

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

August 15th, 2017

“Final”

1 **PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Rick
2 Hardy, Brian Stelmack, Alternates; Ben Ming, Bill Moseley and Jeff Peters; Mark LeDoux
3 Ex-Officio for Selectmen

4
5 **ABSENT:** Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Chet Rogers, Dan Turcott and David Petry, Ex-
6 Officio for Selectmen

7
8 **STAFF PRESENT:** Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Wendy Trimble, Assistant Planner
9

10 **1. CALL TO ORDER:**

11 D. Cleveland Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 7 pm. D. Cleveland appointed B.
12 Ming to vote on behalf of C. Hoffman, J. Peters to vote on behalf of C. Rogers and B. Moseley
13 to vote on behalf of D. Turcott.
14

15 **2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:**

16 R. Hardy made a motion to approve Planning Board Minutes July 18th 2017 as submitted.
17 Seconded by B. Moseley. All in favor none opposed. M. LeDoux abstained.
18

19 **3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:**

- 20 a. Agenda additions and deletions – none.
21 b. Committee Reports – none
22 c. Staff Report – none
23 d. Regional Impact – none
24

25 **4. Signature of Plan:**

26 **File #2821 Island Time Realty – Site plan review proposed storage building**
27 **replacing landscaping yard, 250-254 Proctor Hill Road, Applicant Erich**
28 **Mueller Owner Island Time Realty LLC Map 11 Lot 24.**

29 R. Hardy made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign plan File #2821. J. Peters
30 seconded. All in favor none opposed.

31 **File #2818 Subdivision of an existing 8.2 acre lot into two lots. 154 Proctor Hill**
32 **Road, Map 12 Lot 18. Applicant/owner George and Gloria Burton.**

33 R. Hardy made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign plan File #2821. J. Peters
34 seconded. All in favor none opposed.

35 **5. PB2017-014: Design Review: Proposed site plan application for the**
36 **construction of a 52 unit “Housing for Older Persons” development on a**
37 **30.8 acre site, Applicant/owner Raisanen Homes, Inc., Map 45-50,**
38 **Silver Lake Road, Zoned R&A Residential Agriculture. Tabled from July**
39 **18. Site Walk scheduled for 5 PM August 15, 2017.**
40

41 M. Fougere explained this is the over 55 development review that has been before the
42 board. There is a revised traffic memo that the board had asked for to answer a few
43 questions that had been raised. More specifically to show the trips on Witches Spring Road.

44 The Planning Board has conducted a site walk tonight at the property and walked the road
45 to get an idea of what it is like on the top of the site.

46 R. Hardy did not feel that every station was very visible, and he had also made a comment
47 at the July meeting that the buffer should be delineated both on the plan and it was stated
48 by their engineer that was the no-cut line. He would like to see a dimension on the plan
49 before approval.

50 B. Moseley added that on the site walk it was stated that every stake was visible however he
51 agrees with R. Hardy that this was not necessarily the case.

52 M. LeDoux stated his concern is with the density of the project and with the older folks
53 there is a higher risk of medical emergency requirements, and the slope of the proposed
54 road will be difficult to navigate emergency vehicles in the winter. J. Peters explained that
55 what you see now is not how it will be finished and that it will conform to the 8% grade.

56 Chris Guida, Fieldstone Land Consultants, Soil Scientist and Wetland Scientist approached
57 the podium. He referred to the site walk and stated that they had walked site and every 100
58 feet is staked and the board had been given the option of walking through the heavily
59 wooded section that was staked. He offered to walk the board through this area again
60 although it is more difficult to walk hence why they had walked the existing woods road. He
61 was happy to address any questions regarding topography. He confirmed the road in would
62 be 8% grade. He added the well has been installed, an application has been submitted to
63 the Drinking Water Bureau at the State and they anticipate approval in 2-3 weeks. The
64 minor comments for the traffic study have been address in the more recent traffic survey
65 document. He added if the board were to vote to go to final then they would continue with
66 the engineering aspects and drainage with proposed grading.

67 R. Hardy asked where in the new traffic report, was the response to D. Petry's concern on
68 traffic on Witches Spring Road. M. Fougere indicated where the results were. B. Stelmack
69 asked for the final conclusion. M. Fougere said the impact was not any different but they
70 would need to apply for a new State driveway permit. D. Cleveland added that the
71 conclusion was the impact on traffic would be relatively neglectable.

