

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 18th, 2017

“Final”

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Rick Hardy, Brian Stelmack, and David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen; Alternates; Ben Ming, Bill Moseley and Jeff Peters

ABSENT: Dan Turcott and Chet Rogers; Alternate Jeff Peters.

STAFF PRESENT: Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Wendy Trimble, Assistant Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER:

C. Hoffman Chairman called the meeting to order at 7 pm. C. Hoffman appointed B. Ming to vote on behalf of D. Turcott and B. Moseley to vote on behalf of C. Rogers.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

D. Cleveland made a motion to approve Planning Board Minutes June 20th 2017 as submitted. Seconded by B. Moseley. All in favor none opposed.

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

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

4. Signature of Plan:

PB2017-011: Hollis Veterinary Hospital, 11 & 11a Silver Lake Road. Application minor site plan application to expand existing parking lot.

D. Cleveland made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign plan PB2017-011. D. Petry seconded. All in favor none opposed.

File #2820: Hollis Recreation Commission, Map 18 Lot 14 Depot Road. Application site plan for the construction of a recreational field adjoining existing parking lot and fields.

D. Cleveland made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign plan #2820. D. Petry seconded. All in favor none opposed.

- ### 5. PB2017-013: Proposed Conceptual Consultation outlining two development options on the property, a four lot subdivision serving four lots and a three lot subdivision that will require ZBA relief. A portion of this site lies within the City of Nashua, including the sites frontage. Applicant/Owner: Crimson Properties, 1095 West Hollis Street, Map 10 Lot 16, Zoned R Recreation. Tabled from June 20 2017.

M. Fougere explained that this proposal involves two conceptual subdivision plans, a three lot subdivision with two lots served by a private way and a four lot subdivision with a new

44 674 foot long public road. This 8.38 acre site lies along the Nashua River and is partially
45 split by the Hollis-Nashua town line. If this project proceeds, approval from both Planning
46 Boards will be necessary. As the site adjoins the River, a shoreline Permit will be required;
47 the rules relative to development within 250 feet of the Nashua River limit tree clearing
48 along with other regulations.

49 The three lot subdivision would be serviced by two driveways, one drive would be a private
50 way and would serve two lots. All homes would be located within the Town of Hollis. The
51 four lot subdivision would be accessed via a new public road with a turnaround. Three
52 homes would be located in Hollis and one in Nashua. Given that the proposed road starts in
53 Nashua and ends in Hollis, responsibilities as to which community would maintain the road
54 would have to be finalized.

55 The applicant is looking for input from the Planning Board prior to proceeding to the ZBA;
56 variances will be required to gain approval of the 3 lot subdivision because of the lack of
57 frontage and land area.

58 Issues include:

- 59 • State permits will be required, including Shoreline.
- 60 • Clearing along the Nashua River and the site should be detailed on the plan.
- 61 • On the four lot subdivision plan Lot 1 has an odd lot shape, with frontage proposed
62 along the entire length of the proposed roadway.
- 63 • Input from the Conservation Commission should be obtained.
- 64 • If a new road is constructed, an agreement on maintenance with City of Nashua will
65 be required. The beginning of the roadway is in Nashua.
- 66 • Easement documents will be required for the common driveway.
- 67 • The site must be serviced by underground utilities.
- 68 • Details relative to drainage will be required.

70 C. Hoffman questioned they were here tonight to get some direction. M. Fougere suggested
71 comments from the board tonight rather than direction would be very useful in moving
72 forward.

73 Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer with Fieldstone Land Consultants, representing Crimson
74 Properties LLC. He wishes to discuss tonight and seek the Planning Board's feedback on the
75 two development options shown on the plans presented. Parcel 10-16 is situated in Hollis and
76 Parcel D-69 (2.17 acres) is situation in Nashua, along West Hollis Street with 232 feet of
77 frontage. Parcel D-69 does have some improvements on the property, such as an existing
78 barn, a paved driveway and a concrete apron. There is also a second access into the lot. This
79 is a gravel access which used to go behind a home that has since been demolished. Parcel 10-
80 16 (approx. 6.24 acres) does not have any frontage, does not have any improvements on it
81 and it is bordered north to the Nashua River. Total together these properties are
82 approximately 8.4 acres of land. These development options have been evaluated over the
83 past year or so. One of these layouts consist of a construction of a road (674 foot roadway
84 with turnaround) with four lots and the other 3 lot layout show 3 back lots. He added his
85 client would prefer the 3 lot layout as it is more consistent for this setting, the lots would be
86 a great size, topography is flat and the view across the river is the golf course. It is a more
87 simplified development and it eliminates the need for the road and maintenance concerns

88 over two municipalities. He added that as the properties does not have the frontage or area
89 they will need to go the ZBA for a variance. They wanted the feedback prior to going to the
90 ZBA.

