

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 16, 2019

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Moseley – Chairman, Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Chet Rogers, Jeff Peters, Ben Ming, David Petry, Ex-Officio for the Selectmen; Alternates; Rick Hardy, Matt Hartnett.

ABSENT: Cathy Hoffman, Dan Turcott.

STAFF PRESENT: Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Virginia Mills, Interim Planning Assistant.

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance, led by J. Peters. The Chair appointed R. Hardy to vote for C. Hoffman.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

J. Peters moved to approve the Planning Board Minutes of March 19, 2019 as written. Motion seconded by R. Hardy. All in favor; none opposed.

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING

- a. Agenda additions and deletions – M. Fougere requested that File PB2019:01 – Three lot subdivision for Steve Rheaume, 205 Proctor Hill Road, Map 11 Lot 12, be withdrawn pending receipt of required information. J. Peters moved to withdraw File PB2019:01 from the PB agenda. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved.
- b. Committee Reports – None
- c. Staff Report – None
- d. Regional Impact – Town of Amherst. Application for a 254,915 sq. ft. warehouse building with associated parking and site improvements located at the Bon Terrain industrial park near Walmart. The town has received notification of this pending application, and after speaking with M. Fougere, the Amherst planner has indicated that there will be a condition of the planning board that that no trucks will be allowed to enter or exit the site via S. Merrimack Road. They will use the “Walmart road.”
- e. Correspondence – None
- f. Election of PB Officers – (M. Hartnett and B. Ming have not had an opportunity to be sworn in by the Town Clerk so they sat in the audience for this meeting). J. Peters moved to nominate Bill Moseley as Chairman. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved (B. Moseley abstains). J. Peters nominated D. Cleveland as Vice Chairman. Motion seconded by R. Hardy and unanimously approved. (D. Cleveland abstains).

4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS – none

5. HEARINGS -

a. Scenic Road Hearing – tree trimming and removal: Eversource – South Merrimack Road, Farley Road, Nevens Road, Wheeler Road and Ridge Road.

Rick Sullivan, Arborist for Eversource, appeared before the Board to discuss proposed tree trimming on several scenic roads (see memo dated March 18, 2019). On Ridge Road the line is being extended at the end of the road to accommodate a new home. Abutting property owners have approved of the work. The plan on all the other roads is for standard maintenance trimming. All of the trees are either in a state of “advanced decline” or dead, and are flagged with orange ribbons. The stumps should be no more than 3” above ground. B. Moseley asked about the specifications for clean-up. Mr. Sullivan responded that smaller logs are left for townspeople to gather for firewood; larger trees are picked up by log trucks. B. Moseley noted

50 that there have been numerous situations where trees have been cut and the debris has been left
51 for extended periods; he suggested that the Board may want to stipulate maximum stump height
52 as well as set time limits for clean-up. Several Board members noted that Depot Road is “still a
53 mess” after cutting done long ago. Mr. Sullivan agreed to arrange to have the log trucks pick the
54 wood up. Board members agreed to specify a maximum stump height of 3”, and that the debris
55 be trucked out if the property owner does not want it. This should happen within a month of the
56 work being done. Mr. Sullivan stated that the debris on Depot Road will be picked up within 2
57 or 3 weeks, and he agreed to not start any of the work on scenic roads until Depot Road is
58 cleaned up.

59 Public Hearing. Philip Coates, 70 Runnells Bridge Road, requested that the Board require that
60 no road or driveway be left impeded at the end of the work day. Last year his driveway was left
61 completely blocked for 24 hours. Mr. Sullivan apologized for this happening and stated that
62 anyone is welcome to call Customer Service (800) 286-2000 at any time to report problems.

63 There being no further comments, the chairman closed the public hearing.

64 **b. File PB2019:04:** Proposed minor subdivision of 38.4 acre lot into four lots ranging in size
65 from 5.9 to 15.7 acres, 43 Farley Road, Map 38 Lot 37, Owner/Applicant: Raisanen Homes
66 Elite LLC, Zoned R&A. Tabled from March 19th.

67
68 Staff noted that a site walk was held on April 6 and noted receipt of a letter dated April 9
69 from Barbara Dunn, 29 Farley Road, which has been distributed to all board members. Also
70 submitted is a wildlife report from Chris Guida of Fieldstone Land Consultants. Grading
71 plans for the two driveways on the east side are pending. There is a requested waiver from
72 doing topography on the rear portion of the property, which is wet. The public hearing
73 was held at the last meeting.

