

1 **HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

2 **August 17, 2021**

3 **Final**

4
5 PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Moseley-Chairman; Doug Cleveland – Vice
6 Chairman; Virginia Mills, David Petry (Ex-Officio for Selectmen); Benjamin Ming; Kevin Anderson
7 Alternates: Julie Mook, Rick Hardy
8 Absent – Jeff Peters, Chet Rogers
9 Julie Mook voting for Jeff Peters
10 Kevin Anderson voting for Chet Rogers
11

12 STAFF PRESENT: Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Evan Clements, Assistant Planner
13

- 14 1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM. B. Moseley led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.
15
16 2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:
17 a. July 16, 2021: Site Walk NH DOT Engineer re: Toddy Brook Estates
18 **Motion to approve** – D. Cleveland, seconded by D. Petry. B. Ming abstained. Motion passed.
19 b. July 20, 2021: Site Walk
20 **Motion to approve** – D. Petry; seconded by V. Mills. K. Anderson abstained. Motion passed.
21 c. July 20, 2021 Public Meeting
22 **Motion to approve** – D. Petry, seconded by D. Cleveland. Motion passed.
23 d. July 20, 2021 Non-Public Meeting minutes
24 **Motion to approve the Non-Public meeting minutes as submitted/corrected and to keep**
25 **them sealed in accordance with RSA 91 – A:3 II (c) Reputation** – D. Petry. Seconded by J.
26 Mook. K. Anderson abstained. Motion passed.
27
28
29 3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BREIFING
30 a. Agenda Item changes:
31 M. Fougere suggested that case File PB2021:015, Final Review of proposed minor subdivision
32 of property on Dow Road. Believes will be a shorter discussion.
33 **Motion to shift agenda to take on File PB2021:015 before File PB2020:024** – K. Anderson,
34 seconded by D. Petry. Motion passed unanimously.
35 b. Committee reports – none
36 c. Staff reports – none
37 d. Regional impact – none
38
39 4. Signature of Plans: File PB2021-018 11 Monument Square Amended Site Plan. Agricultural use.
40 Determination to hold until after HDC meeting.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 5. CASES:
48

- 49 a. **File PB2021:015 – Final Review:** Proposed minor subdivision of a 20.77 acre property into 4 single
50 family lots. Map 4 Lot 58, Dow Road, Applicant: Brian S. Zagorites, LLC, Owner: Frances Forrester
51 Revocable Trust, Zoned R&A.
52

53 M. Fougere stated this plan has been before the board for a few months. There was a site walk of the
54 property. This is a 20.77 acre property that would be subdivided into 4 lots. Two lots will be
55 serviced by a private way. Wetlands are present in the middle of the site but will not be disturbed.
56 There will be disturbance of buffers for drainage and access. No waivers have been submitted.
57 Town Engineer has reviewed the plan and has signed off on the drainage and the design of the private
58 way. The only outstanding issue Staff sees is the landscaping proposed along the common property
59 lines of the south and the private way. We have an updated report from our landscape expert, Mr.
60 Leedy, recommending some changes to that landscaping. D. Petry reviewed that letter and concurs
61 with those changes. He is suggesting a mix of materials that are more native to the area that won't
62 require any maintenance rather than a hedge that would need some care over the years. I reached out
63 to the engineer and he didn't have a problem with the letter from the landscaper. The applicant has
64 received a state subdivision approval recommending bonding for any landscaping, that the private
65 way be inspected during construction by our inspector. Notes should be added to plan about buffers
66 prior to the CO. Private way maintenance and access documents shall be executed in accordance
67 with the plan. Draft documents were submitted to staff and were acceptable. There will be driveway
68 permits required by DPW.
69

70 **Motion to accept application** by D. Cleveland; seconded by V. Mills. Motion passed unanimously.
71

72 R. Haight, Meridian Land Services, representing Zagorites subdivision of the Frances Forrester
73 Revocable Trust. As M. Fougere stated subdivision approval has been received for two of the lots.
74 Two lots were less than 5 acres and two other lots were larger than 5 acres. A landscape plan has
75 been submitted and has received suggested changes from R. Hardy. D. Cleveland asked M. Fougere if
76 the changes included the staggered trees. M. Fougere replied that it does. R. Haight stated a no-cut
77 area was added along the front of all the lots, with the exception of the driveway access points. This
78 would preserve all the trees that are present and meet the rural character requirements.
79

