

# HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 16, 2020

Final

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bill Moseley – Chairman; Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Ben Ming, Chet Rogers, Matt Hartnett and David Petry (Ex-Officio for Selectmen)  
Alternates: Rick Hardy, Julie Mook

**ABSENT:** Jeff Peters – Rick Hardy voting

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Evan Clements, Assistant Planner

**THIS MEETING WAS CONDUCTED VIRTUALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION  
IN COMPLIANCE WITH GOVERNOR SUNUNU'S EMERGENCY ORDERS #12, 16, & 17**

**1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM.** B. Moseley led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

- a. **May 19, 2020 Minutes** – Motion to approve. Motioned by D. Cleveland; Seconded by R. Hardy – motion passes unanimously

**3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING**

a. Agenda Additions and Deletions:

- PB2020-009 4 Spaulding Lane Proposed Subdivision was tabled by the applicant to the July 21, 2020 meeting.
- PB2019-021 Olson Subdivision has requested to be heard first.

b. Committee Reports – none

c. Staff Report – none

d. Regional Impact – none

**4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS**

**5. HEARINGS**

- a. **File PB2019:021** – Proposed **Design Review** subdivision application of an existing 17.75 acre property into five frontage lots, Map 2 Lot 44, North Pepperell Road & Worcester Road, Owner/Applicant: Kathleen & Hans Olson, Zoned R&A Residential & Agriculture. **Tabled from April 21.**

M. Fougere discussed that the requested Wildlife study had been submitted and that a second site walk was conducted on June 13, 2020. He noted that there was a significant amount of interested parties in attendance. He noted some of the topics discussed include combining the driveways of the three Worcester Road lots into a single common access drive, adding additional landscaping on lot 2-44-2 along the frontage as well as the future fire cistern. He continued to state the need for wetland buffer markings, especially considering that some of the buffer markings will need to be installed in the field. Getting access for a driveway off of Deer Run for lot 2-44-4 was discussed. It was also noted that if the driveway for lot 2-44-4 was to remain on North Pepperell Road then it should be shifted to preserve a cluster of trees along the road.

T. Carr noted that the wetland buffer shown on the plan properly includes the vernal pool. He agreed with M. Fougere's synopsis of the site walk including the need for additional landscaping. He noted the trees that would be planted along Worcester Road would be of a variety and species that would not cast shadow on Worcester Road during the winter as it currently receives direct sunlight. They would be proposing evergreen trees by the cistern area to allow for continuous screening throughout

the year. There would also be landscaping by the driveway cut of lot 2-44-3 along the wetland buffer as the Conservation Commission agreed that as long as the wetland was not a vernal pool then the wetland impact for the driveway would be acceptable.

T. Carr stated that he felt that the proposal was ready to move to a final application and that they would be updating the subdivision plan to reflect the agreed upon proposals from the Planning Board.

B. Moseley asked about the proposal for a common access drive to serve all three lots along Worcester Road.

T. Carr responded by saying that he would be able to explore that but had some concerns relating to how it would impact the drainage along Worcester Road. He noted that would be feasible by crossing the existing swale with a culvert.

B. Moseley noted that there was a natural break in the tree line that would make for a good location for the curb cut.

T. Dufresne, chair of the Conservation Commission stated the Wildlife study was very thorough and does not have further wildlife concerns. He did ask if it would be possible to designate a pollinator habitat around the wetland area. He understood that it would be up to the future property owners but asked if that recommendation could be made to the buyers, the Conservation Commission would be able to work with the property owners to achieve the desired pollinator habitat. He clarified that a pollinator habitat would consist of wild flowers and outer natural fauna such as small brush to promote healthy pollinator populations.

T. Carr stated that he did not foresee that recommendation from the Conservation Commission being an issue and asked if the Conservation Commission would be able to supply seeding and advice. T. Dufresne responded by saying they would be able to do that. He did note that this was an ad hoc idea that he would like to discuss with the commission. T. Carr responded that he would discuss this suggestion with the applicant.

B. Moseley asked T. Dufresne if the Conservation Commission would have any issues with moving this project into final review. T. Dufresne stated that there would be no issue as all of the Conservation Commission's concerns have been addressed.

B. Ming asked if the driveways for lots 2-44-3 and 2-44-4 were going to be combined.

T. Carr responded that were not going to be combined. He noted that they were going to explore accessing lot 2-44-4 from Dear Run. A spite strip is currently preventing access but the applicant is going to approach the property owner of the spite strip to see if some arrangement can be made.

