

**HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**  
**“FINAL”**

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, R. Hardy, Brian Stelmack, Chet Rogers, and Alternate members; Bill Moseley, Benjamin Ming and Jeff Peters

**ABSENT:** David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen and Dan Turcott.

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

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

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

D. Cleveland moved to approve the minutes of October 18<sup>th</sup> 2016 as amended. Motion seconded by R. Hardy. All in favor, none opposed. B. Stelmack abstained.

C. Hoffman Chairman appointed B. Moseley to vote on behalf of C. Rogers (who had not yet arrived) and B. Ming to vote on behalf of D. Turcott.

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 #2816 – 4 Cleasby Lane, 0 Depot Road and 15 Broad Street. Lot line relocation.**

B. Moseley made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the plan #2816. D. Cleveland seconded. All in favor none opposed.

5. **File#2821** – Continued discussion, major site plan review for the construction of seven storage buildings replacing approved landscaping yard, 250 – 254 Proctor Hill Road, Applicant Erich Mueller, Owner Island Time Realty LLC, Map 11 Lot 24, Zoned IN Industrial Tabled from Oct 18<sup>th</sup>.

M. Fougere explained that this application had been tabled from October 18<sup>th</sup> to allow time for a number of outstanding issues to be addressed. He stated that most of the engineering issues had been addressed. A 15,000 gallon cistern has been added to the plan by the request of the fire department instead of a 30,000 gallon tank. The cistern area will however be built to accommodate another 15000 gallons if in the future more development occurs in that part of town. An easement will also be provided as requested by the fire chief email November 14<sup>th</sup>. He has also asked for the cistern to be reviewed and approved by Reggie Ouellette, Town Engineer, before acceptance of the easement or deed. A revised landscaping plan was received today and has been forwarded to D. Gagne for review. They will also need an alteration of terrain permit which has been applied for.

Chad Brannon, Fieldstone Land Consultants approached the podium. He wanted to address the request from the Fire department for a cistern. This has been discussed on a number of occasions with the Fire Chief. He had requested a 15,000 gallon tank for this

52 project with the option of an easement area be shown on the plan to accommodate a 30,000  
53 gallon tank should this become necessary. Chief Towne does want the construction  
54 inspected by the Town Engineer. He added that they had received a letter from D.  
55 LaBombard with regard to the cistern design, and he had some requests for additional  
56 details to the pull off area. They are proposing 14 ft gravel shoulder pull off to access the  
57 fire cistern. They will provide extra details relative to that. Landscaping comments were  
58 also raised in October and unfortunately it has taken time to have revised plans addressing  
59 these comments. The board agreed to these plans being handed to them so they could see  
60 the items addressed during tonight's meeting. These new plans addressed comments from  
61 D. Gagne letter dated October 18<sup>th</sup>. There were 7 comments and C. Brannon walked the  
62 board through the new plans in relation to these comments. C. Brannon also confirmed  
63 that he had added a number of notes to the plans as per the staff stipulations. These  
64 included no hazardous materials will be stored onsite, no doors will be facing the road, and  
65 there would be no outdoor storage on site.

66  
67 C. Rogers arrived at the Planning Board meeting and the Chairman asked B. Moseley to  
68 stand down from voting tonight.

69  
70 M. Fougere added a comment relative to the cistern that maybe D. LaBombard would also  
71 address, that maybe DOT will need to issue some kind of driveway permit for the cut off to  
72 the cistern.

73  
74 R. Hardy asked for a specific plan for the 20 white pine to be located such as where they will  
75 start and finish as he does not like the term 'organically clustered'. C. Brannon stated he  
76 would be happy to work with D. Gagne and put it on the plan.

77  
78 Dennis LaBombard approached the podium to discuss his latest review of the plans that  
79 now include the cistern. There was no new storm water management report as the change  
80 was minor. He did ask for some additional clarification for the pull off as it is right on  
81 Route 130 and it was just a graphic shown. He agreed that NHDOT should be informed  
82 also. He would like a definition added to clarify the length of this pull-off as well as the  
83 bollard locations. This should include the spacing between the bollards and grading  
84 between the proposed edge of pavement for the pull off and the front edge of the concrete  
85 tanks should be provided. He also wanted details or notes of how the vent and liquid level  
86 connections for the future tanks are to be capped.