72 D. Cleveland asked if the board was happy for this applicant to go to final application. A
73 motion was made to go to final, all in favor none opposed. M. Fougere added that this
74 submission should include the results of well tests with the application and include all the
75 issues that have been raised to allow consultation with D. LaBombard and other
76 department's right from the beginning.

77 **6. PB2017-015: Major Subdivision – Amendment: Proposed amendment to**
78 **the stormwater design for the approved Woods Subdivision relative to**
79 **lots along Depot and Dow Road, Applicant/owner: Elizabeth J. Woods**
80 **Rev. Trust, Map 13 Lots 68-5, 68-6, 68-7, 68-8, 68-9, 68-10 & 68-11, Dow**
81 **and Depot Road, Zoned R & A Residential Agriculture. Application**
82 **Acceptance and Public Hearing.**
83

84 M. Fougere began by stating this was a very old application that when approved it fronted
85 onto Dow Road, Depot Road and Merrill Lane. It was approved 10 years ago and to date
86 only one home has been built. Cucco and Cormier was the original designer and is no
87 longer in business and Meridian has now taken on the work. The applicant working with

Meridian felt that the drainage that was originally approved for the project seemed excessive so they have asked Meridian to look at it and see if the portion of the Dow Road and Depot Road drainage plans can come up with a different design. The footprint of the drainage system, the size of the detention ponds, would reduce the impact of the project with less grading. This is an unusual application for the board to review but as the original plan was approved any alterations need to be revised by the Planning Board. Town Engineer, D. LaBombard has had a copy and his review letter was part of the packets. No new lots or new homes are being proposed.

Kevin Anderson, Meridian Land Services approached the podium stating he is here to present a Plan Amendment for the Woods Subdivision, Map 13 Lot 68-5, 68-6, 68-7, 68-8, 68-9, 68-10 & 68-11, Dow and Depot Road. It was originally prepared by Cucco and Cormier, approved in October 2006. This plan amendment is limited to just the drainage design. No driveway location no adjustments to any lot lines etc. K. Anderson believes it was designed to the States Alteration of Terrain permit regulations which are very strict, and at that time they were very new, so there were some interpretation issues and also they erred on the side of safety. Nowadays this subdivision would have never gone to an AoT standard regulation. He has clarification from AoT agreeing that a frontage lot subdivision would not require an AoT permit. The reason for this is that AoT permits normally revolve around road design, large infrastructure design and not residential house lots with driveways. He has been tasked with redesigning the drainage system, and he handed the board a new handout stating the areas colored in blue will be dealt with in a separate application at a different date. The areas in red are for this application. They are separate drainage systems, they don't interlink at all, so it is a perfect line to separate the two systems. The second plan handed to the board tonight show the original basins, along with the driveways. They were very large basins to meet the State's requirements. Then he showed the revised basins on a plan showing them up against Dow Road, they are very small in size and they meet the town's requirements. He is limiting it to the Towns requirements.

M. LeDoux made a motion to accept the application as presented, B. Moseley seconded. All in favor none opposed.

M. LeDoux asked if he was conforming to State Law. K. Anderson stated he was conforming to Town Regulations. M. Fougere explained that when the application first came to the Planning Board in 2006 the State was just introducing their new Alteration of Terrain standards, and the engineer based on those early interpretations felt that it met the criteria to require a state permit, and since that time the rules have changed and been clarified and this type of project typically does not need Alteration of Terrain permits. With these changes the amount of disturbance is significantly less.

K. Anderson noted that this project is under the review of D. LaBombard and he is in complete agreement with his questions and concerns, he has written a response letter and would like to meet with D. LaBombard to clarify a couple more issues. Also the southern area, on the original plan it was requested by the abutters that a swale is installed near lot 13-68-11 and 13-68-10. These swales would have been maintained by the Town of Hollis. R. Hardy asked about the topography of the lots. K. Anderson had stated the lots were flat however they are not flat. R. Hardy suggested there was a need for these swales. K. Anderson agreed to take this proposal off the table and will leave it as is.

