

## HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 19th, 2016

“FINAL”

1 **PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Brian  
2 Stelmack, Chet Rogers, Dan Turcott, David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen, Ben Ming –  
3 Alternate and Bill Moseley – Alternate  
4

5 **ABSENT:** Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, R. Hardy and Jeff Peters - Alternate  
6

7 **STAFF:** Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Wendy Trimble – Planning Secretary  
8

9 1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The Chairman Cathy Hoffman called the meeting to  
10 order at 7:00 pm.  
11

12 C. Hoffman requested B. Ming to vote on behalf of D. Cleveland and B. Moseley to vote on  
13 behalf of R. Hardy.  
14

15 2. **APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:**  
16

17 D. Petry moved to approve the minutes of June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016. Motion seconded by B.  
18 Stelmack. All in favor, none opposed.  
19

20 3. **DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:**

21 A. Agenda Additions and Deletions – None

22 B. Committee Reports – None

23 C. Staff Report – None

24 D. Regional Impact – None  
25

26 4. **SIGNATURE OF PLAN** – None  
27

28 **File #2806** – Proposed site plan amendment for the Hollis Montessori School to expand  
29 occupancy of the school from 120 students to 200, increase staff, expand the number of  
30 parking spaces and improve traffic circulation, 9 South Merrimack Road, Map 36 Lot 32,  
31 Owner/Applicant Hollis Montessori School, R/A Residential Agriculture. Application  
32 Acceptance – April 19, 2016, **tabled from June 21, Review period extended to July**  
33 **19.**  
34

35 Mark Fougere recapped that at last month's meeting the board spent a lot of time talking  
36 about the landscaping plan and traffic report. Since then a number of different documents  
37 have been included in the packets. A landscaping plan was submitted on Thursday of last  
38 week and reviewed by Rick Hardy. He has a number of comments and concerns related to  
39 the revised plan he would like to see addressed, it is a very detailed list of concerns. Along  
40 with this landscape plan the applicant submitted a maintenance plan and a soil analysis.  
41 This soil analysis was requested by the board. They also submitted a revised site plan  
42 addressing some issues. Relative to access there is a concern from the fire chief. Along the  
43 access road he asked for 'No Parking' signs to be installed. The signs on the plan show no  
44 parking signing between 8-3. They have also submitted a Plan B scenario for the traffic.  
45 This was to address concerns should the limits for queuing traffic down towards the  
46 bunkhouse be exceeded; Plan B would be implemented to avoid traffic spilling out onto the  
47 South Merrimack Road. The outline submitted in the packet explains this Plan B, as  
48 allowing two cars to come up together in front of the school to pick children up.  
49

50 M. Fougere also stated that there has been questions raised over the use of the facility, what  
51 they can and cannot do, the applicant will be going to the zoning board next week, with a  
52 goal to appeal the building inspectors letter that was sent out last month. This zoning board  
53 meeting will be on July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

54  
55 C. Hoffman stated that when it came to the board's attention that there were outstanding  
56 issues with this application, she is hesitant to continue discussing this application tonight  
57 and she wanted to open this up to the board to get their opinions on this. There is  
58 enforcement as well as additions that have been added to the plan such as using the  
59 bunkhouse for classrooms and an athletic field. This is an expansion of use and she wanted  
60 to get the feeling of the board on this to see if they agreed it being an expansion of use, as  
61 they were not on the original zoning board Special Exception Approval. She confirmed they  
62 were going to the zoning board, next week, but this was to appeal the enforcement letter.  
63 M. Fougere confirmed next week they are appealing a notice that the Building  
64 Inspector/Enforcement Officer sent the school regarding violations. They are not going to  
65 the zoning board next week for an expansion of use or a new special exception. C. Hoffman  
66 explained that she feels this should not be discussed any further, and she wanted to ask the  
67 board what their feelings are on it. There are a couple of options. The time period to review  
68 this application is today, so the board has to ask the applicant if they want to table the  
69 application until the next planning board meeting in August, and then most likely table  
70 again into September, or if they do not agree to table it then the board would have to vote  
71 on it tonight. The consequences of that are if the board 'deny' the application they would  
72 have to start all over again or appeal the decision to the superior court.

