

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 16, 2021
Final

1 **PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bill Moseley – Chairman; Doug Cleveland – Vice
2 Chairman, Virginia Mills, Ben Ming, Rick Hardy, Jeff Peters, Chet Rogers, and David Petry (Ex-
3 Officio for Selectmen) Alternates: Julie Mook, Rick Hardy

4
5 **ABSENT: None**

6
7
8 **STAFF PRESENT:** Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Evan Clements, Assistant Planner

9
10 **THIS MEETING WAS CONDUCTED VIRTUALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION**
11 **IN COMPLIANCE WITH GOVERNOR SUNUNU’S EMERGENCY ORDERS #12, 16, & 17**

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

13
14 **2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:**

- 15
16 a. November 17, 2020 Meeting – Motion to approve – motioned by D. Cleveland;
17 seconded by C. Rogers – V. Mills abstained – passed
18 b. December 15, 2020 Meeting – Motion to approve – motioned by V. Mills; seconded
19 by J. Peters – passed unanimously
20 c. December 15, 2020 Non-Public Meeting – Motion to approve and keep sealed –
21 motioned by D. Petry; seconded by V. Mills – J. Peters abstained – passed
22
23

24 **3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING**

- 25 a. Agenda Additions and Deletions:
26 b. Committee Reports – none
27 c. Staff Report – none
28 d. Regional Impact – none
29

30 **4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS: PB2020-030** 20-23 Broad Street Minor Subdivision – Motion to
31 authorize plan signature – motioned by J. Peters; seconded by D. Cleveland - passed
32

33 **5. HEARINGS**

- 34
35 a. **File PB2020:024 – Design Review** Proposed site plan/subdivision for the development of
36 a 50 unit Housing for Older Persons development on a 36.09 acre property, Map 41 Lots
37 25, 28 & 44, 365 Silver Lake Road, Applicant: Fieldstone, Owner: Raisanen Homes Elite,
38 LLC, Zoned R&A.
39

40 V. Mills recused herself – J. Mook voting instead
41

42 M. Fougere provided an update to this proposal. He stated that this Application was last
43 before the Planning Board on January 5th. At that time the Board requested the
44 application be removed from the Agenda until such time that a road plan could be
45 developed that did not require a waiver from the Cuts & Fill Regulation. The revised road
46 profile outline submitted by the applicant’s engineer has been reviewed by the Town
47 Engineer, (letter dated Feb. 2, 2021 attached), and who confirms the revised plan complies
48 with Town’s regulations.
49

50 D. Petry stated that before the Board moves any further on this application the entire
51 proposal needs to be submitted without any waivers being needed, not just the road layout.
52 He wanted to confirm with the applicant that the latest submittal does not require any
53 waivers.

54

55 Chad Branon P.E., Fieldstone Land Consultants – stated that he could confirm that the
56 current submittal does not require any waivers. He also stated that he does not anticipate
57 any waivers moving forward.

58

59 D. Petry asked if they were compliant with all Town Ordinances, including Rural
60 Character.

61

62 C. Branon stated that the currently submittal has not undergone a visual impact study and
63 there is still work to be done with other aspects of review. The plan presented shows road
64 design and proposed grading. He went over the details of the plan and what was changed
65 to make the road compliant.

66

67 Mike Vignale P.E., Town Engineer – explained his review of the submitted road plan
68 including grade requirements at a stop condition.

69

70 B. Moseley asked about a letter received from an outside engineer and if M. Vignale
71 wanted to comment on that letter.

72

73 M. Vignale stated the letter brought up two issues. First issue was grade at a stop condition
74 when in proximity to an intersection. The grade at the stop sign is compliant and allows for
75 a flat landing for a vehicle to stop at. The grade requirement does not apply for the through
76 road with no stop condition. The second issue was the 100' width of the road. The
77 proposal uses a curb to make the road tighter and avoided the need for a 4:1 sloping ditch
78 along the roadway. He stated that you do not need a ditch on the other side if the curb and
79 the curb is allowed by regulation. He noted the letter also brought up a guardrail setback
80 from the road but with the curb the guardrail needs to be flush with the curb face.

