

## HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 19th, 2016

“FINAL”

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Doug Gagne - Chairman, Cathy Hoffman – Vice Chairman, Doug Cleveland, R. Hardy, Brian Stelmack, Chet Rogers, and David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen, Dan Turcott – Alternate.

**ABSENT:**

**STAFF:** Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Wendy Trimble – Planning Secretary

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The Chairman Doug Gagne called the meeting to Order at 7:00 pm.

D. Gagne opened the meeting firstly noting the new table and then announcing this would be his last meeting as a member of the Planning Board.

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

D. Cleveland moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Motion seconded by D. Petry. 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** – File #2781, Federal Hill Estates; File #2785, 101 Federal Hill Road; Sheet six for 4 Lot subdivision Merrill Lane, this application was recorded with only five sheets and the sixth was missed.

**File #2781 – Federal Hill Estates**

C. Hoffman made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the plan. D. Cleveland seconded. D. Petry abstained. All in favor none opposed.

**File #2785 – 101 Federal Hill Road**

C. Hoffman made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the plan. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

**File – Merrill Lane (Map 13 Lot 68 Woods Subdivision)** – M. Fougere explained that this application was recorded in 2007 and was a 6 sheet Mylar, however only 5 mylars were recorded. This was noticed recently and now the 6<sup>th</sup> Mylar needs to be recorded.

C. Hoffman made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the plan. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

5. **Election of Officers:**

D. Gagne decided this would be postponed until the next Planning Board Meeting in May to give everyone a chance to decide if they wished to become Chairman or not.

**6. File #2806** – Proposed site plan amendment for the Hollis Montessori School to expand occupancy of the school from 120 students to 200, increase staff, expand the number of parking spaces and improve traffic circulation, 9 South Merrimack Road, Map 36 Lot 32, **Application acceptance and Public Hearing**

M. Fougere started by explaining the Hollis Montessori School, when constructed, was built to accommodate a total student population of 200 and 25 staff, but was only approved for 120 students and 10 staff. This application requests approval to allow for the full student build out of the facility.

At present the school starts between 8-8:30 and ends at 3 pm. The increase in students and staff will occur over a 7 – 8 year period. Onsite parking will increase from 22 spaces to 43, with 14 of these spaces gravel. The parking regulations require a range of 42-45 spaces. The gravel spaces will be located parallel to the access drive (8) and down by the bunkhouse (6). To address a concern regarding cars queuing out onto South Merrimack Road during the afternoon pickup time; a new traffic pattern is being proposed. If vehicles queue from the front door back towards the entrance, cars will then be directed down to the bunkhouse area and use a new loop driveway to return to the main school building to pick up students.

M. Fougere also explained that staff had become aware that the Applicant would like to use the bunkhouse as classrooms for grades 7-9. The building was approved for uses such as art projects, pottery, and woodworking in 2012. The number of classrooms, staff, etc, will use the bunkhouse building should be added to this site plan to fully outline the use on the property.

The Town's septic consultant has also recommended the engineer verify that the existing bunkhouse septic system is adequate for the existing and proposed uses. If that is not possible, then a new septic plan must be developed and approved. This system would not have to be installed until such time there are indications that the existing system is not functioning properly. We are waiting a letter from the engineer verifying the existing system serving the bunkhouse is adequate.

The Police department and Fire department were consulted.

The recommendations from the Fire Chief, Rick Towne, were;

- a) The Lane edge closest to the building shall be at least 10' from the building
- b) The cul-de-sac turnaround shall have a minimum centerline radius of 50ft
- c) The lane shall be able to withstand a live load of our heaviest fire apparatus, 45000 GVW
- d) The lane shall have no parking on either side
- e) No vegetation shall be planted that will exceed 13' in height within 15' of the cul-de-sac turnaround

The recommendations from the Chief of Police was there would be a need to be make changes to the loading and unloading process if the enrollment level ever reached the level permitted by the septic system. It would be important for the school to revisit traffic patterns should congestion occur.

Earle Blatchford, Hayner-Swanson, approached the podium. Although M. Fougere had covered most of the points in his summary, he proceeded to explain by using a colored plan, to show all the proposed extra parking spaces, where the road would be widened, and how and when the traffic would be directed towards the bunk house.

