



Town of Hollis

7 Monument Square
Hollis, NH 03049^[SEP]
Tel. 465-2209 Fax. 465-3701
www.hollisnh.org

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES **February 15, 2022 – 7:00 PM Meeting** **Final**

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

ABSENT: Jeff Peters.

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

1. CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 PM.^[SEP] Bill Moseley led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Moseley announced that Assistant Planner Evan Clements will be leaving Hollis in the coming weeks to accept a new position, this being his last meeting with the Board, and March 1st being his last day at his current position. B. Moseley thanked E. Clements for his excellent service over the last two years, and wished him much luck in his future endeavors.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

January 4, 2022: **Motion to approve with stipulated edits** – motioned by D. Petrie, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed.

January 18, 2022: **Motion to approve with stipulated edits** – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by R. Hardy; motion passed.

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

a. Agenda Additions and Deletions:

- Not an agenda change, but M. Fougere pointed out for Hollis voters that there is a Zoning Guide, with graphics, which E. Clements put together; it gives a detailed outline of the zoning changes that will be on the ballot this year. The Zoning Guide is available on the Town's website, and it summarizes the discussions the Board had during the Public Hearing process. If anyone has questions, they may reach out to Staff.
- B. Moseley mentioned that in Other Business at this meeting, the Board will go over the Town of Hollis Volunteer Handbook for Appointed and Elected Officials; there is a form at the back of the handbook that needs to be signed by each volunteer and returned to the Town Hall.

b. Committee Reports: none.

c. Staff Report: none.

d. Regional Impact: none.

4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS:

- a. File PB2021:025 – Minor subdivision of an existing 74.506 acre parcel into two lots, Applicant & Owner: Gloria R. Law Revocable Trust, Map 14 Lot 35. Zoned R & A.

Motion to approve signature – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

- b. File PB2021:026 – Lot Line Adjustment to amend the lot lines between lots 32-45-2, 32-45-6 & 16-1A Howe Lane in order to consolidate lot 16-1A into the other two lots, Owners: John & Linda Seager and James & Judith Seager, Map 32 Lots 45-2, 45-6 & 16-1A. Zoned R & A.

Motion to approve signature – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

5. Cases:

- a. Scenic Road Hearing – Eversource Tree Trimming Operations: Hayden Road, Richardson Road, Wright Road.

E. Clements explained that this would be specific work taking place on Hayden Road in regard to new construction and other projects that Eversource is doing, and that the work on Richardson Road and Wright Road will be part of their more routine tree-trimming operations, to maintain clearance between vegetation and the existing lines.

Applicant: Crystal Franciosi, arborist for Eversource. Introduced Alison Marcotte, additional arborist for Eversource, who, with Crystal, will be overseeing the work on these areas. Applicant described the Hayden Road work as involving Eversource construction projects, dealing with system upgrades and full replacements. This will include installing a private primary line tap. According to new standards, Eversource must move a transformer from the existing primary line extension; in order to move the transformer, it will be necessary to remove some trees from Hayden Road. The trees have been marked in blue and white tape, and all customers have been notified, and have given permission. The customers each want to keep the wood from the trees that are being removed. Applicant will ensure that the wood is not left in the roadway and is at least 10 feet back. Smaller debris will be chipped on-site, at the time of the work, and taken away.

E. Clements added that this work involves 20 trees total, with frontage on 213, 207, and 201 Hayden Road.

Applicant stated that the Richardson Road and Wright Road tree trimming will not involve tree removal. For the tree removal on Hayden Road, Eversource will flush-cut the stumps as close as possible to the ground. Clean-up will be done at the time of the work, which is expected to last at most two weeks. The starting time for the project is dependent only on approval by the Planning Board; Massachusetts-based Northern Tree Service will be doing the work for Eversource, and can begin at any point.

Public Hearing.

There were no speakers on this case.

97 **Public Hearing Closed.**

98
99 **Comments from the Board:**

100
101 D. Petry mentioned that we have had some experiences in the past with Richardson Road,
102 and recommended that applicant be sensitive to the area, careful, and do only what is absolutely
103 necessary. There will undoubtedly be complaints.

