

**HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD**  
**November 16, 2021 – 7:00 PM Meeting**  
**Final**

**MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING BOARD PRESENT:** Bill Moseley Chair; Doug Cleveland V. Chair; Chet Rogers, Julie Mook, Benjamin Ming, Virginia Mills, David Petry, Ex-Officio for the Selectmen; Alternate Members: Richard Hardy, and Kevin Anderson.

**ABSENT:** Jeff Peters

**STAFF 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 – October 19, 2021** **Motioned by C. Rogers; seconded by D. Cleveland – passed unanimously**

**3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING**

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

**4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS:**

**5. Cases:**

**a. File PB2021:021** – Proposed site plan for a ground mounted solar system with the installation of two 41 foot by 14 foot solar arrays on a 19.1 acre residential lot, 91 North Pepperell Road, Applicant: Revision Energy, Owner Laura Gargas 2005 Rev Trust, Map 7 Lot 48. Zoned R&A. Tabled from October 19th.

E. Clements explained that there was a site walk and the site is in a wetland. The applicant's representative was tasked with talking to the DES. The applicant will go to the Conservation Commission and they are scheduled for the December agenda. He did have a conversation with the revision rep. The Rep has talked to DES and DES basically told her that as long as the impact wasn't in a prime wetland, she would not need a permit. For this level of impact, it would be considered a minimum impact, both at the state level and our local ordinance,

47 which is less than 3000 square feet of impact. Nobody from this application is  
48 present at this meeting. The representative from revision had some engineering  
49 concerns regarding installing the array within a wetland. He is unsure if they've  
50 decided that they're comfortable with the proposed location or if they need to  
51 change the proposed location. It is his belief that they were aware that this  
52 meeting was taking place, and they would need to be a part of it. He suggests  
53 the case be tabled and be moved to next month's meeting.

54 Confirmation was made that there was no one in the audience representing this  
55 case. **Motion made to table until the next regular meeting, December 21,**  
56 **2021, by D. Petry; seconded by D. Cleveland. Motion passed unanimously.**  
57

58 **b. File PB2021:022 – Design Review:** Proposed amendment to the approved  
59 Federal Hills Estates HOSPD (Keyes Road) subdivision, by attaching a minor  
60 subdivision of an adjoining 18.7 acre property into three lots (Lots sizes ranging  
61 from 5 – 7.8 acres) through the extension of Lorenzo Lane, in addition a lot line  
62 relocation will occur with an adjoining property, Owner: C.W. Rev. Lvg. Trust &  
63 Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC – Applicant: Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC, Map 29 Lot  
64 1, 1-17,2 & 4, Zoned Rural and R&A. Tabled from October 19th. Public Hearing.  
65

#### 66 **V. Mills & D. Petry recused**

67

68 M. Fougere stated that the purpose of this plan is to amend the approved Federal  
69 Hills Estates HOSPD plan with an extension of Lorenzo's Lane. The road would  
70 be extended 380 feet in order to access an adjoining 16.1 acre land locked  
71 parcel. In addition, a lot-line relocation is proposed which will add 3.52 acres to  
72 the project. Three non-HOSPD standard lots will be created ranging in size from  
73 5 – 7.8 acres; two of the lots will be backlots. The road extension will encumber  
74 7,195 square feet of HOSPD open space, which will be replaced with an area of  
75 28,395 square feet of new open space (+21,208 square feet). The existing  
76 house Lot 1-17 will decrease in size by 4,160 square feet with the lengthening of  
77 the road. All proposed driveways reach the Building Box without the need for  
78 waiver of the cut/fill regulation. A small wetland impact (600 square feet +/-) is  
79 planned on Lot 4-2 relative to a proposed driveway. The proposed road  
80 extension is mostly fill which should reduce the probability of ledge removal.  
81

82 Chad Brandon,  
83 Civil Engineer  
84 Fieldstone Land Cosultants  
85 Representing Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC  
86