- 93 D. Gagne asked for clarification on the Fire Chief request, to have no parking on either side of the  
94 lane to the bunk house. M. Fougere explained that whilst the bunk house was being used there was  
95 to be no parking along the lane that would block it. The six parking spaces outside the bunk house  
96 would be available, and the Fire Chief would like signage to say no parking along the lane.
- 97 C. Hoffman asked if it would remain gravel. E. Blatchford said it may be top dressed. C. Hoffman  
98 also asked if a traffic survey was going to be done. There had been no request for a traffic survey. R.  
99 Hardy agreed it would be very beneficial that traffic study is done as the South Merrimack Road has  
100 become very busy during drop off. The Planning Board all agreed it was needed. D. Petry requested  
101 that the traffic study be done in two areas, and it includes speed also.
- 102 D. Cleveland asked if there were any future plans to pave the lane to the bunkhouse. Frank  
103 Grossman approached the podium to explain there are no current plans to pave. They had checked  
104 with the Fire Department and they were ok with the proposed traffic flow, and as it is a natural area,  
105 they had decided to keep it natural with gravel and the Fire Department was ok with this. D.  
106 Cleveland said he raised it because if they intended to pave it later why not do it now. So from this it  
107 will be left gravel. F. Grossman confirmed there are no plans to pave.
- 108 At this point, D. Gagne pointed out that in the letter dated March 21<sup>st</sup> 2016 from Hayner/Swanson, it  
109 stated that “in addition of the gravel parking spaces, and topdressing the existing gravel driveway  
110 shouldn’t change the peak rate of runoff from the current condition”. From this C. Hoffman said that  
111 if they decided to pave then they would need to address the ‘*drainage collection system and outfalls*’  
112 for further runoff with a Stormwater Management Report.
- 113 D. Petry asked for the present number of students attending the school. Kari Hedington stated there  
114 are 116. The number of families that this involved was answered by the schools representative.  
115 Currently they work out that they have 1.5 students per family and she confirmed they have grades  
116 Age 3 to Grade 9. They have two staggered start times, one from 8-8:15 and the other 8:15-8:30.  
117 When she spoke with the Police Chief it was an option to have further staggering start times if  
118 needed. D. Petry suggested we wait until after the traffic study to look at this further but they may  
119 well need to readdress their staggered start times to be allowed their full capacity.
- 120 D. Gagne had omitted to ask if this application was complete and if there were any waivers required.  
121 M. Fougere confirmed it was complete with no waivers required. C. Hoffman moved to accept file  
122 #2806 for consideration. C. Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.
- 123 C. Hoffman asked about the septic system for the bunkhouse and a need to have it reviewed. E.  
124 Blatchford confirmed they had found through an archive search the operation permit. They have  
125 looked at it and they believe they will use about one third of the capacity. Tom Mercurio is aware,  
126 and he wanted confirmation that the system can handle this. They have discussed this and he has  
127 been copied in with the results.
- 128 B. Stelmack raised a concern that the person directing traffic was only going to be doing this for  
129 pickup and maybe it should also include drop offs in the morning also.
- 130 D. Cleveland also requested that the leach field for the bunkhouse septic be detailed onto the plan. E.  
131 Blatchford confirmed that would be done.
- 132 C. Rogers asked at 200 students would they be maxed out on the building or the septic system. E.  
133 Blatchford confirmed that the septic had been designed for 225 people (200 students and 25 staff).

134 This was to serve the main two buildings. The bunkhouse has a separate system. So yes they would  
135 be maxed out. C. Rogers also asked if the queue system did not work had they considered adding a  
136 second entrance to the left of the main one. Frank Grossman said they had not considered this but  
137 the traffic report should deal with any further queries on traffic.

138 D. Gagne opened the Public Hearing.

139 Paula Papineau, 21 South Merrimack Road, approached the podium. She was joined at the meeting  
140 by her husband Scott Papineau. She began by stating her concerns with the traffic issues, saying a  
141 lot of traffic comes down Silver Lake Road taking the hairpin turn onto South Merrimack Road  
142 where there is a lack of signage to warn drivers on the approaching school. There has already been  
143 one fairly bad accident involving a parent and child and resulting in them being taken to hospital.  
144 She said it would be interesting to see the results of a traffic survey on how much increase in traffic  
145 has occurred.

