

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

December 20th, 2016

“FINAL”

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Dan Turcott, Chet Rogers, and David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen, Alternates Ben Ming, Bill Moseley and Jeff Peters

ABSENT: Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Rick Hardy & Brian Stelmack

STAFF PRESENT: Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Wendy Trimble, Planning Assistant

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

Doug Cleveland appointed alternates Jeff Peters to vote on behalf of Cathy Hoffman, Ben Ming to vote on behalf of Brian Stelmack and Bill Moseley to vote on behalf of Rick Hardy.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

Bill Moseley made a motion to approve Planning board minutes of November 15th 2016 as amended. Motion seconded by Dan Turcott. All in favor none opposed. D. Petry and D. Turcott 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 #2817 – Lot line relocation between two adjoining lots, 60 & 74 Ridge Road, Map 12 Lots 13 & 14

B. Moseley made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the plan #2817. D. Turcott seconded. All in favor none opposed.

5. File #2825 – Proposed amendments to approved Lovejoy Lane landscaping plan associated with the subdivision plan, Applicant Flint Hill Real Estate Trust (Elizabeth Wright), Map 14 Lot 37, Zoned R & A Residential Agriculture. Tabled from November 20, 2016

M. Fougere explained that this had been in front of the board in November and a site walk had been done on Saturday 3rd December. Board members looked at the entrance to the project and walked further into Lovejoy Lane to look at the former entrance where the tree cutting landing was, and a couple of members asked about planting in a gap at this point. The applicant is requesting a waiver from the conditions set on the application when it was approved, given the plantings that are there today and along with the trees that remained as part of the subdivision. Tonight the board needs to discuss the site walk and how they would like to proceed.

48 D. Cleveland concluded from the site walk that it was not necessary to plant all the plantings
49 that was proposed years ago, however at the so called landing area, there was an obvious
50 opening and it was decided that some more trees should be planted staggered and fairly
51 close to the road maybe about 20 feet from the road.

52
53 J. Peters had not been able to attend the meeting but visited the site and asked why we were
54 waiving this as we are setting a precedent to other developers to not install their plantings
55 for a number of years and then ask for a waiver. D. Cleveland said this was discussed at the
56 site walk, and each application needs to be looked at in its own right and it was decided that
57 there was a need for a few more trees in one area but otherwise it looked ok. J. Peters asked
58 how to avoid this happening again. M. Fougere added there are a number of projects
59 approved since forming the Rural Character Ordinance. Some of these have outstanding
60 landscaping that is bonded but not yet done, and because of this trend last year the
61 Planning Board adopted new regulations to have the plantings done at the beginning of the
62 project with the road construction. There were no further questions or comments from the
63 board.

64
65 D. Turcott made a motion to approve this application with a condition that five evergreens
66 are planted staggered within 20 feet of the road at the 'landing area' and consulted with
67 Doug Gagne for spacing and location to maximum the impact. C. Rogers seconded. All in
68 favor none opposed.

69
70 **6. File #2824 – Proposed minor subdivision of an existing 13.94 acre lot into two lots,**
71 **Applicant/Owner William & Lynn Moseley, 278 Depot Road, Map 9 Lot 58, Zoned R**
72 **Recreation. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.****

73
74 J. Peters made a motion to accept this application. D. Turcott seconded. All in favor none
75 opposed. B. Moseley recused himself from this application and stepped away from the
76 table.

77
78 M. Fougere explained this proposal involves a minor subdivision of an existing 13.94 acre
79 lot into two lots, an 11.5 acre lot and a 2.439 acre lot. The site abuts the Nashua River and is
80 within the 250 foot Shoreline Protection zone; a majority of the development area is outside
81 of the critical 150 foot woodland buffer. Prior to obtaining a building permit, an application
82 will have to be made to the Shoreline Bureau. State subdivision approvals have been
83 obtained. Given the constraints on this property, the proposed home will have to be
84 constructed within the Building Area.

85
86 M. Fougere added that the property is opposite Morin's Landscaping and the board may
87 want to consider the rural character ordinance.

88
89 Brent Cole, Project Engineer from Keach-Nordstrom Associates approached the podium to
90 represent the applicant. He explained this property is situated between Depot Road and the
91 Nashua River. It has 13.9 acres and had 1961 feet of frontage along Depot Road and 1750
92 feet along the Nashua River. This subdivide will occur on the southern most portion of the
93 lot. The new lot will contain 2.4 acres, meets all the minimum standards and contains a
94 building area of 100 x 200 sq foot. He indicated the well and sewage loading areas on the
95 plan.

David Petry arrived at the meeting.

B. Cole answered the concern of Rural Character as he felt it did not apply to this lot. He stated that travelling from the south the property would not be seen due to a large hill, and travelling from the north the view would be blocked by the wooded area. The only person who may see the property is the commercial property across the road, Morin's landscaping.

D. Cleveland asked the board if they had any questions. C. Rogers asked why there was a step to the shape of the lot. B. Cole explained that the applicant would like to retain the access to the river. Other parts of the river fall off 4 – 10 feet. The other area is best for a septic system.

D. Cleveland opened the public hearing.

No one wished to speak so the public hearing was closed.

The conditions of approval are:

- All missing lot bounds on the south side of the properties shall be set prior to recording
- A driveway permit shall be obtained from NHDOT
- Prior to construction and tree removal, the building area shall be clearly marked on the site
- The applicant shall submit a recordable Mylar and three paper prints along with associated fees for recording

J. Peters made a motion to approve File #2824 proposed subdivision of an existing 13.94 acre lot into two lots with these conditions. C. Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

B. Moseley returned to the table and meeting.

7. File #2828: Scenic Road Hearing: Eversource: 183 Federal Hill Road, remove 13 trees including one large 36 inch plus maple, four 10 inch trees and eight 6 inch trees.

M. Fougere explained that this stretch of Federal Hill Road has no power lines on it at the moment. Using the photographs taken from the site he explained that at the moment the last power line shows where it cuts off into the woods area across country and the owner of this lot has had trouble with electricity for a while and the best way to address it is to bring power to her home along the road. By extending the poles there will be a loss of one large really old maple tree and one other maple which will be pruned but not cut down. Other trees marked will be removed along the road.