M. Fougere noted that R. Hardy and D. Gagne, Landscape Inspector would be available to discuss the proposed final landscape plan prior to final submittal.

T. Carr stated that they intended to take advantage of that.

**Motion to move proposal to Final Application** – D. Cleveland motioned; C. Rogers seconded – motion passed unanimously

99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145

- b. **File PB2020:017** – Application to revoke the approved Hollis Hills major subdivision at the request of the owner, Map 43 Lots 9, 9-A, 9-1, 9-2, 9-3, 9-4, 9-5, 9-6, 9-7, 9-8, 9-9, 9-10, 9-11, 9-12, 9-13, 9-14, 9-15, 9-16, 9-17, 9-18, 9-19, 210 South Merrimack Road, Applicant DePaulis Family Revocable Trust, Zoned Residential & Agricultural. **Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere stated that this is an unusual application that does not happen often. This was originally an approved major subdivision that was never constructed, due in part to the cost of infrastructure improvements required. The DePaulis family bought the property and intend to build one single family home. Since there are several easements, open space restrictions, and a road deed to the Town, the plan must be revoked before the DePaulis' can move forward with constructing their new home. After consulting with the Town Attorney, it was determined that formal revocation of the approved subdivision was the cleanest avenue to remove the encumbrance of easements on this property. The 18 lots would be combined and all easements would be extinguished.

C. Rodgers asked about the size of the subject parcel and if the owner intends to put the remainder of the land not in use into some kind of conservation or other restriction preventing it from being subdivided again.

M. Fougere responded by saying that the subject parcel is close to 100 acres and the property owner has not indicated if they intend to put the land under any kind of restriction.

B. Moseley asked if the property owner wanted to resubdivide the property after the revocation at a later date, would they need to start the subdivision approval process over again.

M. Fougere responded by saying that was correct. The property owner would have to come back to the Planning Board for new subdivision approval with a new plan.

### **Public Hearing**

David and Jennifer Annand; 7-2 Hickory Lane Road – stated that they are in favor of the application. They stated that it is a large piece of land and they like the idea of have a single neighbor across the street.

Jerimiah Peters; 196 South Merrimack Road – stated that they were in favor of the application as there is a lot of nice land with wildlife and wetlands. They also like the idea of just having one new neighbor.

### **Public Hearing closed**

D. DePaulis, the applicant, stated that their intent for now was to bring it all back together and build their house where the old house was.

D. Petry thanked the DePaulis family for revoking the approved subdivision and using it as a single lot. He noted that it was a rare occurrence and appreciated what they are doing.

**Motion to Revoke the Hollis Hills Subdivision, prepared by Cucco & Cormier dated March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2010 – HCRD Plan #37200 and all associated deeds and easements** – Motioned by D. Petry;  
Seconded by R. Hardy – motion passed unanimously

- c. **File PB2020:001** – Proposed **Design Review**, site plan application outlining the construction of a 4,500 square foot gas station and one apartment and an 8,000 square foot retail store on a 4.19 acre site, Map 5 Lot 28, 82 Runnells Bridge Road, Applicant Runnells Bridge Realty Trust Owner Team Yarmo Investment 1, LLC, Zoned Commercial. **Tabled from June 1, continued Design Review Discussion, public hearing.**

M. Fougere stated that the Board needed more time to review the submitted Truck Turning Plan due to its late submittal at last meeting but would be discussing it at this meeting. He also noted that the applicant had submitted various renderings depicting the landscape buffering around the site. A Well Radius Plan was also submitted showing the locations of neighboring wells.

J. Hill, TF Moran began by discussing the Truck Turning Plan. He stated that the fuel delivery for the gas station would occur most often early in the morning such as 5:00 am to 6:00 am. He noted that the site is narrow and as such the truck route requires a U-turn movement around the dry goods retail before getting into position to fill the underground storage tanks. He noted that the travel lanes would accommodate a WB62 Semi Tractor Trailer. There is a raised truck apron in the central drive aisle to accommodate a portion of the U-turn maneuver.

B. Moseley asked about a movement on the plan that appeared to show the truck coming off the road. J. Hill responded by stating that was a symbology error and the true movement stays on the road.

J. Hill continued by stating that the truck exiting the site would be able to turn either right or left. He noted that they had the space to make the radius wider and can provide an updated plan showing that.

D. Petry asked about the left turn the truck will make up the center drive aisle and the shaded grey area on the median. Specifically, asked if the truck was driving up onto the median to execute the turn.