137

138 D. LaBombard approached the podium. He has responded to the first set of plans and K.
139 Anderson response letter. He went over a few of the comments that still need to be
140 addressed including the Conservation Overlay District. Essentially all run off finally runs
141 into a wetland, so that section where the drainage goes applies to everything in the whole
142 town. He just wanted to reconfirm that to make sure everyone is on the same page. K.
143 Anderson said he will put the rate and volumes of runoff in a table for the next report to
144 allow him to look at them. Infiltration needs to be addressed to abate the increase in offsite
145 stormwater volume runoff. The treatment swales are now included, the common driveway
146 grading will be addressed as he will be sending him the original plans from Cucco and
147 Cormier. Generally speaking as far as carving this subdivision up, they did do it in the best
148 spot possible. The drainage along Depot Road goes under Dow Road and continues along
149 whereas the stuff on Dow Road has a tendency to flow back to the East. Their basic concept
150 is still the same. They will turn their detention basins into retention basins or exfiltration
151 basins.

152

153 R. Hardy asked who gets notified about State Regulation changes. D. LaBombard said he
154 had been notified but he is unsure of who else gets notified. B. Stelmack asked what drove
155 these changes to be made. K. Anderson stated he was offered the opportunity to redesign
156 the drainage and he cannot redesign it if it needed to adhere to AoT standards, so he
157 enquired whether or not this needed it, he did not think it did, and when AoT stated no it
158 was not needed then he was able to proceed with the redesign. D. LaBombard stated by the
159 time they have finished it will meet State criteria.

160

161 D. Cleveland opened the public hearing.

162

163 Michael McLaughlin, 9 Eastman Lane approached the podium. He is concerned with lots
164 10 & 11. It does drain towards a small stream. He is concerned with changes maybe
165 increasing the water flow to the stream and basements getting flooded.

166

167 Resident from 23 Eastman Lane approached the podium. He is also concerned about the
168 drainage and referred to an abutter having to pump out their basement. One had a
169 foundation drain that failed. This spring saw the water higher than usual. The field behind
170 9 Eastman Lane is extremely wet. The vernal stream dries up in the summer but in winter
171 it is very full with a Mallard visiting. The swale should be kept.

172

173 Brian LeClerc, 19 Eastman Lane approached the podium. He also referred to the stream.
174 He showed the board on the plan how it flows and feeds. He is concerned about the
175 drainage changes.

176

177 The public hearing closed.

178

179 D. LaBombard approached the podium, adding that he did review the original Cucco and
180 Cormier plan and he acknowledged that the area does have a high water table. The
181 subdivision was not going to make the water issue better but it also was not going to make it
182 worse.

183

184 K. Anderson added that the Town's storm water regulations require that developments do
185 not increase the rate or volume of storm water runoff, so by meeting both of these the
186 conditions should not change.

187

188 R. Hardy had one question, regarding the plan, the area he referred to was a septic system.
189 As it was part of the previous plan, K. Anderson could not answer it. R. Hardy suggested
190 maybe as runoff cannot be increased add some further retention areas.

191

192 M. LeDoux summarized that the board and neighbors are concerned about if berm was
193 removed and he has thought maybe asking the Fire Chief if a new fire pond could be made
194 and solve two problems and provide protection for the residents on Eastman Lane. K.
195 Anderson stated they are not designed to hold water for more than 72 hours.
196 The proposed cistern was pointed out on the plan. B. Stelmack wanted to confirm that the
197 swale was staying.

198

199 M. Fougere stated the engineer was involved with the original plan and will make sure the
200 end impact will be the same as before, no increase. During his review maybe he could come
201 up with some other solutions to problems out there. K. Anderson also added that the
202 rainfall data used is now localized and not the state numbers, much more accurate.

203

204 M. LeDoux made a motion to table file PB2017-015 to September 19 2017. J. Peters
205 seconded. All in favor none opposed.

206

207 **Other business**

208 **Discussion:** Mr. John Ferlins and Ms. Beth Reynolds of Dow Road, expressing concerns
209 regarding the approved (by Staff with concurrence with Pl. Brd. Chair) Farm Stand located
210 on the Moskun farm.

211

212 M. Fougere explained the applicant came to the office with an application for a farm stand.
213 In 2013 the ordinance was amended for Farm Stands and the Board authorized staff to have
214 the authority to make a determination if it needed to go to the Planning Board or not.
215 Based on the information we received we thought it was a minor farm stand, due to size and
216 temporary seasonal nature, the Police department, the Fire department and DPW and the
217 Planning Board Chairman where are consulted and found no issues and a decision was
218 made to approve the application. The neighbors complained about the stand. Staff met
219 with two of the abutters John Ferlins and Beth Reynolds. They asked for a meeting with the
220 Chairman however she felt this would not be appropriate. However they were invited to
221 come to the Planning Board tonight to have a discussion. The farm stand has now been
222 operating for approximately six weeks and business is quiet. It is placed where there used
223 to be a family home so there is a driveway there already. This was why they liked the idea of
224 having the farm stand at this location as there was already a stable place to pull off the road,
225 have enough room for parking and turnaround to avoid reversing onto Dow Road.