Brian Salas, an arborist from Eversource approached the podium. The main goal is to bring the transformer closer to the property. They already have an underground conduit in place, poles are all set and the trees are all flagged. This tree removal and pruning will allow the lines to be fed along the road to the property much easier and provide easier access for restoration and bring the transformer closer so should there be any issues with the transformer then it could be located and fixed more easily. He is concerned that we have numbered 13 trees but some of them are root sprouted and may be counted as two or three trees.

J. Peters asked if this was to prevent the lines going through the woods. B. Salas explained the transformer is in the woods right now and this would bring it out onto the road side. There was further discussion about upgrading poles and speed of restoration.

D. Cleveland opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

C. Rogers made a motion to approve file #2828 Scenic road hearing. B. Ming seconded. All in favor none opposed.

8. File #2822 – Proposed lot line relocation between three adjoining lots, Applicants/owners John & Linda Seager, IIEE's, Jonathan & Ruth Bruneau and David & Linda Seager, TTEE's, 11 & 25 Howe Lane and Ranger Road, Map 32 Lots 45-4, 46, 45-2, Zoned R&A Residential Agriculture. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

J. Peters made a motion to accept application #2822. D. Petry seconded. All in favor none opposed. D. Turcott recused himself from this application as he is an abutter.

M. Fougere explained this proposal involves the relocation of lot lines between three adjoining properties. Lot 32-46 will increase in size from 2.38 to 2.61 acres, Lot 32-45/2 will increase in size from 8.21 to 13.11 and Lot 32-45/4 will decrease in size from 21.60 to 16.47 acres.

He stated his conditions of approval would be:

- All missing lot bounds on the south side of the properties shall be set prior to recording
- The applicant shall submit a recordable Mylar and three paper prints along with recording fees.

Dave OHara approached the podium to speak on behalf of the applicant. He explained this application was lot line relocation between three lots. He said it straightens out a line between 32-45-2 and 32-46. It removes a jig jag line on one lot, and makes two other lots more equal in size. There were no questions from the board members. The public hearing was opened. No one wished to speak and the public hearing was closed.

With no further discussion, D. Petry made a motion to approve file #2822 with conditions as stated by M. Fougere. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none opposed.

9. File #2817 – Proposed site plan of a single ground mounted solar "All Earth" Tracker array, Applicant: GoSolar NH, Owner Pat Quaine, 12 Jambard Road, Map 9 Lot 70-21, Zoned R&A Residence-Agriculture. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing**

D. Turcott made a motion to accept the application. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none opposed.

M. Fougere explained the applicant is proposing to install one ground mounted solar array on their 1.1 acre property. The panel is 21.5 x 19.11 feet and can reach a height of 20 feet. A limit of 10 feet in height is required but can be waived by the Board if a determination is

195 made that the installation will not be detrimental to public safety, adjacent property values
196 or rural character.
197
198 The single array will be located 160 feet behind the home. Evergreens and deciduous trees
199 line both property lines to help screen the proposed unit. All required setbacks are met.
200
201 He added this is a Conditional Use Permit application and he listed the findings that would
202 also need to be considered.
203
204 Sean Carlson, General Manager from GoSolar approached the podium. He was
205 representing Mr. Quaine. He explained his company and he explained that they had
206 applied for the tracker without doing their due diligence. He stated that they have now got
207 two newer options for ground mounted solar panels and will not be proceeding with the
208 tracker. He explained this new application and he passed the board a copy of the new
209 designs and talked briefly about how they would be fixed to the ground.
210
211 C. Rogers asked why they had originally proposed the tracker if the ground mounted would
212 do the same. He explained that solar in New Hampshire is all about covering your overall
213 usage per year and the tracker is 45% more efficient as it follows the sun. So the ground
214 mounted will need more panels.
215
216 The board members discussed the change of application and that a site plan would be
217 needed to help discuss this application and the impacts. M. Fougere asked the applicant to
218 stake out exactly where these panels would be located and how tall they will be so the board
219 members will be able to see them at the site walk. B. Moseley asked for a lot plan to show it
220 more accurately. A screening plan will also be needed.
221
222 D. Cleveland opened the public hearing.
223
224 Brian Walsh, 10 Jambard Road approached the podium. He is very concerned about the
225 impact on his property and he invited the board members to view the proposal from his
226 back deck. He added the lot abuts common land, the Richardson Estate Home owners
227 association.
228
229 David Sacks, 43 Jambard Road approached the podium. He is in favor of alternative energy
230 but he also concerned with what will be seen from the road from all angles and all roads
231 including Barton and Jewett. He asked the proposal be staked out for the site walk and it
232 could be left out for a couple of days to allow others who cannot attend on Saturday 7th they
233 will be able to see it.
234
235 David Sabo, 14 Jewett Lane asked the board to consider the impact on the abutters from
236 Jewett Lane also as they have direct line sight and there is no shielding as it is all open with
237 common land.
238
239 Sophia Walsh, 3 Jambard Road, stated her property was in direct line of sight. She stated
240 for the recorded that anything high and movable she is opposed to including anything with
241 sound.
242

No one else wished to speak. So the public hearing was closed. D. Turcott asked that the applicant provide more information with regard to screening both on plans and on the site.

M. Fougere confirmed that we are doing a site walk on January 7th at 9 am and tabling the application until our next meeting on January 17th. C. Rogers asked we start on the neighbor's deck at 10 Jambard Road.

D. Petry made a motion to table the application until January 17th. C. Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

10. File #2826 – Proposed minor subdivision to subdivide existing 20.4 acre lot into 4 lots with 3 lots served by a common drive. Applicant/Owner – Skinner Family Nominee Trust, 81 Jewett Lane, Map 9 Lot 9, Zoned R&A Residence-Agriculture. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

D. Petry asked if we had verified that this is not part of another subdivision on Jewett Lane making it a major subdivision and not a minor subdivision. M. Fougere explained that there was a lot line relocation application previously; therefore this is still a minor subdivision.

