

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

January 16th, 2018

“Final”

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Cathy Hoffman – Chairman, Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Rick Hardy, Bill Moseley, and David Petry, Ex-Officio for Selectmen; Alternate: Jeff Peters

ABSENT: Brian Stelmack, Chet Rogers; Alternates; Ben Ming and Dan Turcott

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

1. CALL TO ORDER:

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

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

4. Signature of Plan: None

C. Hoffman appointed J. Peters to vote on behalf of B. Stelmack.

- 5. File PB2017-024** – Major site plan review for changes to approved storage buildings and the change of use of an existing dwelling to an Office and site manager apartment, the removal of an existing single family home and replacing it with an outdoor storage area and truck rental, 250 – 260 Proctor Hill Road, Applicant Hollis Self Storage, LLC (C/O Paul George), Map 11 Lot 24 & 25, Zoned IN Industrial.
Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.

M. Fougere explained this site plan outlines a number of changes to the approved self-storage site plan approved by the Planning Board in 2016. Few changes are proposed to the storage unit area except that the two existing driveways serving the site will be gated and a new main access point developed on the adjoining property. In addition, the applicant has proposed a flatter roof design than originally shown; an outline and pictures of the proposed changes are attached.

Adjoining the subject site is a 3.27 acre property that will become a part of this project. The existing single family home located at the front of the site will become an office and a manager's apartment. In addition, six parking spaces will be constructed along with nine parking spaces for truck rental. All access to the property will enter through this area. In the rear of the site, an existing single family home will be removed and an outside storage area (28,900 sq. ft.) will be constructed. A row of five foot tall evergreens will be installed to buffer this area from the roadway. This storage area will be over 200 feet from Proctor Hill Road (Rt. 130). A new storm water area has been proposed to accommodate this revised site disturbance. The Town Engineer has reviewed these new plans. The Fire Chief has also reviewed the plans and requested a Knox padlock be provided for each gate to allow fire department access, and also if any building is equipped with an alarm system a Knox box shall be provided for each building allowing fire department access to them also.

The previously approved landscaping plan will be followed for this project. Additional plantings are proposed on the site.

- 49 - A new landscaping plan has been submitted for the adjoining property. Review
50 comments are needed from Doug Gagne. He needs to complete this.
51 - The plan has been reviewed by the Town Engineer. The applicant has responded to the
52 Engineers comments.
53

54 If this application was to be approved tonight the conditions would be:

- 55 1) The applicant shall submit four (4) hard copies of the revised final plan.
56 2) Grading and the placement of drainage facilities will take place within the 100 foot
57 wetland buffer; this buffer line should be clearly marked in the field and silt fenced
58 installed prior to any work starting on the site. This work should also be reviewed by the
59 Town's Inspector during construction.
60 3) The applicant shall submit a letter from an engineer, upon project completion, certifying
61 that the porous pavement construction was installed consistent with the approved plans.
62 4) Prior to plan signature, receipt of NHDES Alteration of Terrain permit shall be obtained.
63 5) The lot line shown on the plan sets shall be removed and the two sites shall be considered
64 one property. A lot merger form shall be filled out and submitted to the Planning &
65 Assessing Office.

66 B. Moseley made a motion to accept application PB2017-024 for consideration. D. Cleveland
67 seconded. All in favor none opposed.

68 Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer for Fieldstone Land Consultants, representing Paul George
69 and Peter George of Hollis Self Storage LLC, Map 11 Lot 24 & 25, who are here tonight also.
70 Following M. Fougere summary of the project, Map 11 Lot 24 had a site plan approval in 2016,
71 and this application before the board is to add Map 11 Lot 25 to this development, including
72 a number of changes to the approved design. Having purchased the two lots, they had a
73 different vision and would like to provide a full service self-storage facility. This means there
74 will be an on-site office, some truck rental, and some outside storage area. There are no
75 design component changes on lot 24. The proposal now includes gating the two entrances,
76 and to relocate the main entrance to the site onto Map 11 Lot 25. The lot has 3.271 acres of
77 land, the access will be upgraded on this site, change the existing dwelling into an office and
78 managers apartment unit, parking, and a gated access into the storage facility. The proposed
79 outdoor storage area is currently to the back of Lot 25 and is approximately 28,900 sq. ft.
80 There is a proposed evergreen hedge to buffer this area, which is set back 215 feet set back
81 into the property. One change being proposed to the self-storage units is flattening the roof.
82 The prior approval consisted of 3:12 (rise to run) pitched roof. Hollis Self Storage would like
83 to construct buildings with a 1/4:12 (rise to run) pitched roof for safety reasons. The flatter
84 pitch keeps the snow on the roof and allows for a gradual melt which provides for a safe site.
85 Snow and ice leaving a metal roof is a big safety concern in this business and the snow
86 maintenance that a steeper pitch requires due to snow and ice in front of doors is also an
87 operation concern. In order to service the area best by providing for a safe and functioning
88 site the client would like the Board to consider a revision in the style of the buildings as
89 outlined.