104
105 **Motion to approve this action** – motioned by D. Cleveland; seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed
106 unanimously.

- 107
108
109 b. [File PB2021:021](#) – Proposed site plan for a ground mounted solar system with the installation of two
110 41 foot by 14 foot solar arrays on a 19.1 acre residential lot, 91 North Pepperell Road, Applicant:
111 Revision Energy, Owner Laura Gargas 2005 Rev Trust, Map 7 Lot 48. Zoned R&A. **Tabled from**
112 **January 18th.**

113
114 M. Fougere reported that this is a case upon which the Board did a site walk and discovered a wetland
115 in the area in which the solar panels were to be installed. The company's engineers would not
116 authorize installation of the solar panels in that area, as it wouldn't be stable enough. They have
117 come up with a secondary location and submitted a new set of plans detailing that location.
118 Unfortunately, the applicant was not able to attend this meeting, and are requesting that the
119 application be tabled until the Planning Board's meeting on Tuesday, March 15, 2022.

120
121 **Motion to table File PB2021:021 until the next Planning Board meeting on March 15, 2022** –
122 motioned by C. Rogers, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

- 123
124
125 c. [File PB2021:022](#) – **Final Review:** Proposed amendment to the approved Federal Hills Estates
126 HOSPD (Keyes Road) subdivision, by attaching a minor subdivision of an adjoining 18.7 acre
127 property into three lots (Lots sizes ranging from 5 – 7.8 acres) through the extension of Lorenzo Lane,
128 in addition a lot line relocation will occur with an adjoining property, Owner: C.W. Rev. Lvg. Trust
129 & Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC – Applicant: Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC, Map 29 Lot 1, 1-17,2 & 4,
130 Zoned Rural and R&A. A.A. Jan. 18th, **Public Hearing closed, tabled from January 18th.**

131
132 M. Fougere reported that this application has been in front of the Board for about six months. The
133 Planning Board did a site walk on the property, and were waiting for some cleanup issues with the
134 Town Engineer, and those have been taken care of. There was a concern raised by an abutter
135 regarding the open space relative to the trail network that goes up along the power line; the trail goes
136 through a wetland. Although that may be the case, the easement we have for that trail along the
137 power line is quite wide – as wide as the power line itself – and if the trail happens to be
138 underwater, in the wetland, hikers can certainly go around it and have rights to do that, so it should
139 not be an issue. There are a number of trails in that area that do go through wetlands.

140
141 M. Fougere stated that an issue with this application is that at the last Planning Board meeting the
142 Board discussed the potential to limit rock hammering/crushing activities relative to the buildout of
143 this project (road and home construction). As such, Staff offers the following stipulation for
144 consideration: *“Any rock hammering/crushing activities associated with the buildout of the proposed*
145 *three lot development shall be limited to 7 am to 5 pm and may not occur two days in a row; in*
146 *addition no rock hammering/crushing shall occur on weekends.”* If the applicant wanted to operate
147 outside of these restrictions a hearing before the Planning Board would be required.

148
149 If the Planning Board is inclined to approve the plan at the February 15th meeting, M. Fougere has
150 prepared the following draft conditions of approval:

1. The applicant shall submit a digital file along with three (3) hard copies of the revised plan along with a recordable mylar.
2. Prior to plan recording, all lot bounds shall be set.
3. Plan Sheet 3 shall be amended to show a drainage easement to encumber the front lot area of Lot 4-2.
4. A trail easement document shall be provided to connect to the project's open space areas. In addition, snow storage & drainage easement documents shall be submitted. Said documents shall be recorded with the mylar.
5. NHDES wetland permit shall be obtained prior to plan recording.
6. Proper security shall be in place prior to any road construction. A preconstruction conference shall be held with the Town's Staff and road inspector to coordinate timing and details of road construction.
7. Wetland buffer signs shall be installed, every 50 feet, along the wetland buffer areas for Lots 4, 4-2 & 4-1, prior to any site construction.

Applicant: Chris Guida, for Raisanen Homes, Elite, LLC. Stated that he believed the loose ends in regard to this application have been resolved, and that in terms of the conditional restrictions on the rock crushing/hammering, they have no objection.