D. Turcott made a motion to accept the application. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none opposed.

M. Fougere explained this proposal involves the subdivision of an existing 20.4 acre lot into four lots. Three of the lots will be accessed via a common drive; this driveway is presently constructed and provides access to an existing home located in the rear of the property. This driveway does not meet common driveway specifications. A new driveway will be constructed for lot 9-9-1. To meet zoning requirements for a back lot subdivision an existing detached garage will have to be removed, all structures are required to be set back 200 feet from an existing public road.

The two rear lots have legal frontage from Fieldstone Drive and will be 4.1 and 6.6 acres in size. Our Ordinance requires that an applicant must prove that access can be provided to the building box, meeting all grade and cut/fill requirements, if access to those lots will not be provided from the lots legal frontage. A drawing has been submitted demonstrating that a driveway could be built off the end of Fieldstone Drive meeting grade and cuts/fill requirements. The applicant does not intend to use Fieldstone Drive for access and will use the common driveway off Jewett Lane.

There have been a number of comments from abutters and the board will have received them in their packets.

He added the issues for discussion were:

- The existing driveway does not meet the specifications for a common drive (20 feet wide) and will have to be constructed to meet those standards or a waiver granted to allow the existing drive (16 feet wide) to be used as a common drive. Fire Department input should be received if 16 foot driveway is to be used.
- The rural character ordinance should be discussed as part of this application in case of a need for landscaping.

Should the board wish to consider the application for approval then the following conditions would be required:

- All missing lot bounds shall be set prior to recording.
- Access to all lots shall be from Jewett Lane and Fieldstone Drive shall not be used to provide access to the project development.
- The existing garage located on Lot 9-9 shall be removed from the 200 foot setback prior to the plan being recorded. The Applicant shall submit evidence to the Planning Department that the structure has been removed.
- A location for the disposal of stumps shall be noted on Lot 9-9-1 or a note shall be added to the plan stating that all stumps shall be removed from site.
- Snow fencing or some other barrier shall be erected along the 100 foot wetland setback line prior to any ground disturbance or construction and remain in place until construction is complete and the site is stabilized.
- Sheets SP-1 & SP-2 both make reference to proposed driveways, these notes should be clarified to denote which driveways are proposed and which driveway designs are conceptual to demonstrate compliance with the Town's regulations.
- The Public Works Department shall be contacted to secure a name for the proposed private way
- The applicant shall submit a recordable Mylar and three paper prints along with recording and LChip fees.
- The Fire Department has asked for an easement on the fire pond area and also between the pond and the common driveway next to Jewett Lane. He has also asked that if the gate is to remain to have a Knox box located at the gate so access can be gained without delay.

Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services representing the applicant Skinner Family Nominee Trust, approached the podium. He added to M. Fougere's comments that they have received DES Subdivision Approval for lots 9-9-1 and 9-9-3. Both lots are just over 4 acres. He explained the layout of the subdivision plan to the board members and also handed out photographs to help give a perspective of the lot rather than a flat plan.

D. Cleveland asked if the gate was proposed to stay for three lots. R. Haight said yes and they had no problems adding a Knox box as requested by the Fire Department. Lot 9-9-1 is proposed to have its own driveway access onto Jewett Lane. D. Cleveland asked why this was separated and not sharing the existing driveway. R. Haight suggested they were keeping their options open and the owner of that lot could have his own driveway. M. Fougere added that our regulations limit the maximum number of properties off a common driveway to four. If they wished to do this it would be an additional request to the waiver request.

D. Petry asked M. Fougere if our regulations asked for them to prove out a driveway from a cul-de-sac i.e. Fieldstone Drive. M. Fougere stated that our regulations require them to prove they can gain access from Fieldstone Drive, without any waivers, meeting the regulations for cut and fills, and maximum grade of 8%. He is confident they have met this. R. Haight explained that their intention is not to use this access but only to prove it could be used if required.

D. Cleveland stated that it appears there could be a through road between Jewett Lane and Fieldstone Drive. R. Haight said that was the original intent when Fieldstone Drive was being proposed. But they are not proposing to do a through road; Fieldstone Drive would remain a cul-de-sac. The existing driveway is 16 feet wide; it lends itself to three other lots, with underground utility supply also and would minimize other alterations.

D. Cleveland suggested this application also requires a site walk. He opens the public hearing.

Paul Armstrong, 28 Fieldstone Drive approached the podium. He abuts both Fieldstone and Mr. Skinner property line. He is very concerned that this will be opened up for either traffic or for utilities going in and that the trees at the end of Fieldstone Drive will be cut down. It is paved a certain length and then it turns into forest towards Mr. Skinner's property. If they were to use this as an access then they would need to put in a hammerhead turnaround for snow plowing. He would like some assurances that if this plan gets approved then there is some kind of stipulation that Fieldstone Drive does not open up into a straight cut through to Jewett Lane. His concern is if this happened four lots could become eight lots. He has no concern with the three proposed lots and they will not affect him.

Joel Richter, 75 Jewett Lane approached the podium. He has a couple of concerns with this proposed subdivision. Firstly the proposed driveway to lot 9-9-1 is shown on the site plan but not to the building box and he is not sure how that would be done to keep to the 8% grade. He stated that maybe accessing it from the common driveway it would be much shorter and therefore have less run off with less environmental impact. The proposed driveway to lot 9-9-1 also goes through forested land which will require a lot of clearing of trees, and have a big impact aesthetically. His other concern is water quality. Mr. Skinner acquired some land from 75 Jewett Lane a while ago which moved the lot line closer to the property of 75 Jewett Lane and also it's well. The well is now only 10 feet from the new property line. Where there used to be a large buffer from the dug well there is now very little buffer and this new plan shows a proposed leach field only 100 feet away. He said this leach field is about 12 feet higher than his dug well also. So he is very concerned with what will happen to his water quality or will he be forced to find an alternative water source. He is glad to hear there will be site walk to allow the board members a chance to look at all his concerns. Building these properties will have a significant negative impact on his property and the properties along Dalkeith Road also. He added his neighbors, Christopher and Cynthia Andreola, were not able to attend but did submit their concerns in writing regarding the water and aquifer.

