

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
October 16, 2018
Final

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Moseley – Chairman, Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Cathy Hoffman, Chet Rogers, Jeff Peters; Alternates; Benjamin Ming and Rick Hardy

ABSENT: Brian Stelmack, Dan Turcott, David Petry, Ex-Officio for the Selectmen.

STAFF PRESENT: Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Virginia Mills, Interim Planning Assistant.

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:04 PM

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance, led by J. Peters. The Chair appointed B. Ming to vote in place of B. Stelmack.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

B. Ming indicated one correction: Line 226 – change second to motion to C. Hoffman rather than B. Ming. C. Hoffman made a motion to approve the Planning Board Minutes of September 18, 2018 as amended. J. Peters seconded. All in favor; none opposed. (D. Cleveland abstains.

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

- a. Agenda additions and deletions - None
- b. Committee Reports – None
- c. Staff Report –None
- d. Regional Impact – M. Fougere stated that this should be discussed for the Housing for Older Persons application on Silver Lake Road which appears on tonight's agenda.
- e. Correspondence

4. Signature of Plans: None

5. Hearings

- a. PB2018:017:** Site plan relative to the construction of additional ground mounted solar systems, 23.5 feet x 9 feet. Owner: Russell Kellner, Applicant: Jake Ottolini, GoSolar NH, 161 Hayden Road, Map 35 Lot 1, Zoned R/A Residential-Agricultural.
Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.

M. Fougere reviewed this application to install one ground mounted solar array on a 9.15 acre parcel. The new panel will be 23 x 9 feet wide and 9 feet tall and will sit behind two existing ground mounted arrays. All required setbacks are met and it will be located over 500 ft. off Hayden Road on a heavily wooded lot. This requires a Conditional Use Permit and is subject to the following findings:

The applicant has requested a waiver of Sec IV4A.2(a) that plans be prepared by a surveyor or engineer, as well as a waiver from the buffer plan required per Sec. IV.A.3(g), due to the extensive buffering already existing on the property.

C. Hoffman presented a motion to accept File PB2018:17 for consideration. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved.

Jake Ottolini, Rangeway Road, Dunbarton, NH, representing GoSolar New England, addressed the board. He pointed out that the site is heavily wooded, and that this is a very small system adding to an existing installation. No tree cutting or trenching is required, and it has already been approved by the utility company. J. Peters asked if the new installation is at the same scale and height (9') as the existing. J. Ottolini responded that it is.

The chairman opened the public hearing; there being no comments, he closed the public hearing. B. Ming asked if an additional site plan is required for the electrical; M. Fougere noted that this is handled through the building permit process.

D. Cleveland presented a motion to approve the two waivers. Motion seconded by J. Peters and unanimously approved. D. Cleveland presented a motion to approve File 2018:017. The motion was seconded by C. Hoffman and unanimously approved.

- b. File 2018:018:** Site plan relative to the construction of two ground mounted solar systems. 78 feet x 38 feet. Owner: James Moskun. Applicant: ReVision Energy. 12 Bell Lane, Map 9 Lot 2, Zoned R/A Residential & Agricultural. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere reviewed this application to install two rows of a ground mounted solar array on a 54 acre parcel. The panels will be 78 x 38 feet wide and 11 feet tall. The new system will be located 600 feet off Dow Road and behind the existing garage. All setbacks are met. The use requires a Conditional Permit and is subject to the following conditions:

- a. The use is specifically authorized by Section X as a conditional use.
- b. The development in its proposed location will comply with all requirements of the Hollis Site Plan Regulations, as well as specific conditions established by the Planning Board.
- c. The use will not materially endanger the public health or safety.
- d. The use shall provide adequate screening to ensure adjacent property values are not adversely impacted. Screening may be provided by maintaining existing vegetation or through the installation of site specific evergreen landscaping, suitable fencing, or a combination thereof. Such screening shall be maintained during the operative lifetime of the Solar Energy System Conditional Use Permit. The screening shall be of such quality & quantity as to adhere to and meet the objectives of the Hollis Rural Character Preservation Ordinance.

e. In granting a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to this section, the Planning Board may impose any reasonable conditions deemed necessary to carry out the intended purpose of this ordinance.

f. The Planning Board reserves the right to waive the height conditions of the Conditional Use Permit if the applicant proves to the Planning Board that the requested waiver will not be detrimental to public safety, adjacent property values or the rural character.

