

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

September 20th, 2016

“Final”

1 **PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Doug
2 Cleveland – Vice Chairman, R. Hardy, Chet Rogers, Dan Turcott, Alternates Ben Ming, Bill
3 Moseley and Jeff Peters.

4
5 **ABSENT:** Brian Stelmack and David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen

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

13
14 R. Hardy moved to approve the minutes of August 16th 2016. Motion seconded by D.
15 Cleveland. All in favor, none opposed.

16
17 3. **DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:**

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

22
23 The Chair appointed Benjamin Ming (Alternate) to vote on behalf of Brian Stelmack.

24
25 4. **SIGNATURE OF PLAN –**

26
27 **File #2812 – Hayden Road Map 28 Lot 16 & 17**

28 R. Hardy made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the plan #2812. D. Cleveland
29 seconded. All in favor none opposed.

30
31 **5. File #2806 –** Proposed site plan amendment for the Hollis Montessori School to
32 expand occupancy of the school from 120 students to 200, increase staff, expand the
33 number of parking spaces and improve traffic circulation, use of bunkhouse for classrooms
34 and the addition of an athletic field, 9 South Merrimack Road, Map 36 Lot 32,
35 Owner/Applicant Hollis Montessori School, R/A Residential Agriculture. Application
36 Acceptance – April 19, 2016, tabled from July 19, Review period extended to Sept. 20th.

37 C. Hoffman stated that in light of the Zoning Board special exception that was granted on
38 September 12th 2016, and is completely inconsistent with the current application before us,
39 she proposed two options to the planning board and applicant to consider. The first is for
40 the applicant to withdraw this current application, with the understanding that they can
41 reapply without additional fees. The other option is for the board to deny the current
42 application as it is inconsistent with the ZBA approval, without prejudice to submitting a
43 new application that is consistent with the terms of the ZBA special exception approval.

44
45 Brad Westgate approached the podium and introduced himself as Lawyer at Winer &
46 Bennett, representing Hollis Montessori School. He was joined at the meeting by Kari
47 Headington – Head of Hollis Montessori School, Tom Morin – Morin’s Landscaping and
48 Earle Blatchford – Hayner/Swanson. He stated that before making the decision it

appeared to him there was a third option. And that was to bring the board up to speed with the revisions made to the plans submitted on September 9th in anticipation of this meeting. To get some feedback from the board on two fundamental issues that was part of that plan, one being the event or additional parking, and the other was the landscaping plan that was submitted with a lot of effort by Morin's and Hayner/Swanson. He went on to explain that the process was in place since April 2016 and if the board felt there should be further amendments made to the plan derivate from the special exception granted by the ZBA this could be done. The school has spent a lot of time, money and effort getting it to this point, it is a nonprofit operation, with operations that are dependent on parent and tuition support, and is a significant strain to go through these processes, and it would be valuable to get feedback from the changes made.

C. Hoffman asked the board to give their opinion on this. Each member was asked individually how they wished to proceed and after hearing this B. Westgate suggested that not a lot had changed and they had gone to the zoning board because the planning board had compelled them to go. He asked for a formal determination that his option was not acceptable and then he would ask for the motion to withdraw to which he would respond. Cathy asked M. Fougere to comment. He stated that he felt at the end of the day everyone would end up at the same place as the board had talked about having another public hearing outside of the options given today, obviously 20 conditions from ZBA is significant changes to dissect and it would be helpful to get comments or questions from the Planning Board on this issue. C. Hoffman agreed there were clarifications from a few of the conditions that would be needed from the ZBA. However the Chairman still felt that to withdraw this application and ask for a new application, detailing all the 20 conditions listed on the plan that agrees with all these new conditions, a new public hearing would be open for the abutters, and this would be clearer. B. Westgate asked for his motion to table the application until November to be made before any other motions made. D. Cleveland made a motion to deny the option to table the application until November that Attorney Westgate proposed. R. Hardy seconded. C. Hoffman asked if there was any discussion needed. None was requested. The board voted 5 – 1 to approve this motion. D. Turcott opposed this motion. Attorney Westgate respectfully requested that they will withdraw the application without prejudice the right to re-file. W. Trimble confirmed that the dates to re-file where the submission date for the Planning Board Meeting on November 15th 2016 the submission deadline was October 18th, and for the Planning Board meeting on December 20th 2016 the submission deadline was November 22nd.

