

## HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 18th, 2017

“Final”

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

**ABSENT:** Jeff Peters - Alternate

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

### 1. CALL TO ORDER:

### 2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

R. Hardy wanted to make sure it was clear that the trees where to be 3 inch calipers. W. Trimble checked and line 171 stated that T. Morin confirmed the maple trees where to be 3 inch caliper.

R. Hardy made a motion to approve Planning Board minutes March 21<sup>st</sup> 2017. Motion was seconded by D. Cleveland. All in favor none opposed. B. Stelmack and D. Petry abstained.

### 3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

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

### 4. Election of Officers; Chair and V. Chair

R. Hardy nominated C. Hoffman as Chair of the Planning Board. D. Petry seconded. All in favor none opposed.

R. Hardy nominated D. Cleveland as Vice Chair of the Planning Board. C. Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

D. Turcott arrived at the meeting.

### 5. Signature of Plan: Application PB2017-004 Kevin & Melanie Hill and Fred & Carol Doleac, 64 & 66 Baxter Road Hollis. Lot line relocation between two adjoining properties.

D. Petry made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign plan #PB2017-004. R. Hardy seconded. All in favor none opposed.

- 46       **6. PB2017-07:** Proposed Lot line relocation between two adjoining lots and a  
47       subdivision creating one new back lot, Applicant/Owners: Patrick Boyle-Amber  
48       Pursel & Yvonne & Gerard Ouellette, 46 Laurel Hill Road & 27 Mossman Road, Map  
49       45-18 (Hollis) and 57-7 (Milford), Zoned RA Residential & Agriculture.

50       **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

51  
52       M. Fougere explained this proposal involves the relocation of lot lines between two  
53       adjoining properties and a one lot subdivision. Approximately 30,668 square feet of land  
54       within the Town of Milford will be added to Lot 18 which will allow for creation of one back  
55       lot in Hollis. A home presently exists on Lot 18 and this home will reside on a 2 acre lot  
56       with 250 feet of frontage. All required zoning details have been met. One issue that is for  
57       discussion tonight is that this site involves property in two communities' approval of the  
58       Milford Planning Board is also required. On February 28, 2017 the Milford Planning  
59       approved the application with stipulations.

60  
61       D. Cleveland made a motion to accept application #PB2017-007 for review. D. Petry  
62       seconded. All in favor none opposed.

63  
64       C. Brannon from Fieldstone Land Consultant representing the applicants approached the  
65       podium. He believes the subdivision meets all the site plan regulations and he has no  
66       objections to staff recommendations. He is happy to answer any questions from the  
67       Planning Board. C. Hoffman asked how does the back lot work being in two towns, does it  
68       depend where the house is built. C. Brannon explained that the state statute explains that if  
69       the home is built on the Hollis land then it needs to meet the Hollis regulations.

70  
71       C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

72  
73       Laurie Shiffer, 522 Ponemah Hill Road Milford approached the podium and asked for C.  
74       Brannon to confirm the position of the well and proposed building box for property. C.  
75       Brannon added that the building area is shown but they aren't depicting an exact location  
76       for the home at the moment.

77  
78       C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

79  
80       M. Fougere listed his conditions as:

- 81       1. All missing lot bounds shall be set prior to recording  
82       2. NHDES approval shall be obtained.  
83       3. The plan shall note the location of stump disposal area or they shall be removed from  
84       the site.  
85       4. The applicant shall submit a recordable mylar and three paper prints along with  
86       appropriate recording fees. The Town of Milford Planning Board shall sign the plan  
87       prior to recording.

88  
89       R. Hardy made a motion to approve PB 2017-007 with these conditions as listed. D. Turcott  
90       seconded. All in favor none opposed.