74
75 Chad Brannon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, noted that, as stated in the wildlife evaluation,
76 this project develops approx. 4 acres of the 38 acre property. The property abuts 900 acres
77 of undeveloped land. Mr. Brannon reviewed the grading plan for the two properties in
78 question. The primary concern was potential impacts to the rural character. The plan shows
79 the limits of clearing on lots 2 and 3. The existing vegetation is quite thick and the only cut
80 is for a swath for the driveway, with the natural drainage along the side. J. Peters noted that
81 the growth is primarily mature trees, but not much low canopy. R. Hardy stated that it was
82 brought up at the site walk that the plan would benefit from some screening on these two
83 lots. C. Hoffman had suggested at a previous meeting that wetland boundary markers be
84 placed at the appropriate locations.

85
86 D. Cleveland moved to approve the waiver from doing topography on the rear of the
87 property. Motion seconded by C. Rogers and unanimously approved. M. Fougere reviewed
88 the proposed conditions of approval:

89 *Note indicating stump disposal area or that stumps will be removed from the site;

90 *Wetland buffer signs to be placed along the 100’ buffer area;

91 *All utilities from poles on Farley Road to the homes will be underground.

92 *The two eastern lots to submit a landscaping plan to be reviewed by staff;

*No tree cutting along the 100' building setback along Farley Road except for driveway construction. J. Peters noted that there is one very rotten tree to the left of the old house should be removed.

D. Petry moved to approve File PB2019:04 with the stated stipulations. Motion seconded by J. Peters and unanimously approved.

- c. **File PB2019:06: Design Review** – Site Plan amendment detailing proposed storage buildings – 23,000 sq. ft., 9,100 sq. ft., and a 3,000 sq. ft. seasonal housing building. 38 Broad Street. Applicant/owner Brookdale Farm. Map 24 Lot 2, Zoned A/B Agricultural-business & Historic District. **Public Hearing.**

(R. Hardy stepped down to the audience for this case.)

Kevin Anderson, Meridian Land Services, representing the applicant, presented an update since the plan was presented conceptually in the Fall. The building sizes, layout and stormwater design have been finalized. Because this is an agricultural use, the wetland area may be utilized for that use. All of the stormwater will be conveyed to a sediment forebay and ultimately treated by a wet pond in accordance with State standards resulting in an impact to the wetland of about 9800 sq. ft. and a buffer impact of 53,900 sq. ft. The Conservation Commission has asked for some additional plantings in and around the wet pond, and for an oil-water separator at the discharge point of the stormwater, and that no hazardous fuel be stored in the buffer. The applicant agrees to all these requests. The proposed structures are not visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Hardy has been to the Historic District Commission. It is understood that some landscaping buffers are needed. Mr. Anderson reviewed the proposed landscaping, and emphasized the expansive buffer along the lot line with the post office. There will be wildlife plantings in that area. In conclusion, Mr. Anderson summarized that this is not an expansion of the business, but to better utilize storage of equipment and materials and improve circulation. The applicant has requested a waiver to the Special Studies.

J. Peters asked if there is any way to drain the water off the pavement in the northwest quadrant.

K. Anderson responded that the design calls for all the water to be trapped. He noted that D. LaBombard has not yet reviewed the plan, but that will be done shortly and therefore he would request that the plan move to final review at the next meeting.

Public Hearing. Andrea Seddon, 50 Wheeler Road, asked about the wildlife habitat plantings – will they be native species, who will be checking them, and how long do they have to do the work? K. Anderson reviewed the list of proposed species, which were chosen by Rick Hardy. Mr. Hardy (applicant) responded that they are all native except the Norway Spruce. Some of the chosen species are part of the pollinator restoration. M. Fougere added that all landscaping is inspected during construction by town staff.

Board members agreed that no Special Studies be required for this application. J. Peters moved to authorize File PB2018-019 to move to final application. The motion was seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved.