81

82 J. Peters asked if the road needs a waiver to encroach into the wetland buffer what the
83 setback from roads to property lines is.

84

85 E. Clements stated that roads are a permitted use in the wetland buffer. He stated that roads
86 are not considered structures that are subject to a yard setback.

87

88 D. Petry noted that does the location of the proposed road meet rural character
89 requirements and any buffer the Board may want installed.

90

91 R. Hardy noted that the road is approximately 12' from the property line. He noted that
92 with the Cobbett Lane project and others had a buffer requirement around the entire
93 project.

94
95
96
97
98
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

C. Branon noted that this current proposal is to prove that a road plan can be made that requires no waivers. He would be willing to alter the road plan if the Board was supportive of waivers that resulted in a public benefit.

M. Fougere recommended that for the March meeting the applicant show a road plan that takes into account a 35' buffer away from the property line.

C. Branon noted that they had taken away plan details such as house locations for ease of understanding the road plan. They intend to bring those details back in for the next submittal.

J. Peters stated that the Board could be receptive to waiver requests moving forward based on plan changes made by the Board.

M. Fougere asked about possible drainage details on the next submittal.

C. Branon stated that drainage was a concern, especially considering the project's proximity to Witches Spring Brook. They are hoping to disperse detention around the site so that there are not large ponds at the bottom of the hill by the brook. They are proposing a closed drainage system for greater control of the runoff.

J. Peters asked if soils were like the Cobbett Lane project.

C. Branon stated that the soils are actually better than Cobbett Lane in terms of septic and infiltration.

Motion to continue to the March 16, 2021 – motioned by J. Peters; seconded by C. Rogers – passed unanimously

- b. File PB2021:001** – Proposed site plan to replace existing 8 x 10 shed with a new 12 x 20 shed located on the athletic field adjoining the Library, Map 52 Lot 50, 1 Monument Square, Owner: Town of Hollis Applicant Friends of the Hollis Social Library, Zoned TC Town Center.

M. Fougere stated that this proposed Site Plan is for the demolition of an existing 8' x 10' storage shed used by the Hollis Social Library and replaced with a new construction, 12' x 20' storage shed in the same location. The storage shed is located in the north east corner of Little Nichols Athletic Field, near the outdoor playground area. The shed is used by the Library to store a large volume of books throughout the year and is in need of a larger shed for more storage space.

The existing shed is located approximately 3.5' from the rear property line and 12.5' from the eastern side property line. The new shed will maintain the above mentioned setbacks.

138 Since this is a governmental use on Town property, this proposal is not subject to Hollis
139 Zoning Ordinance minimum setback requirements for structures.

140

141 The applicant went to the HDC on February 4, 2021 as a courtesy and received conditional
142 approval for the shed. Conditions for approval set by the HDC are the addition of a
143 window on the eastern face of the shed and Site Plan approval from the Planning Board.

144

145 **Motion to accept application** - Motioned by J. Peters; seconded by D. Cleveland – passed
146 unanimously

147

148 Shannon Laine, President of the Friends of the Hollis Social Library – explained the
149 condition of the old shed and that they use the shed as storage for books. The books are
150 resold to raise funds for the library. The plan is to install a new larger shed that can be used
151 for year round storage. No funds from the Town are needed.

152

153 J. Peters asked about the shed being only 3’ from the rear property line.

154

155 E. Clements stated that the proposal was a governmental use on Town property and is not
156 subject to Zoning.

157

158 D. Petry added that this application is a courtesy to the Board since they do not actually
159 need approval from the Board.

160

161 **Public Hearing**

162

163 No public comment

164

165 **Public Hearing closed**

166

167 **Motion to approve application** – Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by V. Mills – passed
168 unanimously

169

170 c. **File PB2021:002** – Proposed minor subdivision to convert an existing duplex unit into two
171 condominium units, Map 5 Lot 9, 54 South Depot Road, Applicant: Attorney Jeff Zall,
172 Owner: White Family Ventures, LLC, Zoned R&A.

