

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 16, 2021
Final

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

ABSENT: None

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

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING

- a. Agenda Additions and Deletions:
- b. Committee Reports – none
- c. Staff Report – none
- d. Regional Impact – none

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

5. HEARINGS

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

V. Mills recused herself – J. Mook voting instead

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

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 C. Branon noted that this current proposal is to prove that a road plan can be made that
 96 requires no waivers. He would be willing to alter the road plan if the Board was supportive
 97 of waivers that resulted in a public benefit.
 98
 99 M. Fougere recommended that for the March meeting the applicant show a road plan that
 100 takes into account a 35' buffer away from the property line.
 101
 102 C. Branon noted that they had taken away plan details such as house locations for ease of
 103 understanding the road plan. They intend to bring those details back in for the next
 104 submittal.
 105
 106 J. Peters stated that the Board could be receptive to waiver requests moving forward based
 107 on plan changes made by the Board.
 108
 109 M. Fougere asked about possible drainage details on the next submittal.
 110
 111 C. Branon stated that drainage was a concern, especially considering the project's
 112 proximity to Witches Spring Brook. They are hoping to disperse detention around the site
 113 so that there are not large ponds at the bottom of the hill by the brook. They are proposing
 114 a closed drainage system for greater control of the runoff.
 115
 116 J. Peters asked if soils were like the Cobbett Lane project.
 117
 118 C. Branon stated that the soils are actually better than Cobbett Lane in terms of septic and
 119 infiltration.
 120
 121 **Motion to continue to the March 16, 2021** – motioned by J. Peters; seconded by C.
 122 Rogers – passed unanimously
 123
 124 **b. File PB2021:001** – Proposed site plan to replace existing 8 x 10 shed with a new 12 x 20
 125 shed located on the athletic field adjoining the Library, Map 52 Lot 50, 1 Monument
 126 Square, Owner: Town of Hollis Applicant Friends of the Hollis Social Library, Zoned TC
 127 Town Center.
 128
 129 M. Fougere stated that this proposed Site Plan is for the demolition of an existing 8' x 10'
 130 storage shed used by the Hollis Social Library and replaced with a new construction, 12' x
 131 20' storage shed in the same location. The storage shed is located in the north east corner
 132 of Little Nichols Athletic Field, near the outdoor playground area. The shed is used by the
 133 Library to store a large volume of books throughout the year and is in need of a larger shed
 134 for more storage space.
 135
 136 The existing shed is located approximately 3.5' from the rear property line and 12.5' from
 137 the eastern side property line. The new shed will maintain the above mentioned setbacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Hearing

No public comment

Public Hearing closed

Motion to approve application – Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by V. Mils – passed unanimously

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

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

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

Motion to determine that this project does not constitute a Reginal Impact –

Motioned by V. Mills; seconded by D. Cleveland – passed unanimously

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

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

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

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

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

Public Hearing

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

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

Public Hearing closed

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

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

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

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

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

apartment. The property owner intends to return the combined space into two separate units, which were used as storage space and an office for rent before they were combined.

Alan Wentzell, owner of 22 Ash Street – explained that the cost to convert the space into a third residential unit was prohibitive and would like to return the space to its former condition.

Public Hearing

No public comment

Public Hearing closed

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

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

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

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

Roll call vote:

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

Motion passed unanimously

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

Conclusion of Non- Public Session

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.

Roll call vote:

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

Motion passed unanimously

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

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

7. ADJOURN

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

276 Motion seconded by J. Peters and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourns at 8:40 PM.

277 Respectfully submitted,

278 Evan J. Clements,

279 Assistant Planner