

**HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**May 21, 2019**

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bill Moseley – Chairman, Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Chet Rogers, Cathy Hoffman, Jeff Peters, Ben Ming. Alternates; Rick Hardy, Matt Hartnett.

**ABSENT:** David Petry; Dan Turcott.

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

**1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:04 PM**

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance, led by J. Peters. The chairman appointed Matt Hartnett to vote for Chet Rogers for the Brookdale application since he (Chet) is an abutter.

**2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

J. Peters moved to approve the Planning Board Minutes of April 16, 2019 as written. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland. All in favor; none opposed (Ben Ming abstains).

**3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING**

- a. Agenda additions and deletions – None
- b. Committee Reports – None
- c. Staff Report – None
- d. Regional Impact - None
- e. Correspondence – None

**4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS – none**

**5. HEARINGS -**

- a. **Final 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, Application/owner: Brookdale Farm, Map 24 Lot 2, Zoned A/B Agriculture-Business & Historic District. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

(R. Hardy recuses himself for this case.) Planner Mark Fougere reviewed his staff report dated 5/21/19. The plan has been reviewed and approved by the Historic District Commission, Conservation Commission, Fire Dept., the Planning Board's landscaping consultant and the Town Engineer. The applicant has submitted a waiver request for Additional Studies for environmental, wildlife, traffic, fiscal, visual and historic.

Kevin Anderson, Meridian Land Services, noted that the only outstanding items for this application are an Alteration of Terrain permit and State Wetlands permit. Mr. Anderson has responded to a letter from the Conservation Commission regarding a number of items (oil-water separation, plantings around the pond, seed mix and construction staging.).

The chairman opened the public hearing. Peter Baker, 40 Buttonwood Drive, questioned what happens if the wetlands application goes over 10,000 sq. ft. He noted that this is a very large wetland disturbance. M. Fougere explained that the Wetlands Conservation Overlay Zone gives great deference to farms and agriculture. K. Anderson stated that there will be 9,853 sq. ft. of wetland disturbance and 53,980 sq. ft. of buffer disturbance. Agricultural

entities are allowed to work within the wetland. Man-made ditches are exempt, as is the pond. Mitigation is required for greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and this plan is under that.

D. Cleveland moved to grant the waivers request for Additional Studies. Motion seconded by J. Peters and unanimously approved. J. Peters moved to approve File PB2019-006 subject to the following stipulations: (a) A NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit and (b) NHDES Wetlands Permit. The motion was seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved.

- b. PB2019:01 – Minor Subdivision of three lots served by a private way, 205 Proctor Hill Road, Map 11 Lot 12. Owner/Applicant: Steve Rheame, Zoned RL Rural Lands.

**Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere reviewed his staff report. This subdivision will subdivide a 13.57 acre lot into three lots with an existing single family home being removed. A waiver has been submitted to allow three lots on one private way. Wetlands on the site will not be disturbed. D. LaBombard has reviewed the plan and finds it acceptable. D. Cleveland presented a motion to accept File PB2019:01 for consideration. Motion seconded by C. Hoffman and unanimously approved.

Kevin Anderson, Meridian Land Services, pointed out that the site is largely wooded and the three lots will be for family members. The applicant is agreeable to a 100' no-cut buffer along Proctor Hill Road. A State DOT permit for the driveway is pending, as is an Alteration of Terrain permit. There are no wetland or buffer impacts. A maintenance agreement for the driveway will be prepared. (Staff noted that a draft has been received.) Solar panels shown on the plan will require a separate application. J. Peters: How far off the property line is the driveway going to lot 11-2. K. Anderson: About 20'. B. Ming: How much further back is the driveway from the road? K. Anderson: 200'-300'.