90 The other changes consist of the interconnecting access between lot 24 & 25, with slight
91 drainage modification, and also the access into the outside storage area. There is some
92 additional storm water management to the rear of the site that has been designed to mitigate
93 the improvements being proposed, this includes another infiltration basin, and a revised
94 storm water management report was submitted to Town Engineer and they are now in receipt
95 of a letter stating all his concerns have been addressed. All improvements being proposed are

96 outside of the 100 foot wetland buffer, the only one area that is within this 100 foot buffer is
97 drainage swale that was already approved with the previous application.

98 A revised landscaping plan has also been submitted. The design in front of the storage units
99 is relatively the same, there is however a new plan, for the adjacent lot that shows the existing
100 building and they are proposing some additional plantings in the front, plantings around the
101 sign, circling the building to dress up the site. They have satisfied all the parking
102 requirements and also site plan requirements. They have had a chance to look at and review
103 the staff report for tonight and they have no issues.

104 C. Hoffman asked about the outside storage and what was going to be proposed to being
105 stored there. C. Brannon stated that typically vehicles, campers and boats. Things of this
106 nature. J. Peters asked what was to stop this area becoming a junk yard. C. Brannon said
107 there would be certain criteria for storing and this would include registered vehicles. J. Peters
108 also asked the surface was proposed to be gravel and what was to stop the leakage of oil etc.
109 passing into the aquifer. After discussion, including the truck rental part, D. Petry asked M.
110 Fougere to remind the board of what had happened with other similar projects, and that the
111 board should remain consistent. C. Brannon also added that there would be a contract that
112 everyone would have to sign, to store on site, this would include no repairs on site and all
113 vehicles have to be registered. C. Hoffman asked if they would be willing to pave that area.
114 C. Brannon suggested they could look into better options to better address the board's
115 concerns. J. Peters asked how many vehicles could be stored there and he is concerned about
116 the five foot trees being adequate screening. C. Brannon said that would depend on the type
117 of vehicle and its size. R. Hardy asked the number of vehicles question to be directed to the
118 owner. Paul George, approached the podium and said between 42 and 65, depending on what
119 is there. He added there would be someone on site at all times, the vehicles need to be
120 registered and insured, and certificates are needed as proof. Again after much discussion the
121 range of vehicles allowed to be stored there will be motorhome, boats, residential cars, trucks
122 and trailers. J. Peters asked if we could see the contract that clients would be agreeing to. P.
123 George said yes and he is happy for a spill kit to be kept on site. He added the U-Haul's are
124 all new U-Haul's and they don't own them they lease them and they will be kept on the paved
125 parking area. He has businesses in Alton and Derry New Hampshire. J. Peters also asked
126 about the doors facing the Proctor Hill Road, whereas the previous proposal they had not
127 faced the road. C. Brannon added they are happy to change the doors and add more
128 landscaping if that's what the Board wants.

129 D. LaBombard explained to the board that he had had a couple of chances to review these
130 plans. He suggested that consolidating the lots has to happen or else the drainage would be
131 split in half, the permits will have to be renewed as we are increasing the size of the lots. He
132 asked if the Fire Chief was happy with the cistern. They have complied with the town's storm
133 water regulations.

134 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing and as no one wished to speak she closed the public
135 hearing.

136 R. Hardy asked about merging the lots. C. Brannon explained it is a simply task of completing
137 a form and submitted it to the Planning Board and Assessing. C. Brannon added his client
138 was willing to pave the outdoor storage area and install a water quality unit into the plan and
139 have a spill kit onsite and this may help alleviate some concerns raised today. He added there
140 will be someone on the site at all times, therefore there will be constant monitoring of the site
141 and outdoor storage area. D. Petry confirmed that access would be 24/7.