173

174 M. Fougere stated that the purpose of this subdivision application is to convert an existing
175 duplex home (built in 2003) into two condominium units. Each unit will be assigned
176 limited common area around each unit and a common area has been created in the very
177 rear of this dogleg shaped lot. The total lot area is 4 acres, with 62,216 square feet in
178 Hollis and 112,166 square feet in Nashua. Both of these units are connected to city water.
179 No physical changes are being made to the property.

180

181 J. Peters recused – J. Mook voting in his place

182 **Motion to determine that this project does not constitute a Reginal Impact –**
183 Motioned by V. Mills; seconded by D. Cleveland – passed unanimously

184
185 **Motion to accept application –** Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by D. Cleveland –
186 passed unanimously

187
188 Jeffrey Zall, Attorney – went over the wavier requests and explained that this proposal
189 does not include any changes to the land or the building.

190
191 J. Zall explained that the duplex has existed for 15-20 years and the existing tenants are
192 looking to be able to buy their respective units. This is the reason for converting the duplex
193 into a condominium.

194
195 B. Ming asked if any interior work would be done on the building.

196
197 J. Zall stated that no work was proposed on the building.

198
199 **Public Hearing**

200
201 Joe Garruba; 28 Winchester Drive – asked about the distribution of shared common area
202 and limited common area. The plan appears to be two lots.

203
204 M. Fougere explained that the subject is a single parcel and the plans shows shared
205 common area and limited common area.

206
207 **Public Hearing closed**

208
209 **Motion to grant wavier for plan details –** Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by V.
210 Mills – passed unanimously

211
212 **Motion to approve application –** Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by V. Mills –
213 passed unanimously

214
215 **Motion to grant waiver from the 30 day waiting period to sign plan at applicant’s**
216 **own risk –** Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by V. Mills – passed unanimously

217
218 **d. Revocation** of approved Site Plan PB2020-018 for Hollis House of Pizza. Map 53 Lot 35,
219 22 Ash Street, Owner and Applicant: At Hollis 88 LLC, Zoned A&B.
220 The property owner has requested that the Planning Board revoke the approved Site Plan
221 for a third residential unit to utilize that space for a previously approved commercial use.

222
223 M. Fougere stated that the owner of 22 Ash Street, AtHollis88 LLC is requesting that the
224 Board revoke the approved Site Plan file PB2020-018 pursuant to RSA 676:4-a, I. The
225 approved Site Plan amendment converted units A & B into a single 675 SF, first floor

226 apartment. The property owner intends to return the combined space into two separate
227 units, which were used as storage space and an office for rent before they were combined.
228
229 Alan Wentzell, owner of 22 Ash Street – explained that the cost to convert the space into a
230 third residential unit was prohibitive and would like to return the space to its former
231 condition.

232
233

Public Hearing

234
235

No public comment

236
237

Public Hearing closed

238
239

Motion to approve Revocation – Motioned by J. Peters; seconded by D. Cleveland –
240 passed unanimously

241
242

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

243
244

RSA 91-A:3-II(l) Legal

245
246

*J. Peters moved that the Planning Board enter Non-Public Session in accordance with
RSA 91-A:3-II(l) Legal. Seconded by V. Mills*

247
248

Roll call vote:

249
250

*V. Mills – yes J. Mook – yes R. Hardy – yes B. Ming – yes C. Rogers – yes D. Petry –
yes D. Cleveland – yes B. Moseley – yes J. Peters – yes*

251
252

Motion passed unanimously

253
254

The Planning Board entered Non-Public Session at 8:32 pm.

255
256

Conclusion of Non- Public Session

257
258

*J. Peters moved that the Planning Board come out of Non-Public Session and seal the
minutes in accordance with RSA 91-A:3-II(l) Legal. Seconded by V. Mills.*

259
260

Roll call vote:

261
262

*V. Mills – yes J. Mook – yes R. Hardy – yes B. Ming – yes C. Rogers – yes D. Petry –
yes D. Cleveland – yes B. Moseley – yes J. Peters – yes*

263
264

Motion passed unanimously

265
266

The Planning Board came out of Non-Public Session 8:38 pm. No Decisions were made.

267
268

Motion to approve December 15, 2020 Non-Public meeting minutes and keep sealed –
268 motioned by D. Petry; seconded by V. Mills – J. Peters abstained – passed

269
270

271
272

273
274

7. ADJOURN