226

227 John Ferlins, 88 Dow Road Hollis. He started by saying he appreciated the opportunity to
228 address the Planning Board and have their concerns heard. He lives directly across the
229 street from the Farm Stand. Joining him tonight was Beth Reynolds, Jack Plummer, Bruce
230 Bower and Mr. & Mrs. Fyfe. He stated than none of them are really opposed to Hollis
231 Agriculture, but they do have some very serious concerns about the location of the Farm

232 Stand. A year ago the applicants had the same intention, to put up a Farm stand, however
 233 that no formal application was submitted as it had come up against some strong objections.
 234 They were told that the abutters would be notified if the applicant came back. However this
 235 did not happen, it is not fair that one person can make a decision like this and have an
 236 impact on the abutters. He has lived there for over 30 years and knows the traffic situation
 237 very well. There is history there around 1990 there was a serious accident at the top of the
 238 hill. Later when discussion about repaving the road 2010, there was a lot of discussions and
 239 the subject of safety and concern kept coming up. He described speeding traffic at the crest
 240 of the hills, the issue of traffic turning in the farm stand and kids playing. Lorin Rydstrom
 241 and Gerry Gartner have also testified to the speed issue. A police speed trap sits on the site
 242 of the Farm Stand but this is not a permanent fix. Other concerns include how they live,
 243 how they wanted to live on Dow Road which is a quiet area and a retail business right across
 244 the street is a nuisance and really impacts our quality. It affects their market value of their
 245 properties.

246
 247 Beth Reynolds, 92 Dow Road Hollis. She confers with everything that John Ferlin has said.
 248 However she had things to add. According to town records, DPW came out to measure the
 249 site distance. She strongly believes that in that 200 feet there is an unsafe situation. She
 250 has a blind driveway with a three and half foot retaining wall and the road is incredibly
 251 narrow. So by adding the farm stand and commercial traffic to that location adds another
 252 element of risk in an area with a lot going on. She added just below this is another blind
 253 driveway. The farm stand has been operating irregularly since it opened, and their hours of
 254 operation stated 10 – 5 and they have been opening around 8:30am so already they are
 255 doing something they should not be doing. She added they live in a small area rural
 256 environment, they do not know the Moskins, her husband reached out directly to discuss
 257 our concerns neighbor to neighbor and they declined to speak. She read directly from a
 258 letter from Steve Reynolds.

259
 260 “I wish I could be at the meeting tonight but unfortunately I had to travel for work. Thank
 261 you for the opportunity to be able to voice our concerns regarding the location of the Farm
 262 Stand. We are truly fortunate to be able to live in Hollis in a beautiful historic home, and on
 263 a scenic location on Dow Road. We have worked hard to be able to live and we work hard to
 264 maintain our property. Here are a few facts, not opinions that I would like remind
 265 everyone. Private nuisance – operating a commercial business 87 feet from our home
 266 interferes with our right to peacefully enjoy our home and our property. Business
 267 expansion – The farm stand applicant has indicated that it is their plan to expand this
 268 business. This negative impact will increase with this expansion. Safety – safety sight
 269 distance is the barest minimum allowed. There is not much of a margin of safety especially
 270 with wet conditions for distracted drivers. We live on this exact spot and enter and exit our
 271 driveway multiple times a day. We have personally witnessed speeding vehicles and close
 272 calls on this narrow stretch of road on many occasions. Why place a business here when
 273 there are many safer locations. Permitting process – the town was fully aware of abutters
 274 concerns. We were clearly advised by the town that should a permit be applied for abutters
 275 would be contacted and allowed to comment before any permits were issued. Why was this
 276 process bypassed especially when concerns were known. Property value – permitting a
 277 commercial enterprise to be located 87 feet from our home will have a negative impact on
 278 our property value and the ability to market it in the future. Alternate suitable locations –
 279 the owner of the property and the farm stand has 54 acres and significant frontage on two
 280 roads, Dow and Bell Lane. As well as good access and parking near their residence and barn