J. Hill responded by saying that the grey shaded area is a truck apron, which is a raised area of pavement that a truck has clearance for but a regular vehicle would not drive on. He noted that the trailer would use this area to complete the turn, not the cab.

D. Petry stated that the proposal is a lot use for a tight site and adjustments should be made to avoid truck movements that require a truck apron. He raised concerns about deliveries occurring during business hours disrupting traffic flow through the site.

J. Hill responded that since they had two additional parking spaces there was some flexibility in moving and/or widening the center drive aisle to provide more room for the truck turning movement.

M. Fougere stated that the proposal was at the minimum amount of parking required and did not have two extra spaces. He did note that there was probably more parking spaces provided than would be needed for the site.

193 B. Moseley asked if there was some way to get comments on the proposed truck turning movement  
194 from a truck driver or someone who drives large trucks regularly.  
195  
196 M. Fougere noted that there are strict engineering standards that dictate truck movement and turn  
197 radius requirements. He did note that the movements were still very tight.  
198  
199 R. Hardy raised concerns regarding the truck making the left turn away from its refueling position and  
200 exiting the site. He noted that this specific turn is not shown on the plan.  
201  
202 D. Cleveland noted that the Fire Department should be shown the plan and provide comments as to  
203 the truck movements. He also noted there is a lot cramped into this site. He stated that the Board  
204 needs input from NHDOT regarding the traffic impact on Runnells Bridge Road from this proposal.  
205  
206 B. Moseley noted that the bend in the road when traveling eastbound towards Nashua limits the ability  
207 to see the site entrance.  
208  
209 D. Cleveland suggested scaling down the site, such as fewer gas pumps, and combining the two (2)  
210 buildings into one (1) building. He noted issues regarding the location of the ordering board, dumpster  
211 enclosures, and screening. He also stated that another site walk may be necessary.  
212  
213 C. Rogers supported D. Cleveland's comments. He finds it hard to believe that a market analysis  
214 would show that the ten (10) fueling positions are necessary. He also noted that the retail building is  
215 over sized and not a good location for a retail business as it is hidden behind a gas station.  
216  
217 M. Hartnett stated that the truck turning plan shows the optimal path that the truck can take and does  
218 not take into account human error. He notes six (6) spots that the truck leaves the road. He also raised  
219 concerns regarding the truck exiting the site. He also raised concerns about deliveries to the  
220 convenience store itself.  
221  
222 D. Cleveland stated that he has seen fuel delivery trucks at all times of day at the other gas station in  
223 Town. No reason to believe that this proposed site would be any different.  
224  
225 M. Fougere noted that Dunkin Donuts does their delivery with a tractor trailer truck as well.  
226  
227 D. Petry asked about delivery to the dry good retail building. He asked about how a large truck will  
228 back into the loading dock.  
229  
230 J. Hill noted that the dock is designed for a smaller type of truck. The movement around the site is the  
231 same. The truck will then back into the loading dock.  
232  
233 D. Petry asked if the drive aisle will be obstructed by the delivery truck.  
234  
235 J. Hill estimated that the parked delivery truck will allow for a 12' lane.  
236  
237 B. Moseley asked if a traditional tractor trailer could use that loading dock and would it block the  
238 drive aisle.  
239  
240 J. Hill stated that it could use the loading dock. He anticipated limited regular vehicle traffic around  
241 the dry goods retail and suggested that it be restricted to delivery trucks only.

B. Moseley asked if a fire truck could get around a truck parked in the loading dock.

J. Hill stated that it could and he would provide an exhibit showing the clearance between a parked truck and the drive aisle. He noted that it would be a rare occurrence for a fire truck to need to get by while a delivery truck is in the loading dock. He stated that he could also widen that portion of the drive aisle to accommodate additional traffic flow.

M. Hartnett stated that are frequently delays in delivery schedules due to unforeseen circumstances.

J. Hill stated that he doesn't want to put a restriction on the timing of delivery vehicles but the applicant doesn't want a site filled with delivery trucks during hours of operation.

B. Moseley raised a concern regarding traffic flow with snow piles on the ground. The tightness of the travel lanes will only be exacerbated by snow accumulation.

B. Ming stated that if the site is to be redesigned to consolidate both uses into a single building then consideration should be taken to ensure that the building location reduces the impact on abutting property.

B. Moseley asked about the western abutter's well location as well as the south western abutter as it is not shown on the requested well radius plan.