142 C. Hoffman stated she liked the façade of the building having the doors face the road. D.
143 Cleveland agreed. The Board also agreed they preferred the flat roof option with a fake façade

144 pitch i.e. photo 2 in the packet, D. Petry adding as long as the screening works and it isn't an
145 issue.

146 M. Fougere summarized that following tonight's meeting a note be added to the plan stating
147 that the outside storage consist of motorhomes, boats, residential cars, trucks and trailers.
148 The applicant is willing to construct the roof shown in photo 2 in the packets, with a 3:12
149 pitch roof with a parapet on gable end. Doug Gagne will complete his landscaping review.
150 The outside storage site will be paved as discussed along with appropriate treatment and the
151 spill kit. R. Hardy asked if the board was asking them to continue this until the next meeting.
152 The majority asked for the application to be continued. D. Petry made a motion to table
153 PB2017-024 to February 20th 2018. B. Moseley seconded. All in favor none opposed.

154

155 Zoning Amendments

156 1. Amend Section IV Enforcement and Administration, paragraph J. by deleting the
157 paragraph in its entirety ~~If, after the issuance of a permit, the operations authorized~~
158 ~~there under are not commenced within one year after day of permit or, if after the~~
159 ~~commencement of operations the work is discontinued for a period of one year, such~~
160 ~~permit shall be void and work may not again be commenced until a new permit shall~~
161 ~~have been issued for the original work, and building materials and equipment on the~~
162 ~~ground shall be removed or stored according to the requirements of the Building~~
163 ~~Inspector and replacing it with "A building permit shall be valid for one year from the~~
164 ~~date of issuance. Said permit period may be extended for one or more times with~~
165 ~~approval of the Building Inspector. If said permit expires, the building materials and~~
166 ~~equipment on the ground shall be removed or stored according to the requirements~~
167 ~~of the Building Inspector.~~

168

169 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing for any comment. Bill Condra, Building Inspector at
170 Town of Hall, spoke in favor of this change. By shrinking the text he feels it makes it more
171 understandable. No one else wished to speak so the Public Hearing was closed.

172

173 D. Petry made a motion to take this amendment to ballot. B. Moseley seconded. All in favor
174 none opposed.

175

176 2. Amend Section VIII Definitions, by making the following amendments to the term Farm
177 Stand and adding a new Definition Roadside Stand and amend Section X Zoning
178 Districts Section E. Mobile Home-2 Zone (MH-1), F. Recreation Zone (R), G. Residential
179 and Agriculture District (R&A), H. Rural Lands Zone (RL), and I. Town Center (TC) to
180 add the term Roadside Stand as a Permitted Use in those Districts:

181 *FARM STAND:* An Agricultural Enterprise ~~which~~ that displays and sells agricultural
182 products raised, produced, ~~and-or~~ processed on the premises, ~~and which may include a~~
183 ~~Structure(s) used in the operation. All Farm Stands Structures must be set back at least~~
184 ~~35 feet from the adjacent Public Road and have adequate off street parking.~~ A Farm
185 Stand shall remain an Agricultural Enterprise and shall not be considered a commercial
186 use, provided that at least 35% of the products sales in dollar volume are attributable to
187 products raised, produced, or processed on the farm or farms of the stand owner.
188 ~~Owners of Farm Stands, based upon review by town staff, may be required to obtain site~~
189 ~~plan review approval from the Planning Board. All Structures shall be setback at least~~
190 ~~35 feet from the adjacent roadway.~~

191 *ROADSIDE STAND:* An unattended Agricultural Enterprise that displays and sells
192 agricultural products raised, produced or processed on the premises. A Roadside Stand

193 shall remain an Agricultural Enterprise and shall not be considered a commercial use or
 194 a Farm Stand, provided that all of the products sales in dollar volume are attributable to
 195 products produced on property in Hollis owned or operated by the owner or operator of
 196 the property upon which the Roadside Stand is located. All Structures shall be at least
 197 15 feet from the adjacent roadway.
 198

199 M. Fougere also added that D. Gagne had sent in comments and concerns relative to these
 200 changes for the Board to read. The email and document were included in their packets. Also,
 201 Gerry and Teresa Gartner, 134 Dow Road had sent in a memo for the board to read as they
 202 were unable to attend the meeting tonight. There are representatives from the Agricultural
 203 Commission at the meeting tonight also. M. Fougere has also given the board a draft outline
 204 of a new section to go into the Site Plan Regulations. This would be for the Planning Board
 205 to agree on to create some parameters for an applicant to follow, specifically stating setbacks,
 206 parking, permits, structure sizes. These can be adopted after town meeting after the Town
 207 Meeting if this were to proceed.
 208

