

## HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016

“FINAL”

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, R. Hardy, Brian Stelmack, and David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen, Bill Moseley – Alternate, Jeff Peters – Alternate.

**ABSENT:** Chet Rogers, Dan Turcott, Ben Ming – Alternate, Wendy Trimble – Planning Secretary

**STAFF:** Mark Fougere, Town Planner

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

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

J. Peters moved to approve the minutes of July 19<sup>th</sup> 2016. Motion seconded by B. Stelmack. All in favor, none opposed. D. Cleveland abstained.

B. Moseley moved to approve the site walk minutes of June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016. Motion seconded by B. Stelmack. All in favor, none opposed. C. Hoffman abstained.

3. **DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:**

- A. Agenda Additions and Deletions – None
- B. Committee Reports – None
- C. Staff Report – None
- D. Regional Impact – None

4. **SIGNATURE OF PLAN –**

**File #2807 – Proposed Conditional Use Permit and site plan for the installation of a Ground Mounted Solar Energy System, Tolmac Solar LLC, 140 Ridge Road Map 7 Lot 37**

R. Hardy made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the plan #2807. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

**File #2813 – Lot line relocation, 19–35 Flagg Road, Map 7 Lot 44-1 and 45.**

R. Hardy made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the plan #2813. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

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 Agriculture. Application Acceptance – April 19, 2016, tabled from July 19, Review period extended to August 16.**

M. Fougere introduced the application by updating the board with news that Hollis Montessori School are going to the Zoning Board on August 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016 with a Special

49 Exception application. Attorney Brad Westgate wanted the opportunity to speak to the  
50 board tonight.

51

52 Brad Westgate, Lawyer with Winer & Bennett, LLP approached the podium representing  
53 Hollis Montessori School. He stated that following last month's meeting the landscaping  
54 plan and maintenance plan still remain outstanding items. These plans are not ready for  
55 action at tonight's meeting but there are a few other items he wanted to discuss briefly  
56 tonight to maybe make more efficient use of the time at next month's meeting. He stated  
57 for the record the timeframe for review by the board was extended through to tonight and  
58 they do agree to and commit that the timeframe be extended through to September 20<sup>th</sup>  
59 2016. They fully understand that this application would be deferred to that next Planning  
60 Board Meeting.

61

62 The first item B. Westgate wanted to address was the landscaping. Since the last month's  
63 meeting, he confirmed the representatives of the school board have met with Tom Moran of  
64 Moran's Landscaping and they hoped to be working with T. Moran to achieve a goal and  
65 objective of pulling together a landscape plan and maintenance plan. The intent is to make  
66 these plans available 10 days prior to the next Planning Board Meeting.

67

68 M. Fougere also added at this point that Doug Gagne had provided the Planning Board with  
69 a letter. D. Gagne had visited the site at Rick's request, to look at the landscaping. He was  
70 involved with the original approval and was involved with the application. He has put  
71 together some recommendations and a copy had just been given to Brad Westgate to pass  
72 onto the appropriate persons at the school. B. Westgate thanked him, and confirmed he  
73 would pass it onto Moran's and those at the school working on the landscaping.

74

75 The second item that B. Westgate wanted to address at this meeting was the pickup  
76 contingency plan. It was discussed at the last meeting, but after reading the minutes it was  
77 not clear if the board had any remaining questions or concerns about it. He would like to  
78 address any concerns if there are any so it would be helpful if the board could confirm if  
79 there were any regarding the queuing contingencies, and if not then no time would be  
80 needed to deal with it next month.

81

82 C. Hoffman asked the board members if anyone had any issues with Plan B, i.e. doubling up  
83 of cars outside the school at pickup. R. Hardy stated that he was aware the school had  
84 asked for an extension of hours for the school into the evening, and he is concerned that if  
85 the Fire Chief had requested that no parking is permitted along the loop to the bunkhouse,  
86 where would people park and also is there enough parking for the requested increase in  
87 students from 120 to 200 and staff from 10 to 25. Is there enough additional parking for  
88 teachers and staff?

