

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 21st, 2016

“FINAL”

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, R. Hardy, Brian Stelmack, Chet Rogers, Dan Turcott and David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen, Benjamin Ming – Alternate, Bill Moseley – Alternate, and Jeff Peters - Alternate.

ABSENT: Cathy Hoffman – Chairman

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The Chairman Doug Cleveland called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

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

W. Trimble explained to the Planning Board that Frank Grossman wanted an amendment made to the minutes reference the cost of the installation of the Ground Mounted Solar Panels. He felt the question was inappropriate and asked for it to be removed from the minutes. However, the members of the Board did not wish to amend the minutes as this was discussed at the meeting and is therefore part of the minutes as recorded and accurate. D. Petry moved to approve the minutes of May 17th, 2016. Motion seconded by R. Hardy. 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** – None

5. **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, Owner/Applicant Hollis Montessori School, R/A Residential Agricultural. Application acceptance – April 19th, 2016 tabled to June 21st.

M. Fougere explained this application came before the board in April and a few concerns were raised by abutters. One concern was traffic, so a traffic analysis was requested. A traffic survey was given to board members last week and the applicant will present the findings of this report. Also, a number of correspondences from abutters have been received and the applicant is dealing with a number of different issues related to the site. With regard to the plan itself staff has 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. Details such as how many classrooms, staff etc will use the bunkhouse building should be added to the site plan to fully outline the use on the property.

M. Fougere stated we had received an email from our septic inspector Tom Mercurio, which confirmed that the existing septic system at the Hollis Montessori School bunkhouse

building and the proposed change of use will meet the Town of Hollis and the State of NH DES Septic Regulations.

A traffic study has been completed and will be presented to the Board this evening and it will get into the detail of traffic flows at pick up and drop of times. M. Fougere also added for consideration that a “school zone” could be considered for this area, which would reduce the speed limit to 20 mph during am/pm drop off and pick up times.

Landscaping has been a concern and there were a few dead apple trees. M. Fougere confirmed he had visited the site today and those apple trees have been replaced. A maintenance plan has been submitted to the board for their consideration.

The plan will also need to address all fire department issues.

The Applicant will be going the ZBA in July to make an Administrative Appeal to the Zoning Board from the Building Inspector’s decision relative to what school related activities can occur on the property. The Applicant hopes to clarify the conditions of approval from their Special Exception approval.

Earle Blatchford from Hayner/Swanson approached the podium as a representative of Hollis Montessori School. He announced that with him tonight were Kari Headington, Head of School; Frank Grossman who is Board of Trustees; Attorney Brad Westgate; and Kevin Dandry Principal traffic consultant with TEC. He also thanked the families for coming along to the meeting to support the proposed improvements to the school.

E. Blatchford explained that they were here looking for an amended site plan, proposing to add 21 parking spaces, improve the gravel driveway that goes down and loops in front of the former bunk house. These proposals are in support of the new queuing for drop off and pickup of children for the school. The plan was implemented after the May Planning Board meeting and this was being used before the end of school. The bunkhouse is being converted to classroom and they are working with the Building department and Fire department.

E. Blatchford stated that there has been some question over the trees out front being used as a screen, however the original intent of that was to replace the apple trees that were there as part of the orchard that were removed and it was really meant as keeping a remnant of the orchard, but there will be further discussion of this later. He hoped that with everything presented tonight will be satisfactory to the board and a decision can be reached. The applicant has a concern that September for the beginning of the new school year will come very quickly.