209 C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.
 210

211 Mark Post, Chair of Agricultural Commission approached the podium. He began by stating
 212 it was useful that Mark Fougere had talked about the addition to the Site Plan Regulations,
 213 placing there the guidance that will be left out of the definition section of the Zoning
 214 Ordinance. He summarized that the Agricultural Commission had been asked to look at this
 215 over the last 3-4 months. Better language was needed to do two things. One was to recognize
 216 that there is a class of farm stand that is very minor. They like to call it the lemonade stand.
 217 There has been some attempt to create a series of regulations and procedures that would ease
 218 the administrative burden for people who are simply setting up a table and selling eggs. The
 219 Agriculture Commission took the approach to try and make a definition of what we mean by
 220 something that small. Hence, Road Side Stand. Something very specific, very small and very
 221 restricted. And if the applicant were planning on doing something so small then there would
 222 be an ease in the regulatory process. In December, they came to the meeting with specifics,
 223 the produce needs to be 100% of goods grown on the specific property on which the road side
 224 stand sits. The nature of the definition of a road side stand was intended to be extremely
 225 restrictive, consisting of a 4 x 8 table and a pop up canvas. They were concerned that when
 226 they saw the posting there was no mention of these restrictions and they did not understand
 227 where the word unattended came from. C. Hoffman said she had asked for that to go into the
 228 definition as around town these small stands do not have people standing at them. After
 229 discussion it was agreed to leave it out. The Agriculture Commission realizes this is extremely
 230 important for the town, it is supportive of both agriculture and conservation. And to say you
 231 support agriculture and conservation it means that the home owners and agricultural
 232 community in this town recognizes that there will be points these intersect. Unlike any other
 233 business, agriculture can only take place where the land is. And we have allowed housing to
 234 be built around the farms which causes the tension that is trying be addressed by these
 235 ordinances and changes. They want to get it right.
 236

237 D. Petry stated that tonight they should take public input on these changes and if we need to
 238 redraft these for next year, and have site plan regulations drafted ready to work in concert
 239 with the definitions. He doesn't want to rush it either, they want to try to avoid any mistakes.
 240

241 J. Ferlins – 88 Dow Road. He is an abutter to a farm stand. It is good to hear that the
 242 Agricultural Commission will continue to work on the definitions. He was scared by what he
 243 read in the text of the ordinance change as it was constructed with the idea to shield the road

side stands from the permitting process. The Agriculture Commission want to encourage local people to set up farm stands and shield them from the permitting process. He queried the road side farm stand being as close as 15 feet away from the road side, and this means it can be directly across from your neighbor house, which is an outrage. The biggest thing this ordinance lacks is an opportunity for input from abutters or others in the neighborhood that would be affected. He is also concerned with how it would be affected by a Pick your own scenario. After listing his concerns, he wants the ordinance to have fairness with respect the Hollis residences and affected neighbors who are not farmers, and their interests also have to be balanced with the agenda of the Agricultural Commission who are encouraging more and more road side stands. He feels what they cannot ask is those that have been supporting agriculture to now also support an ordinance that will open up the way to an unsightly eyesore, neighborhood nuisance, potential safety hazard, as written right now those are the risks. He thanked the Planning Board to the work they have done, he realizes that there is still a lot to do and he hopes they will build in some fairness and balance. He states we need guidelines, approval process, and the most important thing is to bring the affected neighbors and abutters into the approval process.

D. Petry explained the answer is no. He explained we allow for abutter input we do not allow for abutter approval. The opportunity for the abutters to have an approval is when a change is made on the ballot. Abutter approval is in no other zoning ordinance in town where we allow abutters to veto or vote on a property. That is completely unrealistic to expect the Planning Board would allow veto power to abutters. J. Ferlins asked if there was any way this could be addressed. After much discussion and highlighting that the road side stand is a newly proposed definition not yet in the ordinance, only Farm Stands, and road side stand are not intended to grow into Farm stands. There is a need to put parameters around each one that is very clear to both abutters and applicants. He would like the words seasonal and temporary defined clearly also. M. Fougere read the ordinance for **temporary structure**:

“A structure, which is designed, built, created or occupied for short and/or intermittent periods of time. This shall include, but is not limited to, plastic, fabric, and/or canvas covered frame structures. All temporary structures will require a building permit. Temporary structures shall comply with all applicable setbacks, except as noted in the Farm Stand definition, and/or height requirements for accessory or principal structures, as outlined in Section X. Zoning Districts. Structures which are in use for a period of less than 7 days are exempt from the permit requirement. Temporary structures located within the Historic District shall be appropriately screened from public view and must obtain prior approval from the Historic District Commission.”