J. Hill noted that the western abutter denied permission of the survey team to enter the property and determine the location of their well. The south western abutter's property line exceeds the 250' state criteria so they did not survey the well location. He noted that the plan exceeds the requirements of the approved minimum distance to surrounding potable water sources.

D. Petry stated that wellheads are registered with the state and was unsure as to why the wellhead for the western abutter could not be identified through state records. He also noted that it may be helpful if the Town asks the abutter for the information directly.

M. Fougere stated that the western abutter's home was built in the 60's and the Town does not have anything on file that might identify the location of the wellhead. Staff would reach out to the property owner to see if the information could be obtained.

B. Moseley asked about a possible wetland located on the north western corner of the property on both the subject property and the western abutter's property.

J. Hill responded by saying that the area indicated is ledge that will require a retaining wall. He does not know about the abutter's property as he does not have permission to enter or survey the abutter's property. They did survey the subject property and did not find any wetlands. The approved subdivision for the subject parcels did not show any wetlands.

B. Moseley asked the Board for comments relating to D. Cleveland's idea of a single building.

C. Rogers suggested that the Board ask the applicant for a design that shows only one (1) building and reduce the size and scope of the project.

B. Ming also agreed with D. Cleveland's idea of reduced scope and M. Hartnett's comments regarding truck movements staying on the road.

R. Hardy agreed with other members comments regarding reduction in project scope and traffic flow concerns. He also noted that the submitted color renderings that show the buffering do not indicate where the viewer is standing on the site or what direction the viewer is looking. He stated that this information should be provided.

**Motion to table discussion to the July 21, 2020 meeting** – Motioned by D. Petry; Seconded by M. Hartnett – motion passed unanimously

- d. **File PB2020:016** – At the request of the Planning Board, limited application review to amend approval of the Federal Hill Estates major subdivision to explore available options to reduce the hammering and extraction of ledge necessary to finalize the development of the project. No other aspects of the project, such as project density will be considered. Map 29 Lots 1-1 to 1-28 & 29-1, Keyes Hill Road & Lorenzo's Lane (Federal Hill Road & Rocky Pond Road), Zoned R&A, Rural Lands, Applicant/owner: Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**

D. Petry recused himself as he is an abutter. Mark Ledoux, Chair of the Hollis Select Board voted in his place.

M. Fougere stated that this request was brought to the applicant from the Town in order to explore options to reduce the noise being caused by the construction of phase II of the approved subdivision. Last meeting the Board discussed several options and decided on a turnaround located just past Lorenzo Lane. This hearing is to make a final decision regarding amending the subdivision approval to all Keyes Hill Road to become a dead end road instead of a through road as it was originally approved. The proposed turnaround was reviewed by the Town Engineer. If approved the road work would end in approximately a month. If not approved the road work would continue for approximately eight (8) months. He noted that a significant concern of abutters was travel of the school bus and school aged children on the street.

**Motion to accept application** – Motioned by M. Hartnett; Seconded by D. Cleveland – motioned passed unanimously

C. Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants representing the applicant stated the developer was willing to work with the Town to address the noise issue and supported the turnaround idea. He noted that the proposed turnaround meets all Town requirements. An easement would be placed on lot 29-1-12 to provide room for the turnaround but the lot would remain buildable.

B. Moseley asked a clarifying question that the only options the developer was entertaining was the turnaround option or the change nothing option.

C. Branon stated that was correct. The proposed field changes to raise the road out of potential ledge was not viable since the stream crossing culvert would still have to be installed and the cross slope cut limited any possible changes that could occur.

