HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES June 15, 2021 Final

| | ANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Moseley – Chairman; Doug Cleveland – Vice airman, Virginia Mills, and David Petry (Ex-Officio for Selectmen) Alternates: Julie Mook |
|----|--|
| AB | SENT: Jeff Peters, Chet Rogers, Ben Ming, Rick Hardy |
| ST | AFF PRESENT: Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Evan Clements, Assistant Planner |
| 1. | CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM. B. Moseley led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance. |
| 2. | APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES: |
| | a. April 20, 2021: Motion to approve – motioned by D. Petry; seconded by D. Cleveland – V. Mills abstained – motion passed b. May 4, 2021 Meeting: Motion to approve – motioned by V. Mills; seconded by D. |
| | Cleveland – motioned passed unanimously May 4, 2021 Site Walk: Motion to approve – motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by D. Petry – motion 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: a. File PB 2021:006 – Ground Mount Solar, 59 Hideaway Lane b. File PB 2021:008 – Site Plan Amendment, 145 Runnells Bridge Road c. File PB 2021:009 – Lot Line Relocation, 85 Long Hill Road & 54 Wheeler Road d. File PB 2021:012 – Minor Subdivision, Map 17 Lot 34-1, Love Lane & Proctor Hill Road e. File PB 2021:013 – Minor Subdivision, 120 Federal Hill Road i. Motion to approve all for signature – motioned by D. Petry; seconded by D. Cleveland – motion passed |
| 5. | HEARINGS: |
| | a. <u>File PB2021:011</u> – Final Review: Proposed major subdivision of a 55.49 acre property into 12 single family lots, HOSPD layout, Map 32 Lot 45-3, Howe Lane, Applicant/Owner Ducal Development, LLC, Zoned R&A. Application Acceptance on May 18 th , tabled from May 18 th . |
| | M. Fougere explained that this application was tabled at the last meeting to address a few outstanding items such as a note for the cistern and documents related to the open space conservation easement. |

B. Moseley asked about the Fire Department inspection of the old well.

48 49

| 50 51 52 | M. Fougere stated that the Fire Department did inspect the well and determined that as long as it stays in its present, sealed condition that it is does not pose a safety hazard. |
|--|---|
| 53 54 | Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services – noted that since the last meeting the project has received subdivision approval from NHDES. |
| 55 56 57 58 | M. Fougere noted that additional landscaping has been added along the western property line and R. Hardy has reviewed the supplemental landscaping and is comfortable with it. |
| 59 60 61 | Motion to approve – Motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by D. Petry – V. Mills abstained – motion passed |
| 62 63 64 65 66 67 | <u>File PB2020:024</u> – 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 May 18 th . |
| 68 69 70 71 | M. Fougere explained that he talked to the applicant's engineer and they were finalizing new plans with grading, drainage and other details per the Board's request and they would be ready for the July 20, 2021 meeting. They have requested to be tabled to that meeting. |
| 72 73 74 | B. Moseley stated that depending on how robust this new submittal package is that Board will decide when to hold the next Public Hearing. |
| 75 76 77 | Motion to table to July 20, 2021 – Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by J. Mook – passed unanimously |
| 78 79 80 81 82 83 | <u>File PB2021:014</u> – Planning Board Waiver: A Planning Board Waiver request to allow for a second driveway access onto the public right of way, Map 19 Lot 63, 15 Maple Knoll Drive, Applicant/Owner: Bohling Trust 2018, Zoned R&A. Application Acceptance & Public Hearing. |
| 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 | M. Fougere explained that the purpose of this plan is to request a waiver from the Road Standards section of the Hollis Subdivision Regulations to allow for a second curb cut on the property where only one curb cut is permitted. This is allowed under Section IV(H)2(b)1 of the Road Standards section of the Hollis Subdivision Regulations, which states, "A second curb cut is necessary for access to a secondary use or structure, and the physical constraints of the lot, including natural features, unusual lot shape or, or elevation change necessitates the second access." |
| 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 | The property is a one acre corner lot with approximately 150' of frontage on Maple Knoll Drive. The existing curb cut is located on Maple Knoll Drive and the proposed second curb cut will be located on Juniper Lane. Due to the location of the house and existing accessory structures it is not practical to extend the existing driveway. The proposed second curb cut is located approximately 140' from the intersection of Maple Knoll Drive and Juniper Lane. The intent of the applicant is to construct a detached garage to store an RV camper that is currently being stored outside. |