Kevin Dandry, from TEC, the company retained by Hollis Montessori School to prepare an updated Traffic Impact and Access Study (TIA) for the proposed student enrollment expansion of the Hollis Montessori School along South Merrimack Road in Hollis. TEC previously submitted a TIA to the town in 2011 for the original application. He stated that in 2011 the best available data that they had to produce future traffic volumes was guidance estimated on standard trip rates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). As they had the opportunity to update the study for future enrollment up to 200, they do not need to rely on the ITE data as they have now got good hard data. They went

99 out and collected daily and hourly volumes during the morning, afternoon and weekly
100 evening's peak periods both for the site driveway and the adjacent intersections consistent
101 with the original report, giving them updated data from which they can do new projections.
102 When they compared what was projected in 2011 to what has actually been generated for
103 traffic both on and off the site, there has been an increase of 30% in the morning and 65%
104 in the afternoon. This is a considerable difference from what was estimated based on
105 industry trends back in 2011. Some factors affecting this increase could be the proximity of
106 the school to the population it serves, and also not being a walking neighborhood school per
107 say, but drawing from a larger area could have affected this traffic characteristic. He
108 confirmed that what was originally estimated for the 120 students at the school already, the
109 actual volumes we have found based on hard data are between 30% and 65% higher than
110 what they originally estimated in 2011. The good thing with having good concrete data is
111 that it is a good foundation for them to look towards the future. Now they know what this
112 specific school generates in this area with 120 students and the staff that serves them, and
113 when we project out to the 200, it will be a very good estimate for the future conditions.
114

115 The crash data was also reviewed coordinated with the Police department and counting at
116 the intersections, giving them a good understanding as from May 2nd 2016 of what is
117 actually occurring and this is the platform from which future traffic is estimated. There
118 were 7 total accidents reported over 4 years, there has been nothing to indicate a negative
119 safety trend, and 4 of these were single vehicle crashes. Sight lines are good. However prior
120 to this study it was a fairly routine basis of 4 to 5 vehicles queuing out onto the South
121 Merrimack Road, waiting to enter the school grounds to pick up their children. Since then,
122 they have worked with Montessori School and the site team to make changes and have
123 traffic routed up towards the bunkhouse in a more organized single lane fashion. And what
124 has happened since that time they have observed it working very well and keeping the
125 traffic off South Merrimack Road. Also, with widening of the gravel driveway and
126 increasing the radius of the turning area makes it more usable for the continued trend.
127 Based on actual data and the relation between the 120 enrollees and the 200 enrollees with
128 layers of conservatism there could be up to 55 cars waiting if they all got there at the same
129 time and there is sufficient time for 58. Since April the school has been able to manage it
130 successfully.
131

132 B. Stelmack asked for the average time to load per car? K. Dandry stated the more recent
133 occurrence of queuing trends of three cars in a single line, it is about an average of 20
134 seconds to stop, receive the child, get buckled in and proceed on. D. Turcott asked how
135 drastic a change was this from the previous practice. The biggest change was that it was
136 side by side and stacking which caused problems to load the children between vehicles and
137 moving out two by two, but also making it easier for others to park and also the safety
138 aspect of leaving in single line.
139

140 R. Hardy asked as they did the initial traffic study how they can confirm the same problems
141 that arose with that study will not happen with this one. K. Dandry confirmed that the
142 study in 2011 was based on the Industry Standard Rate and the benefit now is they have
143 good concrete data, along with the changes that have been made operationally on the site
144 and the proposed improvements to the driveway. R. Hardy mentioned the improvements to
145 the driveway. He is concerned with the width of the driveway and any drainage concerns it
146 might raise.
147

148 D. Turcott asked for further background on the 55 cars. K. Dandry referred to the traffic
149 survey and Section “On-Site Circulation”, they know the number of trips generated; they
150 know the number of stacked cars per day. With the increased projection of number of
151 families calculating 1.5 kids per family average, they looked at the increase of the current
152 trend of 71% to account for that proportional increase in student enrollment. And this is
153 where we get the 55 vehicles, by having a proportional relationship from what we observed
154 in the field and applying the increased data. K. Dandry also mentioned that they tried to be
155 as accurate as they could and there were a couple of field trips that day so they factored in
156 the number of kids on the field trip. It was fully scrutinized and the school provided good
157 detailed information. D. Turcott asked as more kids are added to the school the volume will
158 increase and potentially it could be more difficult to manage, are there any measures put in
159 place to help manage more traffic. K. Dandry explained that the school has committed to
160 manage the flow of traffic with staff out in the area. It is important to keep the staff
161 member outside, as they found it was the pick up that was causing the back up onto the
162 South Merrimack Road, and this has been managed well since April 2016, and is most
163 critical. D. Turcott was concerned that this would be more likely to back up with more cars.
164 K. Dandry said he didn’t think this would be the case.