87 C. Brandon brought a plan map for reference and explained that much work has  
88 been done since last meeting. He plans to address the concerns and questions  
89 that were raised at that time. They propose to amend the approved Federal hill  
90 Estates HOSPD development plan with the extension of Lorenz Lane. Lorenzo  
91 Lane would be extending approximately 380 feet in order to access the adjoining  
92 parcel, which is 29-4 for 16.1 acre property. The extension of Lorenzo Lane will

93 decrease lot 291-17 by approximately .096 acres. That lot will still be conforming.  
94 The extension of Lorenzo Lane will essentially go through parcel 29-171. The  
95 extension of the road will also encumber the existing open space land which is  
96 part of the HOSPD development. That land will consist of about 7,195 square  
97 feet. This open space area is proposed to be replaced by parcel A. Parcel A is a  
98 28,394 square foot piece of property. It is about four times the size  
99 of the piece that they are looking to impact. This will result in an overall increase  
100 to the open space land and will maintain compliance with all the mathematical  
101 calculations. The new total area for the HOSPD development would be 116.32  
102 acres of land. 40% of that land area has to be maintained in open space, and  
103 that area has to be exclusive of wetlands and steep slopes. That requirement  
104 would be 46.529 acres. The gross open space area provided would be 69.434  
105 acres. When the steep slopes and the wetlands are subtracted, the total area  
106 would be 48.558 which exceeds the 40% by about 2.03 acres. This application  
107 also includes a lot line adjustment between parcels 29-4 and 29-2, this would  
108 consist of a 3.52 acre increase to the project area. C. Brandon continued that  
109 essentially there would be an increase to lot 29-4 for this will yield 29-2, which is  
110 the back lot property which M. Fougere referred to which has frontage along  
111 Federal Hill Rd. It would yield a 4.914 acre compliant back lot which he believes  
112 would still meet all the town regulations including lot size, frontage, building  
113 blocks, and contiguous acceptable land area. He stated that he would be happy  
114 to produce additional information regarding that. The remaining parcel, which is  
115 29-4 would consist of 18.797 acres. He is now proposing to subdivide that into  
116 three non-HOSPD standard conventional lots. Those lots would consist of 5.973  
117 acres in size. 29-4-2, would be a 7.850 acre property. 29-4-1 would be 5.007  
118 acre property. The proposed lots do meet all the local regulations for frontage,  
119 acreage, contiguous area, as well as depicting building box areas on each of the  
120 lots. The roadway extension and driveways will not need waivers for this  
121 proposal. All of those designs have been done at this stage and they are  
122 compliant with the four foot cut and fill requirements. The driveways also access  
123 all of the building blocks areas without the need for any waivers, which is also a  
124 requirement. The topography for this subdivision is very favorable and we are  
125 meeting all of those requirements with no need for any waivers. The access to  
126 the property is generally in a fill condition. The roadway is in a fill for its majority  
127 of the extension, the driveways accessing each of the three lots is in a fill. He  
128 does not anticipate extensive interference with ledge with this project. They tried  
129 to do an extensive amount of research and soil observations on this subdivision  
130 to verify with some confidence that they can avoid ledge, but they did not dig  
131 everywhere. The soil observations that they have done have been very  
132 favorable. They show seven test pits on their plans. Those test pits all indicate  
133 that they did not encounter ledge at all to depths of about 90 inches. In total, they  
134 performed 24 test pits for ledge.  
135 He stated that they are in receipt of the staff memo and engineering review letter  
136 for this project. They do not have any issues with any of the comments or  
137 concerns. Many of the comments are related to design specific items, which he  
138 hopes he can address the final stage. He understands that the board would like

139 to do a site walk and would like to schedule that. Is asking to be moved to the  
140 final phase.

141  
142 Discussion:

143 D. Cleveland asked

144 1. if the original hammerhead on the end of Lorenzo Lane will be eliminated.

145 C. Brandon stated that they would not construct, it would be removed.

146 2. would driveways for lots 29-4-2 and lot 29-4-1 share a driveway.

147 C. Brandon stated the driveway for 29-4-1 comes off of Lorenzo Lane at  
148 about station 1000.

149 3. Will the existing trails be connected?