K. Anderson mentioned that he had requested that site-specific soil mapping be done on the property, mostly because it drastically impacts the building area. He noted that USDA Web Soils was cited as applicant's source, with a certification on the application for site-specific soil mapping, and did not see how the two could both be included. Applicant clarified that the document referenced had to do with acceptable land, and that it did not include a site-specific soil map. In applicant's understanding, the request that the document was meant to address was only in regard to showing the acceptable land, which only had to do with those soils that are not either somewhat poorly drained, or poorly drained. The document is based on site-specific soil mapping standards having to do with drainage classes, but agreed that it is not a formal site-specific soil map. The soils had not been delineated according to slopes because those are not part of the acceptable land; the slopes don't come into the requirement for the Town of Hollis in his understanding.

K. Anderson pointed out that slopes of 25% and greater do, in fact, come into the requirement. Applicant said that within the shown building area, the slopes are restricted to less than 25%.

B. Moseley stated that if approved, applicant would be expected to meet the Staff recommendations, as well as the stipulations regarding rock hammering/crushing.

D. Petry noted that there were some misleading comments in the Public Hearing regarding this application, and he wanted to make it clear that although this proposal would disturb 7158 square feet of open space, it is being replaced by 28,394 square feet of new open space. The creation of a great deal of new open space was one of the major considerations in hearing this application to begin with.

Motion to approve PB2021:022 in accordance with Staff recommendations, including the rock hammering/crushing stipulations – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by C. Rogers. V. Mills and D. Petry recused. Motion passed.

- d. [File PB2022:001](#) – Proposed site plan amendment to accommodate a special event use to an existing Bed & Breakfast on a 2.10 acre mixed use property, 162+162A Broad Street, Owner & Applicant: Timber Post Bed & Breakfast LLC, Map 54 Lot 17, Zoned R&A. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing Open, application tabled from January 18th.**

E. Clements stated that the purpose of this plan is to detail the expansion of an existing Bed & Breakfast to accommodate special events that include the use of a small outdoor tent. The proposal includes 11 parking stalls along the front of the barn, 8 parking stalls behind the barn, 4 parking stalls under the barn, and 1 parking stall in front of the house. The applicant has informed staff that there are plenty of overflow parking opportunities on the front lawn to the east of the house. The anticipated flow of traffic is to travel along the western property line around the garage then wrap around east before traveling back towards Broad Street between the house and barn. The 40' tent is proposed in the north east corner of the property.

This application was not accepted at the January 18, 2022 meeting but the applicant was able to have a discussion with the Planning Board to identify issues and received instruction to provide a more detailed site plan of the property and proposed use. A revised, scalable, site plan was submitted on January 24, 2022 that shows the location of 24 proposed parking stalls, including four stalls located underneath the existing barn. Drive aisles and parking stall dimensions meet site plan requirements. The stay length of guests has been clarified by Zoning Department staff and is limited to 90 consecutive days.

An email sent from the Fire Department dated January 31, 2022 discusses issues that the Board should consider including the materials of drive aisles, parking stalls, propane tanks, and underground parking. Another issue the email raised was that the site plan indicates that the drive aisles and parking area are dirt/gravel, however, the area behind the barn is grass. Is the intent to remove the grass and replace it with a dirt/gravel surface?

E. Clements mentioned the question of how sanitary facilities will be dealt with for outdoor special events of 50 persons. The applicant has submitted an Onsite Water Treatment System Inspection Report prepared by Maznek Septic Service LLC, dated January 21, 2022. The report indicated that the septic system for the B&B was in "Fair" condition and indicated that the system was in its middle age and in normal working condition. Due to the seasonal nature of the use of the septic system, the existing system appears to be adequate for the 5 bedroom use of overnight guests. The Board should consider the applicant's wavier request from the requirement to provide an updated septic plan that reflects the 5 bedroom count of the B&B.