73  
74 D. Petry stated that there are outstanding issues and R. Hardy has outlined quite a few  
75 issues with the drawings as submitted. These plans were submitted late, as the board needs  
76 to have then ten days before the meeting date. He asked M. Fougere to confirm the  
77 information was submitted last Wednesday and Thursday. He stated that what they are  
78 showing on the plans now is clearly an expansion and we need to fully understand what  
79 they plan on doing, having an updated plan that is correct, and he would prefer that we  
80 request an extension. B. Stelmack agreed with D. Petry's comments especially as he did not  
81 have enough time to review everything.

82  
83 C. Rogers, referring to the conditions set a few years ago with regard to the hours of use, no  
84 weekends, no overnights, etc, he asked if the planning board has prevue over that or is that  
85 the code enforcement officers job? Or are they asking to change those stipulations. C.  
86 Hoffman explained they are asking to use the bunkhouse for classrooms, and also have  
87 overnights, and these things were not discussed during the original 2010 application.

88  
89 M. Fougere said the applicant obtained a Special Exception from the zoning board in April  
90 of 2010; there were two stipulations with that approval. He quoted:  
91 'The board is concerned regarding the potential number of students that this site could  
92 accommodate. The board recommends (ZBA) that the Planning Board issues suitable  
93 restrictions and limitations concerning the number of students.' and  
94 'No after school or weekend teaching activities and all main school activities shall occur  
95 between the hours of 8 AM and 3 PM, Monday through Friday.'  
96 He added that the second stipulation has been raised as a question as far as what is  
97 happening after hours on the property, that is what the letter sent by the building inspector  
98 addressed, what they are asking for is not outside the scope of that but when we approved

99 the plan three years ago it was for 120 students, so to add to that count they had to come  
100 back. C. Rogers asked are they coming back to change the stipulation 8 AM – 3 PM. M.  
101 Fougere said we cannot change that stipulation, we do not have the authority, and only the  
102 zoning board can change that stipulation.

103  
104 D. Turcott agreed that with both the zoning board regulations and consideration as to what  
105 appears to be changed on the plans it appears to grant requesting a continuance.

106  
107 F. Grossman, 140 Ridge Road, President of Hollis Montessori School Board, approached the  
108 podium. He stated that they had talked with staff and their Attorney that the zoning issues  
109 are about hours of use and the Planning issues are about traffic, use of the buildings and  
110 number of students. He stated that what the Planning Board does and what the zoning  
111 board does should be separate from each other, because they already have rights to use this  
112 as a school, the zoning board does not discuss the use of buildings, it discusses the use of  
113 the property as a school. It is up to the planning board to say which buildings can be  
114 approved and permitted. So zoning has already said we can have a school there, and it set  
115 the stipulations about the hours which have raised the questions about the wording and  
116 what the wording really means. Our request here is we are already allowed to operate as a  
117 school we are asking to operate as we did before with 120 students and now over the years  
118 to 200 students. He feels they are pretty separate. He said he knows they have to follow the  
119 zoning rules that are put upon them, the enforcement officer has stipulated this, and  
120 whether we have 120 or 140 students he says they must follow those rules.

121  
122 C. Hoffman said she did not see the separation, as what he was saying was the site plan they  
123 have asked for is an expansion of use. To use the bunkhouse for classrooms and you also put  
124 in an athletic field. That is a use and that is what the zoning board deals with, if there is an  
125 expansion of the use of the property then they are the ones that have to issue them with a  
126 new special exception. She stated that the school needs to go to the zoning board and tell  
127 them exactly what the school is going to do, and they have to approve that, and the planning  
128 board does the site plan which is where the buildings are, the landscaping, the driveway and  
129 the parking lots, etc.

130  
131 F. Grossman said he understands that interaction but the playing field is a recess area, it is  
132 not a playing field that will be used for anything other than recess. C. Hoffman asked if it  
133 has the potential to become a soccer field. F. Grossman said that any part of the property  
134 has the potential. C. Hoffman said that is the point. F. Grossman stated that right now they  
135 cannot use that field for anything other than their recreation. If they wanted to use it for  
136 anything else they would have to go and ask the zoning boards permission. Whether we  
137 draw it on the plan as a playing field or just having kids playing soccer or volleyball on  
138 there, he wasn't sure. They didn't have it on the plan and it was asked to be put on the plan  
139 by staff. It was asked that you have included a flat area, could you draw it on there. He  
140 stated that they cannot use that field for anything other than what zoning tells them to use it  
141 for. The same for the building they are using. When the school started, there were  
142 buildings that were not on that property that are now on the property, there is some that  
143 have disappeared, and there is some that are still there. So they looked at the property and  
144 said you want to use that property as a school, they did not say how many buildings are you  
145 going to build, they did not ask those questions. That building is already there and the  
146 planning board has already approved it for overnights in 2011. The application came in to  
147 ask to use the building for craft area and overnights and the planning board approved this.