6. File #2816 – Proposed lot-line relocation between three adjoining lots, 4 Cleasby Lane, o Depot Road and 15 Broad Street, Map 50 Lot 11, Map 50 Lot 13, Map 52 Lot 61, Owner/Applicants: Jonathan L. & Sarah H. Burns, Traci L. Weaver Rev. Trust and Kathryn R. & Thomas W. Hildreth Rev. Trust, Zoned TC Town Center. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere explained this proposal involves the relocation of lot lines between three adjoining properties. The applicants received a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for the creation of a 1.103 acre lot where 2 acres is required. The land involved with the plan actually lies behind two of the adjoining lots.

This plan shows the reduction in lot 50-13 lot from 2.053 acres to 1.103. Lot 50-11 will increase in size from 1.1 to 1.58 acres and Lot 52-61 will increase in size from 2.01 to 2.49 acres.

98

99 C. Hoffman asked to be clear, this is not creating any new house lots, and it is just lot line
100 relocation.

101 Tom Hildreth approached the podium to represent the applicants including himself. He
102 wanted to add to Marks report some information included in the letter submitted August
103 19th. The proposed lot line adjustment will move approximately 0.9 acres from Traci
104 Weaver's lot, to the lots of two of her neighbors – lots 50-11 and 52-61. The area in question
105 is largely unusable to the Weaver lot. It is around the corner from the home which is close
106 to Depot Road. The area is much more naturally connected to lots 50-11 and 52-61. Those
107 lots share much longer boundaries with the land in question; are directly affected by its
108 appearance/views; and more motivated, interested and inclined to care for the land. Traci
109 Weaver seeks to be relieved of the cost/responsibility for insuring, maintaining, monitoring,
110 and paying taxes on the land, which has little relevance and little connection to her house.

111 He continued by adding that on July 28, the Zoning Board granted a variance to Traci
112 Weaver to pave the way for this lot line relocation.

113 Doug Cleveland made a motion to accept file #2816. R. Hardy seconded. All in favor none
114 opposed.

115 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak so public hearing was
116 closed.

117 M. Fougere stated there would be two conditions.

118 1. The applicant shall submit a recordable mylar and three paper copies.

119 2. An LChip fee of \$25.00 is required to record the plan.

120 R. Hardy made a motion to approve file #2816. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none
121 opposed.

122

123 **7. File #2817** – Proposed lot line relocation between two adjoining lots, 60 and 74 Ridge
124 Road, Map 12 Lots 13 & 14, Owner/Applicants Thomas & Mary Ann Stawasz and Andrew &
125 Brooke Arthur, Zoned RA Residential & Agriculture. **Application Acceptance and**
126 **Public Hearing.**

127

128 This proposal involves the relocation of lot lines between two adjoining properties. Lot 12 -
129 13 will decrease in size from 6.72 to 4.91 and Lot 12-14 will increase in area from 2 acres to
130 3.8. This new area adjoins and is behind Lot 14.

131 Dan Turcott made a motion to accept File #2817 for consideration. D. Cleveland seconded.
132 All in favor none opposed.

133 Richard Maynard, Maynard & Paquette Eng, approached the podium representing the
134 applicants. He explained this was lot line relocation between lot 13 & lot 14.

135 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

136 E. Lones from 82 Ridge Road approached the podium. She asked what the applicant intent
137 to gaining this piece of land as it contains wetland. Mr. Maynard explained the wetland is
138 mapped on the plan and stamped by Gary Flaherty and there are no proposals to construct
139 anything. It also means no movement of water.