E. Clements outlined further issues with the application, such as that the applicant is advertising parking for horse and snowmobile trailers which should be addressed as part of the parking plan. Oversized parking stalls for these vehicles are not shown on the revised plan. Access on and off the site should be limited to the single curb cut on the property. The second curb cut on the property should be permanently decommissioned as NHDOT will not permit its usage. A plan to permanently decommission the curb cut has still not been submitted. The subject parcel is located within the MS4 Urbanized area and is subject to additional scrutiny in regards to drainage and potential water quality issues. The applicant intends to allow the parking of oversized vehicles such as horse trailers and RV campers for guests on the property. In order to prevent contamination of water resources on the property and surrounding area, a parking duration limit should be set for oversized vehicles. A Stormwater Management Plan could be submitted and installed by the applicant as an alternative to the Planning Board setting a limit on the stay of oversized trailers and vehicles.

In regard to these issues, E. Clements stated that Staff recommends the Board should consider limiting the length of stay for RV, horse trailers, and other oversized vehicles to three nights in order to protect water resources on and around the property. Additionally, the Board should add the following ZBA conditions as conditions of their own approval: no amplified sound equipment shall be used during outside events; outdoor events are limited to 50 persons; outdoor events are limited to 6 per year; all outdoor events shall end no later than 10:00 pm; the length of stay for overnight guests shall not exceed 90 consecutive days.

C. Rogers questioned why the B&B would not be considered to be like a permanent residence in regard to the septic system, if guests may be staying up to 90 days. E. Clements responded that the fact that the B&B does not have any guests for several months out of the year is rationale for that recommendation.

C. Rogers further questioned the septic use during events that may have 50 people attending; E. Clements agreed that that is a discussion point for the Board – will an area for port-a-potties be needed? Is the system capable of handling 50 guests?

D. Petry questioned the need for a Bed & Breakfast to host special events several times a year, and asked if the ZBA had addressed that. What kind of special events are included? E. Clements summarized the applicant’s description of the special events from the previous Planning Board meeting, January 18th; the intent is to allow things such as wedding receptions, birthday parties, special events of that nature, as part of what a Bed & Breakfast does.

D. Petry responded that he has concerns regarding at what point this would be turning from a Bed & Breakfast into a full business? According to the ZBA stipulations, a guest could stay for 90 days, leave for one day, and return for another 90 days, ongoing. He is concerned about the septic being able to handle such situations plus events, and suggested that a site walk would be warranted. D. Petry further questioned the tightness of the outlined parking spots – if 50 people are coming to an event, would that not potentially entail at least 25 cars? And if the four stalls underneath the barn are to be designated for the residents/owners of the property, that leaves 20 spaces for 50 attendees.

B. Moseley concurred that that would be a major point for a site walk.

K. Anderson commented that the septic inspection report indicated that it was inspected with regard to the home being “unoccupied”. Was it inspected during a time at which the septic had been sitting dormant? The events would surely need to be classified as an increase in use. Additionally, this change in use would reflect the need to have DOT revisit the plan and possibly issue permits. If the site is going from a Bed & Breakfast with a handful of people to hosting events, it involves a lot more traffic on and off the main road.

B. Moseley asked if, taking all discussion into account, is it Staff’s finding that the application is ready to be accepted? E. Clements stated that they do believe so; with the scalable site plan, it allows us to address the specifics in a more detailed fashion.

Motion to accept the application – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

Applicant: Vivian Girard, 162 Broad Street, for Timber Post Bed & Breakfast LLC. In regard to the Fire Department question regarding the grass or gravel area behind the barn, it is to stay grass. There is no plan to pave or gravel the area, as it is their intent to maintain the rural look of the property, for the Town. She will have the propane tanks re-added to the plan. The underground parking spaces are indeed only for the owner/permanent residents. The other outlined parking spaces will be solely for guests. A couple times a year they have had small events, and they include the overnight guests. Applicant stated that their proposal is for events including “up to” 50 people; they have had small events with just 30 people in the past, and having 24 cars parked in the designated area has not been an issue. They do not anticipate needing port-a-potties; the events they have had in the past have not needed such. Applicant pointed out that the business is very seasonal; at most, events are twice a month. Even in the summer months, the house is not fully occupied. The five rooms of the B&B can occupy up to 16 people – the difference from those 16 people to 30 at a four-hour event has a minimal effect on the septic system. Applicant does have the septic pumped after an event, if there has been high use; at such times, talking with the septic company, the company has indicated that the septic had not been filled and did not even need pumping, but that they would pump it anyway for peace of

mind. Otherwise, they have the septic pumped every year, sometimes twice a year. Applicant said that the septic company considered the system to be in good condition particularly considering that it only gets partial use.