Randall Clarke, 80 West Hollis Road and Vice Chair of the Agricultural Commission. He wanted to make a comment on D. Gagne’s email received today. He added he did the drafting and revision of the work that was submitted to the Planning Board several weeks ago. He explained his reason for deleting the word ‘and’ and used the word ‘or’ and the intention was to note that there are differences within these activities and it is possible for something to be processed but not raised or vice versa. This was to allow a fairly broad range of activities. With regard to road side stands he had asked for the word ‘and’ to be used in order to be more restrictive. The second thing he wanted to address was the agricultural commission intention to do, and what he thinks is a misconception, the previous speaker spoke about the commission shielding the proprietors of road side stands from a permitting process. He said he used that language at the last meeting and he meant it to be fairly precise, he meant it to

295 shield them from the permitting process, so they do not need to present paperwork, it was
 296 not meant that they would be shielded from the regulatory process. He explains and speaks
 297 to if regulations are not being adhered to then abutters can complain, the town official can
 298 check it out and if it is found to be in violation then they can be asked to remove it.

299

300 Marsha Cone, 94 Dow Road. She is confused what the difference is between a farm stand and
 301 road side stand. She is concerned about the setback, off road parking and safety. She walks
 302 her dogs daily and feels it is very unsafe. She would like the definitions to be clearer. She
 303 wanted clarification on the word processed and what and who could buy and sell produce on
 304 their stands. She stated that Hollis is an agricultural community which is great, a lot of people
 305 live in Hollis where a lot of agricultural land is sold to build houses on and there are certain
 306 expectations these residents have aside from farm stands, in terms of when they go sit in their
 307 front or back yards. This has to be important regardless of the paper work, it needs to be safe
 308 and fair. She also stated that most people do not realize what they are voting on with the
 309 ballot. They do not appreciate the importance of the ballot.

310

311 Steve Reynolds, 92 Dow Road. He thanked the Planning Board for taking on this issue and
 312 he appreciates the work done. He doesn't think that by just changing the two definitions will
 313 work. Hearing some of the comments, the site plan regulations should be amended in parallel
 314 with the zoning ordinance. Some of the recommendations made by the Agricultural
 315 Commission were spot on. He mentioned the comment about shielding the road side stands
 316 from the permitting process, and treating them a bit differently from Farm Stand, and he
 317 agrees with the concept but the devil is in the detail. If we can get the definition right on the
 318 road side stand he said it could work. Conceptually it makes sense and it does not shield them
 319 from regulations. He agrees there is more work required and it is smart to continue this. He
 320 explained his neighbors are concerned the definition as it stands at the moment, the farm
 321 stand opposite his house, would fall under the definition of road side stand. As a couple of
 322 other high level comments he feels there should be some provision for safe parking within a
 323 road side stand definition and there are concerns of putting structures within 15 feet of an
 324 adjacent roadway. With the Farm Stand definition his comments are the language removed
 325 needs to go somewhere else at the same time. It needs to be done in parallel. He suggested
 326 that if the Board is going to approach this, to try to fix it, a comprehensive review of the
 327 ordinance needs to take place not just the definitions, for example how a site plan review is
 328 handled, and from what he sees at the moment for Road side stand there is no site plan
 329 review or abutter input. If there are known concerns from abutters this he feels is something
 330 that should be changed. He understands that abutters do not approve an application but they
 331 are allowed input. He raised an issue about having consideration for a minimum distance for
 332 siting of a farm stand from a principle residence (neighbors), and he feels this is a provision
 333 that should be put into the definition or regulation. This would avoid the situation that he is
 334 having a farm stand 87 feet from his house when the owner owns a 54 acres with other
 335 options. This would not limit the number of farm stands or cause undue hardship to anyone.
 336 He agrees with taking the time to get it right. He handed copies of his comments to each
 337 member of the Planning Board.