87 M. Fougere had nothing further to add. C. Hoffman asked if the board would be  
88 comfortable with a conditional approval. Everyone was in agreement. M. Fougere  
89 summarized the conditions.

- 90
- 91 • To submit four hard copies of the revised final plan
  - 92 • Obtain and provide receipt of NHDES Alteration of Terrain permit
  - 93 • Letter from Fire Department relevant to the easement documents
  - 94 • Escrow account set up for cistern inspections
  - 95 • Obtain if necessary a permit from NHDOT for cistern
  - 96 • Address all outstanding issues by D. LaBombard
  - 97 • Receive and address the final comments from D. Gagne regarding landscaping and  
changes to "organic cluster" of pines as raised by R. Hardy

98

99 R. Hardy made a motion to accept the conditions as listed. D. Cleveland seconded. All in  
100 favor none opposed.

101 D. Cleveland made a motion for a conditional approval of File #2821. C. Rogers seconded.  
102 All in favor none opposed.

103 **6. File #2823** – Proposed subdivision of an existing 9.47 lot into two lots, one which will  
104 be a back lot, 146 Broad Street, Applicant George & Stella Demetri, Map 19 Lot 22, Zoned R-  
105 A Residential Agriculture. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**  
106

107 M. Fougere stated this proposal involves the subdivision of an existing 9.27 acre lot into  
108 two, a 5.1 acre front lot and a 4.3 acre back lot. The back lot will be served by a common  
109 drive, providing access to both lots. An existing home does exist on the front lot 19-22 and  
110 will remain; a new home will be built on the rear lot. The driveway will be altered and a  
111 NHDOT driveway permit will be required. This property is relatively flat and contains no  
112 wetlands. The applicant has requested a waiver from Section IV.2.G which requires side lot  
113 lines to be perpendicular to the street at least 100 from the right-of-way. The existing side  
114 lots are not changing and are only slightly off angle from the requirement. He  
115 recommended the following conditions should the application be considered for approval.

- 116 1. The applicant shall submit a recordable mylar and three paper prints and all  
117 appropriate fees to record and LChip.
- 118 2. NHDOT driveway permit shall be obtained prior to plan signature.
- 119 3. An escrow account shall be established to cover the cost of inspections that will be  
120 required during the construction of the proposed private common driveway.
- 121 4. Driveway easement documents shall be submitted outlining joint maintenance  
122 responsibilities for the common drive. Documents shall be recorded with the plan.  
123

124 R. Haight, Meridian Land Services approached the podium representing the applicant. He  
125 explained the existing property will remain and there will be one common driveway. There  
126 is a circular driveway at the moment and this will be changed. The waiver is being  
127 requested as they wish to maintain the 35 foot distance from the house. A State subdivision  
128 approval has been received also.  
129

130 B. Stelmack asked a question regarding land owned by the Town. B. Ming asked a question  
131 regarding Plan P2, site distance and the work involved. R. Haight discussed both these  
132 questions. B. Stelmack asked about the wells, there are two shown, but R. Haight said  
133 neither of these worked and a new artesian well will be drilled.  
134

135 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.  
136

137 Cathy Goldwater, 149 Broad Street approached the plan, as she wanted to look at it more  
138 closely. Bill Hills representing Harriett N. Hills Revocable Trust also wanted to look at the  
139 plan closely. B. Hills spoke regarding the trail that is on his lot and that they had granted a  
140 conservation easement. He has no objection to a trail being put on his property but he had  
141 hoped the previous owner would have been approached before passing, as there is a woods  
142 road on the property that would have made an easier walking trail, but since it did not

143 happen he stated that it could be just as easily cut a trail on his side if they really wanted to  
144 do it. C. Goldwater stated has lived there 33 years and she in full support of this subdivision  
145 as it will improve the area.