Laura Lamalva, 74 Jewett Lane approached the podium. She wanted to second Joel's concerns regarding the water quality. She is also concerned about the wildlife and the fire pond and also the potential of creating a through road to Fieldstone Drive.

There were no other residents wishing to speak so the public hearing was closed.

D. Cleveland proposed a site walk on Saturday 7th January around 10 am. It may be a little earlier as it will follow immediately after the site walk on Jambard Road. D. Cleveland will keep the public hearing open until the next meeting.

387 D. Turcott asked R. Haight the thought process of the proposed driveway. R. Haight stated
388 that the layout of the existing driveway lends itself to minimal disruption. M. Fougere
389 asked him to flag the entrance to Fieldstone Drive for the site walk. C. Rogers also wanted
390 to see the driveway to lot 9-9-1 on site. D. Petry asked in relation to rural character that
391 consideration be given to no cut zones and screening. R. Haight said the test pits were done
392 in the lease offensive areas.

393

394 D. Turcott asked when the lot line was moved was there any conditions placed around the
395 well. M. Fougere said he would check the application.

396

397 J. Peters made a motion to table the application until January 17th. D. Petry seconded. All
398 in favor none opposed.

399

400 **11. File #2819** – Review of buffer impact per Wetland Ordinance, Section C3 Jurisdiction,
401 Existing Lots for the construction of a single family home on a grandfathered lot of record,
402 1.14 acres, Witches Spring Road & Ames Road, Map 46 Lot 12, Owner/Applicant Douglas
403 and Cynthia Nye.

404

405 M. Fougere stated that we had a revised plan of this proposal with additional clarification.
406 The plan shows the filling of wetlands behind the proposed home, it also shows a new
407 culvert being constructed to take water from under Ames Road and bypass the new home; it
408 shows the topography lines and refined grading lines that were not on the previous plan.
409 The board did a site walk approximately 8 weeks ago, and this is a grandfathered lot of
410 record. Presently it will need to go to the ZBA for a variance on the front setback. Some of
411 our criteria with our wetlands ordinance are:

- 412 1. It is not feasible to place the structure outside the buffer zone
- 413 2. The structure must be set back as far as possible from the delineated edge of the
414 wetland or surface water
- 415 3. Appropriate erosion control measures must be in place prior to and during
416 construction
- 417 4. Any disturbance to the surrounding buffer zone must be repaired and restored
418 upon completion of construction
- 419 5. All available mitigation measures to address changes in water quality and
420 quantity are implemented if required by Planning Staff/Planning Board.

421

422 D. Cleveland asked Doug Nye if it was possible to move the building further away from the
423 wetlands. He explained that he had moved the building currently five feet away from the
424 wetlands which currently put him in violation of the fifty foot setback. M. Fougere stated
425 until he goes to the ZBA it will be unsure of what they will be comfortable with. He feels
426 there is an option to change the layout of the house and that may help. J. Peters suggested
427 rotating the property maybe. M. Fougere suggested he has to go to the ZBA and presently
428 the other homes nearby are all within the setback also. D. Cleveland asked if he had applied
429 to go the ZBA yet. Doug Nye was waiting to get through tonight's meeting. C. Hoffman was
430 not present at tonight's meeting but she had left a few comments. D. Cleveland read that she
431 felt a variance to the front setback should be obtained, all NHDES wetland permits be in
432 place and reviewed by the Conservation Commission, and a note added so that the town will
433 not be held liable for this property and the applicant should sign a waiver of liability.

434

435 M. Fougere agrees that both the ZBA and Conservation Commission need to be involved.
 436 The culvert will mean that D. Nye engineers needs to review and produce an analysis of the
 437 size so our engineer can review it. It needs to be sized properly. If there is wetland work a
 438 special exception will be required, and there is a small section to be filled where the
 439 retaining wall is, so this will need a dredge and fill permit from the State, and also
 440 Conservation Commission review along with a Special Exception for that disturbance.
 441 D. Turcott again asked about the layout of the house. Is it set in stone or can it be revisited?
 442 He suggested that maybe a narrower version of the property may fit better. D. Nye
 443 suggested he was trying to replicate the original property that was there. He said he would
 444 look at rotating it.

445
 446 D. Petry asked how many waivers are needed. The way the plan is drawn now, he needs a
 447 special exception for the wetland fill.

448
 449 D. Petry made a motion to continue this application and re-notify once issues are resolved.
 450 C. Rogers seconded. All in favor none opposed.

451

452 **12. Zoning Changes: Public Hearing**

453

454 D. Cleveland opened the public hearing for each proposed zoning change.

455

456 **1. Amend Section XXIV; Solar Energy systems, C. Definitions, Solar** 457 **Energy System by decreasing the allowable area of a Solar System from** 458 **43,560 to 21,780**

459

460 E. Ryherd, 150 Witches Spring Road, also a member of the Hollis Energy Committee,
 461 approached the podium to state his reasons against this proposal. He has a desire to get as
 462 much renewal energy into the town as possible and the current regulations as they stand
 463 keep everyone within the bounds of the rural character of the town. We already have
 464 screening requirements, height restrictions, and he doesn't feel that cutting the size of area
 465 will help anyone. In fact he would like the size double or the limitation removed altogether
 466 and they are currently proposing a school system that will exceed this size and that is only a
 467 fraction of the schools needs. He feels we are already over regulating things and we need to
 468 encourage solar power.

469

470 Paul Happy, 140 Broad Street approached the podium to state his reasons against this
 471 proposal. He is opposed to any additional rules to this ordinance. He would like the board
 472 to connect the dots from the four objectives set out last year to why halving the size of the
 473 site will help meet those objectives. Also by halving the size of the site will put further
 474 restrictions on it because it will hamper state incentives when you get into the size of 100kw
 475 commercial sites for example. The example of Frank Grossman site would in the future not
 476 be given enough land to do what he did. He feels the Planning Board already has enough
 477 restrictions to get people to come to the board in order to give them their opinions.