150 C. Brandon stated the trails would be connected and it will show on a future  
151 plan.

152  
153 J. Mook asked

154 1. If there is open space to make the connection (of the trails), or if it will be  
155 through private property.

156 C. Brandon stated that part of the original approval of that subdivision was  
157 to maintain the trails through that area. He will show the connection and  
158 possibly a small easement on the corner of parcel 29-4 to maintain the  
159 connection.

160 2. Is there a plan to try to connect open land off Keyes Hill Rd. with trails  
161 near Lorenzo Lane?

162 C. Brandon stated that would be done through an easement.

163 3. Would he consider making some of the 18 acres open land.

164 C. Brandon answered that this is proposed to be a conventional style  
165 subdivision with all the lots over five acres in size. The properties will be  
166 developed on just a portion, so the likelihood is that the remainder will  
167 remain open. They are not proposing open space as part of this three lot  
168 subdivision.

169 4. Would the construction vehicles be traveling on only Rocky Pond Rd and  
170 not Federal Hill?

171 This has not been determined yet, but the development favors the Rocky  
172 Pond Side.

173  
174 K. Anderson requested additional notes be added to the plan regarding how the  
175 lots meet regulations for acceptable land and buildable area. Add some notation  
176 with regards to 25% slopes and also soils. He would like to see the calculations  
177 on a per lot basis, or acre and a half buildable land or acceptable land for each  
178 lot.

179 C. Brandon will break it down and provide the detail.

180 K. Anderson added that he would like a notation on the plan depicting the trail,  
181 specifically where it goes through lot 29-4-2 where there would be an easement.

182  
183 D. Cleveland commented that Eversource has an easement in the area near the  
184 powerlines. C. Brandon confirmed.

185  
186 **Public Hearing:**

187 **Abutters:**

188 Christie Valihura

189 70 Federal Hill Rd.

- 190     • Expressed concern about safety on the roads, particularly on Federal Hill  
191       Rd. She feels it is not safe for pedestrians and would like the Board to  
192       open up Rocky Pond Road access to alleviate some of the construction  
193       traffic.  
194     • She is also concerned about the trails and their maintenance as much of  
195       the trail is in wetlands and is asking the Board to continue to monitor the  
196       trails and their maintenance.

197  
198 **Town Residents:**

199 Paul Valihura

200 273 Hayden Rd.

- 201     • Believes the construction vehicles are a problem and would like to have  
202       the vehicles use Rocky Pond Rd.  
203     • Is hopeful there will be no hammer drilling and moving of rock for fill in the  
204       area. Is suggesting that all of the fill be obtained elsewhere and brought in,  
205       if need be.  
206     • Would like a thorough, far-reaching transportation study.  
207     • Would like to understand the cumulative impact of the new houses which  
208       are being proposed. Would like a cumulative impact study done.  
209     • Has submitted a letter to the Board.

210  
211 Joe Garruba

212 28 Winchester Dr

213 Addressing:

- 214     • *Open Space covenant:* Believes there is no reason for the planning board  
215       to allow a significant change to the restrictions that were agreed to as part  
216       of the approval of the original development. If there's no clear benefit to  
217       the town, the planning board should not approve this road extension into  
218       protected lands, lands that were protected for the benefit of the town's  
219       residents not reserved for future development, and to provide easy access  
220       to a particular developers parcel. He is asking the planning board to  
221       withhold approval of the extension of Lorenzo lane into protected open  
222       space.  
223     • *Concept of hybrid HOSPD and non-HOSPD development:*  
224     • It is his view that if this project been brought to the board as one large  
225       project eight years ago, the five lots would have had to have been HOSPD  
226       lots like the others. He also states, there's no concept in the zoning  
227       ordinance of a hybrid development where some lots are HOSPD and  
228       some lots are not.