Public Hearing. J. Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive, asked about the justification for the waiver for the driveway. M. Fougere: Two driveways are allowed by right and a third requires a waiver. It is to ensure that the lot and layout are appropriate to handle 3 instead of 2. J. Peters: It provides for only one driveway cut onto the road. K. Anderson: Shared driveways are traditionally endorsed by the Board, and are also looked on favorably by NH DOT for reducing the number of curb cuts onto a State road. B. Ming: There is a dangerous curve in the road at this location. M. Fougere: The State looks at the sight distance when issuing the driveway permit. M. Hartnett: Is there any concern about having the driveway so close to the property line? M. Fougere: There are no setback from lot line requirements for driveways.

J. Peters moved to approve the waiver request to allow three homes on a private way. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved. J. Peters moved to approve File PB2019:01, subject to the following conditions:

- Prior to plan signature, NHDOT and State Subdivision permits are required;
- Final plan approval shall be obtained from the Town Engineer. (Done)
- All bounds shall be set prior to plan recording.

- Existing trees within 100 feet shall remain to preserve rural character.
- A private way easement/maintenance document shall be submitted and recorded with the plan.
- An inspection escrow account for the proposed private way shall be required
- The existing home shall be removed prior to a C/O being issued for Lot 11-12.

The motion was seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved.

- c. **File PB2019:07** Minor Subdivision of an existing 10.9 acre lot into two lots of 5 and 5.9 acres served by a private way. Map 28 Lot 45. Duymazlar Rev. Trust. Applicant: Laurie Perreault, Esq., 244 Hayden Road, Zoned RL Rural Lands. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere noted that staff is waiting for details of the private way and he therefore recommends that the Board not accept the plan but go ahead and take public comments. C. Foley, Fieldstone Land Consultants, presented plans to subdivide 10.96 acres into two new lots and one existing house lot of 5.04 acres. All lots are serviced by a common driveway. There are wetlands on the site. A common driveway design and private way details are underway. There is evidence of a trail but it does not appear to have been used recently. The chairman opened the floor for public comments. Linda Fenlon, 238 Hayden Road, stated that she has no objections to the plan and characterized it as “practical”. Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive, asked about the significance of the circles on the plan. M. Fougere responded that these show the required buildable area; however, there is no requirement that people actually build in these areas.

D. Cleveland moved to table File PB2019:07 to the June 18 Planning Board meeting. The motion was seconded by C. Rogers and unanimously approved.

- d. **File PB2019:08** Proposed lot-line relocation between two adjoining properties, 19 & 85 acres. Map 36 Lots 17 & 18. Owner/applicant: Society for the Protection of NH Forests, 80 South Merrimack Road, Zoned R/A Rural Agriculture. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

Planner M. Fougere presented this plan to relocate the boundary between two adjoining properties, most of which is a conservation easement. The purpose of the plan is to separate the conservation land from the house lot. The applicant has requested a number of waivers.

Ken Clinton, Meridian Land Services, presented plans for this lot line relocation at 80 S. Merrimack Road. This parcel, owned entirely by the Forest Society is approx. 104 acres, and the purpose of the plan is to shrink the house lot down to 5 acres, leaving 99 acres in conservation. Due to the unique nature of the plan, a number of waivers (see staff report) are requested. B. Moseley: Are all lot corners pinned? C. Foley: Not yet on the large lot. C. Rogers: Is the 5 acre lot in conservation? C. Foley: No – it is residential but cannot be further subdivided. There were no comments for the Public Hearing.

122 J. Peters moved to approve the waiver from plan details. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and  
123 unanimously approved. C. Rogers moved to approve File 2019:08. Motion seconded by J.  
124 Peters and unanimously approved.

125 **e. File PB2019:05: Design Review:** Bella Meadows. Proposed two lot subdivision and site  
126 plan for multi-family townhome Workforce Housing (10 units) & market rate homes  
127 development (22 units) Old Runnells Bridge Road and South Depot Road, Map 10 Lot 31-1.  
128 Owner: Raisanen Leasing Corp.,LLC, Zoned R & A, Recreation and Multi-family Overlay Zone.