337 M. Ledoux asked about potential blasting when this project first came before the Board and why there  
338 was so much opposition to using blasting.  
339  
340 M. Fougere responded that the developer wanted to blast when the proposal first came before the  
341 Board. The Town brought in a third party consultant to provide advice to the Board to ensure safe  
342 practices. All of the abutters were against blasting as they had concerns to property damage and well  
343 contamination. The developer decided to withdraw his request to blast due to steep opposition from  
344 the community.  
345  
346 M. Ledoux asked about the 8% roadway grade regulation.  
347  
348 M. Fougere stated that this development nearly reached the limit of that regulation when the road  
349 came off Rocky Pond Road into the site. He estimated the current proposed grade was at  
350 approximately 7.7%.  
351  
352 M. Ledoux asked if the turnaround would be able to accommodate a school bus.  
353  
354 M. Fougere responded that it would but noted that the school bus does not usually go down a dead  
355 end road but picks the students up at the intersection.  
356  
357 M. Ledoux asked about the remainder of Keyes Hill Road if the turnaround is approved.  
358  
359 M. Fougere responded that the Keyes Hill right of way would remain in Town ownership but would  
360 function as a paper road.  
361  
362 M. Ledoux asked about estimated traffic from the development.  
363  
364 M. Fougere stated that the traffic study estimated worst case scenario which was ten (10) trips per day  
365 per household so 260 trips per day.  
366  
367 M. Ledoux noted that the Board should give serious consideration to the people who purchased  
368 property on Keyes Hill Road with the expectation that the road would be through to Rocky Pond  
369 Road.  
370  
371 R. Hardy asked about how many residents were concerned with school bus and student safety and felt  
372 the bus traveling from Rocky Pond Road, through the development and turning right onto Federal Hill  
373 Road was beneficial to the neighborhood.  
374  
375 M. Fougere stated the Board received a letter from a resident on Keyes Hill Road who raised these  
376 concerns. The resident stated that there were nine (9) children currently living on Keyes Hill Road. M.  
377 Fougere noted that the school bus have never gone up that part of Federal Hill Road but instead makes  
378 a left onto Wood Lane and picks up students at the corner. The resident added in their letter than when  
379 all 26 homes are occupied the Wood Lane bus stop will be over crowded with students and unsafe.  
380  
381 D. Cleveland noted that the distance from the turnaround to the end of Keyes Hill Road is  
382 approximately half a mile. In winter weather, that is a considerable walk for students to take to get to  
383 the Wood Lane bus stop. He also noted the 1,500' limit to dead end roads per Town regulation.  
384



M. Fougere noted that the subdivision did receive a waiver from the cut and fill regulation to attempt to alleviate some of the earthwork required to complete the road.

C. Branon stated that based on site conditions he expects approximately eight (8) months of hammering will be required to complete the road.

R. Hardy asked if some isolated blasting could be considered to alleviate the hammering noise now that the neighborhood has experienced the hammering noise.

C. Branon stated that blasting could be an option, however, the developer would not accept any liability.

### **Public Hearing**

Ronald Corsetti; 99 Rocky Pond Road – stated that he owns the property located at 101 Rocky Pond as well and that blasting was unacceptable to him as it would take place close to his property. He believed that the turnaround would be the best option. He stated that he did not understand why the Board would not consider changes in the design of the subdivision. He stated that today the construction began before 7:00 am and continued past 5:00 pm and he blames the Town for his suffering and stated that this subdivision should never have been approved.

Alan Lizboli; 121 Rocky Pond Road – stated that he is against blasting and the Town does not have a blasting ordinance. He noted that there is no liability protection for property owners. He stated that the turnaround was the only logical solution. He asked why the school bus does not come down Federal Hill Road to begin with.

### **Public Hearing closed**

C. Branon stated that they dug test pits that abut the Corsetti property and he described them as favorable when they designed the driveway and house location. He stated that he does not anticipate any hammering for the lots that abut the Corsetti property. He noted that additional work was dug in the area in question and that the depth to ledge was favorable. This does not mean that they will not find an occasional high spot of ledge but that the data collected was significant.

D. Cleveland asked about the letters sent to the Board and if staff could summarize the opinions of the resident correspondence.

M. Fougere stated that there was concern about the school bus situation and the Wood Lane pickup. There was also concern regarding the flow of traffic onto Federal Hill Road, especially if Keyes Hill Road becomes a dead end road. Residents of Federal Hill Road believe that the impact on Federal Hill Road will be lessened if Keyes Hill Road remains a through road and does not dead end.

R. Hardy stated that it sounds like more residents are in favor of maintaining Keyes Hill Road as a through road and asked if the Town has asked the developer if they would consider limiting their hours of operation to mitigate construction noise.

M. Fougere stated that hours of operation was not considered during the initial approval of this subdivision. The Board's concerns were focused on vibration of the hammering. The density of the rock was not anticipated. He noted that the developer is bringing in a second hammer in an attempt to

434 speed up the removal of material. This will, however, increase the volume of construction noise. He  
435 stated that it is not the developer's intent to be a nuisance and their goal is to complete the work as  
436 quickly as possible. He stated that staff may be able to work out an agreement with the developer  
437 regarding hours of operation.

438

439 R. Hardy asked if the discussion could be tabled and the developer return with a proposal to limit the  
440 hours of operation.

441

442 B. Moseley stated that the developer already has an approved plan and has no incentive to entertain a  
443 limit to their hours of operation.