338

339 Dave Vijay, 94 Dow Road. He said his friends and neighbors have already stated their
 340 concerns. His wanted to add his concern about how dangerous the road is and it is a
 341 dangerous place to have a farm stand. He moved there in 1991 and in 1989 he believes there
 342 was an accident. He talked about the width of the road, no extra room for walkers or cycling
 343 and having the farm stand there is very dangerous.

344

345 Bill Condra, Building Inspector for Town of Hollis. He has listened to all the input this

evening and he came prepared to make a few comments but the speakers ahead of him have covered almost all his comments. He asked if there was going to be a lot size limitation on where the farm stands and road side stands could be placed. As it is being introduced to all these other zones as a permitted use so that means door to door there could be a road side stand. One part of the town being introduced to this is the town center, one of the smallest lots in town, and if there were to pass there would be a proliferation of tables and tents all through the town. He encourages the tabling of this from this year's ballot until 2019. The scope of work of the farm stand and the road side stand he believes needs to be addressed ahead of time or in consult with the definition.

No one else wished to speak so C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

J. Peters made a motion to table the changes to the definitions until 2019 ballot. D. Petry seconded it. All in favor none opposed.

D. Petry explained that in the meantime, the Site Plan Regulations need to be drafted to be in line with the current definition, this will give us a process to be in place until next year. Then secondly the two definitions i.e. both Farm Stand and Road Side Stand need to be worked on and Site Plan Regulations changes we will need to align for these new definitions. He also explained to the public that the process for the last 20 years we have been very consistent with, and we normally wait for the approval of the changes on the Town Ballot, and then at the very next Planning Board meeting after Town Meeting, the site plan regulation are amended to align. It does not make sense to draft and approve them before the changes get voted on.

3. Amend Section XIV Sign Ordinance, N Agriculture Signs, by deleting paragraph 1. ~~Permanent agricultural signs shall not exceed 20 square feet of sign surface area.~~ And replacing it with the following: Permanent agricultural signs: When affixed to a building, a sign shall not exceed 20 square feet of sign surface area. When free-standing, a sign shall not exceed 20 square feet of surface area. In both cases, the signs shall have no one liner dimension greater than six feet. Posts supporting a free-standing sign shall have a total width of no more than one foot (unless specified otherwise by building code requirements). In addition, amend Section N.2. Seasonal agricultural signs, b. i. by deleting this language ~~Shall not exceed 20 square feet of sign surface area~~ and replacing it as follows: Shall not exceed 20 square feet of sign surface area with no one linear dimension being greater than 6 feet.

C. Hoffman opened the public hearing.

M. Post, Chair of Agricultural Commission. He wanted to make clear that the Agricultural Commission wanted the agricultural signs fixed to the side of a building to not have a linear dimension restriction. This may have been an error in the posting. A building has already been permitted and fixing a 20 sq. ft. sign to the side of this building is not the same as a sign hanging by the side of the road. Another change and a little clarity from the original proposal, where it said maximum linear dimension, to avoid any ambiguity of what a linear dimension is, they would like to make a minor change to make it read, maximum horizontal or vertical dimension of 6 feet. And take out the word 'both cases'. They want to give the farmers who are not located in the business district the same rights as those who are. You cannot move a farm into a business district if you wanted a big sign so this make it equal.

Marsha Cone, 94 Dow Road. Would a farm stand and road sign stand be allowed to put up a 20 square foot sign. D. Petry explained that this will be worked into the road side stand definition and site plan regulations as he doesn't believe that is the intent. However at the

396 moment we have not approved any road side stand definition. She is concerned about seeing
397 a 20 square foot sign outside a farm stand or road side stand.

398 Bill Condra, Town of Hollis Building Inspector. This is a discussion on amendment to Section
399 XIV paragraph N. As the previous person said, maybe there is another amendment that adds
400 the signing regulations for farm stand and road side stands and this should be articulated in
401 the zoning ordinance so he is able to deal with questions and concerns as they arise.