- *Hydric soils: Commented that the criteria in our ordinance, states just hydric soil alone deserves a buffer, there are likely areas that should deserve a 100 foot buffer that are not noted on the plan set yet.*
- *Blasting: Concerned that there will be more blasting with building of basements, etc.*

Chad Brandon,  
Civil Engineer  
Fieldstone Land Cosultants  
Representing Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC

- States that there are no issues with utilizing the Rocky Pond Rd. access for construction vehicles. The reason why that portion of the road is not currently open to the public, is because they have been waiting on guardrail to arrive. It may not be open to the public, but they can utilize that area for construction vehicles moving forward.
- Regarding trail connection, and connectivity, they will be research the need to adjust the easement. The trail has just recently been located through the section and it will be depicted on the plan.
- A traffic study has been done with this project. It was extensively reviewed when we were before this board with the Federal Hill Estates project. There's currently going to be two access points, Rocky Pond Road and Federal Hill Road which was studied at great length in the beginning.
- Pertaining to the covenants, this project started with obtaining an interpretation from Town Council, in regards to whether the project could proceed. Town Council has agreed that the proposal does fall within the parameters of the legal documents for this project. He stated that it's his understanding we would not be here if it was not agreed upon early on in this process.
- Regarding hydric soils, the wetlands delineation does include that evaluation. The four areas that are depicted on the plans do meet that requirement.
- Ledge. Test pits have all been favorable. Will not be excavating on site to generate materials for road construction. The fills are not large in nature, there will be select material hauled in for road construction.
- Hydric development. This is an amendment of exisiting HOSPD open space development to extend an existing road to a land locked parcel. They are proposing to develop land that is currently a separate parcel, which is 29-4. He stated that the town regulations state that all subdivisions with lots that are five acres or more are exempt from HOSPD requirements.
- Believes regulations have been addressed and plan meets all regulations.
- Will submit additional drainage details as requested.

Public Hearing closed.

275 E. Clements noted that the Board did not approve blasting on this site when it  
276 originally came in. Material removal was done using jackhammers.

277  
278 D. Cleveland questioned Open Space.

279  
280 M Fougere explained that originally, when the project came in, it was unusual.  
281 The Board reviewed the regulation and determined that as long as the open  
282 space was replaced, that would be acceptable. Extending a road of a HOSPD is  
283 allowed, we haven't seen it, but that doesn't mean it's not allowed. It's an  
284 adjoining land-locked piece of property. The consensus at that time was because  
285 of the environmental concerns surrounding blasting, that hammering would be  
286 the alternative. Abutters had concerns about the potential impacts on their wells,  
287 etc., so that's why there's been hammering up there and not blasting. The  
288 proposed amendment was vetted by Town Counsel.

289  
290 J. Mook asking for clarification about open space easements.

291  
292 M. Fougere stated that a conservation easement over the wetland areas in the  
293 parts that can't be developed would provide an extra layer of protection.

294  
295 D. Cleveland asking if there is a net increase in the amount of open space.

296 M. Fougere and E. Clements confirmed. There is about 20,000 square feet of new  
297 open space, about half an acre.

298 D. Cleveland asking if this is approved, can there be development in the open  
299 space in the future?

300 M. Fougere stated that for clarification, that these lots have not been built in open  
301 space. The only open space being lost is for the road access and that's being  
302 replaced. The lots themselves are being developed on an adjoining piece of  
303 property that's currently landlocked.

304 D. Cleveland recalled that the developer tried to purchase the land years ago, but  
305 was unable to do so at that time.

306 C. Brandon confirmed.

307 J. Mook asked if there could be a connection of the trails that would be more than  
308 a 5' wide path.

309 M. Fougere explained that conservation easement would lie on top of the  
310 property and provide a layer of protection so that no development or other types  
311 of uses could occur. It wouldn't impact the availability of where the homes are  
312 going to go.

313 D. Cleveland asked if the 3 lots are landlocked.

314 E. Clements explained that the 3 lots don't exist currently. It is a single  
315 landlocked parcel.

316 Once lot 29-2 is used, the parcel has no frontage and is open space.

317 C. Brandon stated that the proposal that's before the board meets regulations.

318 The extension of Lorenzo Lane has been reviewed by town council and they're  
319 proposing a conforming development. He believes there would be no justification  
320 in his opinion, for denial because it is a conforming subdivision. The jurisdictional

wetland area and then the 100 foot buffer is through that area. So by default, there is an undeveloped area that would exist through that section. It's going to be a corridor and they will formalize an area for a trail connection. It is his opinion that the reason why five acre and larger lots are exempt from HOSPD regulations is because a five acre lot, by default is going to have a good balance of developable area, and a buffer area and an open area that's that's likely to be utilized for passive recreation or wildlife. A good area of connectivity through the zone will be provided.