- 94        **7. PB2017-06: Final Approval:** Proposed major standard layout subdivision of six  
 95        lots on a new town road and a lot line relocation, Applicant/owner Lone Pine  
 96        Hunters Club, Inc. & Michael/Jamie Curran and Seth/Kara Myers, 112 & 116  
 97        Rideout Road, Map 15 Lots 71, 71-1, 71-2, & 71-3, Zoned R & A Residential  
 98        Agriculture. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**  
 99
- 100       M. Fougere explained that this application has been in front of the board for the last few  
 101       months. The purpose of the plan is to outline 6 lot major subdivision that will include a  
 102       new 1500 foot long town road. In addition, a lot line relocation is proposed for the two lots  
 103       that presently front on Rideout Road. These two lots were subdivided in 2008 and a single  
 104       family has been constructed on the eastern lot.  
 105
- 106       The proposed lots will range in size from 2 acres to 5.2 acres. The proposed road will end  
 107       with a hammerhead design and will provide access to the last lot and the Lone Pine Club.  
 108       The remaining land associated with Lone Pine will be 97.8 acres. Test pits have been  
 109       provided on each lot and all town requirements have been met.  
 110
- 111       This subdivision layout outlines a standard subdivision which would require a waiver from  
 112       the HOSPD requirements. Given the project size and past subdivision activity a HOSPD  
 113       design is required unless waived by the Planning Board. If a HOSPD design is not required.  
 114       Then the Point System criteria outlined in Section III.J of the Subdivision Regulations must  
 115       be met.  
 116
- 117       M. Fougere stated the issues included.  
 118
- 119       - This is a major subdivision and requires a HOSPD design, which has not been submitted.  
 120       The Board has authority to waive the requirements for a HOSPD design under Zoning  
 121       Ordinance Section XX, 4a, which states: ***“In cases where the Planning Board***  
 122       ***determines that a parcel is unsuited to development as a HOSPD, it may***  
 123       ***wave the requirements of this Section IX, J and permit the parcel to be***  
 124       ***developed as a conventional subdivision subject to the Point Criteria***  
 125       ***System.”*** If this request is supported by the Board, the Point System outlined in  
 126       Subdivision Regulations, Section III Procedures, J. must be met with at least 45 points  
 127       assigned to the project.  
 128
- 129       - The Applicant has submitted Table 9, from the Subdivision Regulations, which outlines  
 130       their assessment that the proposed project qualifies for 52 points. Item 9 relates to Hollis  
 131       Planning Board’s Discretionary point allocation. The Applicant has assigned 10 points out  
 132       of 20 for this item. The Planning Board must make a determination as to the point total for  
 133       this item:
- 134       Hollis Planning Board Discretionary Points to include such consideration as:
- 135       - Upgrades town facilities beyond normal requirements (roads, fire protection, parks,  
 136       sidewalks, bike paths) 5  
 137       - Develops public open space land for suitable use 5  
 138       - Site design harmonious with the natural setting, making best use of vegetation and  
 139       structures for screening, landscaping with minimal disturbance to natural terrain and or  
 140       underground telephone and utilities 10

- 141 - The applicant's environmental engineer has provided a letter outlining the status of the  
142 existing cleanup efforts at Lone Pine. At the time of approval of the underground  
143 shooting range, it was recognized by the Planning Board that the NHDES has full  
144 oversight authority over the cleanup protocols at the Lone Pine site, along with the  
145 monitoring, remediation and timing of such efforts.  
146
- 147 - Does the Planning Board wish to conduct a site walk? He added that he had done a site  
148 walk with Chair, Vice Chair and Dennis LaBombard today. One issue that had come up  
149 today was a request for a waiver for underground utility as there are existing poles that  
150 service the club, they are presently in place and the club would like to keep them,  
151 offering underground utilities from the pole to each new property.  
152
- 153 C. Hoffman thanked a number of individuals who did a lot of historical research on this site.  
154 These included Connie Cain, Assessing, Martha Davis, Historical Society and Wendy  
155 Trimble. This research has resolved the question.
- 156 D. Cleveland made a motion to accept application #PB2017-006. D. Petry seconded. All in  
157 favor none opposed.
- 158 R. Haight from Meridian Land Services approached the podium. He explained the plan  
159 stating that it already has four lots, and this application changes it to six lots, showing the  
160 change of road, drainage, detention basins, cistern area, snow removal area etc. He  
161 explained the Hillside Drive catch basins.
- 162 C. Hoffman asked M. Fougere if they have the ability to waive the underground utilities. It  
163 is in the Rural Character ordinance and it is waivable. C. Rogers asked if it was economic  
164 reasons they were asking for the waiver. R. Haight said it was because they feel they meet  
165 the ordinance. D. Petry said to be consistent with other applications for subdivisions the  
166 board has requested underground. This will be a public road and should be underground.  
167 M. Fougere read the Rural Character ordinance with regard to the utilities.  
168
- 169 *5. Utilities*
- 170 *a. Construct and route utilities underground except in those situations where natural*  
171 *features prevent their underground siting or where safety considerations necessitate*  
172 *aboveground construction or routing.*
- 173 *b. Construct and route aboveground utilities to minimize detrimental effects on the scenic*  
174 *qualities of the site and surrounding area.*
- 175 The board discussed this at length with some suggesting it would be setting a precedent and  
176 others stating it was a unique situation as the poles are already there. R. Hardy made a  
177 motion to not grant the waiver request to keep the electricity poles above ground. C. Rogers  
178 seconded. All in favor none opposed.
- 179 D. LaBombard, Town Engineer approached the podium. He had reviewed the first set of  
180 plans received and submitted a report. He had then received a second set of plans but had  
181 not yet reviewed them. Generally referring to the whole project he stated that there is no  
182 cut and fill waiver required, it is a very level site. During the site walk this morning he spoke