- d. **File PB2019:05: Design Review** – Proposed two-lot subdivision and site plan for multi-family (36 units) townhome Workforce Housing (11 units) & market rate home development (25 units). Old Runnells Bridge Road and South Depot Road. Map 10 Lot 31-1. Owner: Raisanen Leasing Corp., Applicant: Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC. Zoned R & A, Recreation and Multi-family Overlay Zone. **Public Hearing.**

142
143 M. Fougere reviewed the history of this application to date. A conceptual discussion, a general
144 overview of the project, was held in the Fall followed by a site walk. The plan is now in design
145 review, which provides for more detailed review, but it is not the phase in which the plan can be
146 approved. Due to an error with abutter notification, another notice by certified mail will be sent for
147 the next meeting and the public hearing will remain open until that time. Mr. Fougere explained that
148 there is a detailed posting on the website regarding this project, and urged people to not rely on
149 Facebook and other social media, because much of the information is not correct. The Planning
150 Board is anxious to hear from everyone and provide factual information to answer any questions.
151 This is a 32 unit owner occupied development with 30% of the units restricted to workforce housing.
152 Deed covenants restrict the sale prices of the homes. There will be public water. 40% of the site
153 will be open space. There will be a gated driveway to Runnells Bridge Road; the main access will be
154 via South Depot. Workforce Housing is set once a year by HUD criteria and is based on the median
155 income, which for this area is \$106,300. The maximum price for these houses is \$352,500 as
156 calculated by NH Housing Authority. The proposed use is allowed by Conditional Use Permit, and
157 must meet the specific criteria set forth in the ordinance (see staff report). A detailed landscaping
158 plan has been submitted and reviewed, and most of the issues have been addressed. Stephen Purnaw
159 & Company has performed a detailed traffic study, which he will discuss. This site is split zoned,
160 which affects the final density. The town engineer is reviewing a drainage analysis. Test pits are
161 complete and were witnessed by the town's septic inspector. A letter from the past owner regarding
162 the property's history has been received and distributed to the board. The Fire Chief is satisfied with
163 the project's layout and access to water; comments from the Police Chief are pending. Staff analysis
164 of potential number of school-aged children, based on similar developments in neighboring towns
165 comes in at 16.

166
167 D. Petry (Selectmen's representative on the Planning Board), explained that the ordinance is based
168 on NH RSA 674:58-61, and is based on SB 342 that went into effect in January 2010. It "requires all
169 municipalities to provide reasonable and realistic opportunities for the development of homes that
170 are affordable to low and moderate income families". This ordinance was enacted to align with the
171 State RSAs. If people have an issue with the law they should talk to their State reps. The Hollis
172 ordinance provides an access point for people to do this, but restricts the areas where it can occur.

173
174 Chad Brannon, Fieldstone Leasing Corp., appeared on behalf of Raisanen Leasing Corp. Since the
175 last meeting in January, a number of design tasks have been completed and submitted. The design
176 review plan holds the same basic layout as was submitted for the conceptual. There are two roads
177 and they will be 22' wide. A closed drainage system captures all the runoff on the site. The
178 roadway is gated at Runnells Bridge Road. 24 test pits were performed. The project will be entirely
179 self-contained with all stormwater runoff treated on-site. There are treatment swales and two
180 infiltration basins. No seasonal high water table was found in either of those areas. The project will
181 require an Alteration of Terrain permit from the State. The layout calls for 4 parking spaces per unit,
182 and additional spaces are provided for visitors. There is also a recreational area. The project will be
183 serviced by Pennichuck Water and will have underground utilities. Also submitted as part of this
184 design review phase are: an onsite soils evaluation report, architectural plans, a detailed stormwater
185 management report, a traffic report and a detailed landscaping plan with renderings to address the
186 visual impact.

187
188 Mr. Brannon indicated that, based on a recent survey which located the zoning boundary, there have
189 been some revisions to the plan resulting in a reduced density. The plan shows the zone boundary
190 line from the edge of the Nashua River in springtime conditions. The revised plan now shows 32

units. Several buildings have moved to the East. A number of quads have been turned into triplex units. The commercial lot has been increased in size (2.6 ac.) to accommodate a building box and the workforce housing area will be 8.9 acres. Only 30% of the units will qualify to be workforce housing which means that there will be 10 workforce units and 22 market rate units. D. Petry noted that the board typically requires revised plans to be submitted 10 days before the meeting and this is the first time they are seeing them, so more time will be needed to fully review them before the next meeting. The chairman agreed, noting that this plan will be continuing until the next meeting. D. Cleveland asked if Bldg. 6 is the only one being moved. C. Brannon responded that some driveways will be realigned and Bldg. 7 will shift up, but there will be very little effect on the landscaping, drainage, etc. B. Moseley asked about the drainage situation. C. Brannon responded that everything is infiltrated onsite with partially closed drainage systems. A lot of thought has gone into the location of the drainage systems so as not to negatively effect the home. The plan has been designed to exceed Town standards and meet State requirements and will be reviewed by the town's consulting engineer, Dennis LaBombard. The stormwater management areas will look like a green lawn area.