478

479 Eliza Lecour, 4 Pine Hill Road approached the podium to state her reasons against this
 480 proposal. She said a man's home is his castle and the abutters have been protected by the
 481 ordinances to put screening in place. She feels that putting more restrictions on solar is
 482 intrusive adding we need less government not more, and she wanted to ask the board if

483 there was a president for this. She asked the board why we need more restrictions on a
484 home owner especially when we know climate change is a problem.

485
486 Robert Mann, 29 Nartoff Road approached the podium to state his reasons against this
487 proposal. He informed the Board that at the school district they are working on an energy
488 study that it looking at a PV Solar solution, and one of these is a ground based system of
489 100kw and he doesn't believe that government entities such as a school are subject to an
490 ordinance such as this. This would require about an acre to install and this ordinance
491 would be problematic. D. Cleveland asked where this proposal would be placed. R. Mann
492 stated there is an area near the electrical easement way back in the woods. They are looking
493 at roof mounted systems also. They want to remain good partners in the town.

494
495 Frank Grossman, 140 Ridge Road, approached the podium to state his reasons against this
496 proposal. He feels there are a lot of good spaces in Hollis to accommodate all the
497 requirements and he is not sure why we would want to restrict someone if they had enough
498 space. He feels his application and installation has been successful as it cannot be seen
499 from the road. He feels this change and restriction could work against the Planning Board
500 as where there would normally be one panel high would work as they have enough space to
501 be fully screened, now if they have to raise the height then there would be more trees
502 needed to screen so he feels they are trading things off. A letter has been sent in by Kathy
503 Grossman and Venu Rao also sent an email to Frank Grossman.

504
505 J. Peters asked what size system an average home would need? 8 – 10 KW. He asked what
506 the standard footprint that would be? One side of the roof of a normal home. J. Peters
507 added from these two answers the size of the systems being discussed are more commercial
508 systems than residential systems? Yes.

509
510 F. Grossman said he would not call it commercial, his system was called 'group net
511 metering' and could therefore be split between a numbers of houses.

512
513 Eliza Lecour, 4 Pine Hill Road approached the podium again. She added that she would be
514 looking to use solar for a green house, so she doesn't feel you can just look at what you need
515 for a house, and anything over this would be commercial. She would sooner have cleaner air
516 in Hollis and screen Solar than have the alternative of dirty air and restricting solar.

517
518 David Petry, explained his reasons for asking the area to be halved. He explained that from
519 the Master Plan Survey, the majority of the residents in Hollis put Rural Character first and
520 not Solar Energy first. Even by halving the area for ground mounted solar panels, this will
521 still allow people like Eliza Lecour to do what she wants to do and it will also still allow
522 homes owners to install solar energy for their own properties. He went on to explain that
523 when this was submitted to the Planning Board, it was submitted at the same time as an
524 application knowing that 43,000 square foot installation was going to be put in. It was
525 never graphically displayed to the board, to the extent that it was when you do a site walk
526 and you see the impact it has to the neighbors. For that project every single neighbor
527 wanted screening, and if we could not do screening they did not want it installed at all. So
528 to protect the town we need to reduce the size of the larger installations. It is an excessive
529 use for resident properties. Screening may not be adequate, it will take time to grow and it
530 needs to be maintained.

531

532 D. Turcott asked to summarize and confirm the details discussed at the meeting. He asked
 533 for confirmation of 43,560 is an acre, yes, and this area can do 100Kw, yes. The proposed
 534 size of a permissible solar field could still accommodate five houses on a group net metering
 535 system. This was in general without exact figures but on an average, yes. He stated he was
 536 in favor of reducing the size as it is more than sufficient, an area of 21,780 to provide for five
 537 houses is significant and it should be sufficient to do anything with a greenhouse. However
 538 if this was not the case the Planning Board would still have the ability to grant a waiver
 539 based on certain conditions and it seems like a responsible trigger to keep it within the
 540 intent of the ordinance for residential use, for net metering use not for commercial and it
 541 seems aligned with the energy required for that intended use.

542
 543 J. Peters asked if the 100kw system was in New Hampshire or California as there is very
 544 different solar loads. F. Grossman answered the kilowatt hours are what is produced in a
 545 year, that is what you get from the solar, panels in New Hampshire will get less sun but they
 546 are more efficient because when panels get hotter they become less efficient. Since we are
 547 in a colder altitude we do better here.

548
 549 After a lot of discussion, D. Cleveland asked if the board wanted to send the change to Town
 550 Ballot. It was voted 5:2 to go to ballot. Dan Turcott, David Petry, Ben Ming, Bill Moseley
 551 and Jeff Peters voted for. Chet Rogers and Doug Cleveland voted against.

552
 553 **2. Amend Section IX General Provisions; paragraph K Accessory Dwelling**
 554 **Units, 2. Definition, Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) by deleting the**
 555 **existing definition and replacing it with the State definition outlined in**
 556 **RSA 674:71. In addition, add a provision that prohibits ADU's from**
 557 **being rented as short-term rental units (less than two weeks)**
 558

559 M. Fougere explained by amending Section IX General Provisions; paragraph K Accessory
 560 Dwelling Units, 2. Definition, Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) by deleting the existing
 561 definition and replacing it with the following: As defined by RSA 674:71 as amended,
 562 ***“means a residential living unit that is within or attached to a single family***
 563 ***dwelling, and that provides independent living facilities for one or more***
 564 ***persons, including provisions for sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on***
 565 ***the same parcel of land as the principle dwelling unit it accompanies.”***
 566

567 In addition, amend Section 3 Requirements/Limitations by adding the following: ***The use***
 568 ***of an ADU shall not be deemed to include such transient occupancies as***
 569 ***hotels, motels, rooming or boarding houses. This limitation includes short-***
 570 ***term rentals (less than two weeks at a time) of dwelling units. Short-term***
 571 ***rentals are only authorized as specifically provided for Bed and Breakfast***
 572 ***(Inn) establishments.***
 573

574 M. Fougere added that this had been brought to the Planning Board a couple of months ago
 575 by Jim Belanger, State Representative, as a suggestion. It has to do with the Airbnb
 576 concerns and to try and limit the ADU as Airbnb type rental.