89

90 B. Westgate responded in reverse, stating that the plan before the Planning Board calls for  
91 an additional 21 parking spaces that would meet the calculation of 200 students (1 per 12)  
92 and the 25 staff. This plan would meet the parking requirements under the site plan  
93 regulations for a 200 student enrolment and 25 staff, so yes there would be sufficient onsite  
94 parking. R. Hardy asked what happens if there are parents for a school play or other events,  
95 where are all the extra cars parking. B. Westgate said that with any school setting there is  
96 always an issue with temporary need for parking on events. R. Hardy wanted to know how  
97 can the board be sure that the school would follow the fire chief's recommendation of 'no

98 parking' if they don't know where these extra cars would park. B. Westgate said they would  
99 have to follow the recommendation.

100  
101 B. Westgate continued to explain what was being requested. He said they have filed for an  
102 application for a special exception, with the zoning board of adjustment, which will be  
103 heard on Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> August 2016. This was to explain the background to his response.  
104 This application has been filed, because they have tried but were unable to get an  
105 administrative determination as to what the scope of 2010 special exception would permit  
106 in terms of regular school day activity verses extracurricular activities or events, the nub of  
107 the primary issue before both boards. He said they are not asking for an expansion of hours  
108 as you perhaps thought, but they are trying to get definition from the zoning board as to  
109 what constitutes the regular school day activities, and what constitutes the extracurricular  
110 or beyond the regular school hours activities. We have been unable to get that  
111 administratively as the board knows, in May, the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement  
112 Officer Dave Gagnon, issued a letter to the school commenting on uses that were occurring  
113 after the regular hours. The school has appealed that letter and this is also before the  
114 zoning board but it has become clear that route is not going to give them the definition they  
115 need. Hence they have filed a new special exception application. So what they are seeking is  
116 defining what happens in a regular school day and defining what can happen beyond a  
117 regular school day. They are not expanding hours per say but setting forth what can happen  
118 8 to 3 verses what can happen beyond 8 to 3. In terms of parking when you have such  
119 things as a school play in the evening, the only way to think about this is you cannot design  
120 a parking lot for a school that will accommodate 100 cars for example for rare occasions.  
121 This does not make planning sense and the regulations don't call for it. He added that the  
122 Fire Chief has stated that he does not want parking on the gravel loop road (except for 6  
123 proposed parking spaces), but from talking to the schools engineer there is a possibility that  
124 he would be open to parking along the loop if it was more defined as gravel shoulders and  
125 clarity of where the road is verses where the shoulders are. So that still needs to be worked  
126 out a bit. R Hardy stated that the looped road is not paved anyway. He confirmed what he  
127 was concerned about was if the school is having these events, where are people going to  
128 park, he was not suggesting that it needs to be paved, but it should be shown on the plan  
129 with how many cars it can accommodate. B. Westgate said he would report back to the  
130 engineer.

131  
132 C. Hoffman asked if the board had any further questions about plan B. B. Westgate said that  
133 K. Headington was with him tonight and she may be able to address some further questions  
134 better than him. R. Hardy asked, if there were to be evening events is there any plans to  
135 install lighting, as a safety issue, as the abutters need to know this. B. Westgate said he  
136 would pass this question onto Hayner-Swanson. He does not think there is any new  
137 lighting proposed on the site although there is cut of lighting approved on the bunkhouse.

138  
139 Doug Cleveland asked if the final plan to be presented to the Planning Board after next  
140 week's zoning board meeting and they make their decisions, will be the final plan including  
141 all the parking amendments, etc, fully explained, and that over the next 5, 10 or 20 years  
142 will there will be no more expansion, no further changes amendments, or can we anticipate  
143 more changes coming before the Planning Board. B. Westgate stated the goal of the zoning  
144 board meeting is to have clarity on uses, for a school with an enrolment of up to 200  
145 students. The school has stated it will take time and a reasonable significant period of time  
146 to reach this number of students, if it is ever reached. If there are changes to the site in the

147 future they would be under that umbrella of the special exception which we will hopefully  
 148 see granted next week, for up to 200 students. There could conceivably be site plan changes  
 149 in the future, that would obviously have to go before this board, whether they are  
 150 reconfigurations of buildings, internal changes, a change in traffic flow or parking, those  
 151 possibilities will always exist and they would have to come back to the Planning Board. D.  
 152 Cleveland stated that one thing that the board was not in favor of was a piecemeal approach  
 153 where things get change incrementally every few years such as a request for more parking,  
 154 change to loop road, athletic field and facilities, building expansion or new buildings. We  
 155 would rather see the overall big picture now. B. Westgate suggested that we would not see  
 156 in the foreseeable future any intent to go back to the zoning board or to expand the  
 157 enrolment to more than 200 students, if in fact that is what happens next week, but he  
 158 cannot rule out changes in the site that would need to come back before the Planning Board  
 159 but he hears his point. D. Cleveland stated that basically he would like it done right the first  
 160 time.