129 Planner M. Fougere updated board members on items received since the last meeting: revised  
130 master site plan showing 32 units; site loading and nitrate loading exhibit; letter from town  
131 engineer D. LaBombard regarding drainage; outline relative to Hollis school enrollment history  
132 back to 2006 (since that time there are 349 less children in the school system); notes taken from  
133 meeting of town planner, PB chairman and school superintendent, who is not concerned about  
134 the potential number of children who may reside in this project; wildlife habitat outline; outline  
135 relative to the manmade pond; 2 letters from the abutter at 15 Runnells Bridge Road; 2 letters  
136 from Joe Garruba. Also received is a legal opinion from atty. Barton L. Mayer. B. Ming moved  
137 to make the legal opinion a public document. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and  
138 unanimously approved. The chairman then read the letter from Atty. Mayer dated May 20, 2019  
139 into the record.

140 Chad Brannon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, addressed the Board. In April, the design for the  
141 project was presented, along with presentations from the applicant's consultants for landscaping  
142 and traffic. A new zoning boundary line has resulted in a reduction in the number of units to 32.  
143 The revised plan shows a modified layout, with some shifting of buildings and accompanying  
144 adjusting of some septic systems. A well radius has been applied to the neighbor's well because  
145 it is pre-1989. Site loading calcs and nitrate setbacks have been submitted. The plan adheres to  
146 all State and Town regulations. The property can support up to 15,662 gal/day. That equates to  
147 52 units, which is 20 more than what is proposed. The town's engineer is satisfied with the  
148 design. Street names have been added to the plan, as have driveways and parking data. One  
149 hydrant is required for this project; the fire chief has approved the location and this has been  
150 added to the plan. The homeowners association will pay for the hydrant. A stop bar and road  
151 striping per the suggestion of the traffic consultant have also been added. The chairman noted  
152 that Mr. Garruba has submitted a letter outlining a number of concerns that will need to be  
153 addressed. C. Brannon acknowledged receipt of the letter and indicated that he would be happy  
154 to respond. He requested advancing the plan to final design.

155 Questions from the Board. J. Peters: Can the recreation area be moved to a more central  
156 location on the property? C. Brannon: We can certainly look at alternative locations. D.  
157 Cleveland asked about the street names; C. Brannon responded that the DPW assigns the names,  
158 which are ultimately approved by the Selectmen. J. Peters: What about snow storage? C.  
159 Brannon: Typically the snow storage will be along the linear driveway and go into the closed  
160 drainage system to the stormwater management areas. He will add snow storage areas to the  
161 plan. D. Cleveland asked about the logic for street naming. M. Fougere explained that it is done

162 by R. Crowther (past DPW employee) in conjunction with 911 requirements. B. Ming asked  
163 about the construction phasing. M. Fougere: This is done in the final phase.

164 C. Brannon then presented a detailed point by point response to J. Garruba's letter of May 15,  
165 2019, as follows:

166 1. The pond in question is non-jurisdictional which means it could be filled. The net tract area  
167 definition outlines jurisdictional elements (unbuildable areas). The Wetlands Ordinance exempts  
168 this type of pond. The pond is not associated with a jurisdictional wetland area. M. Fougere  
169 noted that he has discussed this with the building inspector and he concurs with this  
170 interpretation. The Town does not regulate man-made features.

171 2. We agree that the property line is not perpendicular and will make a revision as part of the  
172 final application.

173 3. This project is one lot so it defaults to the 5% requirement, which is just under ½ acre of  
174 open space. Everything outside the units is being set aside for the homeowners. There will be  
175 an open space area of about 4.5 acres. The final documents will spell out the uses allowed in this  
176 area and passive recreation is one of them. This project will more than satisfy the half-acre that  
177 is required. D. Cleveland: Will you consider having two recreation areas? C. Brannon: We  
178 will address that in final design.