140 No one else wished to speak so public hearing was closed.

141 M. Fougere stated there would be three conditions.

142 1. Amend the typo on map to read Map 12 Lot 15.

143 2. All missing lot bounds on the south side of the properties shall be set prior to
144 recording.

145 3. The applicant shall submit a recordable mylar and three paper prints.

146 Doug Cleveland made a motion to approve File #2817. R. Hardy seconded. All in favor
147 none opposed.

148 **8. File #2818-** Proposed subdivision of an existing 8.2 acre lot into two lots, 154 Proctor
149 Hill Road, Map 12 Lot 18, Applicant/owner George R. & Gloria Burton, Zoned RL Rural
150 Lands. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**

151

152 Doug Cleveland made a motion to accept file #2818. R. Hardy seconded. All in favor none
153 opposed.

154

155 This proposal involves the subdivision of an existing 8.2 acre lot into two, creating a new 3.3
156 acre lot and a 4.9 acre lot with the existing home. The lot is relatively flat, sloping gently
157 uphill from Proctor Hill Road. This area is presently a farm field with few trees located on
158 the property.

159 The Fire Department has recommended that a \$7,500 fire cistern fee be placed in an escrow
160 upon issuance of a certificate of occupancy for Lot 18-1. Upon installation of the adjoining
161 fire cistern scheduled to be installed as part of the Austin Lane development, said funds
162 shall be transferred to the project owner to contribute to the construction of the cistern.
163 The cistern being installed will provide fire coverage to the entire neighborhood.

164

165 Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services, approached the podium. He asked the board for a
166 waiver request from Subdivision Regulation Section IV.2.G which requires the side property
167 line to lie perpendicular to the street line for at least 100 feet.

168 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak so the public hearing was
169 closed.

170 D. Turcott made a motion to approve the waiver request from a 90 degree angle. D.
171 Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

172 M. Fougere asked the board if they wished to consider the rural character ordinance with
173 this application and there are virtually no trees on this property except around the
174 perimeter. D. Cleveland asked if the cistern would be located in the Austin Lane
175 development. M. Fougere explained there is a cistern planned on Austin Lane, and as this
176 property would benefit from that cistern it would be fair for it to contribute to the cistern.

177 R. Hardy suggested with regard to the character of the land, no other buildings have
178 anything in the front of them, and this is the normal character for this area.

179 M. Fougere stated the conditions for this application are:

180 1. All missing lot bounds shall be set prior to recording.

- 181 2. NHDOT driveway permit and NHDES subdivision permit shall be obtained prior to
182 recording.
- 183 3. All applicable recording fees shall be submitted prior to recording.
- 184 4. Prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued for the development of Lot 12 18-1, a
185 fire cistern check for \$7,500.00 shall be submitted to the Planning Office. These
186 monies shall be deposited into an escrow account until such time the cistern is
187 installed in the adjoining Austin Lane project. Once the cistern is installed these
188 funds shall be given to the project developer.
- 189 5. The applicant shall submit a recordable mylar and three paper prints.

190 Doug Cleveland made a motion to approve file #2818 with the conditions as listed. C.
191 Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

192

193 **9. File #2820** – Proposed site plan for the construction of a recreational field adjoining
194 existing parking lot and fields, Map 18 Lot 14, Depot Road Applicant Hollis Recreation
195 Commission, Owner Town of Hollis, Zoned TC Town Center. **Application Acceptance**
196 **and Public Hearing.**

197

198 Mark Fougere stated the abutter had submitted a letter to raise some concerns he had and
199 the members of the board have been given a copy of this letter.

200

201 The site plan outlines a proposal to construct a new soccer field for the Town's recreation
202 area south of the parking lot. The master plan for this site did show a field in this area of
203 the property. The project will impact 9,500 square feet of wetland and the Conservation
204 Commission has reviewed the proposal.

205

206 M. Fougere asked if this has been to the conservation commission and approved by the
207 conservation commission and C. Hoffman said they had agreed to what was presented.