146  
147 No one else wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

148  
149 C. Rogers made a motion to grant the waive from Section IV.2.G which requires side lot  
150 lines to be perpendicular to the street at least 100 feet from the right of way. B. Stelmack  
151 seconded. All in favor none opposed.

152  
153 M. Fougere listed the stipulations for approval as previously listed.

154  
155 Doug Cleveland made a motion to approve file #2823 subject to the stipulations as listed.  
156 C. Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

157  
158 **7. File #2825** – Proposed amendments to approved Lovejoy Lane landscaping plan  
159 associated with the subdivision plan, Applicant Flint Hill Real Estate Trust (Elizabeth  
160 Wright), Map 14 Lot 37, Zoned R & A Residential Agriculture. **Application Acceptance**  
161 **and Public Hearing.**

162  
163 M. Fougere stated this application deals with a requested amendment to the approved  
164 HOSPD Wright Heirs Property subdivision approved in October of 2005. As part of the  
165 approval for the Lovejoy Lane side of the development, landscaping & buffers were required  
166 in order to comply with the Rural Character Ordinance. Some of these planting were  
167 installed years ago, internal locations around the hammerhead, while others were not.  
168 Given the length of time that has elapsed, significant revegetation has occurred naturally  
169 within the project, including at the project entrance.

170 M. Fougere also stated that both he and Doug Gagne inspected the project a month ago. D.  
171 Gagne provided two reports showing his conclusion of this visit and he agrees that, in many  
172 areas, the landscaping plans approved are no longer necessary. A number of evergreens  
173 have been planted at the site entrance (Area C), per the approved plan, along with most of  
174 those required for Area D. Landscaping has been installed at the turnaround per the plan.  
175 Evergreens that were to be installed along the rear lot lines of Lots 6 – 10 were never  
176 installed; these trees were to buffer the project from an adjoining vacant lot. This lot has  
177 been recently sold to a new owner who is building a home on the property. In D. Gagne  
178 report he stated that due to elapsed time from the project approval, and areas of landscape  
179 had naturally become inhabited with a mixture of native herbaceous and woody species, it  
180 did not make sense to remove these to install revegetation plantings as per plan.

181  
182 J. Leonard approached the podium as representative for Elizabeth Woods's trustee of the  
183 trust that owns the property. Gerry Woods was also present should he be needed to answer  
184 any questions. He referenced being at the October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting and added that the plan  
185 from the original approval had been modified with photographs of the plantings now in  
186 place. He stated that he had been on the site walk with M. Fougere, G. Woods and D. Gagne  
187 and everyone agreed on what needed to be done, and these have now been done. He shared  
188 with the board, that D. Gagne had commented that a lot of the requirements on the plan  
189 was because the board really did not know what to expect as it was going to be a new road,

190 with a lot of grading, and it had all turned out really quite good and it was much less of an  
191 impact than what had been expected.

192  
193 Doug Cleveland made a motion to accept File #2825. B. Stelmack seconded. All in favor  
194 none opposed.

195  
196 R. Hardy asked from Plan C32, the photos showing the Hemlocks, if they were planted  
197 recently as they would need to be bonded for three years. J. Leonard stated some had been  
198 planted in the last year and some had been planted in the last month. This is the practice to  
199 be followed. He confirmed that the original bond was placed and they were asking for this  
200 to be released. They are happy to work with the Town on what still needs to be bonded.

201  
202 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

203  
204 Tom Hickman, 80 Richardson Road approached the podium. He is an abutter and he  
205 shares the opinion that from the road, the landscaping looks good as it was a huge  
206 excavation project. He questioned, as he wasn't sure if there was recourse from the original  
207 plan that between the driveway of 80 & 84 Richardson Road is now a deciduous forest. He  
208 wondered if there were any covenants or anything that said there would be evergreen  
209 screening between these properties and the subdivision. M. Fougere looked at the original  
210 plans and said that there was no planting proposed along this area.

211  
212 G. Woods approached the podium. He stated that there was never any proposed planting  
213 on the original plan for this area. He would be opposed to putting additional planting in.  
214 He added that site as it exists embraces the spirit of the rural character ordinance better  
215 than any other project.

