

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

May 4, 2021

Final

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

ABSENT: Ben Ming – Julie Mook voting; Chet Rogers

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:

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 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. Tabled from April 20, 2021.

D. Cleveland recused himself as he is an abutter. R. Hardy voting in this place.

B. Moseley began by noting that the site walk was productive and the applicant staked out the proposed array as requested.

R. Hardy stated that he went out earlier in the day to view the site. He discussed screening the array with some evergreens to the east of the accessory building where some existing evergreens are located.

V. Mills commented that the applicant was open to screening ideas and that she agreed with R. Hardy's recommendations.

J. Mook suggested a few additional plantings along the east property line to provide screening for the abutter to the east.

Kelsey Warren, applicant – stated that he would work with R. Hardy to come up with a screening plan.

48 M. Fougere stated that the Board would have to decide on the requested waiver for a detailed
49 engineered site plan.

50
51 B. Moseley asked if the Board would be comfortable amending the submitted site plan to
52 show the proposed landscaping in lieu of a separate landscape plan.

53
54 The Board did not object.

55
56 **Motion to waive detailed site plan stamped by a licensed surveyor or engineer –**
57 **Motioned by V. Mills, seconded by J. Peters – motion passed unanimously**

58
59 **Motion to approve with conditions of landscape plan and bonding – Motioned by J.**
60 **Mook; seconded by J. Peters – motion passed unanimously**

- 61
62 **b. File PB2021:008 – Proposed site plan amendment to outline actual limits of gravel area on**
63 **plan, previous plan did not represent existing conditions accurately, Map 4 Lot 64, 145**
64 **Runnells Bridge Road, Applicant Contractor Storage Solutions, LLC Owner: Michael**
65 **Coulombe/Contractor Storage Solutions LLC, Zoned R&A. Tabled from April 20, 2021.**
66 **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

67
68 **R. Hardy voting for C. Rogers**

69
70 M. Fougere stated that the purpose of this Site Plan is to amend the existing site plan of a
71 mixed use storage facility to more accurately depict the historical limits of hardscape located
72 on the property. The subject property used to contain a lumber mill operation with a
73 compacted gravel hardscape. A condition of approval for the previous site plan, PB 2018-
74 026, was that the limit of hardscape could not be expanded beyond what was already
75 existing and that the limit of the existing hardscape would be depicted on the final Site Plan.
76 The depiction shown on the approved Site Plan did not reflect the real world conditions of
77 the property. After the Planning Board approval, the property owner resurfaced the area with
78 a recycled blacktop material called rip rap. The new hardscape material was installed over
79 the existing hardscape, which included installing material beyond the limits of the hardscape
80 as shown on the approved Site Plan. The goal of this Site Plan amendment is to more
81 accurately reflect the real world conditions of the property on the Site Plan and bring the
82 property back into conformance.

83
84 M. Fougere noted that the site has had some enforcement issues with the owner and tenants.
85 Staff and the Building Inspector are working to resolve the issues.

86
87 **Motion to accept application – Motioned by D. Cleveland; second by V. Mills – motion**
88 **passed unanimously**

Trevor Yandow, Meridian Land Services – outlined the proposal. He noted that the previous plan was for a change of use that used record data and did not accurately depict the conditions of the site.

Michael Coulombe, owner/applicant – He explained that he installed recycled asphalt to repair the muddy gravel area. They did not remove any trees or expand any impervious surface area. The error was overlooked during the variance process with the ZBA while M. Coulombe was purchasing the property.

B. Moseley asked if Meridian went on the site during the original site plan design.

T. Yandow stated that he was not at Meridian at the time but record survey data was used. Since it was a change of use he was not sure if a site visit was conducted. A full site survey was not conducted.

M. Coulombe noted that the property had been recently surveyed before he purchased the property.

B. Moseley asked if any policy changes had taken place at Meridian to ensure that mistakes like this do not happen again.

T. Yandow stated that there has been internal discussions to make sure errors like this do not occur again.

V. Mills noted that having an accurate site plan is important. She then asked about the proposed plan bringing the site back into conformance.

E. Clements explained that since the old site plan shows the limit of hardscape closer to the building than it is in real life, the site is out of conformance just by operating normally. Once the lines on paper are moved to their correct spot the site will be in conformance with its approvals.

Public Hearing

Jeffrey Kalchbrenner; 48 Emerson Circle – Asked if a permit was required to perform grading work in the Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone.

Joe Garruba; 28 Winchester Drive – Raised questions related to the dimensions shown on the plan around the cemetery.

M. Coulombe stated that he discussed the resurfacing with the Hollis Building Department and the Pepperell Water Department prior to beginning the work and no objections were stated.

E. Clements stated that the Hollis Zoning Ordinance defines compacted gravel that vehicles drive over as impervious surface so the resurfacing work would be characterized as repair to existing impervious surface rather than an expansion of impervious surface.

T. Yandow stated that the dimensions are correct based on referenced plans cited on the site plan.

Motion to approve the amended Site Plan – Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by J. Peters – passed unanimously

6. Other Business –

a. Resident Presentation – Joe Garruba – Housing Appeals Board

J. Garruba briefly explained the legislative history of the Housing Appeals Board. He went on to discuss the difference between decisions made by Superior Court and the Housing Appeals Board. He raised concerns that the Housing Appeals Board may have more power to overturn local Land Use Board decisions. He noted that the Housing Appeals Board takes precedent over Superior Court. Appeals for Housing Appeals Board decision go directly to Supreme Court. He noted that currently the Housing Appeals Board only has 2 out of the required 3 members.

7. ADJOURN

There being no further business, D. Cleveland presented a non-debatable motion to adjourn. Motion seconded by V. Mills and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourns at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Evan J. Clements,

Assistant Planner