402 C. Hoffman closed the public hearing.

403 M. Fougere read what will be going the public ballot.

404 *1. Permanent agricultural signs shall when affixed to a building, a sign shall not exceed 20*
405 *square feet of sign surface area. A free standing agricultural sign shall not exceed 20 square*
406 *feet of sign surface with no one horizontal or vertical dimension greater than 6 feet. Post*
407 *supporting a free-standing sign shall have a total width of no more than one foot (unless*
408 *specified otherwise by building code requirements). In addition, amend section N.2.*
409 *Seasonal agricultural signs b.i. shall not exceed 20 square feet of sign surface area with no*
410 *one horizontal or vertical dimension greater than 6 feet. (Linear part removed)*

411 D. Petry made a motion for this zoning amendment to go to ballot as amended at tonight's
412 meeting. B. Moseley seconded. All in favor none opposed. D. Petry suggested that on the
413 ballot paper we supply two diagrams showing examples.

414 **Other business**

415 Stephen Meno NRPC – presenting to the board the first meeting for the Land Use Chapter.
416 This is a workshop event and he has brought with him four maps, Land Use, Street Index &
417 Town Facilities, Development Constraints and Zoning. This is the first of two meetings. He
418 summarized the population in 1996 and the chapter was published in 1998 was
419 approximately 6481. Today's population is approximately 7769. Most of the
420 recommendations made in the Land Use chapter were accomplished such as recreating rural
421 design standards, facilitating back lot developments, amending certain set back requirements
422 and not expanding the industrial zone. Between 1998 to today, commercial use land went
423 from 88 acres to 148 acres, residential land went from approximately 5000 acres to 9000
424 acres, agricultural land went from 2400 acres to 1300 acres, and industrial land went from
425 81 acres to 135 acres, vacant land went from 10000 to 2700 acres. These are the big trends
426 and big shifts. Looking at what the Hollis Master Plan Survey from 2016 showed for the top
427 three things that people found living in Hollis, where the rural lifestyle, the geographical
428 location and the school system. The three biggest complaints are growth rate, loss of rural
429 lifestyle and lack of housing at reasonable prices. Also, there is not enough elderly housing
430 or adequate supply of restaurants, entertainment or medical services. 40% of respondents to
431 the survey added that residential growth was too fast, and 52% were in favor of improved
432 wireless telecommunication even if it was visible. The intent of this meeting is to flush out
433 what direction we want to go with this chapter, what themes and recommendations.

434 The first map was the town facilities map which showed the majority of the town facilities in
435 the town center. The next map showed development constraints. D. Petry asked if this plan
436 showed the recently purchased Birch Hill and Stefanowicz properties. S. Meno will check it
437 does. R. Hardy asked if we define tree farms which may come under a separate classification.
438 S. Meno said he would ask his GIS analyst how they would classify that. R. Hardy said it
439 was a State and Federal requirement. D. Petry would like a map showing town owned land
440 specifically. The zoning map shows 67% agricultural zoning, rural lands is 20%, industrial is
441 1%, mobile home is .23% and town center is 2.25%. The current land use map shows
442 primarily single family residential and open space is second primary use.

443 S. Meno asked the board to consider:

- 444 • Are there things you see that don't work – that need aligning?
445 • What are our goals for the future of Hollis?

446

447 M. Fougere explained that Future Land Use Map should show existing conditions and the
448 proposed location, extent and intensity of future land use. And maybe they could consider
449 just a statement, based on public input, this is what we want in the future. D. Petry suggested
450 on area of conflict would be the building permits and building rights. M. Fougere said it was
451 something that we need to monitor and that could be a statement also. M. Fougere said
452 another area we have talked about is the rural zone and possibly changing the zoning there
453 to a lower density. It could be stated as a consideration for the future. Something very
454 generic. Reasons could include steeper slopes in that area, further away from the town center,
455 further away from services. To possibly review and consider lowering the density in the rural
456 zone. The board wanted time to think about these changes. D. Petry asked what the total
457 buildout number. There was no buildout analysis as part of this chapter. The question was
458 asked if there was any future community facilities that the Selectmen are considering. There
459 are maybe future ideas of a fire station substation down near the south (Rt 111) and north of
460 Hollis (Rt 122). Zoning has been changed to support housing for older persons. The title of
461 the chapter is Land Use, and maybe it could be called Current and Future Land Use. D. Petry
462 asked if a map could be made showing land that is owned by the town. The board continued
463 discussion and finished by scheduling the next meeting for this chapter.

464

465 B. Moseley made a non-debatable motion to adjourn. J. Peters seconded. All in favor none
466 opposed.

467

468 The meeting was adjourned at 10 PM

469

470 Respectively submitted by,

471 Wendy Trimble

472 Assistant Planner

473 Town of Hollis, NH