179 4 and 5. These are driveways. This section of the regulations does not apply to private  
180 driveways. There will always be access for the Fire Dept. and a turn-around is not practical, and  
181 the fire chief has not requested one. This is not a public way and it is not a road or street;  
182 specific sections of the ordinance address private drives. Section H. calls out design  
183 requirements, all of which are addressed in this design. The radius is associated with speed. 75'  
184 allows for a good design. We work closely with the Fire Dept. M. Fougere concurred that he  
185 had spoken with the fire chief, who does not believe a hammerhead is necessary for this  
186 application. This can be revisited during final review. J. Peters: A lot depends on our definition  
187 of subdivision per the ordinance.

188 6. We have submitted a Wildlife Habitat letter. There is no critical habitat. The property has  
189 been disturbed by previous farming and golf course activities. There will be 4.5 acres of open  
190 space and the goal is to preserve the pond. The applicant has done a visual impact study, and  
191 provided all the studies that the Board has asked for. The Board has received information from  
192 the Superintendent of Schools regarding the potential impact of the project, but has not  
193 determined that a fiscal impact study is required. With respect to environmental, the applicant  
194 has provided letters from the previous owner on the history of the property. There is an  
195 obligation to report anything of concern and nothing has been found. The property was altered  
196 previously and extensive test pits done. This, with additional information provided previously,  
197 supports the request that no further special studies are needed.

198 7. This project is over 300' away from the river. This project is not near or adjacent to a river  
199 or floodplain. M. Fougere: The actual survey shows that the units are over 600' away from the  
200 river.

201 8. This item is more a question about the regulations rather than the design. This plan meets  
202 the ordinance at a very high level. Adding turnarounds would increase the impermeable surface.  
203 J. Peters: What is the impermeable surface? C. Brannon: Will check. M. Fougere: Workforce  
204 housing is exempt from this requirement. This plan is not the norm and the Board had to waive  
205 its usual standards in order to bring affordable housing to market. The Town is mandated to do  
206 this by state statute. This area was zoned multi-family because it has access to public water. It  
207 is also in the aquifer zone. Waivers were given but there is also a requirement for recharge.

208 The chairman opened the public hearing.

209 ABUTTERS

210 Daniel Brideau, 15 Old Runnells Bridge Road, referenced the two letters he sent requesting a  
211 fence and rural character screening. He asked about plans for snow removal. Will there be a  
212 maintenance facility? Who conducted the wildlife study? Who is responsible for the deed  
213 restrictions?

214 Thomas Mullin, 24 S. Depot Road. Was it the vision of the committee who enacted this  
215 ordinance to see a 36 unit development? The plan seems "overscaled". Like to see an  
216 environmental study by an outside source. Exploratory wells did not go very deep; a lot of soil  
217 was moved to create a golf course. Test holes only go down 10' which is not deep enough. How  
218 will the low income units be separated? M. Fougere: This is not "low income", and they are  
219 integrated throughout the project. Qualifying income is \$105,000 (median income for this  
220 region).

221 TOWN RESIDENTS AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

222 Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive, distributed a handout to board members addressing several  
223 items. The ordinance is clear that surface waters are part of the net tract area calculation. Why  
224 have a town ordinance if it is not literally enforced? The process for relief is through the ZBA.  
225 Will a board member make a motion to see if there is agreement with the applicant's density  
226 calculation? There needs to be an appropriate area set aside for active recreation. A  
227 condominium qualifies as a subdivision which requires 2 acres set aside for recreation. This  
228 application is on the agenda for the June recreation committee meeting. Road turnarounds are  
229 addressed in the "Road and driveway design standards" sections. 32 units with 2-car garages  
230 equals 64 cars and it does not make sense to classify this as a driveway. Emergency vehicles are  
231 not the only vehicles using this road; there are other long-wheelbased vehicles. The narrow radii  
232 are a safety concern; the ordinance calls for 125'. Mr. Garruba presented the most recent  
233 projection for enrollment in the schools shows a 20.4% increase in students. Why proceed  
234 without a fiscal impact study? Workforce housing is exempt from the APO requirements, but it

235 is not exempt from the other R&A zone requirements, including a 25% impermeable surface  
236 limitation. The proposal also needs to comply with the other standards called out in the  
237 workforce housing section with respect to environmental protection, traffic and life safety. The  
238 planning board needs to review the ordinances and regulations as to whether this development is  
239 compliant, and not rely on the applicant and experts.