216  
217 David Harris 77 Richardson Road approached the podium. He agrees with the bonding as  
218 not all trees planted, will survive. He also added that many of these trees should have been  
219 planted 10 years ago and not a month ago so the rural character would look better than it  
220 does now. He stated he feels the least they could do is plant the original trees on the plans.  
221 It should not create a financial hardship and in 3 or 5 years everyone will agree it was  
222 worthwhile.

223  
224 Mark Deyoung, 91 Richardson Road approached the podium. He sat through the original  
225 planning application and he feels the entrance still looks like an exit ramp onto a highway.  
226 He doesn't think it is too much to expect them to prove out what was shown in the original  
227 presentation. With the trees losing their leaves you can see the houses and he wasn't sure if  
228 evergreens were supposed to be planted or not. He agrees with David Harris that trees  
229 should have been planted years ago. He is also concerned with drainage issues that may  
230 have been caused by the subdivision.

231  
232 Holly McCalmont, 77 Richardson Road approached the podium. She stated an agreement  
233 was made and it should be kept. Vegetation does not equate to carefully planned  
234 landscaping that should have been planted especially when it causes privacy issues.

235  
236 J. Leonard approached the podium. He explained the purpose of the ordinance is to protect  
237 views from the public road. He added that both M. Fougere and D. Gagne had visited the  
238 area and agreed that the views are protected. In some areas you would now need to cut

239 down healthy trees to plants other trees. Other areas the planting proposed was small  
240 plants/shrubs and not trees.

241  
242 C. Hoffman asked why the planting had not been done before now. J. Leonard said one  
243 answer is that it was not required and another was the project was bonded from the  
244 beginning and the project has been slow due to the economic climate. He feels that the  
245 plants there now meet the purpose of the ordinances, including the erosion control and  
246 views. He asked the board to go to the site and look at it. He feels this is a carefully planned  
247 subdivision that has come out very well. R. Hardy stated that nature has a way of taking  
248 care of itself. If you go back to the original plans a lot of the plantings were 1 to 1 ½ inch  
249 whips. The idea was to do a mass planting with very close spacing creating a natural  
250 selection that would fill in. The plants on the plans were not intended to be large plants or  
251 trees. He added also that the ordinance is primarily for the view from the road. The only  
252 reason why the evergreens were suggested on the north side was because there was going  
253 to be a trail there eventually and the abutter at the time had asked for this. He also added  
254 that the planting on any road or any area is usually a reflection of what was already there  
255 and if you look at this land historically it was primarily an oak forest and that is why there is  
256 not so much diversity in the planting. There are some areas that should be bonded longer  
257 as they have just been planted.

258  
259 B. Moseley asked the original timeline of the project. J. Leonard stated that maybe 2 or 3  
260 years and that if it had happened the planting would have been done to release the bond  
261 money.

262  
263 David Harris returned to the podium to stated that there was no excuse to the planting not  
264 been done to the approved plan.

265  
266 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

267  
268 C. Rogers wanted to visit the site to see the plants according to the plans. A site plan was  
269 discussed and arranged for December 3<sup>rd</sup> 2016 at 9 am. D. Gagne will be invited. Public are  
270 welcome but not allowed to comment.

271  
272 C. Rogers made a motion to table file #2825 until December 20<sup>th</sup> 2016. B. Stelmack  
273 seconded. All in favor none opposed.

274  
275 **8. Zoning Discussion**

276  
277 M. Fougere discussed with the board present that it had been discussed during the year to  
278 reduce the maximum area to be used for ground mounted solar panels. The board  
279 suggested to wait until David Petry was present.

280  
281 **ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT 1 AS PROPOSED BY**  
282 **THE PLANNING BOARD FOR THE TOWN OF HOLLIS ZONING ORDINANCE**  
283 **AS FOLLOWS?**

284

285 By amending Section XXIV; Solar Energy Systems, C. Definitions, Solar Energy System as  
286 follows:

287  
288 A Customer Generating device or structural design feature that provides for the collection,  
289 storage and distribution of solar energy for space heating or cooling, electricity generation,  
290 or water heating. Said System shall not exceed a footprint greater than 15% of the land area  
291 of lots 3 acres or less and no more than 20% of a lot greater than 3 acres. In no case shall  
292 any System exceed ~~43,560~~ 21,780 square feet in area. The footprint of the System shall  
293 include all above ground components including all access ways and shall be calculated by  
294 including the entire area within a single, continuance perimeter enclosing all elements of  
295 the System.