C. Hoffman presented a motion to accept File PB2018:018 for consideration. The motion was seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved.

Dan Weeks, 7 Chattuck Street, Nashua, and representing ReVision Energy on behalf of the applicant, commended the Town for its leadership on clean energy. He characterized the Moskun project as “fairly straightforward”. It is about 600 feet off Dow Road, with a shielding hedgerow. He is seeking a waiver to engineering requirements, and from the buffering requirement due to the existence of the existing hedgerow. This is a 36.6 kilowatt array, two adjacent rows, ground mounted solar panels using earth screws that will 100% serve the property with an underground conduit going to the main house. Eversource has approved the plans.

Noting the 78’ x 38’ dimension, J. Peters asked how big each array is. D. Weeks responded that the arrays take up 2/3 of the total footprint. The length is 78’, the width is approx. 7’ and the height is 11’. J. Peters: Why 11’ instead of 10’ as required by the regulation? D. Weeks: for the most compact design, allowing for a 4th solar panel.

C. Rogers asked about the height of the hedgerow. Jim Moskun, 12 Bell Lane, homeowner and applicant, explained that the trees are mostly deciduous so it will not be fully blocked in the winter. B. Moseley: Will the hedgerow remain in perpetuity for the life of the solar panels? J. Moskun: Correct. M. Fougere noted that screening for solar arrays is handled on a case-by-case basis. D. Cleveland: Will it be possible to see the array from Dow Road at anytime of the year? J. Moskum: You will be able to see it all the time from some point on Dow Road. The array is down the hill about 50’ from the green house.

The chairman opened the public hearing. John Ferlins, Dow Road, spoke in opposition to the application. “Williams Hill”, where the solar panels will be mounted is a key feature of the rural vista. The barn and green house are clearly visible. Two arrays, each being 78 x 38 feet, will be almost 6000 sq. ft. of gleaming glass and aluminum on the slope, which will be highly visible all year round. Sec. XV of the Rural Character Ordinance expresses the objective to “preserve and maintain Hollis scenic vistas and rural character, particularly as seen from public roads”. Solar arrays are industrial, not rural. The Rural Character Ordinance also

125 states it “would eliminate the siting of new construction on or near the crest of
126 prominent hilltops and ridges, particularly as seen from public roads.” This
127 proposal is contrary to the ordinance and changes the rural character of the road.
128 For these reasons, Mr. Ferlins recommends not allowing this application to go
129 forward. It could also have a potential impact on property values. J. Peters pointed
130 out that it is actually 1,000 sq. ft., not 6,000 sq. ft. The total footprint of the area is
131 78’ x 38’, but the panels are about 1,000 sq. ft. D. Weeks confirmed that the total
132 footprint area is 78’ x 38’, and the area of visible glass is roughly 1,000 sq. ft.

133 Marcia Cone, 94 Dow Road, testified that she has no problem with solar panels, but
134 does have a problem with the proposed buffer, which “does not block anything”. She
135 would feel more comfortable if there was a better buffer, or if the array was relocated
136 to not be visible from the road. She asked if the width includes a stand (yes), and if
137 the panels will move (no).

138 Paul Edmunds, 142 Dow Road, testified that he walks Dow Road about 5x/week. He
139 noted that the array will be right in the middle of the hill and totally visible from the
140 road, and from a viewscape perspective; it will not add to the bucolic feel that
141 currently exists on Dow Road, one of the few rural roads in Hollis that still exists.

142 Lorin Rydstrom, 106 and 124 Dow Road, testified that he owns about 1800’ across
143 the street. He noted that the hedgerow gets very thin on the south end, and if the
144 intent of the ordinance is to block the visual presentation of the field, that hedgerow
145 “doesn’t do it”.

146 Beth Reynolds, 92 Dow Road, agreed with previous statements regarding the
147 inadequacy of the existing hedgerow. She asked how the panels will be installed and
148 affixed to the ground. Dan Weeks responded that the installation will be affixed
149 with “earth screws”, which are 3” in diameter and about 6’ long. Ms. Reynolds
150 expressed concern about pile driving. D. Weeks responded that he is “almost
151 certain” that will not occur.