91 D. Cleveland asked what problems are raised if a property straddles two municipalities. C.
92 Branon does not envisage any problems. M. Fougere added he had spoken with Town Council
93 and from an assessing standpoint the owner would have two tax bills, and any improvements
94 done would have to adhere to the particular rules in the city where this lay on the lot. If the
95 option with the town road was built and it straddles two municipalities D. Petry confirmed
96 an agreement would be made between the two towns such as every other year. D. Petry asked
97 the amount of land of lot 3 that would be in Hollis and the amount of land in Nashua. C.
98 Branon said he did not have the exact amount but he would estimate that three quarters of
99 the land would be Hollis and one quarter in Nashua, and that this would be considered a
100 conforming lot as they would be meeting Hollis regulations. D. Petry asked as there is a total
101 of 8+ acres why had the option of two 4 acre back lots not been offered. He asked also how
102 long the driveways are in the three lot plan, C. Branon stated they were approximately 750
103 feet long.

104 C. Branon addressed the two 4 acre back lot question. They had considered a number of
105 different development options for this lot, including a condo style development in Nashua
106 based on their regulations, and this conventional concept that is before the board tonight.
107 The general yield was for four lots. The three lots would be conforming in Nashua, and the
108 thought was if they dropped down to three lots, it would be a reasonable development
109 considering the unique conditions that this property presents.

110 R. Hardy asked M. Fougere why Nashua's density regulations would influence Hollis. He
111 said it would not. R. Hardy said he would lean towards the four lots as it conforms to the
112 regulations for both towns. He also added by having two lots on the river there would be less
113 impact on the conservation area.

114 B. Stelmack asked if DPW would have an input. They would but they have not been involved
115 at this early stage. C. Branon answered a sight distance query adding it was in an urban
116 compact area and the sight distance at this location was good.

117 R. Hardy added there is a third option of just two lots.

118 B. Moseley asked where the 100 year flood line was. C. Branon indicated it as the heavy line
119 at the back of the property on the plan, and added that there is a much defined bank along
120 the Nashua River which offers relief in elevation. B. Moseley also asked the distance of the
121 lots to the river, setbacks and shore water protection. C. Branon showed where the 100 foot
122 setback line was, and suggested that each property would be approximately 150-175 feet away
123 from the river. The state will dictate by a point system. To comply with the state you would
124 have to apply the rules so it will be at least 100 feet according to Hollis setback. The two
125 existing driveways will probably remain if two back lots were developed. There is also
126 municipal water option in Nashua although they will more likely have their own septic
127 systems. Mains gas would not be an option.

128 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

129 Maurice Thibault, 1 Runnells Bridge Road approached the podium. He is concerned that if
130 the option with the public road went ahead he would be impacted along his boundary. M.

131 Fougere explain that there would have to be a lot more information to make sure no impact
132 to abutters. M. Thibault also attended a Planning meeting in Nashua a few months ago, where
133 there was a proposal for 34 houses and this will significantly add to the already very heavy
134 traffic. It was stated at that meeting there is 17000 cars a day coming down West Hollis
135 Street/Runnells Bridge Road, so every time a house goes up it is adding to the traffic. He
136 explained that some days he and his neighbors have to wait 10-15 minutes to get out onto the
137 road. He added that on recreational Zone R it is listed as 600 feet from the river and he
138 wonders if this applied here, as when they built the Overlook it caused a flood and the water
139 came up very high. M. Fougere stated that there are new maps that Femur have published
140 and this will have to be documented with this subdivision. M. Thibault added that this will
141 set a precedent as he is aware of other land that will be sold along the river. He finished by
142 saying both he and his wife enjoy the quiet place where they live and do not want to see it
143 changed.

144 The public hearing was closed. C. Branon asked for a direction from each Planning Board
145 member. B. Ming stated he would prefer just 2 lots but to choose between the plans presented
146 then he would opt for the 3 lot plan. B. Stelmack also would prefer just 2 lots, but to choose
147 on plans presented would opt for 4 lot because of the one road. R. Hardy agreed with B.
148 Stelmack as it follows the ordinance. D. Cleveland agreed with B. Ming stating 2 lots would
149 be first choice and then the 3 lot plan. C. Hoffman agreed with B. Ming also for 2 lots or the
150 3 lot plan. D. Petry and B. Moseley would only support the compliant 2 lot option.