165
166 B. Stelmack asked what the plan was to manage it in the winter, with high snow banks. K.
167 Dandry said it was important to keep the site lines clear at entrance, and on site the school
168 will have to keep it clear to allow traffic to keep moving during pickup. B. Stelmack was also
169 concerned with the increased traffic figure being around 100. K. Dandry explained that as
170 well has the new pick up routine there is also a proposal to create a number of extra parking
171 stall in different areas. K. Dandry confirmed there would be an extra 21 parking spaces. D.
172 Cleveland asked with the increase to 200 students, the conclusion stated there was no
173 anticipation of backing up onto the South Merrimack Road. K. Dandry referred to a table
174 in the traffic survey on Page 23 that detailed traffic at present, future traffic without
175 expansion and future traffic with expansion of enrollees. The only time period that it trips
176 to an ‘E’ is a time period that no traffic is being generated, i.e. the weekday evening,
177 probably administrators or teachers staying late, but the morning and afternoon peaks
178 times you see delays of 30 seconds or less at each intersection of the study.

179
180 D. Petry asked what the contingency plan was if these estimates are low and when the
181 enrolment gets to 200, and backing up occurs, what is the plan. K. Dandry stated with the
182 layering done within the current study he does not anticipate anything higher than what is
183 documented. The layers are ultra conservative. Only other background projects unrelated
184 to the Montessori School add traffic on South Merrimack Road or Silver Lake Road may
185 cause changes. D. Petry stated they need a contingency plan for real life. Maybe different
186 pickup times one option.

187
188 E. Blatchford, Hayner-Swanson, approached the podium. He stated the traffic survey
189 studies the conditions today and with a full build out. The reality is the Board has been
190 given numbers from the school projecting the yearly increases over the next several years;
191 the population of the school will increase in increments allowing a period of time to observe
192 how everything functions with the gradual increases. D. Petry asked K. Dandry if there was
193 a recommended speed limit for South Merrimack Road in the traffic survey. He responded
194 by stating speed limits are determined by the speed of which traffic travels. Also he referred
195 to the query regarding a flashing light to warn traffic approaching the school and he quoted
196 from 2011 traffic study that “the NHDOT will not approve traffic flashers on any roadway

197 that does not have the presence of pedestrians, as well as pedestrian accommodation such
198 as sidewalks”. So knowing there are no walkers from the school population today and no
199 sidewalks, this would not be an option. D. Petry asked if it was their recommendation not
200 to change the speed limit, K. Dandry stated it would not be consistent with the guidance
201 they receive from NHDOT. D. Petry also asked where the speed data was within the report.
202 This data could be found in Appendix B ‘Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) Data Sheets’.
203 They used Precision data Industries and with the road tubes set out, this data were
204 collected. D. Petry explained the reason for his questions was to find out what happens to
205 the stopping distances particularly when you are traveling south on South Merrimack
206 travelling towards town. If you change the speed to 37 mph, does the stopping site distance
207 fall below the 245 ft. He suggested that if this information was not available then it could be
208 provided later. This is important as traffic does not travel at 30 mph and this will need to be
209 addressed.

210
211 E. Blatchford approached the podium to address the question raised about the driveway and
212 the drainage issue. He confirmed that the driveway will be widened by 4 feet on average,
213 and referred to a letter on file dated March 21, 2016. This letter explains the new
214 improvements to the access/circulation and parking. It stated that “the addition of the
215 gravel parking spaces, and topdressing the existing gravel driveway shouldn’t change the
216 peak rate of runoff from the current condition.” This letter also concluded that it is their
217 “professional opinion that this site improvement project will not adversely impact any
218 downstream drainage condition”. There is no intention to pave and if in the future they did
219 want to they would come back to the Planning Board. R. Hardy pointed out that this
220 information needs to be accurately on the plan.