E. Clements noted that you can cut trees down in the 100 foot wetland buffer, however, you cannot stump. That area isn't completely protected from human activity. Perhaps if the board wants to see that truly maintained untouched, it might be prudent to add a no-cut buffer to that area.

K. Anderson stated that he believes the board has to make a decision as to whether or not this is an amendment to the existing application or if this is a new application. Doesn't the original application have some requirements such as no blasting? Would that not pertain if this was an extension of the existing one?

M. Fougere stated that those prohibitions which the board adopted for the main phase would continue.

K. Anderson stated that the decision (original prohibitions) will need to be made. Regarding cutting within the buffer, the land owner can cut trees in the buffer. There is no requirement to notify the town. The three lots laid out the way they are with the wetland in the middle and buffer, this is probably the best use development for this land. Had it been part of the original application, he believes there would have been a lot more units involved in this. And I guess to clarify one last aspect, we're not changing the open space. There's been no modifications. We're not taking away open space, we're just expanding it through the application. We're not granting a buildable area in the open space. We're only granting access to the open space.

E. Clements confirmed regarding granting access to open space.

Discussion about site walk ensued.

B. Moseley asking C. Brandon to stake out:

1. Corridor of Trail
2. Road Extension centerline
3. Centerline of driveway to 4-2
4. Building box or potential house locations
5. Area of open space that's being transitioned into right-of-way.
6. Wetlands relative to the powerline easements.

Site walk is scheduled for December 4 at 8:30, inclement weather date December, 18.



Motion to table application File number 2021-022 until December 21, 2021. K. Anderson moved; D. Cleveland seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

**File PB2021:023** – Proposed Lot Line Adjustment to amend the common lot lines between lots 12-17-4 / 12-17-5 & 12-17-5 / 12-17-6 Austin Lane, Owners: Craig W. & Laura Lonegan and John V. Testa Revocable Trust, Applicant: John V. Testa Revocable Trust, Map 12-17 Lots 4, 5, & 6, Zoned Rural. Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.

E. Clements: Purpose of this lot line revision plan is to adjust the common lot lines between lots 12-17– 4, 5,6. The proposal consists of two separate transfer parcels, parcel A and B. First transfer is .628 acres of which is known as parcel A. From lot 6 to lot 5. The second transfer is .063 acres known as parcel B from lot 5 to lot 4. All zoning requirements will be maintained. Functionally speaking, all frontage will be maintained. There is a slight change from lots 4 and lot 5 there's a very minor shift along the hammerhead. No issues Mr. Chairman. If the planning board accepts and approves this plan, the following draft conditions would be that all bounds shall be set prior to mylar recording.

Motion to accept the application by V. Mills; seconded by D. Cleveland. Motion passed unanimously.

Randy Haight

Meridian Land Services

Representing the proposed lot line revision between the two parties. As Evan said, lot 4 is, is owned by the Lonegans. And Lot 5 and 6 are owned by the Testa Trust. The proposal is to add 10 feet of frontage to the Lonegan's property along the hammerhead, and then extend that 90 degrees back for 150 feet and then taper back to the existing lot corner that's in the back. So that creates a triangular shaped wedge that would be added to the lot 12-17-4. And the reason for it is that it just makes for a nicer driveway entrance to the existing foundation that's on lot 4. Similarly, lot 6 currently has a foundation on it. The house will be under construction, but not yet. And in looking at lot 5 after both of these are set, it made sense to add lot A from lot six to lot 5. Because when you're physically on the ground, it looks like that belongs with a lot. There's no physical need, there's no obstruction or someone building out of place. The frontage stays the same on 6. Lot 5 is reduced by 5 feet, but it still has more than 100 feet frontage.