148 So yes they are now asking if they can use it for classrooms which seems to him to be under  
149 the prevue of does it get inspected right, is the fire chief happy with it etc. Again this is not a  
150 zoning issue.

151  
152 C. Hoffman stated that our legal counsel has instructed us that it is an expansion of use and  
153 that the school needs to go to the zoning board for another special exception for the  
154 expanded use of the building and anything else. F. Grossman said he had never gone to the  
155 zoning board before.

156  
157 C. Hoffman asked the question do they want to table the discussion and agree to extend the  
158 time limit. F. Grossman said they would agree to extending the time and tabling but he  
159 would like to have some discussion on some of the things that have been submitted to see if  
160 there is still work to be done, and the landscape plan.

161  
162 M. Fougere said that one of the items they responded to was the traffic and the concern  
163 regarding the queue being adequate or not, the traffic engineer discussed that there may be  
164 three or four extra spaces at peak hour, or worse case scenario the board asked for a Plan B.  
165 M. Fougere said that plan was submitted to the board, and if his understanding is correct, if  
166 the monitors out in the parking lot saw the queue backing up onto the South Merrimack  
167 Road they would change the pattern and allow two cars to proceed in front of the school to  
168 pick up children instead of just one lane that is proposed now, this would relieve the queue  
169 down to the cul-de-sac. The school will use radio transmission as to who is in the car, and  
170 the children will be waiting as the car pulls up.

171  
172 M. Fougere added they submitted a landscaping maintenance plan, soil analysis from Penn  
173 State, and a revised landscaping plan. He passed the paper work to Rick Hardy last  
174 Thursday. Today we got a response from Rick which outlines some concerns he has with  
175 details on the plan itself. During the site walk it was his interpretation and our  
176 understanding that some more evergreens would be added along the street this is not  
177 shown on the plan. He also had some comments relative to the maintenance plan as far as  
178 specifics. It is our understanding that they are going to irrigate the front area and he would  
179 like to see where the irrigation is going to take place.

180  
181 M. Fougere also stated they had updated the plan to address the Fire Chef's comments, but  
182 they will need to amend the plan to correct the 'no parking' signs.

183  
184 B. Stelmack asked for the landscaping comments from Rick Hardy. W. Trimble said she  
185 would get these out to the board members.

186  
187 F. Grossman said he was fine with the extension but moving forward he would still like to  
188 hear stuff, even though the zoning has not heard, he would like to know if the contingency  
189 plan was ok and if not they can work on that and the same with the landscaping plan.

190  
191 M. Fougere asked if the board was happy with traffic Plan B. C. Rogers asked why they  
192 would not use plan B from the start. F. Grossman said that this would not be needed at the  
193 moment as they would not have enough cars in the queue. This should hold 58 vehicles and  
194 they are nowhere near this at this time. The contingency plan was asked for should there be  
195 ever more than 58 vehicles. D. Turcott asked if the double stacking of vehicles currently  
196 causing the delays? F. Grossman said no. He did not think there was a delay, they normally

197 finish the pick up process in 8 minutes, and the double stacking was before they started  
198 using the loop.

199  
200 C. Rogers suggested that if he comes back next month to address some of these concerns,  
201 then they will still have a month to redo if they need to.

202  
203 M. Fougere suggested having another meeting with R. Hardy to work face to face, and he  
204 can explain what he meant in the letter and there is no miscommunication between F.  
205 Grossman and R. Hardy and try to work through the landscaping plan to address his  
206 concerns.

207  
208 C. Hoffman explained that if this is tabled we have the right to reopen the public hearing  
209 again. So after they get their approval from the ZBA then we will open up and have another  
210 public hearing due to the changes on the plan.

211  
212 D. Petry added one last reminder that the plans need to be submitted as per our rules, 10  
213 days prior to the planning board meeting so everyone has time to review. And we cannot  
214 have changes in between when they submit the plans and the meeting also.