208

209 Mark Fougere explained this area was proposed to have some tennis courts some ten years
210 ago and those tennis courts were never constructed. Those fields have been an unofficial
211 parking lot and used by residents for years, but it is a low lying area that needs some
212 grading work and at town meeting it was agreed that some funding would be available to
213 formally make it a field. Once they did some measurements they realized they need some
214 help.

215

216 Doug Cleveland made a motion to accept the application file #2820. R. Hardy seconded.
217 All in favor none opposed.

218 Kevin Anderson, Meridian Land Services approached the podium. He will present the
219 application to upgrade the practice soccer field to a full time use soccer field. For the record
220 it is known as Map 18 Lot 14, location on Depot Road across from Nichols Field, also known
221 as the Hardy Field. It is surrounded by residential properties which is important to note.

222 He continued that around 2002 it was an agricultural field and in 2003 there was a site plan
223 that was brought before the planning board was it was presented with tennis courts, soccer
224 field and basket ball court. At that time only parking lot and soccer fields were constructed.
225 The area for this proposed new soccer field is currently being maintained as a practice

226 soccer field. He confirmed they had been before the Conservation Commission. He also
227 confirmed they are looking to fill in and modify 9500 sq feet of wetlands. All of that is being
228 maintained and mowed as part of the practice field. It is showing as red on the projected
229 plan. A conditional approval from the board is needed to send an application to the state
230 submit a formally permit the dredge and fill.

231 He stated that as far a construction of the soccer field, in order to get the proper drainage
232 for the soccer field, so that when it rains water sheds off, we will be bringing it up 2 or 3 feet
233 in grade, and it will be equal to the gravel parking spaces. As far as drainage pattern, it all
234 flows off to the agricultural drainage ditch to the back of the field and you can see that with
235 the topography and the contours. Drainage will not change, it is currently grass, it will
236 remain grass, there is no additional impervious area, and no drainage calculations were
237 provided with this plan. However, if there were, K. Anderson could confirm there will be no
238 increase in drainage from the current conditions today.

239 The board discussed the plan. B. Moseley asked if the current wetland is being mowed at
240 present and if there were any distinguishing features such as wet ground. It was confirmed
241 it was being mowed and K. Anderson stated he had sent two wetland specialists out to the
242 site to confirm where the wetland line needed to be delineated. He said that maintained
243 agricultural fields or grass are the hardest to delineate and it is all based on soil conditions
244 and this is what this plan is based on.

245 C. Rogers asked about the size of the field. It did not appear to be as wide as the existing
246 field. K. Anderson stated that there are no requirements for a soccer field size. There are
247 recommendations for length and width ratios, maximum lengths and maximum widths, and
248 this field that is currently used fulltime is maximized in both width and length for the area.
249 This was the best fit option to maximize the most number of youth groups from smaller kids
250 to high school kids.

251 D. Cleveland asked if the wetland was really a wetland or a drainage ditch. K. Anderson
252 said the short answer is that it is a wetland; it is classified as a wetland and has the features
253 of a wetland such as plant life and soil conditions. The drainage ditch is also classified as a
254 wetland. It needs to be accommodated and dealt with as a wetland. D. Cleveland added that
255 technically it is a wetland even though it is a manmade ditch or was it. K. Anderson stated
256 no, this whole area was wet and the drainage ditch was created to help alleviate some of the
257 water issues during agricultural use. It has always been a wetland. R. Hardy agreed that
258 was correct and if there was any issue with water flow it will be because it has not been
259 cleaned out. R. Hardy confirmed it is a straight drainage ditch and aerial photos as far back
260 as 1950's will show it.

