



Town of Hollis

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

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 18, 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: C. Rogers.

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

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

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

June 20, 2023: **Motion to approve with correction to line 242** – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by D. Cleveland; J. Peters abstained. Motion passed.

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

a. Agenda Additions and Deletions: none.

b. Committee Reports: none.

c. Staff Reports: As discussed at the Board's last meeting, the Planning Board Procedures have been updated to allow more time for public comment on ongoing, continued applications, changing the deadline for comments from 13 days before the meeting to six days before the meeting.

Motion to approve the change – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

d. Regional Impact: K. Anderson brought up the Howe Drive commercial development in Amherst, the non-residential site plan for which includes a 20,000 square foot warehouse and a 2500 square foot office, with parking. The public hearing for the case was July 5th, at the Amherst Planning Board's meeting. K. Anderson sees no issue with the plan, or any regional impact – it was a common courtesy for Amherst to reach out to Hollis.

4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS: None.

46 **5. CASES:**

- 47
- 48 a. **File PB2023:006 – Final Review:** Proposed site plan for a 2,508 SF convenience store with a 2-
49 bedroom apartment on the second floor on a 1.58 acre parcel with an existing residential use, 88
50 Runnells Bridge Road, Owner & Applicant: Runnells Bridge Realty Trust, Map 5 Lot 27, Zoned
51 Commercial. **Continued from June 20, 2023, public comment closed.**
52

53 K. Anderson stated that the outstanding issue from the Board's last meeting on this case was
54 landscaping along Runnells Bridge Road. The Applicant has now provided a plan that meets all of our
55 criteria. R. Hardy has reviewed the plan, and was satisfied with it.
56

57 Staff recommended conditional approval of the plan, with two conditions:
58

- 59 1. The emergency access road shall be used by emergency vehicles only. No delivery trucks shall
60 use the access road.
61
- 62 2. A maintenance agreement be recorded at HCRD ensuring that Pineola Drive is plowed in the
63 winter and that gravel, trees and brush be maintained.
64

65 B. Moseley added that the parking stipulations must also be made very clear. K. Anderson agreed;
66 there is to be no parking other than in the designated spaces. That is to be the case for delivery trucks
67 as well as customers. There is to be no parking in front of the building, no parking along Runnells
68 Bridge Road, no parking along the access driveway.
69

70 Applicant: Jason Hill, Civil Engineer with T.F. Moran, for Runnells Bridge Realty Trust. Stated that he
71 concurs with K. Anderson's summary of the project at this point. Specifically, we are looking at the
72 northeast quadrant of the site, to the left of the building. The landscaping in that area was formerly
73 proposed to be crushed stone. Based on the feedback from last month's meeting, they have come up
74 with an alternative, more natural finish that is to be comprised of a mix of clump river birch, red oak,
75 and some spruce. This will be supplemented by a ground cover to consist of sea green juniper and a
76 New England wildflower grass mix which is meant to not be mowed, so that it will create a natural
77 aesthetic and be able to blend in with the open space and woodland components of the community.
78 Those are the only changes before the Board at this meeting.
79

80 J. Hill added that they do not object to the proposed conditions, above.
81

82 R. Hardy confirmed that he is ok with this new proposed landscaping plan.
83

84 D. Petry stated that the new proposal looks a lot better than the rip rap previously suggested.
85

86 D. Cleveland asked K. Anderson if all the other issues that were raised previously have been addressed;
87 K. Anderson confirmed that yes, they were all addressed on the plan, and/or with notes.
88

89 Per a question from D. Cleveland, K. Anderson clarified that Pineola Drive will not have a gate on it;
90 only the private emergency access will have a gate. The Fire Chief was on board with the gate. It will
91 have a Knox lock on it, so that he can get in and out.
92

93 **Motion to approve File PB2023:006, with the recommended conditions** – motioned by D.
94 Cleveland, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.
95

- 96
- 97 b. **File PB2023:009 – Lot Line Adjustment:** Proposed lot line adjustment between 9, 10 & 11 Monument
98 Square. Owner & Applicant: Robert & Martha Valicenti, Map 50 / Lots 20, 21 & 22. Zoned Town
99 Center (TC). **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

K. Anderson stated that the purpose of this plan is to depict the consolidation of the existing three (3) lots (50/20, 21 & 22) into the proposed two (2) lots (50/20 & 21) relocating the lot lines to align with the interest of the two properties, thus eliminating lot 22. He stated that the plan meets all of the requirements. He had some concerns about building box area, but those have been resolved. This is really just a straightforward lot line adjustment.

Motion to accept the application – motioned by J. Peters, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

Applicant: Sam Ingram from Meridian Land Services, for the Owner. Stated that they are looking to revise the lot line between the existing lots 50/20, 50/21, and 50/22, as well as consolidate the lots 50/22 and 50/21. There is going to be an easement over a portion of 50/21 encompassing the driveway and garage, the purpose of which is for continued use for 50/20.

D. Petry asked Staff if it was correct that there would be no further building on 50/21 without a variance. M. Fougere responded that there would be a lot coverage issue; any further building would have to be compliant. D. Petry stated that he's trying to understand the reason for consolidation. M. Fougere stated that in the back lot there are a lot of things that are non-conforming; the lot lines are two feet from the garage, and there is a back lot with no frontage. If they were to put additional structures on 50/21, one of the issues that would come up is lot coverage and building coverage.

R. Hardy stated that, being familiar with the property, it makes perfect sense.

The Board in general concurred; this change would put the lots more in conformity with the Town's standards.

K. Anderson pointed out that there are some outstanding issues regarding the Historic District as well as regarding a zoning variance on this property (particularly in terms of a freezer on the property and the siding on the freezer). He does not believe that the Planning Board can hold up the case for either of those, but he wanted to inform the Board of them.

B. Moseley agreed that that is a jurisdictional issue with other Committees and Boards – however, it might be good to keep that in mind in terms of a zoning ordinance change; other communities have to deal with such things. K. Anderson concurred with the idea of potentially proposing an ordinance change such that if there are previous violations on a property, the Planning Board can hold up a case dealing with the property. B. Moseley stated that other communities have such a provision, so it should be researched appropriately for consideration at zoning ordinance change season.

D. Petry asked whether the Applicants intend to resolve the mentioned issues before this case before the Planning Board gets signed as a plan. He stated that it might be in their best interest to do so. These issues have been going on for awhile.

Public Hearing.

Abutter: Tom Hildreth, with the Congregational Church, 3 Monument Square. Stated that he is only here to learn and observe. The Church owns the lot just at the north of the parcel in question, and they share an access easement with the Valicentis. They use the lot for overflow parking purposes. He wanted to know about the usage of the driveway, going forward, and assumed that it would continue as is.

Applicant rebuttal: Sam Ingram from Meridian Land Services, for the Owner. Stated that, regarding the easements, the driveways will remain in their current configuration, with the same usage as they have had. There is no intention to change the existing use.

Per a question from J. Peters, it was confirmed that the lot consolidation won't change the easement that the Applicant shares with the Congregational Church.

Public Hearing Closed.

K. Anderson stated that it looks from the plan as if the Congregational Church actually owns the driveway, and the Valicentis utilize it. M. Fougere confirmed that that is correct; that is how the easement works.

Motion to approve File PB2023:009 – motioned by J. Peters, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

6. OTHER BUSINESS: none.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn at 7:30pm – motioned by J. Peters, 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.