240 Peter Baker, 40 Buttonwood Drive, stated that he approves of workforce housing provided it  
241 meets the requirements. He asked if you have runoff and “dense” septic, do the test pits prove  
242 that there is not excessively drained substrata that drains too quickly into the aquifer?

243 Michael Askenaizer, 57 Irene Drive, asked if one fire hydrant is adequate, given the density of  
244 the development.

245 John Garruba, 30 Meadow Drive, discussed the “unequal application of the zoning ordinance  
246 with respect to corporations and individuals”. Large projects go through with little discussion.  
247 The board grants a bye to farming applications and organizations/corporations but not to  
248 individuals. The board should apply the highest standards to this workforce housing  
249 development because it will set the bar for all that follow. He asked that the planning board not  
250 move the plan forward to final and not rush into a large project developed by a corporation.

251 Warren Jackson, 80 Blood Road, asked if there are any other workforce housing projects in  
252 Hollis. M. Fougere – Apple Lane, which was built in the 80s. W. Jackson asked the board to do  
253 due diligence, and agreed with previously stated safety concerns regarding the lack of a  
254 turnaround at the gated entrance.

255 John Ferlins, Dow Road, asked who will be moving into this complex. Of the 32 units, how  
256 many are workforce housing? (30% = 10 units). How will the applicants be screened with  
257 respect to income? M. Fougere: Every applicant will have to disclose their income. How this  
258 will be done will be dealt with during the final application process. Ferlins: What about  
259 residents who may want to downsize? Fougere: 70% are market rate. Ferlins: What is the price  
260 point? Fougere: Currently the maximum price point for the workforce units is \$336,500. This  
261 is set annually by HUD and statute. Ferlins: How many school children? Fougere: I calculated  
262 14 based on number of students at Apple Lane (ratio is .444/unit).

263 Lina Hsu, 60 Dow Road, asked if there is any restrictions on subletting these units. M. Fougere:  
264 Workforce housing units cannot be rented; we are approving owner-occupied and this is a deed  
265 restriction. Hsu: Classrooms are in big demand and the high school is restricting space. There  
266 is an influx of students. My personal view is that people moving here are doing so for the  
267 schools and expect 1 to 2 students per building. Fougere: I do consulting on this all over the  
268 State and the number of children are always less than you think. I used Apple Lane and data  
269 from townhouse developments in Amherst. .44 is a high ratio for 2 bedrooms.

270 Bill Lero, 6 Irene Drive, raised safety issues. What is depth of the pond? This could pose a  
271 hazard to children. Inadequate space in the schools is an issue. This is a 9 acre parcel with 4.5

272 acres of open space. This equates to 32 units being put on functional space of 4.5 acres, which is  
273 8 units per acre. This does not meet the spirit of the Hollis ordinances. Suggest that the  
274 developer revise the plan to 20 units, 10 being workforce and 10 being market rate.

275 Jean Marie Jackson, 80 Blood Road, agreed that the impact on the schools is a concern. Agree  
276 that the development is a magnet for families that want to get their kids into the Hollis school  
277 system at a reasonable cost. There is serious overcrowding at the high school. The plan design  
278 for safety is horrible. This project is one-way in and one-way out. Apple Lane has a cul-de-sac.

279 Jeff Gibbons, 37 Rail Way. Agree on the need for a turn-around. Control of the workforce  
280 housing requirements is important. The prime organization is NH Housing Finance Authority  
281 and you could end up with grants and interest free loans that do not have to be repaid resulting in  
282 not being protected relative to the maximum income amount and it will end up being low income  
283 housing. Suggest the Town take care of enforcing this on it's own.

284 Tricia Harmon, 38 Tyng Hill Road, noted that this development is predicated on the need for  
285 workforce housing in this region and asked if a study has been done to evaluate the existing  
286 housing stock in our region.