444

445 **Motion to amend the approved subdivision to allow for the installation of a turnaround in lieu**  
446 **of the approved through road and waive the dead end street length requirement** – Motioned by  
447 D. Cleveland; Seconded by B. Moseley – D. Cleveland voted aye, B. Moseley voted aye, C. Rodgers  
448 voted aye, R. Hardy voted nay, M. Hartnett voted nay, B. Ming voted nay, M. Ledoux voted nay – by  
449 a vote of **3 ayes to 4 nays** the motion did **not** pass.

450

451 B. Moseley stated that with the result of the vote, the developer will continue with his approved  
452 subdivision plan and that Keyes Hill Road will continue through to Rocky Pond Road.

453

454 M. Fougere stated that on the behalf of the Town and the Planning Board he wanted to thank the  
455 developer for participating in the Town's request.

456

457 e. **File PB2020:012** – Proposed amendment to approved site plan reducing the size of the business to 64  
458 square feet, 7 Main Street, Map 52 Lot 5, Applicant Avalon Firearms, LLC Owner Dennis Johnson,  
459 Zoned A&B. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

460

461 M. Fougere stated that this site plan was approved a few months ago but the applicant has changed his  
462 business model to online sales and customers will no longer be coming into the operation.

463 **Motion to accept application** – Motioned by D. Cleveland; Seconded by M. Hartnett – R. Hardy  
464 abstained – motioned passed

465 D. Johnson, applicant and property owner stated that his business has changed to online sales and he  
466 did not need as much space for the operation.

467 B. Moseley asked the applicant to summarize his business model.

468 D. Johnson stated his business would be custom gun-smithing and one off firearms. Mainly internet  
469 based.

470 B. Moseley asked to clarify that 65 SF would be sufficient to fit the applicant's needs and asked if he  
471 would not be using specific tools such as a Bridgeport machine. He also asked if he would need an  
472 area to store inventory or parts.

473 D. Johnson stated that he would not.

474 B. Moseley asked if all the applicant's gun-smithing would be using hand tools.

475 D. Johnson stated that was correct.

476 D. Cleveland asked about what else was in the building or if it was just a residence.

477 D. Johnson stated yes it was a residence with an apartment upstairs.

478 D. Cleveland asked what would be in the storage area.

479 D. Johnson responded by saying that it would be basically bunches of his junk and clarified that it  
480 would not be part of his business.

481 D. Petry asked if there would be any in person interaction with customers.

482 D. Johnson stated that it would be just for pickup of products. He did not need a waiting area. He  
483 noted that he may want to expand in the future but was unsure of his future plans as he may be  
484 moving out of state.

485 **Public Hearing**

486 None

487 **Public Hearing closed**

488 **Motion to approve amended application** – Motioned by D. Petry; Seconded by D. Cleveland –  
489 motion passed unanimously

490

491 **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

492

493 **Logistics for July 21, 2020 Meeting**

494 M. Fougere asked the Board how they wanted to proceed with the July meeting as the state is  
495 beginning to ease restrictions of public gatherings.

496 B. Moseley stated that after receiving some feedback from Board members he believed that a hybrid  
497 meeting would be best where applicants and Board members can come into the Conference Room if  
498 they so choose but also able to participate remotely.

499 E. Clements asked about if residents should be allowed into the Conference Room to participate or be  
500 restricted to remote participation.

501 M. Ledoux stated that for Select Board meetings the Conference Room is set up for approximately 12-  
502 14 visitors. He thought a hybrid meeting made sense for the next month or so.

503 D. Petry noted that residents need to understand that once the room hits capacity they will not be  
504 allowed in.

505 B. Moseley asked if it would make sense that for the July meeting have just the applicants in the  
506 Conference Room.

507 M. Fougere agreed and noted that the Planning Board generates significant interest with residents and  
508 that there have been 20+ residents viewing online for a single proposal. He noted that with current  
509 restrictions, having 20+ abutters in the Conference Room was not feasible.

510 E. Clements noted that some residents may choose to stay home and participate remotely anyway.

511 B. Moseley stated that for the July 21, 2020 meeting the Board would allow members and applicants  
512 to attend in person if they so choose but residents will be restricted to online participation.

513 **7. ADJOURN**

514 There being no further business, D. Petry presented a non-debatable motion to adjourn.  
515 Motion seconded by. R. Hardy and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourns at 10:00 PM.

516

517 Respectfully submitted,

518 Evan J. Clements,

519 Assistant Planner

520