183 with Kevin Anderson and they discussed the cistern and its proximity to the property line  
184 which is very close. They are looking at a grading plan to fix this to make sure its stays on  
185 the property with the grading, so there may be some reorientation coming from Meridian.  
186 Also, referring to the Alteration of Terrain Permit, and it is his understanding that they do  
187 not want to apply for one and they don't have to providing they do not disturb over 100,000  
188 square feet. The alternation of the road, drainage facilities does come in under this 100,000  
189 square feet, but this means they cannot develop any of the lots until after the road and  
190 drainage structures are all complete. He wanted this to be clear as they will not be able to  
191 come in and ask for a building permit until the road and drainage structures are completed.  
192 He also spoke to Kevin Anderson about the bottom of the infiltration basins whilst on the  
193 site walk. He had a concern on the first submittal that these had a layer of 6 inches of top  
194 soil, which he was concerned about the water getting through the top soil to get to the sand  
195 to drain, so he will be looking at this also. Overall the concept is good and he still needs to  
196 look at the second submittal. R. Hardy asked what he meant by road finished. D.  
197 LaBombard confirmed that all disturbed areas need to be stabilized so this could mean the  
198 base coat and grassed areas would need to be growing.

199 C. Hoffman moved onto the points system. This is not something that arises very often. M.  
200 Fougere explained this to the board. Everyone agreed to the numbers allocated and they  
201 were reasonable.

202 D. Turcott asked if the separation of the subdivision from the club was going to be done. R.  
203 Haight explained that the gate presently used near Rideout Road entrance will be moved  
204 further down to the end of the new town road. D. Turcott suggested that this would only  
205 protect the road not the lot line of the subdivision. He was concerned if children could just  
206 roam in the Lone Pine Hunters Club land. R. Hardy asked if they knew the exact position of  
207 the archery club this would help the board members. Mark Lambert, Chairman of the  
208 Board of Directors approached the podium to address this subject. He indicated on the plan  
209 where the practice range was and that they use a big part of their property for two events  
210 each year. He added that the property has been posted for a number of years, at the gate  
211 and the entire perimeter. He added that very rarely do they have any problems with  
212 neighbors or kids.

213 C. Rogers reminded the board that a previous conversation was to make sure that the deeds  
214 of each lot stated clearly they were next to a shoot range. They agreed.

215 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

216 R. Hallmark, 25 Hannah Drive approached the podium and stated he was not opposed to  
217 this subdivision. He did however have concerns with children wandering into the field  
218 which is contaminated with lead from shot guns. He wanted the board to consider  
219 requesting the club to put up a fence.

220 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing. The board expressed a view that a site walk would be  
221 beneficial. Saturday 6<sup>th</sup> May at 9 am was suitable for most.

222 D. Cleveland made a motion to continue PB2017- 006 to the next meeting on May 16<sup>th</sup> 2017.  
223 D. Petry seconded. All in favor none opposed.

224

225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271

**8. PB2017-08: Conceptual Consultation:** Proposed site plan application for the construction of a 52 unit “Housing for Older Persons” development on a 30.8 acre site, Applicant/owner Raisanen Homes, Inc., Map 45-50, Silver Lake Road, Zoned R&A Residential Agriculture. **Public Hearing**

M. Fougere explained this is a 30.8 acre property and it was approved in 2009 for a 10 lot HOSPD subdivision. Construction of this subdivision has not happened. The purpose of this conceptual plan is to depict an elderly housing development in conformance with section XXI: Housing for older persons of the Hollis Zoning Ordinance with a density of two (2) two bedroomed housing units per net tract acre. The density calculations have been submitted and the total open space requirements as per these calculations is 12.32 acres. Units proposed is 52 according to density calculations. Individual septic systems are being proposed and one community well.