281 bakery. There are many other suitable locations on the property where a farm stand could
282 be located that alleviate our personal concerns, serious safety concerns, and concerns over
283 growth and expansion. This specific location does not have to be used. And in fact it is one
284 of the worst possible locations. We strongly object to permitting and locating a business in
285 this particular location and believe that the safety and general welfare of the residence in
286 this area and those that use Dow Road for transportation and recreation should be
287 considered. We especially request that the permit for the farm stand in this location be
288 revoked and a proper review process be undertaken and alternative location be properly
289 and thoroughly reviewed. Sincerely Steve”

290

291 D. Cleveland asked if one of the suggestions that the Farm Stand be relocated further to the
292 north of Dow Road, toward Bell Lane? B. Reynolds said yes, they have a lot of frontage on
293 both Dow Road and Bell Lane. It does not have to be in that particular location. She added
294 they also have a commercial bakery on their property with other parking areas, it does not
295 have to be right there.

296

297 Marsha Cone, 94 Dow Road a back lot. She is speaking from personal experience. When
298 they applied for the bakery it concerned her. She said they were assured it would be
299 wholesale and not retail. Now she has heard they are selling their cakes at the farm stand.
300 She added if they are not successful and she does not wish this, but it will not be a problem.
301 However, if it is successful it will become a problem for the abutters but not for them. She
302 walks her dogs up and down Dow Road every day and there is also other walkers and
303 cyclists and the road is not very wide and not safe. The residents’ quality of life needs to be
304 considered. There are a lot of issues with this application. They should move to Bell Lane.
305 And will growing grapes turn into a vineyard?

306

307 Bruce Bower, 166 Dow Road Hollis. He has lived there for 30 years and the traffic has
308 increased a lot during this time. Not only with cars but with walkers and cyclists also. The
309 road is narrow and creates dangerous conditions, and he asked why you would consider
310 putting a business at the top of this hill when there are other choices available with less
311 impact.

312

313 Mark LeDoux stated he had been asked five months ago, and he asked staff and he was told
314 the abutters would be notified. Then he heard that the farm stand was permitted without
315 the abutters being notified, and this is a flaw because the abutters here, who are also his
316 neighbors, as he also lives on Dow Road, are concerned and he agrees with their justifiable
317 concerns. He asked for the Planning Board to rescind the concept of just allowing Staff
318 being allowed to make a unilateral decision for a matter of this magnitude and he feels it is.
319 He does not believe we had all the facts, and whilst everyone is well meaning, the doctrine
320 of unintended consequences has raised its ugly head. He finds the Moskins good people,
321 but he is also friends with everyone here. He would ask the process be rescinded to not
322 allow Staff to make a decision without a full public hearing, and also as this is a seasonal
323 permit that this year they are allowed this proceed until November this year however they
324 be asked to come back to the Planning Board next year for a full vetting process with the
325 Planning Board. The error was allowing staff to make this decision without taking all this
326 into consideration. He doesn’t mean to denigrate the staff, they do an admirable job, but
327 when you have this much sensitivity being expressed to the Chairman of the board of
328 selectmen and to the Planning Board members, it is time to take notice as he thinks there is
329 a flaw in the system.

330

331 D. Cleveland asked where the decision came from to allow Staff to make the decision. M.
332 LeDoux stated it would come from the Planning Board. M. Fougere stated that late 2012
333 early 2013 the board took a hard look at agricultural uses, there was a subcommittee created
334 from the Agricultural Commission, and together with considering all concerns we changed
335 our definitions, signage requirements relative to agriculture. A number of changes was
336 made to the zoning code. It went to town meeting in 2013 and the town voted in favor. R.
337 Hardy asked M. LeDoux if the town voted on this why he feels the Planning Board can
338 rescind it. M. LeDoux stated he is looking for a resolution and maybe his is not a suitable
339 one. However the abutters have raised very valid concerns with safety issues. He added it
340 disturbs him that when he is told one thing that the abutters would be notified, and then
341 they weren't. R. Hardy stated that if the town votes on things then the Planning Board does
342 not have the authority to rescind things. A new amendment will need to be made and taken to
343 town ballot.