The applicant's traffic consultant, Stephen G. Pernaw, then presented a summary of his Traffic Impact Assessment dated February 2019. The site has one full access and one emergency access. The study area includes the intersection at 111A, as well as the traffic signal at 111. A recent count by NH DOT found 5500 cars/day at the Nashua/Hollis line on Rt. 111A. Typically, there is a rise in the morning, drop off during the day and another rise in the evening, with the PM peak being higher. Traffic counts at the site were done at 7-9 AM and 3-6 PM on Wed and Thurs in Feb. Wed was higher so that was the number used for projections. The highest AM volume was between 7 and 8, and the signalized intersection carried 1,210 vehicles. During the evening the peak volume was 4:15-5:15, and the volume at the signal was 1,315. The traffic going by the site was 429 in the morning and 463 in the evening. Projections were done for 2020 and 2030 using Feb data. The development will generate approx.. 232 trips on an average weekday, with 18 trips between 7-8 AM and 24 trips in the evening. The projected net increase on Rt. 111 and Rt. 111A is 1% or less. The driveway intersection will operate at a high level of service. Queuing will be <1. The increase in traffic and signal will not change the delay. The increase in traffic at the signal will not dramatically change the delay situation. No turning lanes will be necessary to access the site. The final recommendations are pretty simple: (1) Install a STOP sign exiting the site; (2) 18" stop line; (3) 4' double line on the site driveway. B. Moseley asked what is exactly across the street from the new entrance on S. Depot Road. C. Brannon responded that there are no curb cuts directly across, but it is Alpine Grove property.

C. Brannon noted that a lot of effort has gone into designing the landscaping for the perimeter of the project, as well as considerable landscaping along the entrance to the project. He then introduced Don Scott, Landscape Architect, Harrisville, NH, who walked the Board through the design. He started with interior landscaping with traditional ornamental plantings along the front of the buildings as well as street trees and evergreens between the buildings. He then moved out to the perimeter where construction fencing will protect the existing trees. The other perimeter plantings are species that are already out there – arborvitaes, White Pine and some Norway Spruce, as well as some crab apples and birches to give the border natural character. They are sized at a 5 year period, and are going in at 5' to 6' and will take on additional height. There will be an entrance sign with ornamental plantings around it. By pushing the buildings to the south, the existing pond and surrounding trees can be maintained. The existing ground cover is from the old golf course. The views show the existing vegetation as well as what is proposed. R. Hardy noted that he and D. Gagne had met with Mr. Scott. He (Scott) has added a great number of trees to help mitigate the

impact to the neighbors. J. Peters questioned what happens after the 3 year landscaping bond period expires. He also noted that White Pines need to be topped to be effective for buffering. D. Smith responded that this is why he is using a mix, including Western Arbovites, which spread. The evergreens are spaced 16' apart, which should fill in the gaps. R. Hardy noted that this plan is typical of what the Board has required of others in the past, and they have done a good effort as far at increasing the density. D. Smith stated that he has been working with D. Gagne, who recommends a note that the perimeter plantings not be pruned, and be left in their natural state. J. Peters asked C. Brannon how far the recreation area will be from the abutters. (150').

The chairman then opened the public hearing, which was limited to 30 minutes, with each individual given 3 minutes to speak followed by the rebuttal.

ABUTTERS

Dan Greenough, 15 Old Runnells Bridge Rd., questioned the septic design. How many bedrooms are there in each unit? If they are 3 bedrooms the 100' radius will overlap his well and if 2 bedrooms the 50' radius will touch. The plan appears to be geared towards the maximum allowed, aka "stacked tolerances". How will the septic be repaired? Do the septic calcs take into consideration the slopes and the ponds? This project, while it may be technically compliant, tests the spirit of the regulations.