161  
 162 B. Westgate addressed the chairman and stated that he feels comfortable with Plan B and  
 163 suggested that he hears R. Hardy points regarding parking but that is a little different from  
 164 Plan B issue which was addressing pick up time for the school day.

165  
 166 B. Westgate stated the last item he wanted to discuss today was the discussion the board  
 167 had in the meeting on July 19<sup>th</sup> regarding a change of use or expansion of use. The board  
 168 had some concerns acting on the plan because of that possible issue. B. Westgate wanted to  
 169 state for the record from reading the minutes of the July meeting he got the sense that  
 170 some members of the board are concerned that what is being proposed is either a change of  
 171 use or an expansion of the existing use and that some action at the zoning board level had to  
 172 be taken. The school has now filed the application for special exception but they have really  
 173 been working on that concept before the July 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, not so much in the idea that they  
 174 thought they were expanding the use as respectfully they don't think they are, but because  
 175 of the need to clarify what is going on in regular school hours verses outside regular school  
 176 hours. This is the primary reason the school filed the special exception application, because  
 177 administratively that has not been determined and town staff and the school need guidance  
 178 on that point. However the Planning Board raised a couple of things in July that gave rise  
 179 to the concern about expansion of use. One was the placement of the athletic field on the  
 180 plan and the other was the conversion of the bunkhouse and use of the bunkhouse for  
 181 classroom space. B. Westgate stated he does not think that either of these rise to that level.  
 182 He said the initial one becomes moot should the zoning board grants the special exception  
 183 application. However he wanted to get across their thought process. This application and  
 184 site plan approval was accepted as complete on April 2016 when the process started.  
 185 Obviously if the board accepted the application as complete application then the school  
 186 thought that zoning issues and base engineered planning issues were satisfied or else it  
 187 would not have been accepted as complete and the public hearing process would not have  
 188 started. So that in itself does not indicate an expansion of use or change of use before you  
 189 as the process has been ongoing for several months based on a complete application. But  
 190 also when these two points are examined, and putting them aside, this board has already  
 191 dealt with the change of use of the bunkhouse in 2012, when the school requested the  
 192 bunkhouse to be used for school related activities, and this was approved. So the  
 193 bunkhouse has already been dealt with under the umbrella of the 2011 special exception.  
 194 He went on to say the athletic field is nearly too grand a description of what it is. It is really  
 195 just an area of grass with two soccer nets at either end set up for recreational and recess

196 purposes primarily for the school. This is now noted on the plan to show where it is but  
 197 obviously athletics is a part of any school, as is classrooms a component of any school, so he  
 198 does not think by nature they are an expansion of use. If they board have any other reasons  
 199 to think of the expansion of use then they need to know the rational.  
 200

201 C. Hoffman responded by explaining that the board had received changes to the plan in July  
 202 after the board had accepted the application as it was in the beginning in April. One of the  
 203 changes was adding the use of the bunkhouse to be used for classrooms. There is a big  
 204 difference between using the bunkhouse for classrooms when the kids are going to be in it  
 205 all day from 8-3 compared to using it as a project room with occasional use. The athletic  
 206 field was not even delineated on the plan at the beginning. She stated that the Board  
 207 requires from a site plan to show everything that the site will be used for now and in the  
 208 future. Frank Grossman was asked at a meeting if the athletic field had the potential to be  
 209 used as a full size athletic field in the future and he responded that everything has potential.  
 210 So in the future it could be a regulation field and if so it could be used by other people other  
 211 than the school, and be rented out for soccer practices, etc. Also expanding to 200 students  
 212 from 120 students is quite an increase and for the record the applicant set the limit at 120  
 213 student and 10 staff in the original application.  
 214