221
222 D. Cleveland asked E. Blatchford if he wanted to address the landscaping. E. Blatchford
223 stated that the abutters had brought up a number of issues, and school has put together a
224 detailed response to all of these issues, especially the landscaping. If the board has had a
225 chance to review this information, and have any questions then he would bring up the
226 appropriate person to the podium.

227
228 Frank Grossman, President of the School Board for Hollis Montessori School, approached
229 the podium. He stated they had provided the Planning Board with a document
230 summarizing the landscape from ownership till now, and the school is not happy with
231 where the trees or grass are at. The plants at the top near the road are not doing well due to
232 the amount of ledge there. Some trees had died and they have since replanted these crab
233 apple trees. They have added drip watering to the trees, fertilizing and getting those trees to
234 be as healthy as they can based on the soil that is there. The document also includes a grass
235 project. Figure 3 on this document is incorrect and Frank will make sure the board gets
236 new copies of this document with the correct plan.

237
238 R. Hardy said that it was mentioned in this report that a lot soil was removed and there was
239 ledge, so why did they not replace the soil. F. Grossman explained that they had brought in
240 more soil, and that various loads needed to be tested for arsenic and they finally got some
241 that was ok to use. But one reason why it is low in arsenic means it is also low in pesticides
242 and organics that they did not realize. Now they are fixing this problem by adding organics
243 to the soil. R. Hardy stated he felt the document held only basic information, that it did not
244 have any soil test data, no information regarding compaction for the subsoil or any
245 scarifying or deep till zoning, or anything to help improve your soil. Any even though they

246 have replaced some trees, when you drive past the school, you will see trees struggling with
 247 yellow leaves meaning they are stressed out and not doing well. He asked about the drip
 248 irrigation and fertilizer and the trees are not doing well. Reference to UC Davis from
 249 California is not appropriate for the grass either. He stated that the landscape needed to be
 250 improved as it is not fair to the neighbors, as when an application is submitted and plan,
 251 and the plan is not adhered to, even after the bond was released, the Planning Board has no
 252 alternative other than to make sure the original planting is created as promised. The real
 253 problem right now there is no track record, he suggested they redo the whole landscape
 254 plan, submit a new plan, revisit it and do something that is in keeping with your school and
 255 the neighborhood. F. Grossman responded with they are working on it, putting money into
 256 it and replanting and treating plants with cedar rust. R. Hardy stated realistically they need
 257 to produce a plan that can be approved and not 10 pages of stuff that does not mean
 258 anything. F. Grossman stated they did not put in a landscaping plan as this application
 259 does not add buildings. R. Hardy said they were changing the site plan as they are adding
 260 parking, they are adding classrooms. They are changing things enough that it all needs to
 261 be looked and addressed. B. Moseley asked if they had changed their landscaping company.
 262 F. Grossman confirmed they had because they were not happy with the other company. He
 263 stated it will take time, but they are working on the maintenance improvement. B. Stelmack
 264 suggested that maybe because there is not a great base i.e. there is a lot of ledge that this
 265 could be the reason for the trees not performing well.

266

267 D. Cleveland suggested that we continue at the next meeting. He asked M. Fougere about
 268 the timing of the application. M. Fougere stated we had accepted the application back in
 269 April, and we have 65 days to review the application. If it was to be tabled tonight we need
 270 authority from the applicant to extend the review period, to table until July 19th. D.
 271 Cleveland asked the applicant if they want an extension.