Phillip Coates, 70 Runnells Bridge Rd., stated that he is on the other side of the water from the project. His concerns are the impact on quality of life from construction trucks, etc. For this reason and for the potential loss of property value, he is opposed to the project. Will the project be maintained by a management company? Will it transition to a HOA? Who will insure that the requirements with respect to landscaping, etc will be taken care of?

Thomas Mullin, 24 South Depot Road, expressed concerns with fill going into the project as well the entrance to the property off S. Depot Rd. He already has water flowing into his property and the entrance to this property appears to have as downward slope to S. Depot Rd., which will increase the problem. Other concerns are close proximity of the septic system to the property line and excessive flow into the back part of his property.

Connie Messer, 17 Old Runnells Bridge Rd., questioned if the water runoff calcs are based on this year, noting that there has not been much snow and runoff this winter. She has lived at this location for 40 years and has seen the water come from the river up into the Alpine Grove parking lot. What will the treated water from Pennichuck that flows into the ground do to the surrounding wells?

TOWN RESIDENTS

Kelly Simone, 25 Old Runnells Bridge Rd., agreed with the preceding comments, and expressed concern regarding the impact on the school system. The community grows by less than 20 people a year, the projected number of children from this project is 16. Other concerns are the test pits which were dug at 8' to 12' on elevated land where fill was brought in to create a golf course. There is the potential for a huge traffic impact on Old Runnells Bridge Rd. from people cutting through to Nashua via Gilson. The biggest concern is manipulation of the State statute in a highly sought out community and school system for profit to smash as much as possible into one space.

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive, thanked the planning board for its attention to detail and for providing opportunity for further review of the plans at the next meeting. He supports the concept of workforce housing in Hollis, but has concerns regarding the process, especially limiting people who

289 wish to speak to 3 minutes. The chairman responded that the public hearing will be continued to the
 290 next meeting. Mr. Garruba quoted RSA 674:59 that a town must make workforce housing
 291 “economically viable” but stated that is not a blank check for stuffing as many units as possible into
 292 a property. The ordinance provides that the planning board may require project cost estimates. It is
 293 vitally important that the Board get this information in that it is the first workforce housing
 294 development, and there are two elements that are unusual for the planning process. One is economic
 295 viability, which allow the planning board to look at actual construction costs and assign a reasonable
 296 profit to the developer and then calculate what it would take to make that economically viable.
 297 Hypothetically this equates to possibly 5 units at a total sales of 1.76 million dollars. The chairman
 298 noted that the Board has received extensive correspondence from Mr. Garruba which is under review
 299 and will be dealt with at the next meeting; meanwhile the Board needs to hear from other people in
 300 the audience. Mr. Garruba concluded by stating that the concept of examining economic viability is
 301 addressed in the State guidebook “Meeting the Workforce Housing Challenge”. *(Ed. Note: The*
 302 *lead author of this document is Mark Fougere, who serves as the Hollis Town Planner.)* It is vitally
 303 important that the planning board address this. Mr. Garruba stated that he has many more points that
 304 he is unable to address in 3 minutes. D. Petry stated that the board has received 2 documents from
 305 Mr. Garruba and responded to the first one, which contains some misinformation. The first set has
 306 been posted and the second will be posted. With respect to process, this application is treated exactly
 307 the same as others and according to the planning board’s long-standing process.

308
 309 Terry Gerlach, 19 Old Runnells Bridge Rd., asked what the minimum price of the workforce units
 310 will be. Will they be strictly owner-occupied or can they be rented? Everyday there are 6 deer that
 311 walk across her driveway and go into the subject property; Ms. Gerlach requested that the board
 312 require that a wildlife study be done.

313
 314 Harold Ryder, 9 Terrell Lane, spoke in opposition to the project because of the number of units. He
 315 asked if bringing in the water will provide fire protection along South Depot Rd. and will it go out to
 316 Old Runnells Bridge Rd. Will there be hydrants?