296

297 M. Fougere explained to the board this was ADU amendment would amend our ordinance  
298 to be brought into line with the State Statute. There is an extra layer to the ADU that was  
299 suggested by J. Belanger that could be added to this. It was discussed by the board. It was  
300 decided to focus on the ADU.

301

302 **ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT (2) AS PROPOSED BY**  
303 **THE PLANNING BOARD FOR THE TOWN OF HOLLIS ZONING ORDINANCE**  
304 **AS FOLLOWS?**

305

306 By amending Section IX General Provisions, paragraph K Accessory Dwelling Units, 2.  
307 Definition, Accessory Dwelling Unit by deleting the existing definition and replacing it with  
308 the following: As defined by RSA 674:71 as amended, **“means a residential living unit**  
309 **that is within or attached to a single family dwelling, and that provides**  
310 **independent living facilities for one or more persons, including provisions for**  
311 **sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel of land as the**  
312 **principle dwelling unit it accompanies.”**

313 In addition, amend Section 3 Requirements/Limitations by adding the following: **The use**  
314 **of an ADU shall not be deemed to include such transient occupancies as hotels,**  
315 **motels, rooming or boarding houses. This limitation includes short-term**  
316 **rentals (less than two weeks at a time) of dwelling units. Short-term rentals**  
317 **are only authorized as specifically provided for Bed and Breakfast (Inn)**  
318 **establishments.**

319

320 Explanation: This amendment is being proposed to meet state law changes and to address  
321 new trends in home renting.

322

323 M. Fougere explained this change came in last year. B. Ming asked how the set back would  
324 be policed. It would be up to and explained to the public when the initial enquiry was made.

325

326 **ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT (3) AS PROPOSED BY**  
327 **THE PLANNING BOARD FOR THE TOWN OF HOLLIS ZONING ORDINANCE**  
328 **AS FOLLOWS:**

329 By amending Section VIII Definitions, Structure and/or Building, by adding the following to  
330 the existing paragraph: **Structures and/or Building(s) 120 square feet or less shall**  
331 **not require a building permit, but shall be required to meet all setback**  
332 **requirements.**

M. Fougere also added the ZBA are to discuss the Housing for Older people at there next meeting.

M. Fougere this change is to bring a change to the title “Administrative Board” and update the ordinance.

**ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT (4) AS PROPOSED BY THE PLANNING BOARD FOR THE TOWN OF HOLLIS ZONING ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:**

By amending SECTION XIV: SIGN ORDINANCE as follows:

**C. ADMINISTRATION:** This section contains the requirement and application procedures that govern all matters concerning any sign which is to be erected, displayed, altered, reconstructed or maintained, including its supporting structure and any associated auxiliary devices in respect to structural and fire safety.

**1. ADMINISTRATION:** The Board of Selectmen shall appoint an Administrative Board or the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer that shall to interpret and administer this Sign Ordinance. The Administrative Board the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer has shall have great discretion in many areas, as spelled out in the Ordinance. and the Administrative Board’s policies.

**2. RELIEF:** Any relief, exception or variance sought from this Sign Ordinance, having been denied by the Administrative Board, Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer may be brought before the Hollis Zoning Board of Adjustment. An appeal of the administrative decisions of the Administrative Board shall also be brought before the Hollis Zoning Board of Adjustment.

**3. ENFORCEMENT:** The Board of Selectmen Code Enforcement Officer shall be the enforcement authority of all provisions of this Ordinance. The Building Inspector shall report all alleged violations to the Board of Selectmen. Under the direction of the Board of Selectmen, The Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer shall notify the violator(s) of the violation(s), along with any corrective action required.

