

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 20, 2021

Final

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

ABSENT: Jeff Peters – Julie Mook voting, Virginia Mills – 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. March 16, 2021 Meeting – **Motion to approve** – motioned by D. Petry; seconded by D. Cleveland – passed unanimously

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: None

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. Tabled from March 16th.

D. Cleveland discussed his observations at the site walk. He noted how steep the new roadway appeared. He also noted that the sight lines along Silver Lake Road would be a challenge due to the speed of travel along Silver Lake Road and the “S” curve of the road.

J. Mook stated that she also observed the traffic on Silver Lake Road and agreed with D. Cleveland’s assessment.

M. Fougere explained that due to concern with the connection with Silver Lake Road he contacted District 5 of the NHDOT and talked with the lead engineer there about the project. NHDOT agreed to do a site walk with staff at some point.

R. Hardy talked about the proposed closed drainage system and how the drainage will be dealt with in proximity to Witches Stream Brook and Silver Lake Road.

48 D. Petry stated that the Board should not be reviewing the plan until an entire site plan is
49 presented. He stated that he did not want to review this proposal through incremental
50 disclosure. He would not support leaving Design Review until an entire site plan is
51 proposed. He stated that the scheduled Public Hearing is premature since a full site plan is
52 not submitted.

53 The Board agreed that the entire site plan be presented before the Public Hearing is held.

54 C. Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants – stated that he needed direction from the Board on
55 what they want to see with a road layout before they design the entire site.

56 D. Cleveland discussed the two proposed roadway layouts. He noted that the 35ft setback
57 waiver road profile is farther away from the stream then the non-waiver road.

58 C. Clements asked if it was possible to make a roadway profile that maximizes the distance
59 from the road and the stream.

60 C. Branon stated that it would be possible but there are many things to consider when
61 designing the roadway such as local regulations and previous comments from the Board. He
62 would be willing to put a roadway profile that maximizes the distance to the stream but will
63 require waivers.

64 D. Petry asked if the applicant is anticipating any additional waivers for this proposal.

65 C. Branon stated that he believes that the proposal will not require any additional waivers.

66 M. Fougere noted that DES and DOT will have input relating to the location of the curb cut
67 and the roadway's proximity to the stream.

68 C. Branon noted that the soils are very well drained and they anticipate being able to
69 infiltrate the runoff on site.

70 The Board took a straw poll to see if the members were in favor of a non-waiver or waiver
71 road profile. A majority of the Board indicated that they would be in support of selective
72 waivers for the road profile.

73 The Board discussed potential studies that will be required for this proposal. The following
74 were decided upon:

- 75 ▪ Environmental Impact
- 76 ▪ Wildlife Habitat
- 77 ▪ Stormwater
- 78 ▪ Visual Impact / Rural Character
- 79

80 D. Petry asked for the Highway Safety Committee and NRPC to do an independent traffic
81 count of the area.

82 B. Moseley asked about the water source and well testing.

C. Branon stated that the well permitting for a community well does take a lot of time. He discussed the process of the well study such as a draw down test and monitor nearby wells so see if they are affected.

Motion to table to May 18, 2021 – Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by C. Rogers – passed unanimously

- b. **File PB2021:004 – Design Review:** Proposed three lot subdivision creating properties ranging in size from 4 – 5.3 acres accessed via privates ways (one Love Lane and two Proctor Hill Road), Owner: Fimbal Trust, Applicant: Federal Hill Properties, LLC, Map 17 Lot 34-1, Love Lane & Proctor Hill Road (NH Route 130), Zoned R&A, Town Center, A&B and Historic District. Tabled from March 16th.

The Board began by discussing the site walk.

B. Moseley talked about allowing overhead utilities to pass across the underground water line before undergrounding the utilities to the new lots.

Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services – discussed utilities and the water line and the benefit of overhead utilities to pass across the underground water line before undergrounding the utilities. He noted that he talked with the Conservation Commission about replacing an existing culvert and adding another one as is required. He noted the stone wall on lot 3 and the proposed no cut easement between the rock wall and Proctor Hill Road.

M. Fougere noted that an abutter asked that the driveway for lot 1 be designed so that headlights do not shine into the abutter's home.

Motion to move proposal to Final Review – Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by C. Rogers – passed unanimously

- c. **File PB2021:005 – Design Review:** Proposed major subdivision of a 55.49 acre property into 14 single family lots, conventional & HOSPD layout, Map 32 Lot 45-3, Howe Lane, Applicant/Owner Ducal Development, LLC, Zoned R&A. Tabled from March 16th.

Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services – explained that they went to the Conservation Commission and discussed the meeting. They were able to reduce the area of disturbance for the driveway to lot 14. This includes two separate crossing with culverts. He noted that over 50% of the site will be preserved as either no-cut or open space.