272

273 D. Cleveland asked the applicant if they wish to ask for an extension so this can be tabled to
 274 the next meeting. Brad Westgate representing the Hollis Montessori School approached the
 275 podium. He agreed they would like an extension but they would also like some guidance to
 276 use during this time as to what the Planning Board would like from them precisely from the
 277 landscaping issue. He explained the reason why he was asking. The site plan application is
 278 for expansion of the parking lot, beefing up the lane down to the bunkhouse, and then
 279 having the bunkhouse used for classes. He commented that these were not fundamental
 280 changes to the appearance of the project and it is not fundamentally changing what was
 281 approved four years ago. It is really just adding parking spaces to allow the use of the
 282 building to its already existing capacity. The building does not need to be expanded to hold
 283 200 students it can already do that. He asked if the board was expecting them to do a
 284 landscaping plan as if this was a new project from 2011, or are they trying to implement,
 285 maintain or better put into place what was already approved. They need this guidance to
 286 move onto the next meeting and come back with a plan that hits the target. But at the
 287 moment they do not know what that target is. R. Hardy said he would be happy to work
 288 with them to move forward. He added if they looked back at their plan from 2011 they will
 289 see what they have today is not even close. He suggested also that if Hollis Montessori
 290 School were to do better maintenance and take care of their plantings better they would be
 291 much better today. But they haven't been doing this. The proposal presented to the board
 292 does not say anything specific. In order to enhance the school and the neighborhood and
 293 they are asking for an expansion to the school, it would be in their best interest to submit a

294 new plan. M. Fougere suggested that R. Hardy sit down with the school, maintenance
295 person and the landscape architect to add specifics and details to the document to give the
296 board confidence of what will happen out there. The board also wants a contingency plan in
297 place to know what they will do if the traffic queue gets too long what is plan B.

298 B. Westgate confirmed that their starting point is their 2011 approved plan and the idea is
299 to work the implementation of the work already done, interact with Rick Hardy on his view
300 point of that and his guidance to where it takes us.

301 D Petry made a motion to continue to July 19th. B. Stelmack seconded. All in favour none
302 opposed.

303 **6. File #2807** – Proposed conditional Use Permit and site plan for the installation of a
304 Ground Mounted Solar Energy System, 140 Ridge Road, Map 7 Lot 37, R/A Residential
305 Agriculture. Applicant: Tolima Solar, LLC & Owner Frank Grossman Application
306 acceptance May 17th

307 M. Fougere stated this application was first heard and accepted at the last Planning Board
308 meeting. The Planning Board had requested more detail on the plans, specifics on the
309 disturbance areas and the berm, and buffering. A new revised set has been given to the
310 board tonight which includes topography also. A site walk took place at 5:30 PM this
311 evening, and the Planning Board were able to see for themselves where the units will be
312 placed, the stakes showing the placement and height of the berm, and the board walked
313 down the common driveway also to see where the proposed fence is going to be, the
314 applicant is also talking to abutters regarding putting plants in front of the fence. The new
315 plan seen tonight has been done by an engineering company and shows topography, and it
316 will need to have their professional stamp added to it.

317 F. Grossman approached the podium. He thanked everyone for coming out to the site walk
318 and hoped that they had seen everything they were proposing. There were a couple of
319 things on the cover letter that he wished to point out. The three sided shed which was to
320 house the transformer and AC combiner panel with main AC disconnect has been
321 eliminated. They are working with some neighbors and a landscaper to develop an
322 appropriate set of plantings.

323 R. Hardy asked to confirm the contours on the plan are the panels actually sloped. There is
324 also a side view plan to show this. D. Petry suggested that the fencing is not adequate, as it
325 is not in keeping with the rural character or the neighborhood. F. Grossman stated it was
326 part of the allowed screening in the regulation. R. Hardy suggested the happy medium was
327 to do the fence with plants in front.

328 B. Moseley asked what the prevailing wind was in this area, as the panels can fly. He asked
329 if these panels were designed for such wind. C. Bell from Solar Source approached the
330 podium. He explained the design will come with further tests, test pits, geo-tech report that
331 is submitted to a structural engineering group and they specify what the pile depths are and
332 the conditions for the snow load for the area also. B. Moseley asked if they had the detail at
333 the moment. C. Bell said he would look it up.

334 D. Petry confirmed that under section 3D – conditional use permit – it does give us the
335 ability to make suggestions and changes based on the plans submitted. F. Grossman said he
336 was acting on the request of a neighbor to put the fence there. The other suggestion had
337 been plants but it would take 4 to 5 years to fill in the gap. The fence was the option of
338 blocking the view straight away. D. Cleveland suggested staggered plantings would help. R.
339 Hardy using a white pine as an example, said a six-foot tree, planted ten foot apart
340 staggered with perfect soil and plenty of water they should grow 8 to 12 inches per year.
341 The height should not be a problem as they can be pruned. B. Stelmack agreed that trees
342 would be better than a fence.