**D. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**

2.All signs and their structures that are to be erected, altered, relocated, repaired or reconstructed in any district must be approved by the Administrative Board. Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer.

4.A permit and/or approval from the Administrative Board Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer is not required for maintenance of an existing sign as long as the maintenance does not include the cutting away of the sign structure or any alteration changing the original sign’s appearance including, but not limited to, color, wording, and other sign attributes.

**E. APPLICATION FOR PERMIT**

1.All applications for sign permits shall be filed, by the property owner, building owner or owner in fee. Applications shall be filed with the Building Inspector, on forms provided by the Building Department. All applications shall bear the signature of the building or property owner or shall



include a signed affidavit, by the owner, granting authorization for the applicant to apply for and install the proposed sign. All approved applications shall bear the signature of ~~an authorized member of the Administrative Board~~, the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer, Historic District Commission or Zoning Board of Adjustment, whichever applies.

**F. PERMITS**

1. The Building Inspector shall review and act upon all applications for sign permits and amendments thereto, within 7 days after filing. If the application or the construction documents conform to the Sign Ordinance or Building Code and are complete the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer shall issue a permit. ~~the Building Inspector shall submit the application to the Administrative Board, which shall act upon the application at its next regularly scheduled meeting or within 30 days, whichever is later.~~ If the application or the construction documents do not conform or are not complete, the Building Inspector shall notify the applicant in writing, stating the deficiencies and advising the applicant of his right to amend and resubmit the application or appeal directly to the ~~Administrative Board~~. Zoning Board of Adjustment.

3. Any person, applicant or agency representing a property owner who has been denied a permit can appeal such decision ~~by the Administrative Board~~ to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, within 20 days after receipt of the notice of denial for a permit.

**H. PROHIBITED SIGNS:** This section intends to list specifically some prohibited signs. This list is not meant to be inclusive. Rather, it should be representative of the kinds of signs, which are prohibited in the community. The following are examples of prohibited signs: 3. Any off premises sign (unless where expressly permitted) advertising or identifying a non-agricultural business; 16. Umbrella signs except as may be permitted by the discretion of the ~~Administrative Board~~; Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer.

**LEVENT-SPECIFIC SIGNS:** 2. An application for event-specific signs must be submitted to and approved by the ~~Administrative Board~~. Building Department. A sticker will be issued upon approval, and must be displayed on the sign. 8. The ~~Administering Board~~ Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer has the discretion to vary the terms and conditions identified in this EVENT-SPECIFIC

M. Fougere stated that a public hearing will be at the next meeting to address all these amendments.

**9. Non-public discussion, legal, under RSA 91-A3 II (e)**

R. Hardy made a motion for the Planning Board to enter Non-Public session in accordance with RSA 91-A3-II (e) legal. C. Rogers seconded. Voting in favor of the motion were R. Hardy, B. Ming, B. Moseley, C. Rogers, D. Cleveland, B. Stelmack, J. Peters and C. Hoffman. No one was opposed. The motion passed 8-0.

The board entered non-public at 8:45 pm.

Doug Cleveland made a motion for the Planning Board to come out of Non-Public session in accordance with RSA 91-A3-II (e) legal. B. Stelmack seconded. Voting in favor of the

423 motion were R. Hardy, B. Ming, B. Moseley, C. Rogers, D. Cleveland, B. Stelmack, J. Peters  
424 and C. Hoffman. No one was opposed. The motion passed 8-0.  
425

426 Doug Cleveland made a motion for the Planning Board to seal the minutes of the Non-  
427 Public session in accordance with RSA 91-A3-II (e) legal. C. Rogers seconded. Voting in  
428 favor of the motion were R. Hardy, B. Ming, B. Moseley, C. Rogers, D. Cleveland, B.  
429 Stelmack, J. Peters and C. Hoffman. No one was opposed. The motion passed 8-0.  
430

431 Doug Cleveland made a non-debatable motion to adjourn. B. Stelmack seconded. All in  
432 favor none opposed.  
433

434 The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 PM

435  
436 Respectively submitted by,  
437

438  
439 Wendy Trimble  
440 Planning Secretary  
441 Town of Hollis, NH  
442