215  
216 F. Grossman asked to add a couple more things. He said he had been asked twice to submit  
217 a maintenance plan. Both these have been rejected in interesting ways. He has asked the  
218 town staff to show him an example of what is required. He really needs an outline of what is  
219 required. The most recent one was done by someone who has been in the UNH extension  
220 cooperative for 27 something years. D. Petry said his expertise is in something different.  
221 He recommended he contact Margaret Haygen. D. Petry said that they have received input  
222 from Rick Hardy, who runs orchards and the main concern was to do with the condition of  
223 the trees and the lawn. He stated that Rick is more experienced than maybe some the other  
224 people he has reached out to. F. Grossman wants a copy of a maintenance plan so that they  
225 can get it right. Another thing he thinks the board should consider for the future, and what  
226 has been difficult for them as applicants is that when it comes to things like drainage and  
227 structural pieces the town has professionals to ask their opinion. He thinks the board  
228 should consider that for landscaping. We come before a board to hear from the whole  
229 board, and get votes from the whole board, and there is many times we are hearing from  
230 only one board member and that does not feel fair as an applicant.

231  
232 C. Rogers made a motion table this application in accordance to RSA 676:4 I (c) (1) to the  
233 August 16<sup>th</sup> 2016. Seconded by D. Petry. All in favor none opposed.

234  
235  
236 6. **File #2812** – Proposed lot line relocation between two adjoining properties, Hayden  
237 Road, Map 28 Lots 16 & 17, Owner/applicant Anna Birch & Hildreth Trust – Trust B, Zoned  
238 RL Rural Lands. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**

239  
240 M. Fougere explained this proposal involves the relocation of lot lines between two  
241 adjoining properties. Lot 16 is increasing in size from 13.08 to 22.07 acres and Lot 17 is  
242 decreasing in size from 35.3. to 26.3 acres. Lot 16, which presently has no frontage on  
243 Hayden Road, will have legal frontage and will be a buildable lot. A trail easement is being  
244 provided in the event the owner wishes to remove the existing trail that goes through this  
245 property; the trail would be relocated by the owner to the eastern portion of the property.

246 He added the Planning Board may want to address the Rural Character Ordinance for this  
 247 potential building lot 16. In the past, for lots fronting on Scenic Roads, the Board has  
 248 required an 80 foot wide no cut buffer along the site's frontage. The Board may want to  
 249 address this matter. Also, a waiver request has been submitted that wetland mapping and a  
 250 test pit not be required for Lot 16. Also, on the plan an amendment is required to note 4 as  
 251 this lot is on a Scenic road the front setback is 100' and the wetland setback 100'.

252  
 253 Robert Baskerville, Bedford Design Consultants, approached the podium, did the survey for  
 254 this application. He stated that several members of the Birch family were also present  
 255 tonight also. He showed the board a plan that was outlining both the land being purchased  
 256 by the Town of Hollis and the lot being referred to with this application. The reason for this  
 257 lot line relocation is to give Lot 16 frontage. He explained the reasoning behind how the lot  
 258 line has been chosen, including the topography of the land and the position on a bound. It  
 259 makes Lot 16 a conforming lot. This is all part of a PNS that is being negotiated with the  
 260 Town, and it should all happen at once. He explained the reasons for the waiver request. If  
 261 they choose to come back to subdivide in the future they would need to have the wetland  
 262 mapping and test pit done at that stage. M. Fougere confirmed that he would add a  
 263 stipulation to the effect that prior to any development of Lot 16; test pits shall be conducted  
 264 per town requirements and wetland mapping shall be outlined on the plan.

265  
 266 R. Baskerville stated it was not in the aquifer or the flood plain. He also explained that  
 267 there is no written easement at present, but the Birch family has allowed the snow mobile  
 268 club access to the trails and they currently use the trail on Parcel A on the plan. He quoted  
 269 from note 8 on plan 1 of 2. 'If lot 17 is conveyed to the Town of Hollis a 10 foot wide trail  
 270 easement over the Woods Road/Proposed trail (shown running through Parcel A) shall be  
 271 simultaneously conveyed to the Town of Hollis under terms established by the owner of  
 272 Parcel A. The owner of Parcel A may, at his or her cost, relocate portions of the 10 foot wide  
 273 trail easement into the trail relocation area shown on Parcel A under the terms established  
 274 by the owner of Parcel A. Such relocation may include elimination of all or any portions of  
 275 the (existing) Woods Road/proposed trail'.