317
 318 John Garruba, 30 Meadow Dr., spoke in opposition to the project as it is contrary to the public
 319 interest. He moved to Hollis for the rural character. A recent survey found the top positive in Hollis
 320 is the rural character and the top concern is the rate of growth. This multi-unit development greatly
 321 damages the rural character of Hollis. Any density that is higher than the minimum of statute is
 322 contrary to public interest. This is part of a trend that happens over time. Will the Board be
 323 requesting cost information and building data? The chairman responded that the Board will be
 324 considering any information that it deems necessary. A portion of one of the structures is in the
 325 setback and this should go before the ZBA for a variance.

326
 327 Mark Cramer, 46 Old Runnells Bridge Rd., agreed with concerns raised by abutters, specifically
 328 related to traffic. Is there any assurance that the gated entrance to Old Runnells Bridge Rd will not
 329 be used during construction? It is already heavily travelled and not safe.

330
 331 Curtis Bridge, 3 Dutton Lane, expressed concern regarding contamination due to flood waters. He is
 332 also concerned about the wildlife. This is not what Hollis wants.

333
 334 Nicole Laurencelle, 28 S. Depot Rd., agreed with previous speakers relative to water, traffic,
 335 potential contamination, impact to the schools. She is also concerned about the wildlife; this project
 336 would be a detriment for the town and the wildlife.

337

338 Pam Hicks, 8 Maple Knoll Drive, questioned why this project is being considered at the maximum
339 allowable units. The school budget is expanding at an unsustainable rate. 16 children would mean a
340 minimum of \$320,000 added to the school budget. Absolutely do not support this.

341 Joe Garruba approached the podium to speak again. (Laura Bianco, 151 Nartoff Rd., gave her time
342 to Joe Garruba.) Mr. Garruba addressed the school issue. There is currently an extra section in
343 Grade 6 as a result of a recent enrollment surge, which required hiring an additional teacher. There
344 is a regional shortage of school bus drivers with school buses doubling up routes. Some kids are on
345 the bus for 40 minutes each day. The project should be restricted to 5 units per year through phasing
346 so the school can address the surge of students from this development. How will the cost to the town
347 be for fire protection be paid?

348

349 Michelle St. John, Hollis, asked if consideration has been given to a large capacity septic system
350 instead of individual ones? Can more be done to mitigate the stormwater from a green standpoint?

351

352 The public hearing concluded at 27 minutes with everyone having a first opportunity to speak. The
353 chairman then called for the applicant's representative to respond to issues raised.

354

355 Chad Brannon, Fieldstone Engineering, approached the podium to address the concerns raised:

356

357 • All units are 2 bedroom as allowed by the ordinance. A full site analysis was performed and
358 this property is capable of handling a lot more density than what is proposed. This site is
359 self contained and everyone is up-gradient from the project. No nitrate setback can extend
360 beyond the property line. The design meets and exceeds State and local standards. With
361 respect to the well radius questions – someone's well radius is not allowed to infringe on a
362 property owner's right to develop their property. These are small septic designs, no different
363 than those designed for a traditional single family house. The systems are very shallow and
364 easily maintained. The soils are "phenomenal". There were no artificial hills created when
365 the golf course was built. For the test pits, they hit sand all the way down to 12' (6' to 8" is
366 the average depth). There is plenty of capacity on this site to support a lot more density.
367 This project meets all the requirements outlined in the regulations. All of the workforce
368 housing units will be owner-occupied. If there were workforce rental units, they would need
369 more density. J. Peters noted that there is not sufficient acreage to support more density. C.
370 Brannon pointed out that this is where economic viability comes in – if the applicant can
371 prove that this is a workforce housing project and he needs additional density, he can
372 leverage the RSAs from an economic viability standpoint and request additional density. It
373 is not anticipated that any fill will be brought in. Drainage was designed based on extreme
374 standards based on Alteration of Terrain Permit of the State. Infiltration basins are designed
375 with a factor of safety built in (a factor of 3 on exfiltration rates). While Alpine Grove is in
376 the floodway, this project is not. All drainage runs onto the site, not off, and there will not
377 be runoff onto abutting properties. Test pits were done in all the building, septic, drainage
378 areas and it is all sand. The alterations done for the golf course were all with native
379 materials. The site will be served by hydrants. D. Petry will check regarding the town
380 policy on Pennichuck water. The density meets the calculations in the ordinance and no
381 variances are needed. This may be one of the few properties in town that meet the
382 requirements for workforce housing. The landscaping plan is designed to meet the rural
383 character requirements. There is no problem with not using the gated side of the property
384 during construction. The infiltration meets the green standards, is aesthetically pleasing, and
385 will look like a back yard.