151

152 **6. PB2017-014: Design Review: Proposed site plan application for the**
153 **construction of a 52 unit “Housing for Older Persons” development on a**
154 **30.8 acre site. Applicant/owner Raisanen Homes, Inc., Map 45-50,**
155 **Silver Lake Road, Zoned R&A Residential Agriculture.**
156

157 M. Fougere stated this project was before the board as a conceptual and is now before us as
158 a design review. This 30.8 acre property was approved in 2009 for a 10 lot HOSPD
159 subdivision; this project has never proceeded except for material removal needed in order
160 to construct the proposed road. The purpose of this Design Review plan is to depict a
161 development in conformance with Section XXI: Housing for older persons of the Hollis
162 Zoning Ordinance with a density of two (2) two bedroom housing units per net tract acre.
163 The density calculations have been submitted, and the total open space requirement as per
164 these calculations is 12.32 acres. A total of 52 units are proposed along with a clubhouse.

165 As per the previous subdivision application the proposed access will be from Route 122 and
166 a new NHDOT driveway permit will be required. A traffic survey has been submitted, with
167 the applicant reviewing traffic data from a nearby age restricted development in Amherst
168 (at town line). Peak traffic from the Amherst site indicated an 11am to noon time period.
169 NH Rte 122 has a morning peak period from 7:15 to 8:15 AM and an evening peak from 4:30
170 -5:30 PM. Nineteen trips are expected in the morning with existing peak hour traffic
171 volume of 408 cars, twenty four trips will be added in the PM peak with an adjoining traffic
172 volume of 479 vehicles. Overall traffic volumes on NH Rte 122 have declined over the last
173 ten years.

174 Since the previous approval, the Regulations relative to landscaping have changed. The first
175 section of road profile will remain the same as well as the landscaping details; however a
176 maintenance plan and bonding in accordance with Subdivision Regulations Section IV.3
177 and Section IV.8 will have to be detailed on the plan.

178 He explained the letter from Lewis Engineering Plc that was received, which outlines the
179 *steps required to permit through the NH Groundwater and Drinking Water Bureau a*
180 *small public water supply for the proposed Silver Lake Estates Age-Restricted*
181 *development.* All these steps are necessary for them to get a permit for a community
182 system, and this process proceeds over a number of months and is carefully monitored by
183 the technical staff of NHDWGB (NH Drinking Water and Groundwater Bureau).

184 M. Fougere added the Board has discussed the need for a site walk and tonight determine
185 when they would like to conduct a site inspection.

186 C. Branon, engineer from Fieldstone Land Consultants, representing Raisanen Homes Elite
187 LLC. They were before the Board with a conceptual application in May. He summarized
188 the items submitted with the design review as an overall grading plan, four planning profile
189 sheets detailing the proposed road layout design and grading, the recorded plan and profile
190 for the front of the subdivision showing the first 900 feet of the subdivision which will
191 essentially remain the same as the previous approved subdivision, the previously approved
192 landscaping plans for the entrance of the site and architectural plans for the clubhouse and
193 the elderly units. Also included was site relief calculations for the onsite subsurface septic
194 designs. A traffic report was carried out by Stephen Pernaw & Company Inc, and as the
195 Board requested it collected data at the entrance of Summerfield in Amherst as a
196 comparison, and utilized it in the preparation of his report and the conclusion page outlines
197 that this will be an off peak user and the entrance would be classified as a 'low volume' use.
198 They are in the process of updating the NHDOT permit also. The water summary was
199 submitted by Lewis Engineering Plc.

200 D. Petry asked about the subject of sidewalks that was raised and requested and he doesn't
201 see any sidewalks on these plans. C. Branon stated there was discussion but not requested.
202 R. Hardy asked if it had been voted on, no so it was still on the table. B. Stelmack would
203 prefer to see sidewalks on a development like this.

204 C. Branon went through each of the profile sheet and discussed the grading and the
205 landscaping. R. Hardy stated the grading on two plans were slightly different. Any changes
206 that have been made between the original plan and the one now presented need to be
207 clearly listed to the board so the changes are obvious. C. Branon stated he would provide
208 this in writing as D. Petry requested.

209 C. Branon followed on from the road design to state where the drainage areas are and they
210 are proposing four infiltration basins and they are able to meet the 30 foot separation
211 between basins. They have tried to offer a 25 foot area around each property to offer a good
212 size back yard. The design includes working with the grading on site and design the
213 properties to utilize this with windows in basements and walk outs. The buffering on Silver
214 Lake Road and the landscaping will be very substantial. He acknowledges that a site walk
215 has been requested but he wanted some feedback and comfort in the layout so once this is
216 laid out, the Board will be walking what is being proposed. This design meets all the
217 regulations, realizing they have to meet all the drainage criteria.