As per the previous subdivision this road will access Route 122, and a new NHDOT driveway permit will be required because there is a change of use from previous approval. The grading on the plan is what was originally approved and talking to the engineer none of the specifications associated with that approval will be changed.

We haven’t seen an aged restricted proposal for some time and some issues that will need to be addressed include:

- Landscape plan including maintenance program and bond
- Cistern installed
- Concerns with access during construction
- Disposal of stumps
- Building boxes and if they apply. M. Fougere spoke with Attorney Dresher and given the unique criteria with this type of project, he believed that boxes did not apply.
- Community Centre
- Community mailbox area or not.
- Will the road be private or public
- State subdivision approval
- Permits will be required from NHDES; Alteration of Terrain
- New Hampshire DOT driveway permit
- Town Engineer to review the plan
- Our ordinance also requests that they submit building designs to the board also.
- 40% need to be open space and this should exclude slopes and wetlands. They need to show the open spaces on the plan and where the slopes are.

C. Hoffman asked that there are 52 houses proposed so how does the Community Centre get included. M. Fougere suggested that it is not a living area, but with parking etc. the calculations for maximum impervious area and this would be included. She also asked if the conceptual application meet all the requirements of the new older housing ordinance. M. Fougere said we need more specifics. This is just the first look and lot more details are needed but as far as the density then if the math is correct it does meet the density. The number of septic needed will have to be looked at with Tom Mercurio. D. Petry asked about the cistern size also.

272

273 C. Brannon approached the podium from Fieldstone Land Consultants. He was  
274 representing the application. Summerfield and Farley projects were listed as two that will  
275 give a good idea of density.

276

277 D. Petry asked if they were to be two car garages. C. Brannon confirmed they are proposing  
278 two car garages, up to 2200 square foot properties. C. Brannon showed three different  
279 styles of proposed properties plus the design of the clubhouse. He confirmed that Skilling's  
280 had already drilled the well and it was yielding 30 gallons a minute. This was a critical issue  
281 to address from the start. He added with site loading they will be approaching 30%  
282 including the septic's for each property. This is very light usage. The well is 520 feet deep.  
283 The Home Owners Association would be responsible for this and the road and drainage etc.  
284 It would be a private road constructed to town standards. There was concern with the  
285 volume of traffic that will need to be taken into consideration. A new traffic survey will be  
286 needed along with other permits. They are not proposing sidewalks or solar.

287

288 M. Fougere added there were 17 letters of support for this application.

289

290 C. Brannon stated they intend to keep the existing design all the way to the top of the hill.  
291 He then explained the project and its design elements and how it meets the ordinance. He  
292 also explained how the number of 52 was reached. D. Petry suggested that this is prepared  
293 in more detail for a later meeting. The development would result in less than 15% of  
294 impervious cover. The first property proposed will be 780 feet from Silver Lake Road. It is  
295 felt it is a unique project when contemplating the surroundings as a lot of them are town  
296 properties. So the open space areas will be contiguous to the town properties. This project  
297 will provide a need for the Town of Hollis offering diversity and allowing residents the  
298 chance to downsize and remain in Hollis. The change to the ordinance, that had  
299 overwhelming support at the vote, helps make this project viable.

300

301 He listed the letters of support as C. Kisiday, K. Wood, J. Tamposi, L. Perreault, F.  
302 Farrington & M. Walonis, D. Peninian, M. O'Rourke, M. Cahill, P. Noury, J. Csakai, G.  
303 Prunier, E. & K. Duymazlar, L. & R. Lovering, J. Porter, P. Flynn, S. & L. Cornette, and G.  
304 Nelson.

305

306 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

307

308 B. Johnson 66-2 Truell Road. He is concerned about the effects the well will have on  
309 neighboring properties.

310

311 E. MacDonald 66-3 Truell Road. She is concerned if there was to be any more tree clearing  
312 for this project. D. Petry told C. Brannon we need to know the planned acreage for  
313 clearance of trees and the acreage that has already been cleared. E. MacDonald also asked if  
314 there was any planned access from Mooar Hill Road, and she shared her concern about the  
315 water. C. Hoffman confirmed access would be from Silver Lake only.

316

317 Francis Morrill, 3 Witches Spring Road. He is concerned about the number of properties,  
318 the amount of water that will be used and the effect this will have on neighboring  
319 properties.