J. Mook looking for clarification of 12-17-3

R. Haight explained 12-17-3 is not party of this. It is an abutter.

E. Clements stated that lot 5 is giving parcel B to lot 4.

It's a 10' triangle sliver of land.

**Public Hearing:**

Abutters:

Rick Akatyszewski  
222 Depot Rd,  
Owner, Lot 17-3 where house is currently being built.

R. Akatyszewski expressed concern about the possibility of future construction on small piece of property in front of where he is currently building his house. Wondering about options. The property he is referring to is not owned by J. Testa.

E. Clements explained that his concern is not germane to the current application up for discussion.

No additional comments from Town Residents or abutters.

R. Haight stated that subdivision regulations stipulate that (the lot line) goes 90 degrees from the road for 100 feet and that is the reason for the 100 foot leg. And that's why I say so beyond the owners of lots 3 and 4 are created to alter the line, the board would have to grant a waiver of the subdivision regulation. It's not germane to this particular application. To include lot 3 would mean starting over from scratch and do a new application with all 3. That is not on the table for the board's consideration.

Public hearing closed.  
Brief conversation amongst board members.

**Motion to approve application by D. Cleveland, seconded by C. Rogers.**  
**Motion passed unanimously.**

**File PB2021:024** – Conceptual Review: Proposed conversion of an existing 41.16 acre gravel pit on Depot & Rideout Road into a Major Subdivision with residential building lots and either a conventional or HOSPD design layout, Owner: Douglas A. Orde, Applicant: CFC Development, Map 9 Lots 47, 48, & 51, Zoned R & A and Recreation. Public Hearing.

M. Fougere;  
This is an application proposes to subdivide an existing 40 acre parcel into 13 single family home lots. The site has frontage on both Depot Road and Rideout Road, which is a scenic road along with frontage along the natural river. The state's 250 foot wide shoreline protection regulations will apply to this development. The existing use of the property is a gravel pit and landscape material yard. The conventional subdivision layout yields 13 lots ranging in size from 2 to 6.34 acres. The HOSPD design outlines 11 lots with 20 acres of open space; 16 acres which meets zoning requirements. A 1,450 foot long dead end public road is proposed, with a proposed hammerhead turnaround. A portion of the property lies within the 100 year floodplain. The applicant would like to

construct the conventional layout, not the HOSPD design and has included a point system outlining supporting this design.

Issues:

1. In the HOSPD regulations, there is a provision for waiver of the open space requirement if the conventional plan layout which drives the number lots can't be met in a HOSPD regulation. So that will have to be considered by the board.
2. The DPW was not in favor of the Hammerhead design and would like to see a cul de sac constructed or a through road onto Rideout Road. Staff does not support a cul de sac design. It takes up a lot of land area increases erosion, impacts drainage. But obviously that's something the board will have to decide upon. The fire department would like to see a through road to Rideout to maximize circulation versus the proposed dead end. State permits will be required including State Subdivision, Shoreline Protection and Potential Alteration of Terrain permit. The board should provide some guidance to the applicant as to which specific studies may be required including Environmental Hazard, Wildlife, Traffic, Stormwater, Fiscal Impact, Visual Impact and Historic Significance. The requirements of the rural character units must be addressed. The applicant should address how the existing onsite materials will be addressed upon approval this including the compost piles, any leftover asphalt, concrete or other materials on the property. Also, this site abuts the Nashua River. The floodplain in this area is approximately 171 feet. There appears to be a few areas along the site where, at maximum flood elevation, floodwaters may enter this property. Staff would like some more specifics as far as the Topo along the river, especially in the area of lot 4 to see if material has been removed that would impact the site in a major flood.