261 C. Rogers asked about the parking area and how much it was used. Moving forward M.
262 Fougere stated that the proposed area of the soccer field is currently used on Old Home
263 Days, and this will not be allowed in the future. C. Rogers asked about the option of flip flop
264 the current parking area to be the soccer field. And if used as a parking lot would the
265 wetlands area still need to be addressed. K. Anderson said this would double the cost of
266 construction as you would have to move all the gravel area and the wetland area would still
267 need to bring the grade up and the gravels dry in order to keep it structurally sound. He
268 added he had checked the parking regulations and it gives full reign to the planning board
269 with regard to how much parking is needed for recreation. He feels what is there is

270 adequate. No lights are proposed. He confirmed there is enough space around the field for
271 it to be used as a full time regulation field.

272 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

273 Cliff Conneighton, 53 Depot Road, is the abutter to the south of the field. He had a question
274 regarding the wetlands area. He stated that the area is wet; the area just to the north of his
275 lot line is wet. This year was drier, but typically the water pools there. He stated that it only
276 recently has been mowed and he was not sure why it was mowed, but normally it was left to
277 grow wide with cattails and wild flowers.

278 He gave his history on this application. In 2002/2003 it was discussed he was concerned
279 about the distance from the edge of his property and how they could buffer themselves from
280 the noise and activity. He had received assurances that speak to this in the Planning Board
281 minutes. It was stated at that time “the southernmost point of possible future
282 development” is 415 feet from his property and that a buffer of trees would be established to
283 hide recreation activity from view of his property. The tennis courts never got built and the
284 trees never got planted. He is fine with the proposal but concerned over the impact it will
285 have on his property. He measured the distance from his property line to the goal posts are
286 now on the practice field is 165 feet. He told the recreation commission that he would be ok
287 with this development but he really did not want to see any development any closer to his
288 property line than 165 feet. He was not pushing for 415 feet but not closer than 160 feet.
289 Not with 10 foot overrun but the end of where activity will be should be 160 feet. And this
290 should be left wild for wetland. He had five requests that he had submitted to the Planning
291 Board that afternoon. This was quoted as:

- 292 1. The new field shall not come any closer than 160 feet from my property line.
- 293 2. A buffer of trees shall be planted and maintained immediately south of the
294 construction so as to prevent spectator seating, etc from encroaching closer than 160
295 feet to my property line and to block the view of activity from my property.
- 296 3. To enforce this boundary and to protect the wetlands, the land between this tree
297 buffer and property line shall not be mowed and allowed to grow in its natural
298 wetlands state.
- 299 4. Construction shall be designed and engineered to prevent water from draining onto
300 my property or into my basement.
- 301 5. No lighting or any structures will ever be permitted on this parcel.

302
303 The buffer of trees was previously asked for and he would like to see these planted
304 immediately. He added to the fourth issue, after the work was originally done when it was
305 taken from agriculture to recreation and parking lots, this was when they started to get a
306 real water problem in their basement. They now have two sump pumps in their basement.
307 It is problematic. So any new construction that is done in this area he is naturally
308 concerned about additional water problems. He wanted to make sure and get some
309 assurances that the problem will not be made worse by building the field up 3ft sounds like
310 it possibly could the water problem worse for his property. And then the fifth note was to
311 ensure no lighting would be installed in the future.

312 The board discussed the size of the field. Dave Belanger, Chairman of the Recreation
313 Committee answered some questions. He stated that in soccer the fields are sized to the age

314 groups. The shortage in fields is for the upper age groups. That is where you have the
315 recommendations on the size. The aim is to have two regulation fields for the older kids
316 instead of one. There is a variance anything from 50 yards to 70 yards wide and 450 feet
317 long. R. Hardy asked if there was a zoning ordinance that would be violated if this field was
318 constructed 300 x 165. M. Fougere says no. He then asked the engineer what the fill was
319 proposed to be used, typically there is a high percentage of sand to be used on the top
320 course to give you good drainage is that what is proposed and would it be 50% like on other
321 fields. K. Anderson answered that the final specifications would be done later but it would
322 be a well drained soil. R. Hardy agreed there should be no lighting but he felt that the board
323 cannot dictate something that does not violate the zoning ordinances. He suggested doing
324 the buffering next to the property line where the abutters would get the most value from any
325 height from any planting. It is best where it will benefit the abutter the most. He doesn't
326 believe there are any ordinance to prohibit mowing, and therefore the board would be
327 unable to recommend this either.