- 218 C. Hoffman questioned the traffic study. She wondered if the survey had considered any
219 impact on Witches Spring Road. C. Branon said he would need to ask Stephen Pernaw that
220 question and he would respond to it.
- 221 B. Stelmack asked if there would be a communal mail box area. C. Branon stated the design
222 of the Clubhouse submitted showed a postal area within the building.
- 223 C. Hoffman asked the Board members their thoughts on having sidewalks. All members
224 liked the idea of having sidewalks shown on the design.
- 225 A site walk was scheduled for August 15th at 5pm. The center line will be staked out. D.
226 Petry said that given the topography he wasn't sure it could be laid out any differently. C.
227 Hoffman wanted to make sure the board was happy with the layout so they could clearly
228 indicate the placement of the subdivision.
- 229 R. Hardy asked if the tree line shown on the plan was the no cut line. C. Branon stated that
230 is what they are anticipating as the cut line at this stage. R. Hardy referred to it as a no cut
231 zone, C. Branon agreed. R. Hardy wants to make sure that a buffer is maintained to protect
232 the abutters.
- 233 B. Moseley asked if the abutter's wells will be affected by the subdivision. C. Branon
234 explained that it is part of the state permitting process, including a 72 hour draw down test,
235 and anyone within a 1000 feet of the well will be notified and asked if their well can be
236 tested.
- 237 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.
- 238 Francis Morrill, 3 Witches Spring Road, asked the Board to consider a reduction in units to
239 help reduce the strain on abutters well. And also to consider the increase in traffic
240 especially on Sundays with the flea market traffic.
- 241 B. Johnson, 66-2 Truell Road, asked if this was the most densely housing development that
242 will be in Hollis. C. Hoffman said yes it was as the ordinance had been changed to increase
243 the density for housing for older persons. He asked the Board to bear in mind this proposal
244 for 52 houses, at a starting price of \$340,000, is a very attractive proposition for a
245 developer than the original 10 houses. He also asked, as he has been in house for 18 years,
246 and never had a water problem what guarantee does he have and what comeback does he
247 have if in a years' time his well dries up. He has 18 years of data and would he come back to
248 the Planning Board or the town should a problem arise. Does he have a comeback? M.
249 Fougere explained that if he is within 1000 feet he will get a letter to request access to test
250 his well. He also said they would need to talk to a geologist maybe to get more information.
251 B. Johnson agreed but that 'a data point' that would be one point in time. But it would not
252 take into consideration the fluctuations in weather etc. D. Petry asked M. Fougere to find
253 an answer from the State as it was a valid question and maybe the Board will need a
254 provision as part of the approval to protect the abutters.
- 255 E. MacDonald, 66-3 & 66-4 Truell Road. She wanted to reiterate Mr. Johnson concerns
256 about the water in the area. She would like to see fewer homes there and as she stipulated at
257 the last meeting she is concerned about the water and the traffic.

258 T. Lutz, 378 Silver Lake Road, has a good view of the current roadway and it gets a lot of
259 wash out in the winter, so he would be interested to see what drainage they are proposing.
260 He is also concerned about the traffic. And he is also concerned about the septic as he had
261 similar soil and his leach field only lasted 3 years. If the soil is the same he would be
262 concerned that the same thing will happen for the new septic's. He also added that
263 homeowners do go down Witches Spring Road a lot.

264 D. Petry made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting and the site walk.
265 R. Hardy seconded. All in favor none opposed.

266 **Other business**

267 M. Fougere explained to the board we had received an email from Eric Ryherd, the new
268 Chairman of the Energy Committee offering to add an energy section to the Master Plan
269 document. This is not a chapter we were going to do with this update. The Master Plan is a
270 Planning Board document so whatever content is within that chapter the Board has the
271 power to review, with the authority to amend/edit or reserve the right not to include.
272 However it was stated to take it under advisement at this time.

273 M. Fougere also updated the Board that Staff has signed off on a Farm Stand on Dow Road
274 and one of the abutters is not happy. This abutter has reached out to the Chairman of the
275 Board of Selectmen. The applicant submitted a detailed report, etc. and with this
276 information including an existing paved area/driveway from a previous property, off street
277 parking area, great site distance, its seasonal and a temporary structure. He had spoken
278 with Chairman and they were comfortable that it did not need to come in for review, and it
279 was signed off.

280

281

282

283 D. Cleveland made a non-debatable motion to adjourn. D. Petry seconded. All in favor
284 none opposed.

285

286 The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 PM

287

288

289

290 Respectively submitted by,

291

292

293 Wendy Trimble

294 Assistant Planner

295 Town of Hollis, NH

296

297

298