152 Judy Lane, 102 Dow Road, testified that she sees the hedgerow outside her window
153 every day. Her concerns are night lighting, screening, possible further installations,
154 will it serve the retail activity on this site, the stream running through the property,
155 possible noise generation if there is pile driving. Have there been any
156 environmental studies? Is this protected habitat? Will this site sell electricity? She
157 stated that she does not support where this is being sited, and hopes there is
158 somewhere else on 50 acres where it could go.

159 Teresa Gartner, 134 Dow Road, testified that she is concerned about the size of the
160 installation and the impact on the beautiful vista, and “doing industrial sized solar
161 installations in rural areas”. She also agrees with everyone who testified that there is
162 no buffer, and she is opposed to this application as currently proposed.

163 Dan Weeks responded that, on an annual basis, the amount of power being
164 generated is a little less than what is consumed on the property. Mr. Weeks agreed
165 that the concerns regarding visibility are legitimate and deferred to the homeowner
166 on this matter. He added that this array is small compared with the Grossman
167 installation on Ridge Road. He confirmed that the project will use earth screws, not
168 driven piles.

169 P. Edmunds asked what percentage of the energy generated will be used to support
170 the commercial kitchen vs. the residential use. D. Weeks responded he does not
171 know because the homeowner receives one bill. The system was built for approx.
172 75% of load, and most of the load will go to the home.

173 There being no further comments, the chairman closed the public hearing, and
174 suggested that the board schedule a site walk. The site walk will take place on Sat.,
175 Nov. 10 at 8:00 AM. J. Peters requested that the applicant stake out the full
176 footprint and the array panel, as well as stakes at the 11' height. C. Rogers asked if it
177 is possible to put up an empty frame at 11' height, adding that he would like to see
178 what it will look like walking up Dow Road. There will need to be something to
179 represent the height at each corner that can be seen from Dow Road. C. Hoffman
180 noted that the board should consider a buffer of non-deciduous trees.

181 D. Cleveland asked if this could be the first phase of several arrays. Mr. Moskun
182 responded that he has no intention to build any more arrays, and that he shrunk the
183 array as low as he could and looked everywhere on the property to find the least
184 visible location. He is trying to do what is best for the environment.

185 The chairman reminded the public that they are welcome to attend the site walk, but
186 no comments or questions will be taken at that time. D. Cleveland made a motion to
187 continue File 2018-18 to the Nov. 13, 2018 PB meeting. The motion was seconded
188 by J. Peters and unanimously approved.

189

190 **c. File PB2018:21:** Proposed lot line relocation between two adjoining lots,
191 Owner/applicant: George & Gloria Burton, 154 Proctor Hill Road, Map 12, Lots 18 & 18-1,
192 Zoned R/A Residential-Agricultural. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**
193

194 M. Fougere presented this simple plan to relocate the lot line between two adjoining
195 properties. Lot 18-1 will increase from 3.31 to 4.01 acres and Lot 18 is decreasing in
196 size from 4.89 to 4.26 acres. The plan meets all zoning requirements.

197 D. Cleveland presented a motion to accept File PB2018:21 for consideration. The
198 motion was seconded by J. Peters and unanimously approved.

199 Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services, noted that this simple lot line adjustment
200 adds a 55 foot strip to the smaller lot.

201 There were no comments for the public hearing.

202 C. Rogers presented a motion to approve File PB2018:21. Motion seconded by D.
203 Cleveland, and unanimously approved.

204 **d. File 2018:020:** Conceptual Consultation – Proposed minor subdivision of four
205 lots, two served by a private way. Owner/Applicant: Tom & Kim Lawlor, 140
206 Pepperell Road, Map 3 Lot 26, Zoned R/A Residential Agricultural. **Public**
207 **Hearing.**
208

209 M. Fougere presented plans for a four-lot minor subdivision with three back lots.
210 The four lots will be 4, 5.5, 6.3 and 5.1 acres respectively. One lot has an existing
211 single family home; compliant building boxes are shown for all lots. Access will be
212 provided by a common drive, and some buffer disturbance will be required. Issues
213 to consider: stump location or how they will be removed; how will rural character be
214 addressed; waiver to allow four homes on one common driveway; common access
215 and maintenance agreement; name for common driveway; grading and design of
216 common drive; State subdivision and NH DOT driveway approval; underground
217 utilities; fire cistern fee of \$7,500 per lot at time of building permit; drainage design
218 to be reviewed by town engineer; acceptable buildable land calculations for each lot.