215 D. Petry wanted to ask M. Fougere a few questions. He wanted to confirm did the original  
 216 special exception ask for what hours of operation. M. Fougere stated it said 'No after school  
 217 or weekend teaching activities and all main school activities shall occur between the hours  
 218 of 8 am and 3 pm Monday through Friday.' D. Petry stated it said 8 am to 3 pm it means 8  
 219 to 3. He would assume the later pick up of a student would be no big deal but the board  
 220 does not want long lines after 4 or 5 pm because of another activity. D. Petry then asked  
 221 about the special exception that has been received by the zoning board, was this after we  
 222 had received indications from Town Council, that it was an expansion of use? M. Fougere  
 223 confirmed correct. D. Petry stated that even if town staff disagrees with that  
 224 recommendation the Planning Board are basing their decision and what they believe their  
 225 path forward is based on our Town Council. He added, the board has been advised it is a  
 226 change of use and that is how they are approaching this application. He feels the original  
 227 special exception is very clear and the school may disagree, so to be clear, now there are  
 228 more changes to the plan if the special exception is approved, what are the new hours of  
 229 operation the school is asking for?  
 230

231 B. Westgate stated they had asked the zoning board for the same concept of 8 am – 3 pm for  
 232 what they are calling regular school day activities, as this is the term they would like to use.  
 233 But then they are asking the zoning board to define regular school day activities. D. Petry  
 234 asked what the schools end game is? Is it 5 pm or 6 pm? He wants to avoid more confusion.  
 235 B. Westgate said it would not be confusing if they could get definitiveness from a zoning  
 236 board determination. A school has a lot of things that happen outside 8 to 3. Obviously  
 237 there are activities between 8-3 and after 8-3. He said that Dave Gagnon, Building  
 238 Inspector recognized that when he sent the letter to the school that he recognizes there are  
 239 activities that occur outside of 8-3. He described what he thought were ok activities beyond  
 240 8-3 and those that were not ok. So clearly the special exception contemplates some things  
 241 between 8-3 and other things beyond 8-3. The problem is there is no definitiveness. If the  
 242 zoning board defines clearly, regular school day activities and extracurricular activities then  
 243 everyone will know what has to happen 8-3 and what has to happen beyond 8-3. They have

244 detailed for the board exactly what activities will occur and give an overall time frame, a  
 245 sense of how frequently they occur, and that sort of thing. They do not want uncertainty.  
 246 D. Petry referred to the special exception application that was submitted to the zoning  
 247 board. He said to be clear, that what B. Westgate has described as trying to understand the  
 248 determination is not what they have asked for in the hours of operation. They have asked  
 249 for extension from 3 pm to 10 pm Monday through Friday, and 8 am to 10 pm at weekends,  
 250 with occasional overnight stays at weekends. So for the record they have gone beyond just  
 251 asking for an explanation. B. Westgate stated that this needed to be taken into context the  
 252 hours of operations are for the extracurricular activities and events, not for full school  
 253 blown events. They are asking them to find specific findings and specific definitions that  
 254 will be submitted the next day to the zoning board, to ask them to define precisely what  
 255 main school activity means and what extracurricular are.

256  
 257 D. Petry stated that is he concerned and feels the board should be concerned about getting a  
 258 balance between what the schools wishes are and how disruptive this will be to the  
 259 neighbors. And as R. Hardy stated also, if they plan of having evening performances, the  
 260 site will not accommodate the number of cars that will show up for 200 students for a  
 261 performance without parking on South Merrimack Road. South Merrimack Road is not  
 262 suitable to park on. B. Westgate appreciated that point. D. Petry addressed M. Fougere and  
 263 asked as this proposal is asking to increase students from 120 to 200, is the septic system  
 264 suitable for these numbers. The exact number would be sent to the board.

265 B. Westgate finished by stating that in 2010 the zoning board as part of its approval gave as  
 266 its condition hours of 8 – 5 Monday to Friday, but also a recommendation for the Planning  
 267 Board to give its recommendation for the number of students. The zoning board did not  
 268 impose a student number limitation. The numbers of students that are enrolled now are  
 269 based on parking lot calculations. No one really put down an enrollment mandate. The  
 270 enrollment is governed by parking. C. Hoffman disagrees with that statement as the  
 271 applicant asked for 120 students. R. Hardy added that parking obviously did not work as the  
 272 traffic was backing up onto the South Merrimack Road regularly. He also asked how they  
 273 will accommodate the abutters with the new information on the site plan. C. Hoffman  
 274 added that the abutters will get a chance to speak at the zoning board meeting and the  
 275 Planning Board will also schedule in the September meeting another public hearing.

276  
 277 B. Westgate concluded by respectfully asking for this application is deferred to the  
 278 September meeting. R. Hardy made a motion to table this application to September 20<sup>th</sup>, D  
 279 Petry seconded. All in favor none opposed.