Board members agreed that a wildlife study should be performed on the site. S. Pernaw reiterated that the traffic impact on Old Runnells Bridge Road is minimal. With respect to the school situation, D. Petry stated that phasing may be an option. He also recommended that the town attorney be consulted with regard to this project while it is still in design review.

M. Fougere asked when the State looks at lot loading. C. Brannon responded that this happens during State subsurface review. M. Fougere noted that all units must be owner occupied. This concluded the discussion, with D. Petry moving to continue File 2019:05 to the May 21 meeting. Motion seconded by J. Peters and unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **Jim Belanger – Request for waiver for site plan review, 19 Proctor Hill Road.** **Proposed change involves the establishment of a retail operation and a tree service.**

Mr. Belanger appeared to request a waiver of site plan review for his property located at 19 Proctor Hill Road as outlined in his letter dated April 1, 2019. He stated that he believes that no site plan is needed, and that the Board is focusing too much on the letter of the law and not focusing on its citizens. Mr. Belanger reviewed the history of uses that have occurred at the property, including TV repair, 2-way radio, Dunwell Electric, print shop, stereo repair, gun shop, none of which needed a site plan review. Mr. Belanger sold his business, Beltronics, 11 years ago, and the new owners stayed at the site for 7 years. After that, they moved out and the building has remained empty. There has been some storage for Pioneer Tree Service in the building, whose main location has been next door at the building owned by Spaulding Landscaping. In January there was a fire at that site and much of the equipment was moved to Mr. Belanger's building. Site plans are for adding new buildings, screening, density, none of which apply in this case. His daughter and son-in-law will now be running a business out of this location, but the site is not changing.

The board discussed recent cases in which a site plan was required where there was an existing building (karate studio and law office). D. Petry stated that the latest site plan for 19 Proctor Hill Road was done in 1989 and there have been numerous changes since then. J. Belanger noted that there was a site plan for the tower that came later. D. Petry spoke to the importance of following procedure and being consistent. The issues of importance to the board are: retail uses, hours of operation, parking spaces, number of employees. The problems arise if the use exceeds what it was approved before. If everything that the board would normally ask for is answered in a memo, that may be an acceptable compromise. R. Hardy noted that asking for this information is consistent with what the board required in the two previous cases this past year. It should be appended to whatever existing site plan is available. Staff can review this information.

Spencer Stickney, 17 and 19 Proctor Hill Road, added that he had applied for a new sign and was denied by the HDC, so he has applied for a variance from the ZBA. He stated that the building is still retail/commercial and the hours are identical to what has been there for 30 years. All the information the board is asking for has already been submitted with the ZBA application, but the applicant will be happy to submit it separately for the planning board.

435 D. Petry moved to waive the requirement for site plan review, subject to receipt of the
436 afore-mentioned information, as is consistent with the prior two site plans (law office
437 and karate studio). The motion was seconded by J. Peters and unanimously approved. The
438 motion was unanimously approved.
439

440 **2. Spring Review**
441

442 M. Fougere summarized the activities of the past year: 5 subdivisions ranging from 1 to 6
443 lots; 6 lot line relocations, 7 farm stands, 3 solar arrays. Farmstands was an issue last year.
444 The board is waiting for an amendment from the Agricultural Commission to the definitions
445 of “farmstand” and “roadside stand”. The Facilities chapter of the Master Plan is pending
446 and will require a public hearing.
447

448 M. Fougere noted the need to look into how drainage is addressed in both the ordinance and
449 regulations. The issue is the impact of drainage on the environment and how much
450 disturbance it causes. Drainage is addressed in both the ordinance and the regs and the
451 requirements are not consistent, often requiring applicants to design very large detention
452 basins, which alter the landscape. Are we doing more harm than good? A discussion with
453 the town engineer as well as engineers who work in Hollis would be very useful.
454

455 **ADJOURN**
456

457 There being no further business, D. Petry moved to adjourn. Motion seconded by C. Rogers
458 and unanimously approved. The meeting concluded at 10:10 PM.
459
460

461
462 Respectfully submitted,
463

464 Virginia Mills
465 Virginia Mills
466 Interim Planning Assistant
467
468
469
470
471
472
473