219 Kevin Anderson, Meridian Land Services, distributed colored plans to board
220 members, and pointed out that the site is in South Hollis very close to the Mass. line.
221 In the interest of full disclosure, Mr. Anderson indicated that he is a neighbor and
222 friend of the Lawlors. He presented plans for a 4-lot minor subdivision; the existing
223 house will be retained on a 5.1 acre parcel, with three new lots of 4, 5.5 and 6.3 acres.
224 Mr. Anderson requested that the Board schedule a site walk for this project. The
225 total parcel is 20.9 acres and there are several wetland areas which somewhat
226 dictate the house locations. The challenge was to provide access to the lots. Mr.
227 Anderson indicated that he will be designing driveways for each lot, but will be
228 requesting a waiver for a common driveway, which will follow the existing driveway
229 location. The site is heavily wooded and the houses will not be visible from the road.
230 He indicated that he has been in communication with the Conservation Commission
231 regarding possible wetland impacts and buffer encroachments.

232 There were no comments for the public hearing. The Board scheduled a site walk
233 for Sat., Nov. 10, 2018 to begin at approx. 8:45-9:00 AM. J. Peters presented a
234 motion to continue File 2018:020 to the Nov. 13, 2018 Planning Board meeting. The
235 motion was seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved.

236 K. Anderson requested permission to skip the design review phase and move
237 forward with a formal submission. Board members agreed that this is a reasonable
238 request for this application, and Mr. Anderson could proceed with a formal
239 submission.

240

241 **e. File PB2018:022:** Conceptual Consultation – Site Plan outlining the proposed
242 construction of 30 units of detached Housing for Older Persons, Hollis Springs Active Adult
243 Community, Owner/Applicant: James Prieto, James Seely, 436 SLR, LLC & Silver Lake Flea
244 Market, LLC. Map 46 Lots 6 & 10, Map 45 Lot 51, 436-436A-441-445-447-449 Silver lake
245 Road. Zoned A/B Agriculture Business & R/A Residential Agricultural. **Public Hearing.**
246

247 M. Fougere summarized this proposal to construct 30 single family detached elderly
248 housing units on the site of the current flea market. The applicant was granted a
249 variance to allow for use of the property across the street from the main site in order
250 to comply with the 20 acre lot size. All existing buildings will be removed and an
251 existing single family home may remain on the site to be used as one of the units. 24
252 units are proposed on the east side and 6 units on the west side.

253 Mr. Fougere summarized the issues:

254 -The density calculation shall be added to the plan. (done).

255 -The east lot will be considered Lot 6 and a lot consolidation plan will be required

256 -Building types/elevations shall be submitted.

257 -Rural character ordinance (homes are very close to Rt. 122).

258 -Open space details shall be shown, along with all impervious areas.

259 -Possibility of Pennichuck Water Works providing public water via a water line that
260 currently exists in Amherst. The Fire Department is in favor of this. An on-site well
261 will be required if public water is not installed.

262 -State subdivision approval along with NHDOT access permit. NH AOT permit shall
263 be required,

264 -Underground utilities

265 -Snow storage areas.

266 -Possible studies required – Environmental, Traffic, Wildlife, Fiscal, Visual &
267 Historic

268 -Review by town engineer and landscaping expert. Full drainage analysis.

269 -Determination of Regional Impact.

270 Robert Baskerville, Bedford Design Consultants, discussed plans to consolidate the 6
271 lots. There are 21.7 acres total with 5.9 acres of floodplain or wetland in the area
272 abutting Witches Brook and about half an acre of steep slope, for a total of 15.4 net
273 useable acres. Two units per acre are proposed. Wetlands have been flagged and
274 test pits are done on the east side. There are deep sands that are very well drained;
275 the soils are almost perfect for a development like this. The topo is excellent and no
276 major cuts and fills will be needed. The homes will be about 30 ft. apart. This is a
277 “full service” over 55 development. People will own their own homes, and the
278 association will plow the roads and driveways, shovel the walkways, mow the lawns.
279 Every house will have a landscaping package. Existing structures will be removed,
280 with the exception on one house that may be worked into the development. The
281 homes will all be two-bedroom with two car garages. Mr. Baskerville distributed
282 copies of three possible house designs. Homes will be in the 1600 to 2400 sq. ft.
283 range.

