

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
September 15, 2020
Final

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

ABSENT: Rick Hardy, Jeff Peters, Matt Hartnett

Julie Mook voting for Jeff Peters

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. Approval of the August 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes
 - i. Motioned by D. Cleveland; Seconded by B. Ming

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING

a. Agenda Additions and Deletions:

- **File PB2020:025** – Proposed lot line relocation between two adjoining lots, Map 8 Lots 1 & 1-1, 73 North Pepperell Road, Applicant/Owners: Thomas W. Cook, Jr. & Diane Siteman Living Trust, Zoned R&A. Motion to table – Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by D. Cleveland – motioned passed unanimously

b. Committee Reports – none

c. Staff Report – none

d. Regional Impact – none

e. Planning Chair Letter to Residents:

- *Dear Hollis Residents,*

You may have been receiving communications from organizations commenting on matters before the Planning Board. The Board welcomes and encourages all Hollis residents to participate in planning board matters to relay concerns, thoughts and suggestions. It is particularly important to hear from abutters, who are most familiar with their neighborhoods. However, we all need to be leery of information that does not come from a LICENSED or ACCREDITED civil engineer, wetland soil scientist, soil scientist, hydrogeologist or land use attorney. The Planning Board contracts with a licensed civil engineer to obtain professional review of plans and has done so for many years. If necessary, other outside licensed professionals are brought in to review facets of a plan as deemed necessary. It is critical to understand that the Planning Board, who are volunteers and live in the community, always have the best interests of its citizens in mind when reviewing all development proposals. The Planning Board is duty bound to make decisions based on the Town’s ordinances and regulations, along with state statutes and federal law. The popularity of a project cannot be a basis for Planning Board decision making.

I will point out that the Town of Hollis has some of the most restrictive ordinances and regulations of any community in New Hampshire, written by current and

former planning board members with the input of Hollis residents. It is clear, when you look around our beautiful community, that these rules have had their desired effect. We ask that you support the work of the Planning Board and if you have questions please reach out to our professional planning staff to obtain specific facts about a particular case. Information relative to cases before the Planning Board is available to review on the Hollis Town website (<https://www.hollisnh.org/planning-board>) or at the Town Hall Planning Department Office. Relying on overzealous voices to form your opinion relative to applications is not only counter-productive, but creates a toxic atmosphere in the community, that is sad to see.

Thank you for listening,
Bill Moseley
Planning Board Chair

4. **SIGNATURE OF PLANS: PB2020-020** – Proposed amendment to an approved subdivision plan to allow intrusion into a required 100’ no cut buffer. Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by D. Petry - passed

5. HEARINGS

- a. **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 August 18, continued Design Review Discussion, public hearing.**

B. Moseley asked the applicant to present the current plan then bring the Traffic Engineer to the next meeting where the Board and the public can provide input related to traffic. Staff will then reach out to NHDOT with the list of concerns.

J. Hill stated that the applicant, Runnells Bridge Realty Trust, has since purchased the property.

J. Hill discussed the Board’s previous comments related to truck turning movements within the site. Notes of concern included delivery vehicles and emergency vehicles. The traffic flow has been changed to better facilitate the movements of large trucks.

J. Hill discussed the relocation of the proposed dumpster to lessen the impact to the easterly neighbor.

J. Hill stated that the traffic flow around the rear retail use building has been changed to one way to provide more room for large trucks to turn.

J. Hill stated that another entity associated to the applicant has purchased the property to the west and he stated that the applicant was not willing to incorporate that property into this proposal. He also stated that there were some technical limitations with the property that made incorporation into the proposal challenging.

B. Moseley asked about a one way order box where the person ordering talks and then the response is a digital readout.

J. Hill responded that the applicant may be open to that idea.

C. Rodgers stated that this was first time the Board heard about the viability of the proposed building in the rear. He does not think that it is a good retail site for any use and a mistake to build a building back there. He stated that the applicant has referred to a potential use for the retail building as a state liquor store but he has talked to the real estate guy at the Liquor Commission and they have never heard about the site and that it takes 2 years to approve a new location. He also noted his skepticism relating to scheduled deliveries to avoid peak use times for the site.

D. Petry stated that he had concerns relating to the Traffic Engineer being a member of the T.F. Moran design team and that the Board expects a third party independent traffic study. He also stated that the only example of similar sites in the applicant portfolio is the Candia site. Most aesthetically pleasing and fits in the rural character. He also recommended the Haftner gas station in Groton, MA on route 119 as an example of a site that fits the rural character of Hollis.

D. Cleveland asked about snow storage on the site and raised concerns to the narrowing of the drive aisles during a snow storm.

J. Hill stated that there was snow storage in the front of the site and along the landscape areas on the side. They may need to collect the snow then dump it on the front.

B. Ming asked about how many rows of landscaping are proposed.

J. Hill stated that they would use the screening that was approved with the subdivision plan.

M. Fougere stated that the Board approved a 3 lot subdivision with some screening along the common drive on the east. He noted that the Board specifically stated that the screening would be reevaluated based on the proposed use of the property.