577
 578 No one wished to speak to the public hearing so it was closed. C. Rogers asked where the
 579 two weeks had been decided as he would prefer 4 weeks. It was discussed and agreed to
 580 amend this to four weeks.

D. Petry made a motion to amend the proposal to state four weeks and agreed to send change to Town Ballot. Motion carried 7:0.

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

M. Fougere explained that this suggestion came in late last year but we had run out of time to deal with it. It will help cut down paperwork when dealing with small structures. After a short time to restrict the height it was decided not to change it. D. Cleveland made a motion to send the change to Town Ballot. Motion carried 7:0.

4. **Amend Section XIV: Sign Ordinance to remove references to Administrative Board and replace with Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer.**

M. Fougere explained this change is currently administrative. It references 'administrative board' that does not exist. These changes will bring the sign ordinance up to date.

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** **Building Inspector/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.**

I. EVENT-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

D. Cleveland suggested that number 3 Enforcement needed to be amended to add Building Inspector. This was omitted in error. Everyone agreed. D. Cleveland made a motion to send the change to Town Ballot. Motion carried 7:0.

5. **Delete Section XIII Residential Construction Timing and Phasing Ordinance, along with Definitions outlines in Section VIII; Building Right, Building Year and Transferred Rights.**

M. Fougere explained this would remove from the books the permitting limitation we have been using given the permit activity we have been seeing in town. He added one of the considered options is a phasing option to be put in place. This would be in our subdivision regulations and we could hope to have this in place before town meeting.

Attorney Leonard approached the podium stating he was here on behalf of Liz Woods but these comments also reflect his point of view also. He wanted to direct the attention of the board to the state law, and ordinances and specific language as there is no justification for any kind of building restriction.

The State Law that authorizes growth management is RSA 674:22 Growth management; Timing of Development. He added this is a very specific requirement that is mandates. In order to have a growth ordinance the town must accomplish it within this fashion only.

He read and explained the following ordinance.

RSA 674:22 Growth Management; Timing of Development

II. Towns “may adopt a growth management ordinance under this Section only if

- There is a demonstrated need to regulate the timing of development
- Based upon the municipalities lack of capacity to accommodate anticipated growth in the absence of such an ordinance
- The need to regulate the timing of development shall be demonstrated by a study...
- The study shall be based on competent evidence and shall consider the municipalities projected growth rate and the municipalities need for additional services to accommodate such growth.

He explained that the Town of Hollis needs to prove that it is unable to meet the growth that is presently in place and anticipated. Then the need for growth management needs to be proven out with a study. This study needs to be based on competent evidence.

Then J. Leonard added that once the Town has proven it requires a Growth Ordinance then the following section applies.

III. An ordinance under this Section shall

- Include a termination date
- Shall restrict projected normal growth no more than is necessary to allow for orderly and good faith development of municipal services
- “The ordinance and the plan shall be evaluated by the Planning Board at least annually; to confirm that reasonably progress is being made to carry out the plan. The Planning Board shall report findings to the legislative body in the municipality’s annual report.

He went on to explain that the idea behind this ordinance is that growth management is a short term solution to enable a longer termed plan that is put in place by a town to handle excessive growth, i.e. growth that is beyond what is normal within the region. He also added the Town of Hollis is behind the regular rates for the State of New Hampshire, and therefore he does not believe there is any justification at all under State Law for a growth ordinance. Therefore he is in full support of repealing it and there is no support for a

725 replacement.

726

727 His comment regarding the ordinance that the town presently has in place is that it was put
728 in place in 1992, all the projections from 1992 are wrong, and the studies have no effect at
729 all. It does however state that the Planning Board would monitor certain statistics and this
730 mandate has not been done. It wasn't needed as there has been no growth.

731

732 He quoted from our ordinance Section XIII Residential Construction timing and Phasing
733 Ordinance (Adopted March 1992)

734 H1 The Planning Board shall monitor the following statistics:

735 H2 The Board shall present its findings to the public not later than the second regular
736 meeting of the board within each new building year.

737 J. Leonard then explained the situation of Liz Woods who has had real estate in town for
738 years. There are two subdivisions, one approved in 2008 and the other approved in 2006.
739 The owner is restricted on the number of permits she can have, and for no reason. The
740 economy will restrict it on its own. So as it stands it is interfering with her rights of those
741 properties. And it is also doing it with no benefit to the town. He stated there is no demand
742 in the town and the demand now will not impact the infrastructure and there is no study to
743 suggest it.

744

745 He quoted from our ordinance Section XIII Residential Construction timing and Phasing
746 Ordinance (Adopted March 1992)

747

748 J Building permit limitations shall be terminated without cause by the second regular
749 meeting of the Planning Board...if

- 750 1. The total number of new dwelling units constructed within the
751 previous building year falls below Hollis' fair share of the region's
752 growth
- 753 2. The Board fails to present finding which justify the continuance of
754 the limitation...

755

756 J. Leonard pointed out that J 1. has probably happened for 10 years in a row. He said it
757 makes sense to repeal this ordinance, and it makes more sense to terminate it altogether. It
758 is not legally justified to repeal it upon a condition that there is a replacement, and he added
759 it is this board's responsibility to recommend it be repealed as there is no basis to justify
760 further limitations on building permits.

761

762 He concluded by saying that he was unsure how to address this concern with regard to Liz
763 Woods property on Merrill Lane. He had requested that the ordinance was not enforced to
764 this property. He deemed it a reasonable request. And as he understands it, this is the
765 result.

766

767 D. Petry suggested to M. Fougere that the board discusses phasing developments and not
768 restriction on growth. M. Fougere stated that for new developments that come in, the board
769 could discuss phasing requirements. D. Petry asked for an inventory of all subdivisions
770 currently approved and existing that has not yet had building permits pulled to fully
771 appreciate the impact.

772

773 The board discussed the information given and as no one else wished to speak the public

hearing was closed.