284 B. Moseley asked if the applicant would consider having some duplexes. Mr.
285 Baskerville responded that they have considered duplexes, and they are flexible on
286 the design. A DOT permit will be required, and the applicant will defer to the State
287 on the best locations for the curb cuts. Every house will have its own septic tank and
288 there will probably be two houses per septic field. The association will pump the
289 tanks once or twice a year. There is a wooded buffer to the rear of the property and
290 extensive landscaping is proposed along the road. Some of the existing trees may be
291 maintained but the tall pines will probably be removed. The applicant would prefer
292 to not do open drainage, and is proposing bituminous Cape Cod berms along the
293 front. The front yards will slope gently towards the road. There will be interior
294 lighting for the road. An AOT permit will be required. The site is in the Aquifer
295 Protection Overlay Zone, but the design is at about 24% impervious now, which will
296 be reduced. There will also be infiltration ponds. There will be no wetland
297 disturbance. The plan currently shows wells, with a maximum of 24 people per well.
298 The Summerfield development just over the Amherst line has Pennichuck water.
299 Pennichuck would like to supply water to this development, but they would need to
300 submit a letter to the PUC asking for a limited franchise for just this development.
301 They would prefer a letter of support (or neutrality) from the Town of Hollis to
302 accompany their request to the PUC, and the applicant requests the Planning
303 Board’s assistance in this.

304 There could be paved or stone dust sidewalks in the development. The ZBA asked
305 the applicant to consider putting all the houses on one side of the road, and the
306 applicant is willing to consider this. If the connection to Pennichuck is approved, it
307 may be possible to put some duplexes in the back of the property. This will provide
308 a mix of styles and prices.

309 Questions from the Board. B. Moseley – Will there be an irrigation system? R.
 310 Baskerville: Not sure; will check with the applicant. B. Moseley: Will there be a
 311 cistern? R. Baskerville: Yes – there will be one cistern. M. Fougere added that the
 312 Fire Chief fully supports, and prefers, the Pennichuck water. B. Moseley: Will there
 313 be a clubhouse? R. Baskerville: Right now there is just a gazebo shown, but a small
 314 meeting building is a possibility. B. Moseley: How do you propose people safely
 315 getting across Rt. 122 from one side to the other? When the current flea market is in
 316 operation there are two police officers, and even then it is a “tedious” situation. R.
 317 Baskerville offered to talk to the DOT regarding the possibility of a painted
 318 crosswalk or some type of signage. B. Moseley: What would you prefer to safeguard
 319 the safety of the residents? R. Baskerville: My preference would be Pennichuck
 320 water and all units on one side of the road. C. Hoffman: Will there be private roads?
 321 R. Baskerville: Yes. J. Peters: Where is snow storage? R. Baskerville: Not shown
 322 yet, nor is a location for stump storage. Stumps and any building debris will most
 323 likely be trucked off site. J. Peters: There is another project nearby that has over 50
 324 units on one well; why is that not shown here? M. Fougere explained that if it is over
 325 25 homes there can be a community well. If this project goes with the wells, the
 326 board may want to consider some type of study. R. Baskerville: If we go with a
 327 community well, the design will have to be redone. It is not very cost effective on a
 328 small project. R. Hardy asked if the applicant would consider taking some of the
 329 homes from the east side of the property and putting them on the west side of the
 330 property. R. Baskerville: Yes. J. Hardy: This is because you will have a difficult
 331 time meeting the requirements of the rural character ordinance with the density of
 332 homes along the road as currently shown. D. Cleveland: With respect to the closed
 333 drainage system, where will the water be drained to? R. Baskerville: Design is not
 334 complete, but it will probably go to the low areas. Due to the soils, he may have to
 335 add something to slow the drainage down. You will only see standing water for a
 336 short time, even after a heavy storm. Mr. Baskerville concluded by asking if they can
 337 maintain the granite posts along the front of the site. He agreed to supply modified
 338 sample building plans once they become available. He noted that the requirement
 339 that everyone be over 55 will be written into the homeowners documents. Board
 340 members agreed to add this property to the list of site walks for Nov. 10; they will
 341 decide on the appropriate studies after the site walk.