343 D. Cleveland at this point authorized B. Moseley to vote on behalf of C. Hoffman.

344 D. Turcott asked how long it would take before you could see under the trees. R. Hardy
345 stated maybe 20 years. The board did a sweep and they unanimously liked the idea of
346 greenery rather than a fence. F. Grossman agrees with the Board to plant trees.

347 M. Fougere stated that should the board approve the application tonight the following items
348 would need to be carried out:

- 349 • The revised plans need to be stamped
- 350 • Landscaping be added to the plans and approved by R. Hardy
- 351 • Ten feet spacing and staggered – 6 ft. tall minimum evergreens – with maintenance
352 plan and bond for insurance of installation
- 353 • The proposed berm along the sites frontage shall be a minimum of 3 feet tall or tall
354 enough so that those walking along Ridge Road or driving in a car will not be able to
355 see the proposed solar panels from the public way.
- 356 • The plan needs three distance dimensions to be added showing the distance of the
357 solar panels to the southern property line and applicants driveway.

358 R. Hardy stated that he was really pleased they had done the engineered plans. For an
359 application of this scale it is very useful.

360 R. Hardy made a motion to approve File # 2807 with the changes highlighted above. C.
361 Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

362

363 **7. File #2810** Proposed lot line relocation of two adjoining properties and subdivision, 26
364 Deacon Lane & Proctor Hill Road, applicants John Hamilton and Charles Hildreth Map 17
365 Lot 9 and Map 23 Lot 3, zoned RL Rural Lands.

366 M. Fougere explained this proposal involves the relocating of lot lines between two
367 adjoining lots and the creation of a new lot. A series of lot area exchanges are occurring
368 between the parent Lot 23-3 and adjoining lot 17-9. This exchange creates the ability to
369 create a new lot 23-3-1 which meets all relevant zoning requirements.

370 B. Stelmack made a motion to accept the application and D. Petry seconded. All in favor
371 none opposed.

372 Nathan Chamberlain approached the podium, from Fieldstone Land Consultants. He
373 explained that the purpose of this application is to adjust the lot lines between existing tax
374 map lots 23-3 and 17-9, then subdivide lot 23-3 into two residential lots. The original areas
375 of the tax map lot 23-3 and 17-9 are 5.169 and 49.5+/- acres respectively. The resulting
376 areas after the lot line revision will be 4.841 acres for lot 23-3 and an increase in lot area for
377 lot 17-9 to 50.5+/- . The existing lot has enough land area and frontage to subdivide
378 however, due to the wetland and buffer areas, in its original size it would not meet the
379 building box area. This would allow the subdivision into two lots. The plan shows the
380 driveways and there will be a need for a driveway easement.

381 D. Cleveland asked if this had been all agreed by both landowners, why has it been left with
382 the need for a driveway easement. It has been done this way as the landowners agreed as it
383 is a win win for Mr. Hildreth as he gains more land.

384 D. Petry asked M. Fougere asked if there were any restrictions on the previous subdivision
385 that would not allow further subdivisions. There were 25 year covenants but they have
386 expired in 2014. He also asked if by giving lot 17-9 more does this give further frontage to
387 allow him to develop further. M. Fougere confirmed it is a lot with enough frontage to
388 develop with or without this lot line adjustment. Bobbi Sinyard, a realtor working with Mr
389 Hamilton, spoke from the audience and she confirmed that there is also access from Proctor
390 Hill Road and Rocky Pond Road. D. Petry asked if the easement would be a private matter
391 or if the town would need to see it. M. Fougere confirmed the town will need to see the
392 easement document as it will get recorded with the plan.