B. Ming asked about the material over the gas tanks.

J. Hill stated that it was concrete that could be driven over but the design of the site reduces the amount of traffic that would drive over it.

J. Mook asked about the aquifer and water supply.

M. Fougere stated that during the subdivision of the property, the applicant submitted detailed analysis that was corroborated by a third party that proved that the site was not in the aquifer. He stated that they could have Mr. Emory call into the Board to discuss their review of the aquifer study.

Motion to table to Oct. 20 – Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by C. Rodgers – passed unanimously

- b. **File PB2020:027** – Proposed **Design Review**, minor subdivision application of an existing 13.121 acre property into four lots. Map 20 Lot 22 Broad Street, Owner Paul L. Tringoson Rev. Trust, Applicant Stephen Vadney, Jr, Zoned R&A. **Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere stated that the purpose of the plan is to depict a minor four lot subdivision of an existing 13.12 acre site. The property sits at the intersection of Broad Street and Nartoff Road; NHDOT driveway permits will be necessary to access the three proposed lots on Route 130. The lots range in size from 2 to 6.54 acres. Wetlands exist on lot 3 and a minor dredge and fill permit will be required to access the rear of the lot; a small wetland is present on Lot 22. Test pits have been performed on all of the lots and they have been witnessed by the Town's Inspector. The lots fronting on Broad Street consist mostly of open field, with the Nartoff Road lot heavily wooded.

Tim Peliquin, Promised Land Survey stated that the applicant intends to build their own home on the lot that fronts Nartoff Road. The 3 lots are under a verbal agreement with a builder to construct 3 homes along Broad Street. He stated that they are proposing a wetland crossing with an impact of approximately 150 SF for the driveway to access the rear of the Nartoff lot. After the meeting tonight they will proceed to the Conservation Commission meeting for input on the crossing. He also noted NHDOT driveway approval will be needed for the 3 lots on Broad Street.

B. Moseley stated that himself and staff walked the site last week and noted drilled holes along the road bed north of the property and the stone wall. He noted that the property line seems to be down the centerline of this road bed.

T. Peliquin stated that this is actually the centerline of an old class VI discontinued roadway. He stated that Alan Swanson did the original survey of this area and put the lot line in the middle.

B. Moseley asked to clarify that the drill holes along the stone walls used to be property lines but when the road was discontinued the property line moved to the center of the roadway.

T. Peliquin stated that was correct.

M. Fougere states that state statute states that when a Town abandoned a road, the abutting properties each gain land to the centerline of the abandoned road right of way. He also stated that it is good to note that on new subdivision plans so there is an updated record.

D. Prety asked about an existing driveway that goes to parcel 20-21 and if a note of it could be added to the plan.

195 T. Peliquin stated that it runs along the subject property with access to Nartoff Road and
196 he will add a note.

197
198 D. Cleveland asked if the Town had any interest in an abandoned class VI road?
199

200 M. Fougere stated that the Town gives up all interest in the road when it is abandoned.
201

202 B. Moseley asked who should verify that the road was discontinued property.
203

204 M. Fougere asked for the surveyor to submit any documentation to staff, staff can verify.
205

206 D. Petry asked about meeting the rural character ordinance with the 3 lots on Broad
207 Street since they are mostly open fields currently. He suggested setting the homes back
208 as far as they can.

209
210 T. Peliquin stated that they are not currently showing the house locations but can do their
211 best to show approximate footprint of the homes on the lots.

212
213 Steve Vadney, owner, stated that he is happy to work with the Board to create nice lots
214 since he is planning on living on the Nartoff lot, the other lots will be his neighbors.
215

216 **Public Hearing**
217

218 Brendan Laflamme; 8 Nartoff Road – raised concerns relating to traffic safety along
219 Broad Street and suggested a need for a traffic study.
220

221 T. Peliquin stated that he thinks a traffic study for a 4 lot subdivision would provide
222 negligible information. He stated Broad Street is a state road and they will implement
223 any recommendations given to them by the NHDOT with their driveway permit.
224

225 **Public Hearing Closed**
226

227 M. Fougere stated that he would work with R. Hardy to identify what kind of
228 landscaping would be appropriate to incorporate into this proposal. He also suggested
229 that each driveway have a turn around so vehicles do not back out onto Broad Street.
230

231 D. Petry noted that shared driveways may be required.
232

233 T. Peliquin stated that it is not his preferred design element but he will do what NHDOT
234 requests.
235

236 B. Moseley asked about a possible site walk.
237

238 D. Cleveland stated that he does not need a site walk since the property is very visible.

239 B. Ming asked if there was anything of note that the Board should see.

240

241 B. Moseley stated that it might be helpful when placing the homes as well as see the
242 wetland crossing.

243

244 D. Petry asked that the site be staked out so Board members could view the site on their
245 own or with staff.

246

247 M. Fougere stated that before final submission the Board will want NHDOT driveway
248 permits and a landscape plan.

249

250 **Motion to move proposal to final review** – Motioned by C. Rodgers; seconded by D.
251 Cleveland – passed unanimously