276  
 277 B. Stelmack raised the question of why on the plan there was a section labeled 'Owner  
 278 Unknown'. R. Baskerville explained during a lot line adjustment a deed was acquired and  
 279 at this stage a radius was taken out similar to a road radius needed to put a road in. But this  
 280 was not part of a subdivision plan. It is not owned by the Birches or deeded to the Birches.  
 281 And it also did not get deeded to the other lot. He also pointed out that there is a cell tower  
 282 and it has an easement. There is a road leading to the cell tower. He was surprised that  
 283 Hayden Road is a scenic road. C. Hoffman asked him to amend the plans accordingly. M.  
 284 Fougere confirmed it was a scenic road since 1975.

285  
 286 D. Petry made a motion to accept File #2812. D. Turcott seconded. All in favor none  
 287 opposed.

288  
 289 D. Petry made a motion to waive the test pit requirement and wetland mapping on Lot 16.  
 290 M. Fougere will include a stipulation that will read 'prior to any development of Lot 16, test  
 291 pits shall be conducted per town regulations and wetland mapping shall be outlined on the  
 292 plan'. D. Turcott seconded. All in favor none opposed.

293

294 B. Ming asked a question regarding the easements, on the woods road/proposed trail. R.  
295 Baskerville confirmed the short section referred to at the beginning of the trail could be  
296 moved over if necessary but never removed.

297  
298 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

299  
300 Carl Williams, 201 Hayden Road approached the podium. He lives to the south side of the  
301 property and is a member of the snow mobile club. He wanted to know more about the laws  
302 and regulations with regard to Woods trail and regular trail. What are the laws that govern  
303 moving them and rebuilding them should this every get redeveloped.

304  
305 Sherry Wyskiel, Chairman of the Trails Committee came to the podium to answer the  
306 question. The trail that is there now, the same rules will apply to that as will apply to Birch  
307 Hill once it becomes town owned land. So whatever RSA are on town land or any  
308 conservation land will apply to this area, for example no camping or no wheeled motorized  
309 vehicles will be allowed in this area. That particular trail also, because it goes across the  
310 street, into restricted areas such as snow mobile time – this rule will apply also. Trials shut  
311 down at 9pm. She confirmed that the trail will stay there until the lot will be developed and  
312 if it needs to be moved the Birch family will pay to have the trail removed.

313  
314 D. Petry referred to note 8 and asked for the confirmation that the easement language  
315 ensured that there will always continue to be a trail on this piece of land. The wording of  
316 note 8 may need to be reworked to ensure there is no misunderstanding. R. Baskerville  
317 agreed the wording does need to be tweaked to read clearer.

318  
319 Charles Svirk, 241 Hayden Road approached the podium. His question was not related to  
320 the lot line relocation but with regard to the scenic road, and about the land being given to  
321 passive recreation, he asked what the policy is for parking issues arising on Hayden Road.  
322 This is increasing dramatically on Hayden Road.

323  
324 Sherry Wyskiel, Land Protection Committee, answered this by explaining that once the  
325 Town owns the property, they are hoping to move the cell tower gate and use the landing  
326 area as a parking lot. They understand there is a safety issue, and they are going to work  
327 with American Tower to get the gate moved. It will not happen this year but it will happen.  
328 C. Svirk is concerned about the number of cars this will accommodate to help eliminate the  
329 number of cars parked on Hayden Road.

330  
331 B. Ming asked with reference to this last issue, he wondered were they only talking about  
332 the easement to the north or both easements. He wanted to know where the parking  
333 concern was. M. Fougere explained that anything to do with parking needs to be dealt with  
334 by the Selectman.

335  
336 P. Baker, Land Protection Committee approached the podium and discussed there were two  
337 problematic parking issues that need to be looked at.

338  
339 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

340  
341 B. Stelmack suggested that note 8 be reworded and asked if they should consider the ‘owner  
342 unknown’ parcel of land. We could ask assessing.

M. Fougere read his recommendations.

- The applicant submits four sets of revised plans along with a recordable mylar and applicable recording fees. Appropriate easement documents shall also be submitted.
- Prior to recording all lot corner bounds shall be set.
- Prior to any development of Lot 16: test pits shall be conducted per town requirements and wetland mapping be outlined on the plan
- Note 8 needs to be reworded.
- Amend the plan for scenic road setbacks.

He noted that the board had not discussed the Rural Character Ordinance for this potential building lot 16. In the past for lots frontage on Scenic Roads, the board has required that an 80 foot wide no cut buffer along the site's frontage. It was discussed and the applicant agreed that a no cut is placed on an 80 foot as long as access can be cut through.