320

321 J. Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. He is concerned about the estimated traffic numbers that  
322 are being proposed for this project. Also the vision from the road and the rural character  
323 should also include what you see whilst driving down the road including traffic, stop lights  
324 etc. He also wonders how the restriction of being over 55 will be policed. M. Fougere stated  
325 there would be covenants in place for each property and that neighbors will normally  
326 highlight if they are not. C. Hoffman says it is a state law and cannot be amended by us. J.  
327 Garruba is also concerned about the impact that this will have on our schools as if 52  
328 residents sell their 3 bedroomed properties to move to the older housing and 52 new  
329 residents with families move into town this will have an obvious impact on the schools. C.  
330 Rogers stated that these people would be moving anyways whether it is to Hollis or not. So  
331 this type of change will occur anyways. M. Fougere referred to this as eco impact. He added  
332 there is a declining enrolment in the schools at present.

333

334 M. Savage, 118 Mooar Hill Road. She is not against this project. However she feels that  
335 there is already a traffic issue. This additional traffic will not help and will have a huge  
336 impact.

337

338 J. Porter 27 Lynne Drive. He is a resident in Hollis for 22 years and for the past two years  
339 he has been looking for a smaller property to allow him to continue to live in Hollis. He has  
340 looked at 44 single level living and he only got 2 positive responses and could not purchase  
341 either one. He works in this field and knows there is a high level of demand for single level  
342 living. Some of these individuals seeking this type of dwellings are doing so due to ill health  
343 etc., and some of these don't drive at all. It would be great to see a community like this in  
344 Hollis.

345

346 Chuck Savage 118 Mooar Hill Road. He says he has heard how attractive this project will be  
347 to older people allowing them to downsize and remain in Hollis. He said when you are  
348 looking to downsize this not only relates to downsizing your property but also downsizing  
349 the cost. Developments like this will include Home Owners Association fees and realtor  
350 fees and property and real estate taxes you are not downsizing financially.

351

352 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

353

354 D. Petry asked C. Brannon what the average sale prices were on Farley Road. C. Brannon  
355 said Farley Road was fee simple development and he isn't aware of price. Richard Raisanen  
356 approached the podium and said they ranged \$360000 to \$460000. These properties  
357 would be starting around \$365000.

358

359 M. Fougere suggested going over the math would be beneficial. Also going over the density,  
360 coverage and open space calculations would be helpful. There have been questions about  
361 water supply and some sort of analysis to calculate how much would be drawn from the  
362 aquifer and the impact.

363

364 D. Cleveland asked C. Brannon if numbers could be compared to Summerfield  
365 development. And also maybe a site walk would be useful.

366

367 R. Hardy stated that he agrees with D. Petry that we need to sort out the numbers to start  
368 with, and seeing the areas of slopes and open space. Also to know what the screening will  
369 be.



C. Brannon said all this leads to a design review. He encouraged the board to go to design review so they could provide the level of detail they are asking for. D. Petry wanted to see the numbers so this conceptual will continue until May 16<sup>th</sup> 2017.

D. Petry made a motion to continue application PB2017-008 until May 16<sup>th</sup> 2017. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

**9. Public Hearing:** Amend Subdivision Regulations, Section IV General Requirements for Land Subdivision by adding a new Section G. Phasing & amend Section III, Procedure, Section III.1 Subdivision Procedure A, Application relative to submittal deadlines. Amend Site Plan Regulations, Section III, Procedure, Section III.1 Site Plan Review Procedure A. Application relative to submittal deadlines.

1. Amend Subdivision Regulations, Section IV General Requirements For Land Subdivision, by adding a new Section Phasing:

Per RSA 674:21 IV, (b) the Planning Board may require the phasing of a subdivision if public or private improvements are required in order for the project to proceed. If said improvement are required to be in place or other stipulations associated with the project as required by the Planning Board in order to serve the subdivision, the Planning Board may require that the subdivision be phased to ensure that all required improvements needed to serve each phase are in place prior to the development of subsequent phases. The exact phasing schedule will be determined based upon specific details of the proposed subdivision, the size of the project and the extent of improvement required to serve the proposed development. Critical factors that could influence the phasing of a project include access, timing of offsite road improvements, and coordination with other proposed developments occurring in the area or other aspects that would be important considerations to consider relative to the buildout of the development.