B. Moseley asked about the 12 acre back lot (lot 14) and if the intent was to keep 10 acres of it in current use.

125 R. Haight stated that was the intent of the design of that lot but it would be up to the owner
126 if they wanted to do that. He stated that they would add a note on the plan stating that lot 14
127 could not be further subdivided.
128
129 D. Petry asked about the elevations on lot 18 and their relation to lot 7 in regards to sight
130 lines of the new intersection.
131
132 R. Haight stated that the highest elevation on lot 18 is 320 feet and the low point of lot 7 is
133 262. He stated that they had the required sight distance.
134
135 R. Haight responded to the letter from Con. Comm. talked about the difference between
136 using a culvert versus a bridge crossing for the driveway to lot 14. If it were a common
137 drive it might make sense but for a private drive it is unnecessary. He noted that the cuts
138 and fill would just about even each other out so no additional fill would be needed.
139
140 M. Fougere asked about steepening the head walls to reduce the area of impact.
141
142 R. Haight stated that they could steepen the head walls but that would be less friendly to the
143 wildlife.
144
145 Mike Vignale, Town Engineer – stated that he had a concern relating to a swale and
146 detention basin that is not connected to the roadway drainage and as such should not be part
147 of the Town drainage easement and responsibility.
148
149 B. Moseley asked to clarify that the proposed swale at the back of lots 7-12 where it is the
150 property owner's responsibility to maintain the swale but the Town has the authority to
151 enforce the maintenance of the swale if need be.
152
153 M. Fougere asked why that swale was there.
154
155 R. Haight stated that the swale was needed to catch post-development runoff.
156
157 M. Fougere stated that the swale will impact the visual buffer and suggested some form of
158 individual drainage for each lot at the time of lot development.
159
160 E. Clements noted that policing the condition of the swale by the Town would be
161 challenging.
162
163 D. Petry stated that the swale defeats the purpose of the no cut buffer.
164
165 M. Vignale stated that individual drainage would be an easier solution that reduces the
166 responsibilities of the Town.
167
168 B. Moseley asked about the visual impact of the development from Ranger Road.

R. Haight stated that there may be some visibility of roofs in the winter but it is 2000' away. There will be a 35' no cut buffer as well.

Motion to move to Final Review – motioned by J. Mook; seconded by D. Cleveland – passed unanimously

- d. **File PB2021:007 – Conceptual:** Proposed amendment to the approved Federal Hills Estates HOSPD (Keyes Road) subdivision, by attaching a minor subdivision of an adjoining 16.17 acre property into three lots through the extension of Lorenzo Lane, Owner: C.W. Rev. Lvg. Trust – Applicant: Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC, Map 29 Lot 4, Zoned R&A. **Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere stated that the purpose of this plan is to amend the approved Federal Hills Estates HOSPD plan with an extension of Lorenzo's Lane. The road would be extended 380 feet in order to access an adjoining 16.1 acre land locked parcel and undertake a minor subdivision proposal of three lots. Lots will range in size from 5 - 5.22 acres, one of lots is a backlot. The road extension will encumber 7,195 square feet of HOSPD open space, which will be replaced with an area of 28,395 square feet of open space. Adjoining house lot 1-17 will decrease in size by 4,160 square feet with the lengthening of the road. Staff did discuss this proposal with the Town's attorney who believed the proposal is an allowed amendment.

M. Fougere went on to state that this was a conceptual plan that was missing details such as grading and a road profile for the road extension and driveway profiles to the lots. Building boxes need to be shown and calculations showing the old and new total amount of open space. Any potential waivers should also be identified. Test pits and ledge removal are also a concern on this site.

Chad Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants – described the property as currently land locked and located north of Federal Hill Estates. The intent is to extend Lorenzo Lane approximately 300' with a new hammerhead turn around. The proposal includes taking some open space and using it for the road extension but also induces adding 4x new open space. The three lots will all be over 5 acres in size. Test pits have not been performed yet. He noted that the applicant intends to conduct a significant amount of test pits along the new common drive to identify areas of ledge formation in hopes of reducing the amount of material that will need to be removed.

B. Moseley asked about ledge removal.

C. Branon stated that based on a preliminary assessment, the topography is more likely to require fills instead of cuts.

B. Moseley asked if the proposed lots would not be able to be further subdivided.

C. Branon stated that they were agreeable to putting that condition on the subdivision plan that the lots could not be further subdivided.

Public Hearing

Christi ? ;70 Federal Hill Road – Stated that she walks the area at least once a day and is worried about losing the trails that run though this area and into the Town Forest. Asked if the proposal could be scaled back and made into a park for Keyes Hill residents.

Bob Sengstaken; 98 Federal Hill Road – Stated that he also walks the land and noted that the trail along the power lines is the only access from Keyes Hill Road to the trail system.

Josh Robi; 61 Deacon Lane – Raised concerns related to construction noise. Stated that the entire neighborhood has been disturbed before 7 am by construction noise for the past year. Asked the Board to limit construction times to normal business hours of 9am-5pm.

Alan Bouleigh; 121 Rocky Pond Road – Suggested that Lorenzo Lane be extended and looped back around to connect back to Keyes Hill Road for safety reasons.