252

253

254 **c. File PB2020:028** – Proposed change of use from a grocery store use to an ambulatory
255 surgical center use. Map 52 Lot 31, 2 Monument Square, Owner Phoenix Lane LLC,
256 Applicant Matt Graham, Gastinger Walker, Zoned A&B. **Application Acceptance and**
257 **Public Hearing.**

258

259 M. Fougere stated this proposal is a change of use from the Harvest Market grocery store
260 to Lighthouse Surgical Suites, an outpatient surgery center. The center will focus on
261 Orthopedic surgery such as joint replacement and some sports medicine procedures.
262 Initial consultations and post-op follow ups with occur off site. Patient stays exceeding
263 24 hours are not allowed. There is no emergency room or urgent care services provided.
264 The surgery center will occupy approximately 8,000 SF. This leaves approximately
265 3,000 SF as an additional tenant space in the building.

266

267 The facility will have 15 total employees. The patient capacity will be approximately 5.
268 The proposed hours of operation are Monday – Friday, 6 am to 6 pm. They anticipate a
269 need for 20 parking stalls between employees and patients.

270

271 The Zoning Official has determined this use to be Offices (medical) and/or Personal or
272 Professional Services. The minimum amount of parking allowed for an Office use is 1
273 stall per 400 SF of leasable area. 20 parking stalls will be required for this use. The
274 existing parking area has 25 parking stalls, including 2 ADA stalls, immediately adjacent
275 to the building.

276

277 The proposal does not include an expansion to the foot print of the existing building. An
278 awning or canopy is proposed to be installed at the entrance to the facility. The proposal
279 also includes the removal and replacement of existing HVAC mechanicals along the
280 south of the building and the installation of a back-up generator to be located at the old
281 loading dock.

282

C. Rodgers recused himself as he is an abutter.

Motion to accept application – Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by B. Ming –
passed unanimously

Matt Graham GastingerWalker Architects, stated that the staff summary was sufficient
and would be able to answer any questions from the Board.

D. Petry asked about Lighthouse Surgical Suites as a company such as where are they
located, is ownership of the proposed operation local or long distance.

Jason Martin, Servecenter Development, stated that the operation works by teaming up
with local doctors who use the facility for elective outpatient surgeries. He stated that he
is a development company that creates turnkey facilities like the proposal and turns them
over to local management for day to day operation. He stated that they have developed 3
similar operations in the region.

D. Petry asked who would be the contact person for day to day operations.

J. Martin stated that there will be a local administrator who is responsible for all
operations of the center.

D. Petry stated that since the site is in the Historic District, the removal and reinstalled
mechanicals will have to be screened and meet HDC requirements. He also asked if the
building would be leased or purchased.

J. Martin stated that he building would be leased.

B. Moseley asked if the center has a relationship with a nearby hospital in case a medical
emergency occurs.

J. Martin stated that it is a requirement that any complications would result in the patient
being taken to the partner hospital.

D. Cleveland asked about the additional unused tenant space and how it might be used.

J. Martin stated that the center has no intention of using that space in this time. He did
note that sometimes the doctors use a space such as this for office space as an assessor
use.

B. Ming asked about the old loading dock and if an ambulance would be able to operate
out of that space.

M. Graham stated that they would not use the loading dock to transfer a patient to an ambulance but instead would use the front door.

B. Ming raised a concern regarding medical waste and storage tanks if the business closes.

J. Martin stated that is addressed in the lease as well as the medical storage tanks and other such items are under contract and would be removed by the owners of the tanks themselves.

D. Petry noted that the site has notorious ice buildup issues where the proposed awning and entry way is located.

Public Hearing

Chat Rodgers; 3 Broad Street – asked if there would be medical personnel on site for 12 hours for emergency care.

J. Martin stated that hours of operation would be from 6 am to 6 pm but would only be open when a procedure is scheduled. The center does not offer emergency care of any kind.

Public Hearing Closed

B. Moseley asked about timeline to open the center.

M. Graham stated that they were still working through HDC approval and building permit submission. Hoping to start construction beginning of November.

J. Martin stated that once construction starts they anticipate a 13-14 week construction time to get occupancy. It then takes another 6 weeks to for administrator staff then State and Federal approvals. Late spring to start seeing patients.

D. Petry reiterated screening along Ash Street.

M. Fougere stated that HDC will weigh in on screening.

Motion to approve application with conditions – Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by D. Petry – passed unanimously

D. Petry stated that hours of operation and number of employees need to be added to the site plan so if anything changes they need to return to the Board to amend their site plan.

370

371

372 **6. Other Business –**

373

374 **a. Potential Zoning Changes**

375

376 **7. ADJOURN**

377 There being no further business, D. Petry presented a non-debatable motion to adjourn.

378 Motion seconded by. C. Rogers and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourns at 9:20 PM.

379

Respectfully submitted,

380

Evan J. Clements,

381

Assistant Planner