D. Cleveland made a motion to send this deletion to the Town Ballot. Motion carried 7:0.

C.Rogers made a suggestion that M. Fougere report to the board annually with figures on building permits, school statistic etc. This information would be helpful to the board.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Discussion: ZBA memo relative to suggested amendments to the Zoning Ordinance: Housing for Older Persons & adding "Intent" sections to three zoning districts Industrial, Mobile Home-1 and Rural Lands.

M. Fougere explained we had a memo from the ZBA dated November 18, 2016. Two months ago two members of the ZBA came to talk to the Planning Board about Housing for Older Persons. They would like the board to consider amending the Housing for older person's ordinance.

The proposed changes are as follows:

Amend Section XXI Housing for Older Persons as follows:

1. **GENERAL STANDARDS:** All housing for older persons shall conform to the following standards:
 - a. Dwelling unit density shall not be greater than **two (2)** ~~one (1)~~ two-bedroom dwelling units or two (2) one-bedroom dwelling units/net tract acre when the type of housing that is being proposed is that which complies with NH RSA 354-A:15, II Housing for Older Persons. ~~, which provides an exception to the rule against restricted housing for housing that is "... (II) Intended for, and solely occupied by, persons 62 years of age or older."~~
 - e. The minimum lot area shall be **15** ~~30~~ acres and the lot shall have at least 50 feet of frontage on those roadways listed in Section XXI, A,1,L.
2. **MAXIMUM PERMITTED DWELLING UNITS:** The maximum number of housing for older persons dwelling units approved in a calendar year, when added to all previously approved units of housing for older persons, shall not exceed ten percent ~~(10%)~~ **(25%)** of the total dwelling units existing in the Town for the previous year.

Reason for the request: The ordinance should reflect the changing demographics, match the Intent on which the Ordinance was originally proposed and encourage the construction of Housing for Older Persons.

M. Fougere explained that at the moment we have 3,000 housing units in town so the cap would be 300 units, and at the moment we have 110 age restricted units in town. D. Petry asked what the impact of the density would be. Does that double the number of units you can put on a site? M. Fougere said he would look into this in more detail.

Drew Mason, Baxter Road and member of ZBA, approached the podium. He explained that Page 118 of the zoning ordinance explained the history of past changes. In 1996 the change was made to increase the allowed density to four time the single family density but it does nothing like that. We actually want to allow denser housing for older people. He went on to explain that the ZBA had a case that came before them for a variance on a site

for older housing. He had 16 acres not 30 acres. So given the language in the ordinance they could not grant the variance. By comparing the demographics of Hollis and New Hampshire they would like to encourage more elderly housing in this area. D. Petry asked if we changed it to 15 acres how many units could be put on 15 acres. M. Fougere said it was hard to tell as restrictions include 15% of site being impermeable, 40% open space, exclusive of wetlands, hydric soils and flood plains and slopes greater than 25%. J. Belanger said it was same density as a PUD. M. Fougere said you can only cover 6500 sq ft of an acre and this would be roads, driveways and buildings. J. Peters said that having more opportunity of older housing in Hollis would bring in a tax base, with minimum impact on services. D. Petry understands the reasons for changing this but was concerned that maybe it was going too far or would the other restrictions still limit it. We have to be reasonable. C. Rogers and J. Belanger both asked if there could be a density limit rather than a minimum acreage. This discussion continued between the Planning Board stating it would also need to be on major roads.

D.Cleveland made a motion to the board to vote on this tonight so it can go to Public Hearing in January.

Amend Section XXI Housing for Older Persons as follows:

1. GENERAL STANDARDS: All housing for older persons shall conform to the following standards:

- a. Dwelling unit density shall not be greater than **two (2)** ~~one (1)~~ two-bedroom dwelling units or two (2) one-bedroom dwelling units/net tract acre when the type of housing that is being proposed is that which complies with NH RSA 354-A:15, II Housing for Older Persons. ~~which provides an exception to the rule against restricted housing for housing that is "... (II) Intended for, and solely occupied by, persons 62 years of age or older."~~
- e. The minimum lot area shall be **20** ~~30~~ acres and the lot shall have at least 50 feet of frontage on those roadways listed in Section XXI, A,1,L.

2. MAXIMUM PERMITTED DWELLING UNITS: The maximum number of housing for older persons dwelling units approved in a calendar year, when added to all previously approved units of housing for older persons, shall not exceed ten percent ~~(10%)~~ **(25%)** of the total dwelling units existing in the Town for the previous year.

The consensus was to change the acreage to 20 acres for the purpose of the public hearing. M. Fougere said he would confer with our attorney and we will get a map with areas of 20 acres and 15 acres. The board voted to change to 20 acres. It voted to be posted 6:1. It will now be posted, and go to public hearing.

Amend Section XI Overlay Zoning Districts as follows:

867 6. PROHIBITED USES IN THE AQUIFER PROTECTION OVERLAY ZONE: The following
868 uses shall not be permitted in the Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone: b. **Subsurface**
869 **storage of petroleum or other refined petroleum products.**

870 7. NONCONFORMING USES IN THE AQUIFER PROTECTION OVERLAY ZONE:

871 ~~b. Notwithstanding subparagraph 7.a above, no underground storage tank for~~
872 ~~petroleum or other refined petroleum products may be repaired or replaced.~~
873 ~~All failed underground storage tanks must be removed according to standards~~
874 ~~established in state statutes and regulations.~~

875 **Reason for the request:** Remove sections because current technology and state
876 standards are sufficient to protect the Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone. In addition, public
877 health and safety will be improved.

878 The board voted for this to go to public hearing 7:0.

879 **Amend Section X: Zoning Districts by adding the following Intent Sections as**
880 **follows:**

881

882 ***C. INDUSTRIAL ZONE (I)***

883 **INTENT:** The Industrial Zone is intended to provide for the location of industry and light
884 manufacturing and the Special Exceptions uses noted in paragraph 4.

885

886 ***D. MOBILE HOME-1 ZONE (MH-1)***

887 **INTENT:** The Mobile Home-1 Zone is intended to provide an area in Town in which
888 individual lots for mobile homes as well as mobile-home parks are allowed.