Joe Garruba; 28 Winchester Drive – Stated that he felt this was not ready to move this proposal to Design Review. Stated that he did not believe that the existing HOSPD had extra open space to spare to extend the road. Asked about protections regarding required open space. Stated that he did not think roads were allowed in open space developments. Asked who the owner of the open space is.

Teresa Sengstaken; 98 Federal Hill Road – Asked why this property was not included in the original subdivision on Keyes Hill Road. Asked about an updated Traffic Study for the new lots.

C. Branon stated that the current Keyes Hill development has 69 acres of open space where only 48 acres are required. He noted that HOSPD rules apply to subdivisions over five lots and they are only proposing 2 lots. He noted that the legal parameters of the proposal have been reviewed by Town Consul and he believes that it can move forward. He stated that the applicant did not own the subject property at the time of the initial development. The topic of water quality and traffic are not typically addressed at conceptual review.

Public Hearing closed

B. Moseley stated that a site walk would be appropriate at a later stage of review.

R. Hardy asked if the Town was obligated to allow for a subdivision to be expanded if the original roads are not yet complete.

B. Moseley asked on the status of Keyes Hill Road construction.

C. Branon stated that the road is currently under construction. Typically subdivision review can continue but the Board would put conditions on the new approval such as no Certificates of Occupancy on the new lots could be issued until the road is done. He stated that the intent is to place base material in 3 weeks and paving soon after.

J. Mook asked if steps could be taken to preserve the existing trail along the power line easement.

C. Branon stated that the applicant would be willing to work the Town and residents to preserve the existing trails.

Motion to move proposal to Design Review – Motioned by B. Moseley; seconded by R. Hardy – D. Petry abstained – motioned passed

- e. **File PB2021:006** – Proposed site plan for a ground mounted 1,330 square foot solar array (14 feet x 95 feet), Owner: Warren Amy E2014 Rev Trust – Applicant: ReVision Energy, 59 Hideaway Lane, Map 14 Lot 19-54, Zoned R&A. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere stated that this proposed site plan is seeking approval for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for the installation of a ground mount solar array. The proposed array is 9.5' long and 14' wide with a total area of 1,330 SF. The proposed system is located in the northeast corner of the property, partially behind an accessory structure and approximately 300' from the road. There are some trees located between the road and the proposed array. The system is located within the 100' wetland buffer. The subject parcel is an existing lot of record that pre dates the Wetland Protection Ordinance. He noted that there is a natural berm along the frontage of the property that provides screening for the majority of the property. There are differing spec sheets with different heights of the array proposed that needs to be clarified. A waiver from a detailed engineered site plan is requested.

Motion to accept application - Motioned by J. Mook; seconded by D. Petry – D. Cleveland abstained – motion passed

Chris Kelly, Revision Energy – Discussed the berm and noted that it does level off at the southeast corner of the property. The proposed array is approximately 290' from the road. He noted that the intended height is 9.16' and was achieved by changing the angle of the array from 35 degrees to 30 degrees.

Kelsey Warren, applicant – noted that if the Board wanted additional screening he would be open to ideas from the Board.

D. Petry stated that a site walk with an array mock up would be appropriate.

B. Ming asked about neighbors being able to see the array from their property.

K. Warrant stated that there is a ring of trees that block view from outside the yard.

E. Clements noted that he did a quick site visit of the property and noted that it takes effort to see down the property along the road to where the array will be.

R. Hardy stated that he was familiar with the property it would be easy to achieve the screening required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Public Hearing

Pam Hicks; 8 Maple Knoll Drive – Stated that her property sits higher than the subject property and she does not want to see the array from her property.

Joe Garruba; 28 Winchester Drive – Asked about the location of the proposed array in relation to the shown wetland buffer.

E. Clements explained that the Wetland Conservation Overlay Zone does not apply to parcels that were subdivided prior to the adoption of the wetland ordinance. The shown wetland buffer is informational only.

M. Fougere added that the actual footprint of the array is minor and the existing conditions are a mown lawn so any impact to the wetland is minimal.

Public Hearing closed

The Board set the date for the site walk on May 4th.

Motion to table to May 4th Meeting – Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by C. Rogers – D. Cleveland abstains – motion passed

- f. **File PB2021:008** – Proposed site plan amendment to outline actual limits of gravel area on plan, previous plan did not represent existing conditions accurately, Map 4 Lot 64, 145 Runnells Bridge Road, Applicant Contractor Storage Solutions, LLC Owner: Michael Coulombe/Contractor Storage Solutions LLC, Zoned R&A. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

Motion to table to May 4th Meeting – Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by R. Hardy – passed unanimously

345 **6. Other Business –**

346

347

348

349

350

351

352 **7. ADJOURN**

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

354 Motion seconded by C. Rogers and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourns at 10:35 PM.

355 Respectfully submitted,

356 Evan J. Clements,

357 Assistant Planner