146 D. Gagne noted there was an email on file from the Police Chief.

147 P. Papineau continued and said that during the initial application for the building of the school, they  
148 had met with representatives from the school to raise their concerns regarding noise, traffic,  
149 aesthetics of property and the impact on their property values. They were assured all their concerns  
150 would be addressed. This has not been the case. Having read the application documents, it appears  
151 to her, the total numbers of students enrolled at the school are over the agreed limit. There was also  
152 to be no afterschool activities. However, regularly children can be heard playing after 3pm, creating  
153 a noise issue and she has to keep windows shut at her property. She had been told that a buffer of  
154 vegetation would be planted after the apple trees were taken down to create this buffer. There was a  
155 landscape plan submitted to adhere to the Rural Character Ordinance and nothing has been done to  
156 improve the landscaping. The planting done is subpar and extremely inadequate. Now the school is  
157 proposing to do afterschool activities, summer programs and sleepovers at nights in the bunkhouse  
158 but this will impact the quality of life for the abutter. She also stated that recess times appear to be  
159 longer than originally stated. She questioned who enforces the conditions of zoning as they need to  
160 be held accountable. Both she and her husband strongly object to the proposal because all the issues  
161 raised will only get twice as bad.

162 She summarized her thoughts by stating the traffic needs to be addressed even if this new proposal  
163 doesn't get approved. And the owners need to take responsibility for the landscaping. The building  
164 was supposed to be one storey high and it looks to be one and half stories high. The original old  
165 building was not visible from her property however this new building is very visible. This is a small  
166 issue but is part of a number of issues that have occurred on this site along with not adhering to  
167 zoning ordinances.

168 D. Gagne stated that any site plan that comes before the Planning Board will have certain conditions  
169 attached to it that are expected to adhere to. However, the Planning Board has no enforcement  
170 capability. D. Petry explained there is a Code Enforcement Officer at the Town Hall. He said he  
171 would send him to the school to check out the violations now we have been made aware. He also  
172 pointed out there are formal complaint forms available online.

173 Michael Bates, 26 South Merrimack Road approached the podium. He has two concerns. The first  
174 concern is traffic. By his calculations the increase in students would increase the traffic 70%. He is  
175 concerned with the proposed stacking of cars and the turnoff is at a 90° angle, causing traffic to come  
176 to almost a standstill. Traffic now includes large vehicles such as Fed-ex delivery trucks and there is

177 a lot more traffic using the South Merrimack Road as a cut through. He raised a concern over the  
178 liability to the town. The traffic study will be very important as having lived on the road for 18  
179 years; he has seen a huge increase in traffic.

180 He commented that the landscaping is very poor and is a disservice to the area and the town. This,  
181 he feels, needs to be improved and asked what the town is going to do to enforce the original  
182 landscape plans.

183 Cherlyn Lynch, 16 South Merrimack Road, approached the podium next. Her concern is primarily  
184 to protect their property rights and preserve their property values. She is motivated to help their  
185 neighborhood. However the landscaping is an issue as the planting is not what had been shown on  
186 the plan. Noise is another issue and there is regularly activity after 3pm with children playing  
187 outside. An expansion of hours will definitely cause problems for neighbors as they work from  
188 home in older buildings leaving them no alternative but to keep their windows shut.

189 D. Gagne closed the public hearing.

190 M. Fougere summarized all the concerns raised by the abutter and residents. R. Hardy asked why  
191 the initial traffic survey was so inadequate and we need to make sure this next one is much better,  
192 and covers more than one day. D. Petry asked a few questions regarding the enrollment rate. D.  
193 Gagne stated that some confusion may have been caused by the documents supplied as there were  
194 differing numbers on student increases.

195 D. Petry asked about the bonding for the landscaping. He recalled based on installation and going on  
196 for one year, the bond was released, as at the moment there is no bonding, and the landscape has not  
197 improved since it was installed.

198 M. Fougere said all the plants and trees etc that were supposed to be planted, were planted, and that  
199 he recalls both Rick and Doug going out to look at the trees but as far as it is, it is not a golf club  
200 front lawn.

201 D. Petry said it has not been maintained and the problem begins when plans are presented at the  
202 beginning of the application they are showing them at full grown growth 'x' number of years out,  
203 and they are nowhere near that 7 years later. It should look better and this will need to be addressed  
204 as part of this revision.

205 C. Hoffman read the zoning conditions as:

- 206       • The Board is concerned regarding the potential number of students that this site could  
207       accommodate. The Board recommends that the Planning Board issue suitable restrictions  
208       and limitations concerning the number of students.  
209       • No after school or weekend teaching activities and all main school activities shall occur  
210       between the hours of 8 am and 3 pm.  
211

212 D. Gagne stated he needed the applicant to confirm what extra expansion is being requested. R.  
213 Hardy added the information needs to be accurate and there needs to be a commitment to  
214 maintenance.