2. Amend Subdivision Regulations SECTION III. PROCEDURE, SECTION III.1. SUBDIVISION PROCEDURE, APPLICATION as follows:

Before any subdivision is made, or before the transfer or sale of any part thereof, or before the construction of streets, or before the installation of municipal services therein, or before any application for a permit for the erection of a structure thereon shall be made, the owner thereof or his authorized agent, shall apply in writing to the Planning Board of the Town of Hollis, for approval of such subdivision. The application shall be made on the form provided by the Hollis Planning Board **and shall be submitted at least 21 days prior to the scheduled meeting.**

413 3. Amend Site Plan Regulations, SECTION III. PROCEDURE, SECTION III.1. SITE  
414 PLAN REVIEW PROCEDURE as follows:

415 A. *APPLICATION*. Any applicant may submit a plat for consideration in site plan review  
416 by submitting with the Office of the Planning Board, Town Hall, Hollis, New  
417 Hampshire, an application for Site Plan Review. The application shall be on the form  
418 as provided by the Hollis Planning Board ***and shall be submitted at least 21***  
419 ***days prior to the scheduled meeting.*** A complete application includes  
420 conformance to the specifications contained in the Site Plan Regulations, the  
421 presentation of all required drawings, layouts, reports or other technical data, the  
422 payment of all fees that may be imposed by the Board in accordance with their fee  
423 schedule and the names and addresses of abutters (confirmed within five days of  
424 filing) as indicated in town records on the Submission Date designated by the  
425 Planning Board. . The Board may waive one or more provisions of Section III.2,  
426 below, when appropriate, but only upon written request as provided for is Section 1M.

427 M. Fougere explained to the Planning Board members the reason for amending numbers 2  
428 & 3 was because of a change to State Statute that went from 15 to 21 days that plans have to  
429 be submitted. This change is to keep us consistent with State Statute.

430 The Phasing amendment 1 is a requirement to provide the board with authority to phase a  
431 development if public improvements are required or offsite improvements are required and  
432 time that improvement to the project. If a road needed to be put in after so many units  
433 because of access or fire concerns the board would have the ability to require that. Or an  
434 intersection had to be improved at a certain stage based on the size of the project that  
435 phasing could be incorporated into it with this requirement.

436 D. Cleveland asked about the wording in bold and italics. This font was changed to be the  
437 same as the rest.

438 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

439 J. Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. He feels that this language does not do enough to protect  
440 the town from the loss of Section XIII that was voted to be removed from the Zoning  
441 Ordinance.

442 D. Petry explained that section XIII was removed as they were deemed illegal, they had  
443 been in place for a very long time but were no longer enforceable and Town Council  
444 recommended we removed it. The wording here has been vetted by Town Council and it is  
445 legal and we can request phasing for new subdivision.

446 M. Fougere added that a lot of time had been spent talking about the removal of that  
447 requirement and based on statutes in Concord that impact growth control you have to have  
448 very specific issues within the community to limit building within the town. When it was  
449 adopted in the 1990s there was a significant problem in Hollis. We had between 60-90  
450 building permits per year, the schools were not prepared for that type of growth and it has  
451 been in place ever since. It was no longer suitable. Now we need to monitor the growth to  
452 check trends, and schools are our biggest concern. If there is a problem we can draft an  
453 ordinance for the board to review and approve.

454 J. Garruba felt this did not go far enough.

455 M. Fougere explained as per RSA 674:21 Innovative Land Use Controls it gives a number of  
456 land use controls that the Planning Board can use. He explained that he had looked at, in

457 detail, an analysis of our growth within the community. This included building permits  
458 going back 8-10 years, enrollments in the school has decreased in the last five years and  
459 under state Statute in order to have a growth control limit to limit development you have to  
460 have a an actual capacity problem within the community, a growth problem and we do not  
461 have one. Although there are tools we have available to us, if there is growth, there hasn't  
462 been any growth.

463 J. Garruba continued to discuss with the board his concerns regarding this new amendment  
464 to the ordinance. However, it has been discussed at length and the wording has been  
465 checked by the Town Attorney.

466 D. Petry explained to J. Garruba how the building rights worked and what has been taken  
467 away.

468  
469 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

470  
471 D. Petry made a motion to approve the proposed subdivision and site plan regulations  
472 amendments document dated April 18 2017. R. Hardy seconded. All in favor none  
473 opposed.

474  
475 R. Hardy made a motion to approve nonpublic minutes of March 21<sup>st</sup> 2017, and to remain  
476 sealed. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed. D. Turcott, B. Stelmack and C.  
477 Rogers abstained.

478  
479 D. Petry made a non- debatable motion to adjourn. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor  
480 none opposed.

481  
482 The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM

483  
484  
485  
486 Respectively submitted by,

487  
488  
489 Wendy Trimble  
490 Assistant Planner  
491 Town of Hollis, NH

492