80 As seen on the Site-walk, the land slopes away from Dow Road to the lower area in the middle of the
81 property where there is a wetland. The front portion of the two frontage lots are within an old
82 hayfield and the rest of the site is wooded. Observed the potential sites of the 3 potential curb cuts
83 that they are in optimum places for site distance. Site distance profile for the driveways are shown.
84

85 V. Mills asked R. Haight if the large trees seen on the site walk where the common drive is proposed
86 will be preserved.
87

88 R. Haight states that the trees in question are not within the buffer, they are within the right-of-way.
89 We will leave the decision with the Review Engineer during the construction process to determine if
90 there is enough site distance observable once everything is built. If not, then one or two of them
91 would come down.
92

93 B. Moseley asked if it was safe to say that without any mitigating circumstances, you have no bias to
94 having them removed.

95
96 R. Haight stated that was correct.

97
98 K. Anderson asked R. Haight to review buildable area for lot 4-58-1. He would like to confirm that it
99 excludes all areas that are required.

100
101 R. Haight stated that a proper building area could be drawn on the lot.

102
103 K. Anderson stated that he believes the lot is compliant but noted that the building area would have to
104 be adjusted.

105
106 D. Cleveland asked question regarding revised landscaping. R. Haight does not expect a problem
107 with revisions.

108
109 K. Anderson requesting comments made by review engineer. M. Fougere provided report to K.
110 Anderson.

111
112 K. Anderson asked about fire truck access, turnaround radius, in shared driveway. M. Fougere stated
113 that suggested revisions to plan have been made.

114
115 *Public Hearing:*

116 Abutters - none

117 Town Residents –

118 Joseph Garruba, 28 Winchester Dr.

119 Mr. Garruba stated he is unsure of the required radius on turn of driveway. Inquiring if the
120 radius is sufficient.

121 Other interested parties -none

122
123 R. Haight responded to Mr. Garruba. Radius was made in accordance with the Town Engineer's
124 guidance.

125
126 Public Hearing closed.

127
128 **Motion to approve application PB2021:015** including the staff recommendations by D. Cleveland.

129
130 K. Anderson to add condition regarding building envelopes. Lot 4-58-1, 160' diameter building area
131 circle is to be adjusted to exclude poorly drained soils.

132
133 M. Fougere proposed to add stipulation relative to preservation of large trees as exiting the private
134 way if sight distance can be maintained.

135
136 **Motion by D. Cleveland to approve application PB2021:015** including all the staff
137 recommendations and the recommendations by M. Fougere and K. Anderson and also the landscaping
138 recommendations which has also been reviewed by D. Petry. All recommendations should be
139 included in the proposals and conditions of approval.

140
141 D. Petry added that bonding should be established for all proposed landscaping and should be
142 held for a three year period. Also, a reminder that this plan will not be signed until all conditions are
143 met. We will need evidence that the changes will be made to the drawings and the bonding should be
144 established. Under these conditions, D. Petry seconds the motion.

145
146 Vote to approve this application with the conditions so stipulated, seconded by D. Petry.
147 Motion passed unanimously.

- 148
149 b. **File PB2021:024 - Design Review:** Proposed site plan/subdivision for the development of a 50 unit
150 Housing for Older Persons development on a 36.09 acre property, Map 41 Lots 25, 28 & 44, 365
151 Silver Lake Road, Applicant: Fieldstone, Owner: Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC, Zoned R&A. Tabled
152 from July 20, 2021.

153
154 V. Mills recused

155
156 B. Moseley stated that this has been tabled because the board has been waiting for the applicant to
157 provide a satisfactory package for the public to comment upon, before a public hearing.

158
159 Nathan Chamberlain, Fieldstone Land Consultants. Stated had previously submitted some plans and
160 it was the board's desire that the plans be advanced to include a couple of waivers for the road design
161 to provide a more sufficient buffer to the abutters. It was also required that the plans be advanced to
162 include more detail. The plans have been sent to the Town Engineer who has issued some comments.