Regarding parking for trailers, applicant stated that they have parked in the designated area in the past, in a manner such that they can pull right out again and it has not been a problem. She does not feel that the B&B occupancy should be limited based on what guests drive. Typically, RV and trailer guests have stayed for 1-2 nights, and are self-contained. They do not hook up to the water or septic on site. As far as the DOT may be concerned, people come and go at different times for an event rather than all at once. Additionally, guests tend to come several to a car; there are not as many cars as the application may make it appear. Applicant reiterated that B&Bs typically do host small events, as a general part of their business model, and include the overnight guests.

In terms of guests staying 30, 60, 90 days, it's usually just if someone is closing on a property, or if they are in the area for a 3-month job contract. It is transient, and having such guests typically precludes events from occurring at the same time: events involve current guests. In the eight years that the B&B has been opened, they have only done two events a year. The ZBA allowed the possibility of up to six events a year so that applicant would not need to re-apply for approval if more than two events were to occur annually.

Applicant has agreed that there will not be amplified sound for any events; they have never had amplified sound previously. Events usually involve around 30 people, occasionally possibly up to 40, as opposed to up to 50, and are shut down by 10pm. Applicant and her family live on site, and keep events to a four-hour window.

C. Rogers stated that he'd like applicant to consider limiting events to a 24-person capacity, rather than 50. In looking at the parking spaces outlined on the plan, they are 9 feet wide rather than 10 feet wide. How could trailers be accommodated?

Applicant responded that trailers are not there at the same time as event parking.

V. Mills asked about the designation of the area of the application being within an MS4 Urbanized area – what delineates such a designation? She added that although horse trailers and RV campers may be larger than cars, they're really no different.

K. Anderson responded that the "Urbanized" area is delineated by the EPA, and is based on a number of different factors including the density of the lot and the density of surrounding properties. The EPA's logic in the designation may be difficult to understand. We cannot choose or change the designation.

D. Petry added that we tried to appeal the designation in this instance, in fact, and lost.

M. Fougere added that part of the MS4 designation is the area's adjacency to Flint Pond, Crestwood Lane, and the homes next to the pond – it is denser than other parts of the community. E. Clements pointed out that another part of the designation is proximity to impaired waters. B. Moseley clarified that MS4 Urbanized areas are basically a federal mandate, with no input from the Town or Boards.

D. Cleveland asked where trailers would in fact be parked; applicant answered that they park up toward the top of the driveway where there is a gravel layer, as it's more of a solid grounding for such vehicles.

M. Fougere said that it would be useful if applicant could have the plan clarified to show what area was to stay grass, and what is dirt and gravel. Applicant will have that done, in addition to adding the propane tanks to the plan.

Applicant has a list of neighbors and abutters who support her application, and do not have a problem with the events or attending noise, traffic, tents.

B. Moseley pointed out that the Board will undoubtedly be doing a site walk before reaching any final determination.

K. Anderson asked whether approval for a Bed & Breakfast runs with a property? E. Clements replied that this specific property has a variance to operate as a Bed & Breakfast. After applicant received approval to operate as a Bed & Breakfast, the Town went back and added that use to the Zoning Ordinance by special exception. M. Fougere added that it does run with the land; at such time as the property is sold, any stipulations and conditions go with the property.

Public Hearing Re-opened.

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. Stated that regarding the discussion of parking space width, he asks that the Board review the regulations; as far as he could see, the regulations do stipulate a minimum 9 feet rather than 10 feet. In terms of MS4 regulations and the method used to designate those zones, in his understanding it is not based on the proximity of wetland, but rather based on the density and the skips in the density.

Public Hearing Closed.

Comments from the Board:

B. Ming asked about the siting of the tent for events on the property, and suggested that it be marked.

Applicant responded that they use a tent rental company; the company will set up a tent on the Friday before an event and remove it the following Monday morning. The tenting is very temporary, in place only for a weekend and in use only for the four-hour event itself. There is a big, empty area in which the tent may be erected. Applicant will have the typical tent area marked on-site for the Board's site walk.