393 D. Cleveland opened the public hearing.

394 Donna Dougie, 83 Deacon Lane spoke from the audience.

395 Jeff Peters, 33 Deacon Lane, asked who benefits, and will this offer the larger lot property
396 owner an opportunity do further development. M. Fougere stated that based on our
397 assessing sheet the lot at present already has 50 feet frontage so there is already enough
398 frontage to develop the larger lot. It will go to 104-foot frontage. J. Peters is concerned to
399 keep Deacon Lane as a cul-de-sac and questions regarding the future intend of lot 17-9. R.
400 Hardy stated this lot meets the regulations and we cannot take future possibilities into
401 consideration.

402 Tom Duffy, 83 Deacon Lane, approached the podium. He is concerned over the possible
403 connections between parcels for further development. At the moment there is a timber cut
404 going on. However after a discussion this is not relevant to this application. A new
405 proposed development would undergo the normal application processes.

406 John Hamilton, 26 Deacon Lane approached the podium. He wanted to explain that the
407 timber cut has been done by the Forestry Commission since January is to take out old trees
408 to encourage the younger trees to grow.

409 D. Cleveland closed the public hearing.

410 M. Fougere stated if the Planning Board is inclined to accept and approve the Plan tonight
411 these are the conditions of approval:

412

413 1. The applicant shall submit a digital file along with three (3) hard copies of the
414 revised plan along with a recordable mylar.

415

416 2. Prior to plan recording, all lot bounds shall be set.

417

418 3. The plan shall note the location of buried stumps or remove from property.

419

420 4. Proposed lot 23-3-1 shall be serviced by underground utilities.

421

422 5. Driveway permit shall be obtained from the DPW.

423

424 6. A driveway easement document shall be drafted and recorded with plan.

425

426 7. If required by the Fire Department, a \$7,500 cistern fee shall be required for any
427 development on Lot 23-3-1.

428

429 8. Prior to recording, State Subdivision approval shall be obtained.

430

431 R. Hardy made a motion to approve File # 2810 following the staff recommendations and
432 amendments. D. Petry seconded. All in favor none opposed.

433

434 **8. File #2809** – Conceptual site plan review, proposed storage buildings replacing
435 approved landscaping yard, 250 -254 Proctor Hill Road, Applicant Erich Mueller Owner
436 Island Time Realty, LLC, Map 11 Lot 24, zoned IN industrial.

437

438 M. Fougere stated this site plan outlines a proposal to construct 54,300 square feet of self-
439 storage units in 8 buildings. This site has been approved for a number of uses in the past,
440 including a landscaping yard and a driveway seal coating company. Porous pavement will
441 be used to address drainage conditions on the property.

442 The proposed plan would use the two existing driveways to access the site, one of the
443 storage buildings will lie perpendicular to Proctor Hill Road, providing some screening from
444 the proposed use. No connections to adjoining properties are proposed.

445 A landscape plan has not been submitted with this proposal and the board may want to
446 consider details on this. More detail will be needed regarding drainage and we will have to
447 get our town engineer Dennis LaBombard to have a look at further plans.

448 Nathan Chamberlain, Fieldstone Land consultant. He confirmed that this is a conceptual
449 proposal for 54, 300 square foot of self-storage units in 8 buildings. The unique thing about
450 this particular proposal is that it will be very near an aqua zone so there are limitations on
451 impervious areas, so the proposal is to do the interior isle with porous pavement. Porous
452 pavement allows the flow of storm water to move through the surface quickly avoiding
453 runoff and it moves through the sand below the paving and recharges into the ground. The
454 developer has all the equipment to maintain it and vacuum it out. The exterior pavement
455 will be normal paving as it will see more traffic. They propose to landscape along the
456 highway to help screen it. With regard to storm water – there is an existing pond on the
457 property remaining and one at the back of the property that will be eliminated. But due to

458 the fact that the porous pavement being installed should prevent any excess runoff. A storm
459 water analysis will be submitted for review by the town engineer. The development will stay
460 out of the wetland buffer. Tonight's purpose is to get feedback from the Planning Board.