163
164 The plan hasn't changed since last presentation other than additional detail. Have added some
165 condominium sheets (placeholders) breaking out the lots, consolidation plan, grading plans, overall
166 site plan. Have laid in the houses (units). Have added a spur road to reach the allotted density.
167 Added more detail grading sheets. Have targeted some areas for drainage (storm water). The road
168 will be curbed with a mix of closed and open drainage. No additional clearing from existing house.
169 Preliminary location for proposed detention basins are shown.. Has been laid in to existing
170 topography as best as possible. Engineer has commented about adding access to the detention
171 basins. There is access to two of the detention basins. Can add to third basin in next stage.

172
173 Holding the grades as determined by profile. Pointed out the area where the roads were shifted to
174 increase the road's distance from the property line. This would require a waiver for cut and fills and
175 was discussed at a previous meeting.

176
177 Profile has been previously reviewed. Has increased scale of plan from 100 to 50.
178 Discussed detail about driveway sight lines, radius, speed limit on road relative to sight lines. The
179 road is private and speed limit can be reduced which reduces the required site line. Comparing with
180 low-volume road criteria.

181
182 Discussed retaining wall on certain units. Can add safety precautions for sighting.

183
184 D. Petry asked N. Chamberlain if Fieldstone could address the 8 items that the Town Engineer cited:

- 185 1. Agrees
186 2. Agrees

3. Cross sections - Agrees
4. Railings on retaining wall - Agrees
5. Storm water pond outlets shown – Agrees. N. Chamberlain states they are shown, not specified.
6. Roadway stationing on? Agrees
7. Sight distance - E. Clements stated the Subdivision Regulations for driveways emptying out onto a road with a speed limit of 0 to 39 mph, the sight distance is 200', regardless of public or private.
- N. Chamberlain stated adjustments can be made.
8. –no discussion -

M. Fougere - EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW:

This Application was last before the Planning Board on April 20th. The Board requested that a more complete Site Plan be submitted which included proposed grading, drainage, and sight distances of all intersections and driveways.

The revised plan set contains 24 pages and includes a more detailed overall site plan at 1"=50' scale. Detailed grading is shown for both the proposed roadways and house lots. The new site plan contains a road profile for the added 450' spur road with hammerhead. Initial drainage structures have been depicted on the site plan and consist of a mix of underground catch basin systems, culverts, and detention areas. Sight distances for the proposed project's three intersections and 50 units are shown. 200' of sight distance in each direction is required per the Road Standards section of the Hollis Subdivision Regulations.

On July 16, 2021 the Planning Board conducted a site walk with Richard Radwanski, DOT District 5 Engineer to discuss potential traffic impacts the project may generate on Silver Lake Road. Richard Radwanski explained that 400' of sight distance was preferred for the new access to the project but would not stop the project if the 400' could not be achieved. The curb cut would then be located for the best site distance achievable. He also stated that the proposed project was considered a low traffic impact development and the trips generated by the proposal would not affect existing traffic volumes or patterns of Silver Lake Road. An independent traffic count, conducted by NRPC, has been requested by Board members.

Issues:

- The Board should discuss if this submittal is sufficient enough to hold the Public Hearing for the Design Review phase of review at the September 21, 2021 meeting.

- The driveways for units 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 34, 41, 42 do not have the required 200' of sight distance. The sight line profile for unit 26 states 200' of right hand sight distance but the profile shows the slight line travel through the proposed final grade.

- The proposed drainage is lacking in details and calculations. Further review of the proposed drainage will be required.

- The proposed grading for several of the house lots is significant and may affect the use and safety of the lots. Lot lines are not shown on the grading plan. Will septic systems fit on these lots?

- How will snow storage affect the sight distances for driveways and intersections?

- Should small guest parking areas be included in this proposal?

Ongoing issues that will need to be addressed:

- Has the applicant undertaken a site specific soil survey to investigate soil conditions and their

ability to accommodate the proposed septic loading?

- This subject site lies within the Aquifer and therefore maximum lot coverage of 15% shall apply.

- As required by Ordinance, 40% of the total site area shall be set aside as open space, not including wetlands or steep slopes. The open space requirement shall equal over 14 acres.

- At the April 20, 2021 meeting, the Board decided on the following required studies for this proposal: environmental impact, stormwater, visual impact / Rural Character, and Wildlife Habitat Inventory and Assessment.