| 100 | | B. Moseley asked if DPW needed to be involved with the actual Driveway Permit and |
|-----|----|--|
| 101 | | construction. |
| 102 | | |
| 103 | | M. Fougere stated that was correct. |
| 104 | | |
| 105 | | Motion to accept application – Motioned by V. Mills; seconded by D. Cleveland – motion |
| 106 | | passed unanimously |
| 107 | | |
| 108 | | Steve Bohling, applicant – explained that he wanted to put a garage along the Juniper Lane |
| 109 | | side of his property and the new driveway and curb cut would be to access this new detached |
| 110 | | garage. |
| 111 | | |
| 112 | | J. Mook asked how big the applicant's property was. |
| 113 | | |
| 114 | | S. Bohling stated that it was 54k SF so about an acre and a half. |
| 115 | | · · |
| 116 | | E. Clements added that the parcel was part of an old Planned Unit Development so that is |
| 117 | | why it has reduced acreage. |
| 118 | | |
| 119 | | V. Mills asked if the garage would be for the applicant's RV camper. |
| 120 | | |
| 121 | | S. Bohling stated that the camper would probably end up in the new driveway. |
| 122 | | |
| 123 | | D. Cleveland stated that he lives in the neighborhood and the request is straight forward. |
| 124 | | |
| 125 | | Public Hearing |
| 126 | | |
| 127 | | No public comment |
| 128 | | T. T |
| 129 | | Public Hearing closed |
| 130 | | |
| 131 | | Motion to approve with condition that a Driveway Permit be issued by DPW prior to |
| 132 | | construction – Motioned by J. Mook; seconded by D. Petry – passed unanimously |
| 133 | | The second secon |
| 134 | | |
| 135 | d. | File PB2021:015 – Design Review: Proposed minor subdivision of a 20.77 acre property |
| 136 | | into 4 single family lots, Map 4 Lot 58, Dow Road, Applicant: Brian S. Zagorites, LLC, |
| 137 | | Owner: Frances Forrester Revocable Trust, Zoned R&A. Public Hearing. |
| 138 | | |
| 139 | | M. Fougere stated that the purpose of this plan is to outline a subdivision of a 20.7 acre lot |
| 140 | | into four lots, with two lots served by a private way. The two frontage lots will be 5 and 4.3 |
| 141 | | acres each, with the back lots consisting of a 7.2 acre and a 4.14 acre lot. Wetland areas are |
| 142 | | present within the middle of the site but will not be disturbed; wetland buffer areas will be |
| 143 | | disturbed for access and drainage. No waivers have been submitted. The plans have been |
| 144 | | submitted to the Town Engineer for review. Topics to discuss include how the project will |
| 145 | | adhere to the Rural Character Ordinance, should a no-cut buffer be proposed along Dow |
| 146 | | Road and will the Board want to hold a Site Walk. He also noted that wetland buffer signs |
| 147 | | will be required as well as NHDES subdivision approval. No waiver requests have been |
| 148 | | submitted. |

| 150 151 | Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services – explained that the two back lots will be served by a private common drive and noted that he has received Town Engineer comments and would |
|------------|--|
| 152 | be happy to address them. He noted that the sight distances were very good and that they |
| 153 | would be happy to leave the vegetation along the stone wall and field on Dow Road. |
| 154 | would be happy to leave the vegetation along the stone wan and neid on Dow Road. |
| 155 | V. Mills asked if Dow Road was a scenic road. |
| | v. Milis askeu ii Dow Road was a scellic load. |
| 156 | E. Clamenta stated that Day Bood is not a social mod |
| 157 | E. Clements stated that Dow Road is not a scenic road. |
| 158 | D. Manalan and a 1004 a Daniel amount of the analysis and the same |
| 159 | B. Moseley asked if the Board wanted to conduct a site walk. |
| 160 | |
| 161 | D. Cleveland stated that a site walk is always helpful for the Board to better visualize the |
| 162 | proposal. |
| 163 | |
| 164 | E. Clements asked about the property line at the northwest corner of lot 4-58 since all the |
| 165 | other proposed lot lines and clean but this one is very erratic. |
| 166 | |
| 167 | R. Haight noted that the property line is actually the center of the stream that runs through |
| 168 | the neighborhood. |
| 169 | |
| 170 | D. Petry asked about the rear property line of lot 4-58-2 and why it was broken up like that. |
| 171 | |
| 172 | R Haight stated that was because the existing stone wall itself has gaps in it. |
| 173 | |
| 174 | Public Hearing |
| 175 | |
| 176 | <u>James Harrington</u> ; 196 <u>Dow Road</u> – asked about what the common drive would look like |
| 177 | and if it would be paved and have a buffer on each side of it. |
| 178 | |
| 179 | M. Fougere stated that it is proposed to be a 20' wide gravel drive and noted that the center |
| 180 | line will be staked at the site walk. He added that there is some existing vegetation but there |
| 181 | will be drainage structures along each side of the private common drive. |
| 182 | |
| 183 | <u>Lucas Tieman</u> ; 183 <u>Dow Road</u> – asked about the wetland impact that is proposed with the |
| 184 | development. He also raised concerns to the impact of the rural nature of Hollis and |
| 185 | particularly Dow Road. He noted that his is a ten acre parcel that this proposal is creating |
| 186 | four new lots right across the street from him. He noted that he had to crack his well last year |
| 187 | and what would the impact of water supply be with this development. He also stated a |
| 188 | concern with development of parcels under five acres as he believed that is a restriction for |
| 189 | most residences. |
| 190 | |
| 191 | Cynthia Harrington; 196 Dow Road – stated concerns about her well since it is |
| 192 | approximately 30' from the property line in her front yard. Asked about required setbacks |
| 193 | from wellheads for hardscapes or septic systems. |
| 194 | |
| 195 | M. Fougere stated the setback from the wellhead to a septic system is 75' and her wellhead |
| 196 | is shown on the plan so that should be easily achievable. |
| 197 | 2 2 2 3 3 4 F 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 |
| 198 | R. Haight stated that in regards to Rural Character the existing vegetation along Dow Road |
| 199 | will be kept and the Board can see at the site walk if additional plantings will be needed. He |
| | The second secon |