889

890 ***H. RURAL LANDS ZONE (RL)***

891 **INTENT:** The two-fold intent of the Rural Lands Zone is to encourage farming in Town
892 and to permit limited development in areas where physical site conditions are problematic
893 or access to Town services is restricted.

894

895 **Reason for the request:** All other Zoning Districts having “Intent” sections which
896 outline the general land use goals for those areas. These three Districts lack Intent sections
897 and both the ZBA and Planning Board believe it is important each zoning district have this
898 outline.

899

900 The board voted for this to go to public hearing 7:0.

901

902 J. Belanger asked to address the Planning Board for five minutes. He started by saying the
903 Planning Board is the most important board in any town. He added five or six members on
904 the Planning Board can change this town because 80% of the town voters go with what the
905 Planning Board recommends on the ballot. So everyone needs to be very careful. He stated
906 he was here to give his thoughts and not argue. He also added he has experience with being
907 on the Planning Board including being a Chairman for many years. He stated that a few
908 years ago they tried to get a tax base in town much like Amherst has, and they tried to get
909 111 commercialized. A lot of people living on 111 loved the idea as they could not sell their

homes because of the traffic and more business growth. This proposal was put to a public hearing and it was going to go to town meeting, people from the golf course met and got 10% of the people to sign an objection. So if you get 10% of people in an area to sign an objection to a zoning change, then you need 2/3 of people at town meeting to pass it. So this did not pass. Hence now we are still dealing with route 111 which could be more commercial. He is afraid that this Planning Board is going towards snob zoning. He explained that the tattoo parlor was an idea which was a business, and it appeared that we were restricting more and more businesses within the business zone. And this brings us out of step with other towns in the state. So now he sees us possibly considering daycare within an industrial zone and that is what has brought him here tonight. He said spot zoning was illegal. He stated the definition of spot zoning as the process of singling out a small parcel of land for the use of classification totally different from that of surrounding area for the benefit of the owner of said property and to the detriment of other owners. By allowing a daycare to move into an industrial zone would benefit the land owner because it is being used in a different manor. He added it's inconsistent with the general purpose of the industrial zone and highly incompatible with the uses permitted in an industrial zone. From a zoning policy view it does not make any sense to mix a preschool or daycare facility with truck terminals, sawmills, contractor storage yards, manufacturing facilities. We would have people in here complaining if we allowed this to happen out there by changing the ordinance.

D. Petry asked what he was referring to. The next item on the Planning Board Agenda was stated as Daycare in an industrial zone, but the Planning board had yet to discuss this item. J. Belanger brought the Planning Board up to date. He stated we have an industrial zone in town and the zoning board had a daycare centre come to them this year and they denied it as it is not allowed in the zone. So he assumed this agenda item was because of that and that the Planning Board might be considering allowing a daycare centres in the industrial zone but it a very incompatible use. If we start doing that and we set a precedent and allow more uses in the industrial zone and pretty soon we will not have an industrial zone. D. Cleveland stated the Planning Board had not even discussed this yet and this was the first time that they had heard about it, and M. Fougere added that he had not even given him a chance to present to the Planning Board. J. Belanger stated he was glad he got his chance to speak first. The Chairman and Town Planner had decided not to bring it to the Planning Board this year as it was late in the day and there was already a lengthy ballot paper.

J. Belanger also wanted to talk about the UNH cooperative extension service put on by the UNH folks that are experts in zoning ordinances and Master Plans and will come into our community and look through our ordinance to find inconsistencies and review our Master plan at no charge. We should consider using this service.

Finally he wanted to make us aware about a small pox cemetery. During the civil war there was civil war prisoners in Hollis infected with small pox. They have been buried in a burial ground. Medical doctors state that these bones will maybe still be infected with small pox virus even after all this time. J. Belanger said he has been pushing this with the Board of Selectmen and other boards for about 7 years and trying to locate this burial spot. We need to know where it is. He reckons it is near the Nashua River somewhere near Lone Pine Hunters Land and close to where the Boditch site was, in that timeframe. He has volunteers including the Police department who would volunteer to come in with ground penetrating

959 equipment, to find this burial spot. He would like to find it but as yet he cannot get enough
960 interest from the town to locate it. D. Petry said he would bring it up with the Board of
961 Selectman.

962

963

964 D. Cleveland stated and confirmed that daycare within an Industrial Zone, having spoken
965 with M. Fougere earlier that day and given the length of our Ballot already, we will defer
966 this new topic for future discussions.

967

968 B. Moseley made motion made to adjourn tonight meeting and go into non public. J. Peters
969 seconded. All in favor none opposed.

970

971 **Non-public discussion, legal, under RSA 91-A3 II (e) approval of minutes.**

972

973 D.Petry made a motion to enter non public session in accordance with RSA 91-A3 II (e)
974 legal. B. Moseley seconded. Voting in favor of the motion were B. Moseley, D. Turcott, D.
975 Petry, D. Cleveland, C. Rogers, B. Ming and J. Peters. No one was opposed. Motion passed
976 7:0.

977

978 The board entered non-public at 10:40 PM.

979

980 D.Petry made a motion to come out of non public session in accordance with RSA 91-A3 II
981 (e) legal. B. Moseley seconded. Voting in favor of the motion were B. Moseley, D. Turcott,
982 D. Petry, D. Cleveland, C. Rogers, B. Ming and J. Peters. No one was opposed. Motion
983 passed 7:0.

984

985 D.Petry made a motion for the Planning Board to seal the minutes of the Non public session
986 in accordance with RSA 91-A3 II (e) legal. B. Moseley seconded. Voting in favor of the
987 motion were B. Moseley, D. Turcott, D. Petry, D. Cleveland, C. Rogers, B. Ming and J.
988 Peters. No one was opposed. Motion passed 7:0.

989

990 D.Petry made a non-debatable motion to adjourn. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none
991 opposed.

992

993 The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 PM

994

995

996

997 Respectively submitted by,

998

999

1000 Wendy Trimble
1001 Planning Secretary
1002 Town of Hollis, NH
1003