215 D. Cleveland asked for more information on the landscaping and what should be done.  
216

217 M. Fougere stated the traffic survey needs to include accident history.

218

219 Kari Hedington applicant wanted to clarify a few things and the public objected as they had not been  
220 allowed to speak twice. D. Gagne explained that any further statements or comments should be  
221 submitted to the Planning staff via a letter or email

222

223 Kari Hedington addressed the concerns of the hours of operation. The noise from children after 3pm  
224 would most likely be children of staff who are still working. This may be upwards of eight children  
225 and she would look into this.

226 She also confirmed there are two community based clubs which are not part of the school. They are  
227 indoor activities one of which is a Robotics club. She confirmed that part of the proposal was  
228 requesting sleepovers.

229

230 D. Gagne confirmed they would need to go back to zoning as this and the pickup times fall outside  
231 of 3pm restriction. A lot more detail is needed for this application, for the Planning Board to  
232 consider. Information needs to include days, times, frequency, number of kids, how often and nature  
233 of the activity.

234

235 D. Cleveland made a motion to continue file #2806 to May 17<sup>th</sup> 2016. C. Rogers seconded. All in  
236 favor none opposed.

237

238 D. Petry confirmed to the public the email to send further comments to is [planning@hollisnh.org](mailto:planning@hollisnh.org)

239

240

241 **7. 80-82 Richardson Road:** Request from residents living on a private way off Richardson Road to  
242 waive provisions of the Subdivision Regulations: Section IV.7 Road and Driveway Standards, C2;  
243 naming private drives serving more than two homes per E-911 requirements and Section H. Design  
244 Standards for Driveways; private way serving more than two homes. Subdivision approval was in  
245 1991.

246 M. Fougere explained this is a three lot project that was approved in 1991. Two properties were  
247 constructed and Lot 36-2 has been vacant since then. During the approval time the applicant and  
248 engineer was asked how these lots were going to be accessed. His response per minutes dated  
249 February 5, 1991 stated that lot 36-1 would not be accessed from the existing driveway. This lot  
250 would be accessed directly from Richardson Road as even at this point they would have needed a  
251 waiver to access more than two lots off a private way and this would have involved naming the  
252 private way. So the accesses for the two existing properties were made off the private way and have  
253 remained so since. However, the third lot has now been sold and now as the construction of a third  
254 property begins but has to adhere to our Subdivision regulations. The applicant has been to the  
255 Selectmen meeting and they have directed them to us. Accordingly our subdivision regulations have  
256 a couple of provisions that need to be addressed. Private ways can have two lots but any more needs  
257 a waiver, and any more than two properties on the private way needs to be named by a street name, a  
258 policy for a number of years to meet emergency E-911 requirements. The applicant is here tonight  
259 to request a waiver to allow three homes on a private way and also not to name the street. They are  
260 all agreed to install a sign to indicate where the homes are.

261 D. Cleveland asked if the two existing properties are both on the private way as opposed to what was  
262 originally proposed. M. Fougere agreed although it was not stipulated on the plan. Today we would  
263 be more thorough.

264  
265 D. Gagne asked when the naming of private ways come into play. No one knew – this needs to be  
266 clarified. He also wanted confirmation that Lot 36-2 has the correct amount of frontage. Yes it does.  
267  
268 R. Hardy stated he was in favor of Richardson Road because it was approved years ago. This was an  
269 oversight by the Building Department. M. Fougere explained that staff cannot make this decision; it  
270 has to be the Planning Board decision. D. Cleveland agreed with R. Hardy. D. Turcott wanted to  
271 confirm there is no further expansion beyond Lot 36-2. There is not. Also the police department and  
272 the fire department are ok with it.  
273  
274 D. Petry wanted it to be clear there is a safety issue and he has a concern with this. And these  
275 waivers are being requested purely to avoid people changing their address. He wanted it noted that  
276 this is an unusual case and the result of the building department's oversight. He is not opposed to it.  
277  
278 D. Gagne stated it makes sense to grant it 'specifically' as two houses have been there for a number  
279 of years and if it can be resolved with signage and emergency services are ok with it. D Petry stated  
280 this is a unique case and we are not setting a precedent for future cases. D. Turcott asked if there  
281 should be any clarification on sign visibility during snow fall. D. Petry asked the residents what  
282 happens now during snow storms. Tom Hickman, 80 Richardson Road, explained to the Board  
283 where the snow is plowed. The residents agreed they do already plow and will continue to plow  
284 their own driveways from the triangle back. He has several granite 8ft tall pieces to indicate from  
285 any direction where each house is. He also proposes to put one further on the drive to indicate where  
286 the new property is. D. Gagne wanted to know how long it will take to put these granite posts up.  
287 He wanted it to be a condition that the CO will not be issued unless the granite markers are installed.  
  