342

343 The chairman opened the floor to public comments. Leo Cormier, 451 Silver Lake
 344 Road, testified that there is an existing fence on the north side of the property that
 345 shields the flea market from his property. Mr. Cormier stated that he plans to put
 346 up a solid white pvc fence. He expressed concern that there will be “wanderers” in
 347 this development, and they may wander onto his property. He requested that the
 348 entire subject property be fenced for everyone’s protection and safety. Mr. Cormier
 349 noted that he is required to put trees 10’ apart on the entire area of his new garage.

350 The trees at the proposed site stop at the leachfields. Mr. Cormier suggested moving
351 the leachfields back from the setbacks. He asked if there had been a traffic study.
352 He suggested that there be turning lane to enter the site as well as a median strip at
353 the entrances so the traffic gets diverted to two lanes, and then narrows to one.
354 Vertical curb should be installed. There should be a sidewalk on Rt. 122, as well as a
355 crossing light with a warning light about ¼ mile away. The proposed 20' road is too
356 narrow to accommodate emergency vehicles. Vertical curb is needed on the entire
357 site. If there are propane tanks, will they be shielded? Will there be a new fence
358 along the front of the properties on both sides of the road? If Pennichuck water is
359 provided, will houses along the way to the site be hooked up? What about salt?

360 Greg Marand, Omni Environmental, appeared on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Cormier,
361 and raised several areas of environmental concern:

362 -Drainage areas – What are the volumes at the four areas? How will the Aquifer
363 Protection Overlay Zone and private wells be protected? Proposed well #1 in the
364 northern area of the property on the east side of the road is down gradient and close
365 to a proposed drainage area.

366 -On site water supply – What studies will be done to show that these wells will not
367 have a negative impact on the aquifer, and to determine if a community well might
368 be more suitable.

369 -How will long term runoff from the impervious areas be managed? How will
370 potential contaminants be removed prior to discharge to the aquifer? The number
371 of stormseptors should be of concern to the board.

372 -Concerns regarding septic systems in the aquifer.

373 -There is some evidence of solid waste and landfilling at the site –how will this be
374 managed?

375 -Will an environmental impact assessment be required?

376 -Is a wildlife habitat inventory warranted?

377 -Assessment of any potential damage to the aquifer as a result of the development.

378 -Property has a 50 year history of use as a flea market with the potential for storage
379 or use of potential contaminants. Will a Phase I environmental assessment be
380 required?

381 Mr. Baskerville then responded to issues raised by Mr. Cormier and his
382 representative. Plans are to maintain a fence between the property and the abutter;
383 however, fencing the entire property is not consistent with the rural character
384 ordinance and not necessary. Location of septics and trees is flexible. The applicant

is open to a traffic study. The NH DOT has jurisdiction regarding turning lanes. A median in the entrance is definitely under consideration. The applicant is open to a 22' wide road. There will be no above ground propane tanks. The applicant will do everything possible to beautify the site.

The board set a site walk for Sat., Nov. 10 at 10:00 AM. J. Peters presented a motion to find File 2018:022 to be a development of potential regional impact. The motion was seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved. Staff will notify Amherst and NRPC at the design review stage. C. Rogers moved to table File #2018:022 to the site walk of Nov. 10, 2018 and the meeting of Nov. 13, 2018. Motion seconded by J. Peters and unanimously approved.

- f. File #2018:19.** Conceptual Consultation – Brookdale Site Plan amendment detailing proposed storage buildings 13,000 s. ft., 3,200 sq. ft., 14,635 sq. ft. and 3,375 sq. ft. seasonal housing building. 38 Broad Street, Map 24 Lot 2, Zoned A? Agricultural Business. **Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere summarized this plan for Brookdale Fruit Farm for a series of building expansions for storage and seasonal worker housing. The area to be used is currently an apple orchard. The three proposed storage buildings are 3,200, 12,250 and 13,000 sq. ft. The new seasonal worker housing building is 3,400 sq. ft. A new access drive is proposed, which will enter on the west side and loop around to the east. The improvements are well off Broad Street, behind the existing storage/office buildings.