328 The board discussed options and ideas of where the field should be. D. Cleveland asked if
329 the proposal to increase by 3 feet was to make it level, and more towards the left side next to
330 the drainage ditch. K. Anderson agreed and the field would be crowned. R. Hardy asked to
331 address the abutters concern would it be appropriate to put in a drainage swale to handle
332 any additional water. K. Anderson explained he has a couple of constraints and the first one
333 is the water has to go to the swale and wherever the water is directed it will not change the
334 impact to the abutter. Also he is only has a threshold of 10,000 square feet of wetland
335 disturbance, or else he would have to get into mitigation and this project does not have the
336 resources to do that. Less than 10,000 square feet was the objective and he used the
337 agricultural drainage swale as the boundary and he modified the size of the field
338 accordingly. He added by bringing in structural fills and well draining material and
339 recreating the soccer field the water will drain away from the soils and into the drainage
340 swale. Its grass now and it will be grass later. However, the agricultural swale is not
341 maintained. D. Cleveland talked about mowing and how it would be better to mow to help
342 the wetlands.

343 Kyle Gillis the Recreation Director for the Town of Hollis, stated there is no proposal to put
344 light up and their aim to get a second full sized field so the older kids have more space to
345 play. He added that the past two summers the Hardy Field South has been dry and a wet
346 spring will make it spongy. They want to make it the best field possible.

347 Dave Belanger, Chairman of the Recreation Commission, stated that they did not have a lot
348 of options to reconfigure this field. He explained how busy their schedules are on the fields
349 and the demand for more room. They also need the parking area. He stated they are three
350 fields short in town, and he is hoping this works.

351 The board discussed trees and it was decided not to choose the trees tonight but to work
352 with the abutter and engineer later and a recommended distance of 20ft from the property
353 line.

354 K. Anderson made a correction on item number 1 on the list. He measured the plan and it is
355 145 feet to toe of the grading not 160 feet.

356 The recommendations made were no lighting and trees planted 20ft from property line.

357 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

358 C. Rogers made a motion to approve application with the recommendations and D.
359 Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

360 **10. File #2819** – Review of buffer impact per Wetland Ordinance, Section C3 Jurisdiction,
361 Existing Lots, for the construction of a single family home on a grandfathered lot of record,
362 1.14 acres, Witches Spring Road, Map 46 Lot 12, Owner/Applicant Douglas and Cynthia
363 Nye.

364
365 M. Fougere explained this project involves the construction of a single family home on an
366 existing 1.14 acre lot of record lying at the corner of Ames Road and Witches Spring Road.
367 The home would be built in an area of a former mill that was located on this property for
368 many years. The applicant intends to remove the former granite foundation and build a full
369 basement in the channel that runs through the site. The submitted plan shows no wetland
370 filling for this project, but the building will be constructed up to the edge of the existing
371 wetland. This plan has been submitted to the Conservation Commission for review and
372 comment.

373 This lot is a grandfathered lot of record and can be built on provided specific conditions are
374 met. The Wetland Ordinance, Section C.3 Jurisdiction c. Existing Lots, states the following:

375 This ordinance shall not prohibit the construction of principal and accessory structures on
376 an unimproved lot or the expansion of a legally pre-existing use on a lot that legally existed
377 before March 11, 1997. However, such construction or expansion will only be permitted
378 upon determination by Planning Staff (or Planning Board per staff recommendation) that:

379 (i) It is not feasible to place the structure outside the buffer zone

380 (ii) The structure must be set back as far as possible from the delineated edge of the wetland
381 or surface water

382 (iii) Appropriate erosion control measures must be in place prior to and during construction

383 (iv) Any disturbance to the surrounding buffer zone must be repaired and restored upon
384 completion of construction