| 200 201 | noted that the site slopes away from the road so the new lots will be lower than the road itself. He noted that zoning allows for two acre and four acre lots. |
|------------|--|
| 202 | |
| 203 | D. Petry noted that the seven acre back lot could be split to give a front lot more area. |
| 204 | |
| 205 | R. Haight stated that the intent of the seven acre lot was the capture all of the wetland in that |
| 206 | area into one lot. |
| 207 | |
| 208 | B. Mosley asked about wells and water supply. |
| 209 | The state of the s |
| 210 | R. Haight stated that it was impossible to give a definitive answer since the geology of the |
| 211 | area is complex. He noted that there have been lots with subdivisions where the abutter had |
| 212 | three wells. The first one was not producing enough so they drilled 20' away and it was dry. |
| 213 | They drilled a third well 50' from the second and ended up with 40 gallons per minute of |
| 214 | yield. It is challenging to predict. |
| 215 | yield. It is endirenging to product. |
| 216 | D. Petry asked about the elevation at Dow Road and noted that it appears to slope away from |
| 217 | the road. |
| 218 | me roug. |
| 219 | E. Clements noted that the common drive has an 8% grade change away from Down Road. |
| 220 | L. Cienients noted that the common drive has an 6/0 grade change away from Down Road. |
| 221 | Public Hearing closed |
| 222 | Tubile Hearing closed |
| 223 | J. Mook asked about test pits and if there is any additional water supply testing that can be |
| 224 | done. |
| 225 | done. |
| 226 | R. Haight stated that test pits are dug for septic system viability and they only dig between 5' |
| 227 | and 10' |
| 228 | and to |
| 229 | E. Clements explained that community wells are required to conduct draw down tests to see |
| 230 | |
| 231 | how they impact sounding wells. Private individual wells do not have that same requirement. |
| 232 | B. Moseley asked how far a septic system can be from a test pit. |
| 233 | B. Moseley asked now far a septic system can be from a test pit. |
| 234 | D. Unight stated that the centic system has to be ever the test mit |
| | R. Haight stated that the septic system has to be over the test pit. |
| 235 | E. Clamenta calcad if there was 100's of concretion between the test mits on let 4.50 1 and the |
| 236 | E. Clements asked if there was 100' of separation between the test pits on lot 4-58-1 and the |
| 237 | Harrington wellhead at 196 Dow Road. |
| 238 | D. Hainht stated that there was a manarismetals, 150? heteroom the Hamington wellhood and the |
| 239 | R. Haight stated that there was approximately 150' between the Harrington wellhead and the |
| 240 | test pits on lot 4-58-1. |
| 241 | |
| 242 | D. Cleveland asked that the proposed gravel drive could be paved in the future and would |
| 243 | that change the drainage calculations. |
| 244 | |
| 245 | R. Haight stated that the drainage calculations were very similar for a compacted gravel and |
| 246 | a paved driveway so the proposed drainage system takes that into account. He noted that |
| 247 | they are required to treat the run off before releasing it the same way it would have traveled. |
| 248 | They cannot redirect the flow of water somewhere else as that would impact the wetland. |
| 249 | |
| 250 | J. Mook asked about the standing water on the lots and if that is the wetland. |

| 251252253254255 | R. Haight stated that he did not know since he has not been on the site. He noted that when he was surveying the property behind the subject property there was some standing water further in but not on the subject property.V. Mills asked if the Conservation Commission is involved due to the buffer disturbance. |
|---|--|
| 256 257 258 259 | R. Haight stated that the Conservation Commission has received a plan set and is aware of the proposal. |
| 260 261 262 | Site walk scheduled for 5:00 pm on July 20, 2021 Motion to table to the July 20, 2021 meeting – Motioned by D. Petry; seconded by D. |
| 263 264 265 | Cleveland – passed unanimously |
| 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 | 6. OTHER BUSINESS: a. Board Discussion – Facilities Chapter, Master Plan Update i. Discussion tabled due to absent Board members 7. ADJOURN |
| 276 277 | There being no further business, D. Petry presented a non-debatable motion to adjourn. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourns at 8:05 PM. |
| 278 | Respectfully submitted, |
| 279 | Evan J. Clements, |
| 280 | Assistant Planner |