D. Petry wants a memo sent to the selectman to highlight the parking discussions on Hayden Road.

C. Rogers made a motion to approve file #2812 with the conditions as listed. B. Stelmack seconded. All in favor none opposed.

**7. File #2813** – Proposed lot line relocation between two adjoining properties, 19 & 35 Flagg Road, Map 7 Lots 44-1 & 45, Owner/Applicants Richard & Mary Snell and Allan & Kristen Retter, Zoned RA Residential Agriculture. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere explained this proposal involved the relocation of lot lines between two adjoining properties. Lot 44-1 is increasing in size from 11.1 to 15 acres and Lot 45 is decreasing in size from 15.5 to 11.6 acres. All relevant zoning requirements are met.

There is only one staff recommendation and that is to submit a recordable mylar and applicable recording fees.

Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services, approached the podium. He explained the layout of the two lots and where the lot line relocation was happening and was inclusive of a small pond area. This is just a transfer of acres.

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

C. Hoffman opened the public hearing. As no one wished to speak C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

M. Fougere stated there would be one condition of approval to submit a recordable mylar and recording fees.

D. Petry made a motion to approve File #2813 as submitted with one condition as stated. B. Stelmack seconded. All in favor none opposed.



392 8. **File #2814** – Proposed site plan amendment, remove driveway, extend sidewalk and  
393 add landscaping, 30 Ash Street, Map 53 Lot 11, Applicant: Charlie Morgan, Owner: Swamp  
394 Frogs LLC, Zoned Agriculture Business & Historic Overlay District. **Application**  
395 **Acceptance and Public Hearing.**  
396

397 M. Fougere explained this was before the board a few years ago for an art school. Today  
398 they are returning with a site plan amendment. This site amendment involves removing the  
399 westerly driveway entrance, cutting back the eastern driveway radius and adding  
400 landscaping features to the front yard. The sign will be relocated to the west; trees, shrubs  
401 and hardscape features will be installed. The portion of the western driveway will be  
402 replaced with a concrete sidewalk and granite curbing; the eastern driveway radius will be  
403 improved. A small portion of existing sidewalk/curbing will be removed. The existing  
404 handicap ramp will be replaced.

405

406 The conditions that will apply if approved are:

407

- 408 1. The applicant shall submit five hard copies of the revised final plan.
- 409 2. Address any comments from the Fire Department.
- 410 3. Address comments from DPW, provide sidewalk thickness detail on plan, add required  
411 ADA truncated domes to the sidewalk ramp. The sidewalk on the eastern side of the  
412 driveway will have to have a handicapped ramp.
- 413 4. Obtain NHDOT driveway permit approval for modifying the driveway and sidewalk work.
- 414 5. Add to the plan: abutters, property zoning note and lot size.
- 415 6. The existing road sign on the eastern side of the driveway will need to be relocated note  
416 on the plan.
- 417 7. HDC approval has been obtained.

418

419 Kathleen Morgan approached the podium to talk briefly about the application. She  
420 explained the reason behind the design to make more easily accessed by handicapped  
421 persons.

422

423 M. Fougere also added that the existing design is a curved driveway which is not very safe  
424 and this will definitely help make it safer also.

425

426 Eric Buck, Terrain planning and design LLC, approached the podium and he explained the  
427 plans to the Planning Board including the type of New England native plants to be planted.

428

429 D. Petry made a motion to accept the application for review. B. Stelmack seconded. All in  
430 favor none opposed.

431

432 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing but with no one to speak she closed the public  
433 hearing.

434

435 M. Fougere listed the conditions as above although number 2 and 7 had already been dealt  
436 with.

437

438 D. Turcott made a motion to approve File #2814. B. Stelmack seconded. All in favor none  
439 opposed.

440

441 M. Fougere suggested that tat the next meeting he would like to discuss some zoning issues  
442 as the agenda is small.

443

444 B. Stelmack asked about the statement made by F. Grossman with regard to obtaining a  
445 master maintenance plan for guidance for the applicants. It was suggested that we reach  
446 out to Doug Gagne to see if he would be interested in helping with this task. D. Petry also  
447 added that UNH would maybe have a best management plan that would help.

448

449 C. Rogers made a non debatable motion to adjourn the meeting. D. Petry seconded. All in  
450 favor none opposed.

451 The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM

452

453

454 Respectively submitted by,

455

456

457 Wendy Trimble

458 Planning Secretary

459 Town of Hollis, NH

460