287 Joe Garruba. Apple Lane has a turn-around. The number for students for single family homes in  
288 town is .7 so .4 seems very low. M. Fougere – Single family homes have more bedrooms  
289 resulting in a very different ratio. J. Garruba: Has something changed regarding the policing of  
290 the deed restriction relative to affordable housing. M. Fougere: There will be a deed restriction  
291 on these properties for the workforce housing units. The developer may team up with an  
292 organization to help them with the process. Nothing has changed. The planning board will set  
293 up the parameters. J. Garruba: We need to see that document and see if it meets what we want  
294 as a town.

295 John Garruba. Apple Lane has a big loop; maybe this project could do this.

296 REBUTTAL – C. BRANNON

- 297
- 298 • Doubt that adding 400' of road is consistent with rural character. We have presented a  
299 plan that meets that meets your regulations. We are not opposed to revisiting some  
300 elements; however, the ordinance does not require a hammerhead or cul-de-sac turn-  
301 around. The ordinance has a road section and a driveway section, which are separate.  
302 The design specifications are for a fire truck turn-around. We are interested in  
303 minimizing impervious cover.
  - 304 • Snow removal happens along the linear footage of the road.
  - 305 • No maintenance facility is proposed.
  - 306 • Fencing is not typically part of rural character. Staggering the rows of trees helps  
307 supplement the undergrowth.
  - 308 • With respect to intent, the design meets the ordinance. The underlying section that  
309 addresses impervious cover is exempted under the multi-family ordinance.
  - 310 • The test pits were 10'-12' and into parent (undisturbed) soils that predated any alteration  
of the terrain. M. Fougere: The town's septic inspector witnessed all the test pits.



- 311 • We will address phasing and deed restrictions at final submission.
- 312 • The pond is exempt from the density calculation. The pond is non-jurisdictional and can
- 313 be filled in. There is no rationale to deduct it from the calculations.
- 314 • The fact that the ordinance says that condominiums are subdivisions does not mean lots
- 315 are created, but rather that it is subject to the subdivision parts of the ordinance.
- 316 • If the planning board determines that a turn-around is a good idea, it will be part of the
- 317 plan. This has not been raised as a concern. This is a private development and
- 318 maintenance will be handled by the association. The fire chief does not feel a turn-
- 319 around is needed. We are willing to revisit this, but believe it is not a responsible design
- 320 where emergency response is not requiring it.
- 321 • A 75' centerline radii is safe and is not an issue. This is not a public way.
- 322 • The design does account for excessively well-drained soils. The Alternation of Terrain
- 323 permit requires the designer to augment the soils and restrict the permeability at the
- 324 bottom of the stormwater system so the stormwater infiltrates at a metered rate. The
- 325 means the components are oversized. In addition, there is a factor of safety of 2 that is
- 326 applied to the exfiltration rates which also results in a conservative design. There are
- 327 also additional requirements for septic systems.
- 328 • The Fire Chief and Pennichuck Water were both consulted with respect to the number
- 329 and location of fire hydrants and have determined that one is adequate. The buildings
- 330 will be sprinkled.
- 331 • We will be presenting a plan with 32 units, and this density is supported by the
- 332 regulations. Many workforce housing developments have a lot more density than this
- 333 one. The density per acre is very reasonable. We do not see many kids in 2 bedroom
- 334 units.
- 335 • The pond is 10' deep. Having a fence is more of a liability than the pond, and is not
- 336 consistent with the rural character ordinance.
- 337 • We will revisit the turn-around issue, but do not see the need for a large turn-around.
- 338 • We look forward to putting together a final application which will provide a lot of the
- 339 details that people are asking for.
- 340

341 This concluded the public comment session. M. Fougere read the State RSA regarding the  
342 parameters of the design review phase. The design review moves a plan beyond the conceptual and  
343 into some of the details of the plan, but the plan cannot be approved in this phase. The board needs  
344 to make a determination if it has enough information to proceed to the next phase, which is final  
345 application. At this stage the board can get into the criteria for the Conditional Use Permit and how  
346 the affordable tracking will be handled.

