General Requirements, Road and Driveway Design Standards, B. Hammerheads and Cul-de-sacs: "Cul-de-sacs shall only be extended if the street connects with a planned or existing through street." This is an extension of Deacon Lane.

J. Mook stated that that road would have to be constructed in such a way that a school bus could navigate it.

J. Mook further pointed out that it seems a bit presumptuous to have cleared all this land. D. Petry stated that they are entitled to do that – they are subject to restoration, however; if this project passes and they have cleared too much, they'll have to do restoration.

D. Cleveland asked whether we want to pursue both the HOSPD and the conventional layout at this point. B. Moseley said yes, at this point we need to pursue both until we get more information on both designs.

M. Fougere stated that the conventional layout has to be proven out. Are there going to be any waivers? What would those waivers be? How is the grading going to work? Will all of the homes have proper access without waivers? How will the topography work? Once the conventional layout is firm, and meets all the requirements, we'll have a base idea of X amount of lots. The HOSPD can then be tweaked to accommodate that, and at that point the Board will have enough information to make a decision as to which plan they want to pursue. We have to get into Design Review to get the details the Board needs to make a decision.

J. Mook stated that she would be interested to see the minutes mentioned by a resident, regarding the last subdivision that had been proposed for this area. K. Anderson stated that he has looked through them, and will compile them for the Board members. That proposal, the Whaleback Subdivision, wasn't this property; it was next to this property, but it was accessed from Deacon Lane.

B. Ming pointed out that the currently proposed road layout isn't necessarily what we're going to get, no matter what. It could potentially connect in a different manner. The Board generally concurred that at this point anything is possible. It's impossible to get into specifics at the conceptual stage, or we'll be chasing our own tail.

Motion to move File PB2023:010 to the Design Review stage – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by R. Hardy; motion passed unanimously.

6. OTHER BUSINESS: none.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn at 9:38pm – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Aurelia Perry,
Recording Secretary.

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