288 D. Cleveland made a motion to grant the requested waivers subject to a granite monument being  
289 erected prior to Certificate of Occupancy being issued for 84 Richardson Road. C. Hoffman  
290 seconded. All in favor none opposed.  
  
291 8. Ms. Stephanie Jackson, **179 South Merrimack Road**: Request for a waiver to add a third curb cut  
292 to an existing single family property; site currently served by a horseshoe driveway.  
  
293 M. Fougere explained that our subdivision regulations stipulate only one driveway per home. On  
294 this property this driveway has a circular driveway with a telephone pole and wire in the centre  
295 circle. The homeowner has a horse trailer and struggles on this busy road to park her trailer. She  
296 would like to install a third driveway to enable her to pull her trailer easily and safely. DPW have no  
297 issues with this and has checked the site distance.  
  
298 D. Gagne asked about the parking area as drawn on the photograph. What prevents her to pull in as  
299 it is as it appears flat? Doug Orde, here representing the applicant, explained it is clear to use but has  
300 a steep drop, and it needs gravel to help build up the area next to the road to help her with access.  
  
301 B. Stelmack asked what is opposite this area, would another driveway be proposed directly opposite.  
302 It was stated there is a lot for sale and any driveway for that would used for this lot would be further  
303 down the road.  
  
304 C. Rogers asked if the applicant would give up one of the other curb cuts. D. Orde suggested that  
305 would not help. The pole may be able to be repositioned but it would be complicated.

306 R. Hardy asked for dimensions. D. Orde suggested 35 ft radius. R. Hardy asked for an accurate plan  
307 with dimensions. This will help explain why we are considering this proposal. It would also help  
308 the neighbors understand the need for this. This can be done as a condition.

309 D. Petry said this was a unique case with concerns over safety and site distance, and not setting a  
310 precedent. The Planning Board is asking for the applicant to provide an accurate plan scaling the  
311 dimensions of the access and turnaround.

312 R. Hardy after consideration over safety and site distance, made a motion to approve the waiver  
313 request to add a third curb cut, with a condition that the applicant provides a plan with accurate  
314 dimensions of the access and turnaround. C. Hoffman seconded. All in favor none opposed.

315 **9. Continued Public Hearing: Subdivision Regulation Amendment**

316 Proposed amendment to Section IV, 8 by adding a new section Visual Impact Implementation

317 M. Fougere explained we had done some word-smithing with a few additions and deletions. This is  
318 to get a new time-tabling to landscaping requirements. R. Hardy and C. Hoffman agreed with the  
319 wording.

320 D. Petry made a motion to approve the proposed amendment to Section VI, 8 of the Subdivision  
321 Regulations, Visual Impact Implementation. C. Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

322 **10. Continued Public Hearing: Site Plan Regulation Amendment**

323 Amend Section IV by adding a new section Ground Mounted Solar Energy Systems.

324 M. Fougere explained we had done some word-smithing with a few additions and deletions. An  
325 addition was made to paragraph one.

326 D. Petry wanted to make sure the language is clear enough for the building department to understand  
327 when they need better drawings. M. Fougere explained that staff has been told that any solar  
328 installation needs to be brought to the Planning Department. He would like the Town administrator  
329 to give the Building department a memo detailing this requirement.

330 R. Hardy would like the sketch to be accurate with dimensions. The requirement needs to be a  
331 scaled drawing appropriate to the size of the project and the lot size.

332 C. Hoffman asked if the structures needed to adhere to setbacks for wetlands etc. M. Fougere  
333 agreed.

334 C. Hoffman made a motion to approve Section IV. 4 as amended by adding a new section Ground  
335 Mounted Solar Energy Systems. D. Petry seconded. All in favor none opposed.

336 **11. Other Business**

337 Review application fee requirements for Solar Energy cases; consider reducing site plan fee from  
338 \$100 to \$50.

339 After a short discussion it was agreed to leave the fees as they are.



340 D. Petry in recognition of his year service he presented D. Gagne with a certificate from the Board of  
341 Selectmen.

342

343 C. Hoffman made a non debatable motion to adjourn the meeting. B. Stelmack seconded. All in  
344 favor none opposed.

345 The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM

346

347

348 Respectively submitted by,

349

350

351 Wendy Trimble

352 Planning Secretary

353 Town of Hollis, NH

354