347 The chairman called for board input on moving to final application. J. Peters: Not ready; need  
348 clarification on some legal definitions. D. Cleveland: Need to go to final to answer the questions.  
349 R. Hardy: Agree with Jeff; would be good to have a checklist of what was misinformation and  
350 misunderstood, and what are legitimate issues to follow up on. J. Peters: Would like to see a  
351 financial study of the schools; believe we could see a higher number than the State average. D.  
352 Cleveland (former chairman of the school board): Projections are usually higher than reality. All of  
353 the schools are under design capacity. School personnel will always find a way to use empty space,  
354 but when you need it for classrooms it is available. J. Peters: The schools have changed and there

355 are a lot of other programs that would be a detriment to lose. M. Fougere: The Supt. of Schools  
356 already has the cost of an additional teacher in the budget; what other costs are there? A fiscal study  
357 will look at costs for schools, police and fire. The police and fire chiefs do not see an issue. The  
358 biggest cost is schools and the superintendent has said that the biggest cost would be a teacher  
359 (\$80,000) if every one of the students is in first grade. He will also get numbers from Bedford and  
360 Windham. B. Ming: A lot of questions will only be answered in the final application. M. Fougere:  
361 the details of overseeing the parameters of the affordable housing units will take the most time. The  
362 plan is very far along. C. Rogers: Who determines how the affordable housing component is  
363 policed? M. Fougere: Staff will look into that, along with town counsel. C. Rogers: The planning  
364 board has to resolve the school issue and Mark is getting data from other towns that should solve a  
365 lot of concerns. I moved to Hollis 34 years ago to get my kids in the Hollis schools like a lot of other  
366 people; this does not mean we can slam the door on the next people who want to come in. We have  
367 to allow workforce housing in Hollis. M. Hartnett: Do we look at housing areas that are close to  
368 what the Nashua metro is? When you look at the people who will buy into this you are talking about  
369 police officers, fire fighters, teachers, young engineers, etc., and they do not tend to have big  
370 families. M. Fougere: By statute, Hollis is in the Nashua region. He will be getting data from  
371 Amherst, Bedford and Windham, which are very compatible. Summary of deliverables: Schools,  
372 hammerhead, radius issue, open space, fire hydrant. C. Brannon: The items that are left are dealt  
373 with at a staff level. We are already beyond design review and we would like to provide all the  
374 answers to the questions that have been asked and advance the plan. D. Cleveland (to C. Brannon):  
375 If we do not direct you to go to final design, what can you do in the next 30 days? C. Brannon: Not  
376 much. In order for us to work on design elements the board has to give us direction to go to final. B.  
377 Moseley: No sense in spinning our wheels when things will come out in final anyway. R. Hardy:  
378 What is tipping point on the school number? M. Fougere: We are 349 students less than in 2006.  
379 The enrollment has started to increase since 2015. We need to look at what the magnitude is right  
380 now. B. Moseley: The superintendent was not concerned with this project; he was more concerned  
381 with BAE bringing in 100 new engineers. D. Cleveland: With respect to the radius issue, there are a  
382 number of roads in town that have less than a 75' radius. M. Fougere: The final application has to  
383 come in "full", including the conditional use items and the affordable housing oversight details.  
384 There are a number of issues that must be fully submitted and vetted before the plan goes on the  
385 agenda. This is the first project in of this type; the earliest it can come back to the board is July.

386 D. Cleveland presented a motion to authorize the applicant for File PB2019:05 to go to final  
387 application. The motion was seconded by C. Rogers. Voting in favor: D. Cleveland, C. Rogers, C.  
388 Hoffman, B. Ming, B. Moseley. Voting in opposition: J. Peters. Motion carries.

389 6. ADJOURN

390 There being no further business, D. Cleveland moved to adjourn. Motion seconded by C. Rogers  
391 and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourns at 11:02 PM.

392 Respectfully submitted,

393 Virginia Mills

394  
395  
396  
397  
398