Issues include:

- Historic District review
- Drainage plan and analysis will be required.
- Special studies – historic, visual, fiscal & traffic?
- Concerns relative to rural character
- Does the Planning Board want to do a site walk?

Rick Hardy stepped down from the board and approached the podium on behalf of Brookdale Farm. Mr. Hardy explained that this is a phased development on a small portion of a 100+ acre parcel. Brookdale is increasing production and farming more land and this is a plan to accommodate future growth. The primary use is storage of materials and equipment. This will not include any pesticides or herbicides; there is already a separate containment building for this use. B. Moseley asked how many seasonal workers there are. R. Hardy responded that there are 38 now (Ed. Note:

421 later corrected by R. Hardy to be 33). He added that he wants to be sure there is
422 plenty of room to accommodate stormwater and septic.

423 Project engineer, Kevin Anderson, Meridian Land Services, explained that this is not
424 an increase in use, but a better use of space and more indoor storage. It will also
425 better organize circulation within the site. There is currently a single loading dock,
426 which is quite chaotic early in the morning. This plan will bring this activity to the
427 rear of the property and better organize circulation. A loading dock will provide
428 access to different sections. There will be a large building for equipment storage,
429 and a much better circulation path. There will be a larger building for seasonal
430 worker housing. Building sizes are not exact at this point. The site has manmade
431 ditches and ponds. There is a low function wetland that is an active agricultural
432 field and this wetland will be impacted to some degree. The applicant will be
433 meeting with the Conservation Commission as well as State agencies. Everything
434 will make sense when the board sees it on the site walk.

435 J. Peters: Will the storage pond be similar to the one on the northern side of the
436 property? K. Anderson: Yes – with some additional depth and wetland species.
437 B. Moseley asked about the timeline. R. Hardy responded that it will take several
438 years, with the storage buildings being the primary objective and the secondary
439 being the worker housing. K. Anderson concluded by stating that it will not be very
440 visible from Broad Street.

441 The board agreed that a site walk would be appropriate, and set one for Nov. 10 at
442 approx. 11:00 AM. J. Peters presented a motion to table File 2018:022 to the site
443 walk of Nov. 10 and the planning board meeting of Nov. 13, 2018. Motion seconded
444 by C. Rogers and unanimously approved.

445 **g. OTHER BUSINESS – Review Draft Master Plan Chapter II – Housing and**
446 **Population.**
447

448 Stephen Meno of NRPC appeared before the board to review the latest draft of the
449 Housing and Population of the Master Plan. Text was kept to a minimum and the
450 data speaks for itself. Figs. 5 & 6 have been adjusted to be more user friendly. Table
451 10 is updated to conform with town building dept. data. The only outstanding item
452 is data from the school district. M. Fougere noted that this data will also be included
453 in the Facilities chapter. S. Meno asked if there is anything the board wants to add
454 to the recommendations. This is the last chapter that NRPC will be doing. C.
455 Hoffman stated that the chapter looks good. M. Fougere added that the
456 recommendations capture conversations from the past several years. Building
457 permits should be monitored on an annual basis. He will be sitting down with the
458 school dept in anticipation of doing the facilities chapter. The Master Plan should
459 ideally be updated every 10 years. The last update was 1998, and much of this plan

is “still robust”. S. Meno recommended that this chapter be updated after the 2020 census. He will write up a conclusion paragraph.

h. OTHER BUSINESS – Tree Removal on Snow Lane

M. Fougere discussed the situation on Snow Lane with respect to tree removal. The Planning Board was concerned about removal of several maple trees. The resident at 2 Snow Lane says there are 2 trees that are dead and should come down. Doug Gagne, the board’s landscaping consultant, recommends keeping one of the trees. M. Fougere requested that the board discuss this at the next meeting and decide on a course of action.

i. ADJOURN. There being no further business, J. Peters made a non-debatable motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Mills

Interim Planning Assistant

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510 -

511