280  
 281 **6. File #2809** – Design Review: Site plan review, proposed storage buildings replacing  
 282 approved landscaping yard, 250 – 254 Proctor Hill Road, Applicant Erich Mueller Owner  
 283 Island Time Realty, LLC, Map 11 Lot 24, Zoned IN Industrial. **Public Hearing.**

284  
 285 M. Fougere introduced this design review application that was before the board last month;  
 286 it is on the site of an old landscaping site out on Route 130. This site plan outlines a  
 287 proposal to construct 54,300 square feet of self storage units in 8 buildings. This site has  
 288 been approved for a number of uses in the past, including a landscaping yard and a  
 289 driveway seal coating company. Porous pavement will be used to address drainage  
 290 conditions on the property.

291

292 He added the proposed plan will use the two existing driveways to access the site; one of the  
 293 storage buildings will lie perpendicular to Proctor Hill Road and is 340 feet long. This  
 294 building would provide some screening from the proposed use, but is also an extremely long  
 295 building creating a rather large mass along the street. The Board may want to consider this  
 296 in their discussions. No connections to adjoining properties are proposed. There was a  
 297 landscaping plan showing two alternative ideas. The plan has been reviewed by Dennis  
 298 LaBombard, the town engineer and he has submitted a report. M. Fougere included in his  
 299 list a number of issues. He has asked that they show a prohibition of hazardous materials  
 300 on the plan, and also include salt use on site. He also asked for a maintenance plan or  
 301 requirements for the porous pavement and for clarity on the 100 foot wetland buffer at the  
 302 back of the site and a buffer line should be clearly marked in the field and silt fence installed  
 303 prior to any work starting on the site. More details are needed for proposed lighting and a  
 304 note should be added to the plan stating that all site lighting is downcast and if any other  
 305 lights on the site.

306

307 David Petry asked a question regarding the new plan submitted showing the side elevations  
 308 of the building. D. Cleveland asked if the square footage remained the same. It is almost  
 309 100 sq ft difference.

310

311 Chad Brannon, Fieldstone Land Consultants representing the applicant Erich Mueller and  
 312 Island Time Realty, had approached the podium and was answering these questions. The  
 313 plans were conceptually presented to the Planning Board in June. In the beginning it was  
 314 being looked at 2 dimensionally with a layout. Since then the board requested a design  
 315 review. They had touched on the preferred orientation of the buildings and he would like  
 316 the board's feedback on this layout. His client had gone with the new layout as his  
 317 perception was that the original layout of a building running parallel to the road would be  
 318 preferred by the board as it hid the site, but after new plans were done showing the side  
 319 elevations C. Brannon felt this may be better. He added that they are proposing a  
 320 significant amount of landscaping along the front also. But they want to achieve the balance  
 321 of a commercial building in the right setting. They do not intend to put a hedge along the  
 322 front but to plant some street trees and or shrubs to present it appropriately.

323

324 The other element to this design is the porous pavement which comes with a regimented  
 325 maintenance plan that discourages the applicant from using it. The State has permitted this  
 326 porous pavement for about 10 years. It's a great product for the right application. This site  
 327 is a good use of the product primarily because of low traffic but also because the applicant  
 328 maintains porous paving as part of his job and has the equipment. It reduces the need for  
 329 large areas of storm water management, which would be unsightly. They are proposing one  
 330 infiltration basin, in the south east corner of the site, which will encroach in the wetland  
 331 buffer. If the board chooses to prefer the new site layout, it could be moved somewhat to  
 332 the north but this would not prevent complete encroachment in the wetland buffer. They  
 333 are impacting as they cannot route the storm water runoff from the east part of the site, to  
 334 get it back into the porous area due to the depth. They have tried to minimize the wetland  
 335 buffer impact, with the smaller infiltration basin. The remainder of the storm water for the  
 336 site is routed through a perimeter swale into the porous media or infiltrated along the way.  
 337 The site is self contained. They have no problems with any comments raised by D.  
 338 LaBombard all his comments and concerns will be addressed.

339

340 Lighting has not been planned for this site as building orientation will change it. But this  
341 can be included once the preferred layout is decided. All details will be included.

342  
343 C. Hoffman asked what restrictions would there be on storage. C. Brannon did not have  
344 these details but he would get a list and put notes on plans.