461 D. Petry asked about the proposed screening. New landscaping would be proposed. When
462 asked if this screening would block the proposed buildings from the road, N. Chamberlain
463 did not think it would. Lighting would be included in the final plan, but they are going to be
464 down cast on walls. N. Chamberlain stated it would be fenced in also. D. Turcott asked if
465 there was going to be a snow removal plan, to consider the salt usage with the wetland
466 buffer. This would need to be addressed. Also there may be restrictions within the storage
467 units also.

468 R. Hardy stated the previous owner had an oil treatment area. It was an underground tank
469 to contain oil and if it is there it needs to be removed. Also on Lot 7-25 he questioned
470 whether there is an existing buffer. It needs to be shown for screening. N. Chamberlain
471 confirmed they will replicate the existing screening. Also, run off from the roofs will need to
472 mitigated. B. Moseley asked about guidelines for the maintaining of the porous paving.
473 UNH has guidelines which will be followed. And all this information should be noted on the
474 plan.

475 D. Cleveland opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak so it was closed.

476 R. Hardy felt it was important to submit a design review to answer a number of open
477 questions. The board agreed. M. Fougere confirmed the consensus is for a design review
478 which they will submit when they are ready and this will be sent out to the engineer for
479 review and comments so you will have his comments at the first meeting. The detail will be
480 much more with the design review application.

481 **9. Conservation Easement Waiver:** 102 Broad Street Owner Garry Henkel; amend
482 approved subdivision plan easement to allow the growing of grapes (Fulchino Vineyard)
483 within the easement area Map 19 lot 17, zoned R/A Residential Agriculture

484 M. Fougere confirmed that this lot is part of a larger subdivision that was done a number of
485 years ago. The homes are set way back from the main road. The stipulation that the
486 Planning board put on it at that time was to have the front to remain as a natural field.
487 There was a conservation easement deed that was created and recorded with the plan that
488 put an encumbrance on the land. The owner of this lot, Mr Garry Henkel, would like to
489 make an amended to the easement to allow the planting of vines. A letter from Al Fulchino
490 was supplied to explain the planting and maintenance of these vines. In the easement there
491 is a specific section that allows the planning board to amend it.

492 D. Cleveland asked the board if they had any questions. D. Petry asked if all the lot owners
493 had to agree to this amendment. M. Fougere confirmed that only the Planning Board can
494 make the amendment and the document may need to be redrafted. All abutters and lot
495 owners within this subdivision were notified by letter. It will be amended to allow this lot to
496 plant within the easement area.

497 R. Hardy has no problem with it as it is still open space. Also, a Sunday restriction is now
498 needed.

499 M. Fougere suggested all abutter will be notified of any changes.

500 D. Cleveland opened the public hearing.

501 Rob Ciccone Broad Street approached the podium and was concerned about spraying
502 insecticides. Al Fulchino approached the podium to address the question. He said no
503 insecticides would be used and they will use some fungicides and weed killer. The weed
504 killer will be under 10% and under the rows. Garry will tend to everything else. This may
505 need to be done between 2 and 4 times. For fungicides he uses a trace mineral, and he is a
506 licensed sprayer and he follows all the guidelines.

507 The neighbor the other side was concerned about tractors driving on his property. But they
508 have already considered that and made sure that won't happen. Other than that they have
509 no objections.

510 There was one letter of support.

511 D. Cleveland closed the public hearing.

512 M. Fougere will work with Attorney Dresher to amend the document and all abutter will be
513 notified.

514 R. Hardy made a motion to approve the wording of the easement document to allow the
515 vines to be planted. D. Petry seconded. All in favour none opposed.

516 **Other business**

517 D Petry asked when we can post a zoning change. We can suggest changes now to have
518 them listed and ready. But we are restricted to the number of days before they can be
519 posted. D. Petry would like to propose a change to section 24 solar energy systems
520 ordinance under section c definitions he is suggesting that we change the size to 21500 sq ft
521 maximum.

522 R. Hardy made a non debatable motion to adjourn the meeting. D. Petry seconded. All in
523 favor none opposed.

524 The meeting was adjourned at 10 PM

525

526 Respectively submitted by,

527

528

529 Wendy Trimble

530 Planning Secretary

531 Town of Hollis, NH

532