Randy Haight  
Meridian Land Services

Presented map of conventional design

- Property is in two zoning districts: recreational zone and residential & agricultural zone.
- 1400 foot long road with a hammerhead design, could compromise with a diameter of 170 feet.
- This currently is a materials, landscape area with gravel pit.
- There is a natural low spot along the river which is depicted as being inundated by a 500 year storm, not 100 year storm
- Will reexamine topography from 2010 and look at the floodway and ascertain actual elevation.
- Pointed out sheds, working areas, stockpile area, and materials & storage areas.
- Showed proposed location of road and grade changes.
- Showed open space

504       • Lots average greater than 3 acres  
505       Showed map for open space design  
506       Requesting Board's thoughts on potential development of the site, conventional  
507       versus open space, smaller cul de sac vs large cul de sac vs hammerhead road,  
508       required studies.  
509  
510       B. Moseley asked about the deeds of a number of properties in the area having  
511       National Manufacturing Company reserving the right to raise the dam 15 feet at  
512       Mine Falls.  
513  
514       R. Haight stated that the dam is controlled by the City of Nashua and is used as  
515       a power generating and revenue generating source. He contacted them and they  
516       didn't have any records showing elevation or proof of what could be inundated.  
517       There is also a dam that is downstream that is used to generate electricity which  
518       hasn't inundated this property. He thinks the reservation in the deed is for an  
519       older dam. Will make sure the datum are all equitable to how the analogy of 100  
520       year flood is defined now.  
521  
522       D. Cleveland inquired about grading the site.  
523       R. Haight stated that hasn't been discussed with developers at this stage.  
524  
525       K. Anderson asked about zoning requirements associated with recreational zone.  
526       R. Haight stated that they are the same.  
527       K. Anderson asked for the reason the preference is to do conventional.  
528       R. Haight replied that the lots are more regular and have a nicer look.  
529       J. Mook inquired about the use of the Open Space plan.  
530       R. Hayden explained the constraints: road, distances, contiguous acceptable  
531       land, slopes, wetlands, water table.  
532       Discussion about question of HOSPD development versus Conventional plan.  
533       M. Fougere stated that if the HOSPD is approved, the open space is left as a  
534       gravel pit. It will be restored with vegetation planted. It will not be left as a sand  
535       pit. With a Conventional plan, it would be divided into individual lots.  
536       Discussion about Nashua River and floodplain proximity to development.  
537  
538       Public Hearing:  
539       Abutters:  
540       *Robert Cormier*  
541       164 Rideout Rd.  
542       Expressed concern about drainage for roads as he has a washed well. Lives at  
543       the northern end of the bog at the top of the conservation area. Would like bog to  
544       be protected. Prefers that drainage be directed to the Nashua River than into  
545       wetland near his wellhead.  
546  
547       Town Residents:  
548       Joe Garruba  
549       28 Winchester Dr

550 Concerned about hammerhead concept road. Believes is a problem for school  
551 buses, delivery trucks, snow plows. Prefers cul de sac.  
552 Would like explanation of "Source Water Protection Area" thresholds.  
553  
554 Interested Parties: none  
555  
556 R. Haight  
557 Agrees that a through road would probably provide more drainage control in and  
558 around the bog area. Believes that a cul de sac that accommodates school  
559 busses and fire trucks (170'-175' diameter) would work well in this setting. He is  
560 unable to designate school bus stops in a proposed neighborhood.  
561  
562 Explained Shoreline permitting in protected shoreline area. Calculation for point  
563 system in designated areas determining sufficient number of trees and  
564 vegetation.  
565  
566 Discussion about site walk.  
567 Need stakes for:  
568 1. Centerline of road,  
569 2. 250' shoreline demarcation on lot 4  
570 3. cul de sac vs hammerhead  
571 4. path from pit to Rideout Road.  
572 Site walk on December 4, 2021 at 9:30  
573  
574 Motion to table File PB2021:024 by D. Petry; second by C. Rogers. Motion  
575 passed unanimously.  
576  
577  
578 Other Business  
579  
580 M. Fougere stated that the drainage requirements and regulation have been  
581 updated. Regarding zoning, he wrote up some conditional use permit criteria.  
582 There is some additional information provided to the Board about the airport  
583 issue which can be discussed at work session. Also, provided to Board, is some  
584 EPA information on MS4.  
585  
586 Motion to adjourn by C. Rogers, seconded by D. Cleveland at 9:53 pm. Motion  
587 passed unanimously.  
588  
589 Respectfully submitted,  
590 Cherie Moreno