- A full water well study will be required.

- Permit requirements: NHDES subdivision, Alteration of Terrain, NHDOT, Community water system.

B. Moseley commented, things to focus on before moving into final application:

- Septic systems, sight distances – what the board feels is applicable, guest parking, grading – refer to zoning ordinance regarding rural character, reference section 21-A1G.
- Grading is personally disturbing for people in their older years, steep grade is not very amenable especially for people in older age groups.
- Snow removal.
- Density. Densely populated development. Could be a major point moving forward.
- Water. Major development nearby with 50+ units. Recommend water survey as soon as possible.
- Letter has been received requesting a Archeological study, because of the proximity to the Monson Village as well as proximity of sellers. Will discuss later with Board to see if we want to do an Archeological study.
- Reminder that any waivers that come up are only considered if they are of mutual benefit to you as well as the Town.
- The major emphasis on this evening's meeting is to be certain that we have a good package to present to the public so that we have a very meaningful public hearing associated with the design review. The question for the board, at this time, is if this package is fit enough so that we can have a decent public hearing on Sept. 21.

D. Cleveland commented concerns about sight distances for several lots. Questioning length of cul-de-sac.

K. Anderson stated should review how length is measured. Determine where 1500' mark is. Also consider spur road.

E. Clements stated the maximum length of a cul-de-sac (dead-end road), shall be no greater than 1500 linear feet as measured from the right-of-way of the adjoining road (Silver Lake Road, in this case) to the radius of the cul-de-sac. There is no radius of the cul-de-sac in this situation. This is a loop road. Is of the opinion that this does not meet the definition of a dead end road.

M. Fougere stated does not believe it is 1200' to that intersection.

N. Chamberlain stated the distance is 1250'

D. Petry asked where the cistern will be located. Discussion about location, Fire Chief's review, length of cul-de-sac, dead-end street, measurement. M. Fougere states this is not a dead-end road, it is a loop road. There is a dead-end off of it which should be discussed.

D. Petry stated the spur road was added to include 7 additional lots. B. Moseley stated density concerns reminder. D. Cleveland agrees.

J. Mook stated that the density for Housing for older Persons Ordinance was changed at the 2021 Town Meeting to allow one unit per acre rather than two. At the time, there was support of 85% of voters supporting the decision. Stated she believes there would be great interest of the public to have a good discussion about the density of this project.

B. Moseley stated there was a letter from a resident concerning an archeological study. Discussion to add to list of studies to be required. E. Clements stated there was previous discussion and it was decided the Monson Village was far away from this proposed site.

K. Anderson believes it is reasonable to request it as it will be required for the EPA NOI permit.

D. Petry stated there should be no Public Hearing until there is a full engineered plan.

K. Anderson stated subdivision speed limit should be included on the plan.

B. Moseley stated that primary concerns are:

1. Sight distance
2. Grading and septic systems
3. Snow Storage
4. Open Space
5. Impervious area calculation verification
6. Guest Parking

Determined that a consensus of the Board is to request to see updated plans to include 6 items above before we would be comfortable, after viewing these items, to send this to a Public Hearing.

After documentation is received addressing the above items, the Board will decide if it is appropriate to move ahead to a Public hearing.

N. Chamberlain stated, regarding waivers, the only waiver being requested is the waiver we were directed to adjust the design for, which was to shift the road away from the lot line to provide a buffer to the abutters.

The deadline for submitting revised plans is 9/7 to be provided to Planning Board to be included on the 9/21 agenda.

K. Anderson requesting permission to walk the site. M. Fougere will confirm with applicant that it is permissible.

E. Clements commented need to define what a cul-de-sac is.

D. Petry re-emphasized the rural character ordinance section: 21A.1.1G

327 M. Fougere stated that when Board decides to have a Public Hearing, the abutters will be notified by
328 letter.

329
330 **Motion to table application until 9/21** by J. Mook, seconded by D. Petry.
331 V. Mills recused. Motion passed.

332
333 No further comments by the Board.

334
335 **Motion to adjourn by D. Cleveland**, seconded by K. Anderson.
336 No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

337
338 Adjourned 8:37 pm.

339
340 Respectfully submitted,
341 Cherie Moreno