344

345 R. Hardy stated that he does not agree with the property value theory as he would love to
346 live opposite 54 acres of farmland. He travels Dow Road every day and he does not see a
347 traffic issue. He added the lawn maintenance vehicles parked on the road are probably the
348 largest visual problem. He believes there is 200 feet sight distance and residents respect the
349 area. He really does not see how we can make this call, and the ordinance was passed to
350 avoid the very low impact Farm Stands coming before the Board, and have the Planning
351 Board allow the Planning Staff to take care of this. It is allowed under the present
352 ordinance and voted by the town.

353

354 M. LeDoux wants to further study amendment 12 as he is unsure of what it says. He is not
355 trying to create a problem, he is trying to find a resolution for a problem. Maybe they could
356 put it on a more suitable position closer to their commercial bakery. He wants a solution to
357 what he feels is a failure of the process. He was told as the Chairman of the Selectboard that
358 there will be notification to the abutters and then clearly there wasn't he has a problem.

359

360 D. Cleveland suggested there were two separate problems. One is the process and the second
361 is the current location of the farm stand.

362

363 M. LeDoux wants to see the ballot for the amendment to see what it says and then make a
364 decision on addressing this either at Planning Board level, by petition warrant article or by
365 Board of Selectmen.

366

367 M. Fougere read Amendment 12 – Amend Section X. Zoning Districts by deleting Sections
368 F. Recreational Zone: paragraph 1. Permitted Uses. C. and Section G. Residential &
369 Agricultural, 1. Permitted uses c and Section I Rural Land. 1. Permitted Uses c as they relate
370 to seasonal roadside stands and inserting into those sections the term Farm Stand, along
371 with a new Definition of such.

372 **Farm stand: An agricultural Enterprise which displays and sells agricultural**
373 **products raised, produced and processed on the premises, and which may**
374 **include a Structure(s) used in the operation. All Farm Stand Structures must**
375 **be set back at least 35 feet from the adjacent Public Road and have adequate off**
376 **street parking. A Farm Stand shall remain an Agricultural Enterprise and**
377 **shall not be considered a commercial use, provided that at least 35% of the**
378 **products sales in dollar volume are attributed to products produced on the**

379 **farm or farms of the stand owner. Owners of farm stands based upon review**
380 **of town staff may be required to obtain site plan review approval from the**
381 **Planning Board.**

382 Also amend Section VIII Definitions, Temporary Structure, by amending a sentence in the
383 definition to read as Temporary structures shall comply with all applicable setbacks, except
384 as noted in the Farm Stand definition and/or height requirements for accessory or principal
385 structures, as outlined in Section X Zoning Districts In addition add a new definition for
386 Agricultural Enterprise: any duly permitted farm, agricultural or farming activity as defined
387 in NH RSA 21:34-a.

388
389 R. Hardy added that initially, through the Agricultural committee, part of the concern was
390 to allow small enterprises that are not permanent structures. And as a point of fact you can
391 sell bakery products if you use your own farm product in it. That is allowed by the State.

392
393 B. Ming asked if there was anything other than the process that was an issue. M. LeDoux
394 added he is concerned about the process. But having spoken to his neighbors and visiting
395 the site he has concerns of it position. He will be happy to discuss with DPW, Police and
396 Fire departments. R. Hardy added that Police, Fire and DPW were all consulted and
397 approved.

398
399 B. Stelmack agrees with R. Hardy statements. However if they are operating outside the
400 stated hours then maybe we could ask them to stick to the hours stated.

401
402 J. Peters agrees with R. Hardy. However he agrees with abutters, he has driven past there
403 numerous times, not seen a single car there so not sure how busy they are, there may be
404 other places it could go potentially, but it has now been permitted. As it is seasonal maybe
405 the board could readdress next year.

406
407 B. Moseley had nothing further to add.

408
409 M. Fougere stated that should the farm stand grow they would need to come back with
410 another application. He feels this application is just for this season. The bigger they get the
411 more reason to readdress it.

412
413 M. LeDoux asked the applicant to be sensitive to the request that was approved by staff,
414 including hours of operation and also sensitive to the abutters concerns. He stated he will
415 address this with the agricultural commission and ask them to revisit. He added what they
416 have learned here is that there are certain things we don't see, but the abutters have seen as
417 valid concerns so how this will be addressed needs to be decided by the agricultural
418 commission, the Planning Board and Staff.

419
420 M. LeDoux made a non-debatable motion to adjourn. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none
421 opposed.

422
423 The meeting was adjourned at 8:55PM

424
425 Respectively submitted by,
426 Wendy Trimble
427 Assistant Planner

428 Town of Hollis, NH