385 (v) All available mitigation measures to address changes in water quality and quantity be
386 implemented, if required by Planning Staff/ Planning Board

387 This is the review criteria the Planning Board must follow in reviewing this case.

388 (i) ***It is not feasible to place the structure outside the buffer zone:*** The
389 entire property lies within the 100 wetland buffer zone.
390

391 (ii) ***The structure must be set back as far as possible from the delineated***
392 ***edge of the wetland or surface water:*** The area between the wetland edge
393 and the road right of way averages between 80 and 90 feet in width. A septic
394 system has been designed near the edge of the right of way to maximize the
395 distance to any wetland areas. The home will be constructed on the location of
396 the former mill building.
397

398 (iii) ***Appropriate erosion control measures must be in place prior to and***
 399 ***during construction:*** A detailed erosion control plan is needed for this
 400 project. It should also be inspected during construction.
 401

402
 403 (iv) ***Any disturbance to the surrounding buffer zone must be repaired***
 404 ***and restored upon completion of construction:*** Restoration details of
 405 the site should be added to the plan.
 406

407 (v) ***All available mitigation measures to address changes in water***
 408 ***quality and quantity be implemented, if required by Planning Staff/***
 409 ***Planning Board:*** The Conservation Commission will be reviewing this plan.
 410

411 Additional details should be addressed on the plan; erosion control measures and
 412 construction specifics. Also this site was once served by a channel that carried water from
 413 Witches Spring Brook into the mill area where the home will be constructed. This channel
 414 still exists and in flood conditions could carry water into this site; a 48 inch culvert
 415 presently exits under Ames Road. The applicant has stated that he intends to fill this old
 416 channel. Details of this filling should be provided and the existence of wetlands should be
 417 explored.

418 C. Hoffman asked D. Nye to provide a plan of the complete lot. Then the board looked at
 419 the Mapgeo to show the flood plain. M. Fougere stated the finished floor must be above the
 420 flood plain according to FEMA rules. The plan also needs to be amended to meet the 50ft
 421 setbacks.

422 Doug Nye approached the podium. He explained there is a convergence of the naturally
 423 flowing Witches Spring and a diversion dam that would manually to force the water through
 424 the mill. Currently there is no flow through the site. His proposal is to install some sheet
 425 pilings that are driven into the ground, to protect the wetland area, remove the existing
 426 granite that is on site, stock pile it and reuse the granite to build a wall to protect the
 427 wetlands and bring in the infill. And then pull the pilings out; the wetlands will come up to
 428 the granite wall. C. Hoffman asked if they would have to approach DES. He wasn't sure but
 429 said he was working with Meridian at the moment. M. Fougere confirmed the setback from
 430 the wetlands needs to be 100 feet in our ordinance. It has to meet the front setback of 50
 431 feet. C. Hoffman highly recommended a site walk. This was agreed and arranged for
 432 Tuesday October 18th at 5pm. M. Fougere suggested having the property staked out.
 433

434 This was not a public hearing but there was an abutter who wished to speak. Philip
 435 Lavergne, 11 Ames Road approached the podium. He owns the lot directly opposite and the
 436 lot that contains the barn. He recommends a site walk. There is a lot of water there right
 437 now. Personally he does not want to see a house being built there but that is just his
 438 opinion. He is not an expert, but he had some questions that were addressed by M. Fougere
 439 at the office, but these questions leads to more questions. He gave permission to walk on
 440 his land also if needed.

441 C. Hoffman confirmed the site walk and this will be continued onto the October meeting.
 442

443 M. Fougere also stated that Doug Gagne had accepted the position of Landscape
 444 Consultant.
 445

446 C. Rogers made a non debatable motion to adjourn the meeting. D. Cleveland seconded. All
447 in favor none opposed.

448 The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM

449

450

451 Respectively submitted by,

452

453

454 Wendy Trimble

455 Planning Secretary

456 Town of Hollis, NH

457