345  
346 J. Peters asked if the porous surface self thaws and what is the height of the buildings. C.  
347 Brannon confirms it does and the building is about 12 – 14 feet high. This would be in the  
348 final plan. J. Peters confirmed his question was regarding visibility from the road over the  
349 plantings and landscaping.

350  
351 B. Stelmack asked where the main office would be positioned on site for customers. C.  
352 Brannon confirmed that interestingly they have no offices and people go about renting the  
353 premises by contacting a central office. The site would have a keypad. It is a completely  
354 gated and locked facility from the road. It is normally a six foot high, chain linked black  
355 vinyl coated fence. However the site right now is boarded primarily by conservation land  
356 and fencing is the site as a whole comes with a cost. If the board felt is needed to be fenced  
357 then the applicant will consider as security is always a concern.

358  
359 J. Peters asked what the weight limit of trucks, would be on the porous paving if any. C.  
360 Brannon said it can be designed to handle large trucks, but with large trucks by turning the  
361 wheel the surface can break down. The site will only be able to handle smaller trucks, but  
362 this will be looked at in the final design. They will ask the fire department to look at the  
363 plan to ensure they will be able to access it with a fire engine.

364  
365 B. Stelmack asked if there would be any parking overnight of vehicles on site. C. Brannon  
366 stated there is normally no overnight parking on site or outdoor storage or parking  
367 proposed.

368  
369 C. Hoffman considered the proposal to be open 24/7 for people to have access and asked C.  
370 Brannon to clarify. He said there was never much problem with this type of use and it was  
371 considered light use. As there are no light inside the units it will regulate the usage as you  
372 won't see at night.

373  
374 R. Hardy said when the project was first presented to the board, it was said that there was  
375 lots of screening to the west side. He does not see it on the plan, so would there been an  
376 intention to install screening on the west side. C. Brannon said he would review that with  
377 his client. Even though they own that parcel now if they ever choose to sell it then it would  
378 need to be screened and this needs to be clarified.

379  
380 R. Hardy also requested a scaled plan to be presented to the board 10 days prior to the  
381 Planning Board meeting. He also commented that 8 of the 20 trees on the plan are  
382 evergreen and typically the plantings are required to be in keeping with the rural character,  
383 maybe in front of the fence there could be a few more evergreens to help screening.

384  
385 Dave Petry asked if there was any opportunity for expansion on this property. For example  
386 if the site next door was considered for expansion that a lot line is removed and they wanted  
387 to expand and that would mean a new site plan application would be required. So for the  
388 record this site is built-out with this plan.

The members of the board agreed they preferred seeing the site plan showing gable ends of buildings as opposed to having the full width elevation facing the road.

Dennis LaBombard the consulting engineer for the Town, approached the podium. He has looked at the porous pavement issue as it is relatively new and nothing like this in Hollis. He felt it is a good system on the right site, and this appears to be a good site for it. He referred to his letter dated August 11, 2016 and highlighted his comments from that letter. He asked for further information to be given with the application regarding the infiltration basin and reservoir layer. He also stated there should be an overflow system of some kind. Maintenance is critical and a maintenance plan is required.

C. Hoffman asked if any abutter wished to speak. XX from Hollis spoke from the audience and said his only concern was the porous pavement but after hearing D. Labombard he is ok with it. No one else wished to speak.

Doug Cleveland made a motion to move File #2809 to final design. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none opposed.

#### **Other issues**

M. Fougere wanted to bring the board up to date with a couple of issues. The State statute with regard to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) has changed. Hollis has allowed ADU but some communities did not allow them, and now they have to allow them. They require special exception and our ordinance needs to be changed to say the minimum area is 750 sq ft. We can keep our maximum to be 800 sq ft.

M. Fougere also said that a couple of weeks ago there was an application that got denied before the zoning board for elderly housing asking for a variance on the size of the property and reduce the age to 55. Our ordinance states the acreage is 30 acres and age is 62. They wanted a variance on the acreage and age. The zoning board asked where did these figures originate from and would the planning board consider amending them. R. Hardy and D. Petry asked that the zoning board put something in writing in a formal memo for consideration.

J. Peters asked the board if there had been any consideration given to increasing the acreage on properties from 2 acres to help keep the rural character. After discussion between members of the board, it was decided to leave well alone.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM

Respectively submitted by,

Wendy Trimble  
Planning Secretary  
Town of Hollis, NH

438