K. Anderson helped to clarify that the size of the tent is dependent upon the event; it might not always be a 40' x 60' tent, and will be erected in the flattest location possible within the designated area. He pointed out that the main questions to be determined from the tent rental company are: What is the maximum tent size that can be placed on the property, given the number of allowed guests? And, seeing as a tent is considered to be a temporary structure, are there any regulations regarding set-backs?

B. Moseley and K. Anderson concurred with B. Ming's remarks, and agreed that for the site walk the area should be marked for the largest potential tent.

E. Clements noted the applicable definition of temporary structures: "A structure which is designed, built, created, or occupied for short and/or intermittent periods of time which shall include but is not limited to plastic, fabric, and/or canvas covered frame structures. All temporary structures will require a building permit. Temporary structures shall comply with all applicable set-backs except as noted in the Farm Stand definition, and/or height requirements for accessory or principal structures, as outlined in Section X. Zoning Districts. Structures which are in use for a period of less than 7 days are exempt from the permit requirement. Temporary structures located within the Historic District shall be appropriately screened from public view and must obtain prior approval from the Historic District Commission." – Page 11, Town of Hollis, NH Zoning Ordinance.

D. Petry pointed out that on the applicant's scaled plan, the engineer located the site of the tent as being right on the set-back. If a tent is to go somewhere else on the property that detail will need to be corrected on the plan as the plan must be adhered to.

C. Rogers said that he'd like to see the parking area noted on the plan as spots 16-20 also marked, for the site walk, and B. Moseley added that they'd like to see spots 13-15 delineated as well.

Following a question from D. Cleveland, B. Moseley noted to applicant that on the next version of the scaled plan the septic system and leach field should also be clearly marked.

M. Fougere clarified that this site, as mentioned previously, and this area of the town, is in the MS4 Urbanized area designation, as set by the EPA. The EPA has, at this time, rules for uses and reporting within the MS4 area. The EPA is also considering new rules for the MS4 area, and also considering enlarging the MS4 area in not only Hollis, but in other parts of the community. The drainage regulations that are being discussed by the Planning Board are separate from the MS4 requirements that are currently in place and that the EPA has oversight on, today. The MS4 designation regarding the area of this application is not new, and has been in place for a number of years.

D. Cleveland asked if there were knowledge regarding when the EPA may change the MS4 area; E. Clements responded that it's usually done in coordination with the census, but that it's usually 10-20 years behind.

The site walk for this application will be held at 5pm on March 15, prior to the next Planning Board meeting that evening at 7pm.

Motion to table File PB2022:001 until the next Planning Board meeting, March 15, at which the site walk will be discussed – motioned by C. Rogers, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

- e. [File PB2022:003](#) – Proposed lot line relocation plan between two adjoining properties exchanging .32 acres of property, Owners: John Halvatzes Jr. Rev. Trust & Gisetto Family Rev. Trust, 27 Ranger Road & Broad Street, Map 26 Lots 40 & 48, Zoned R&A Residential Agriculture. **Application Acceptance and Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere stated that the purpose of this plan is to depict the land transfer of .32 acres from lot 26-40 to lot 26-48 increasing Lot 48 from 1.69 acres to 2.01. In addition, 16.5 feet of frontage is being added to the Lot, resulting in a lot with 128.5 feet of frontage.

Lot 48 was illegally created by deed in 1965 without the required 200 feet of frontage (no Planning Board subdivision approval was required at that time). Since 1986 the property has been considered non-buildable by the Town. This lot line relocation plan will bring the lot further into compliance. The applicant applied for two variances from the ZBA (frontage variance and Building Box variance) with the frontage request denied. Upon appeal to the Housing Appeals Board, the ZBA decision was overturned leading to this application.

The applicant is requesting a host of Waivers from the Subdivision Regulations which are detailed in the Waiver request. Staff suggests that the tree line existing within the side setbacks remain in place to address the requirements of the Rural Character Ordinance.

M. Fougere further stated that if the Planning Board is inclined to accept and approve the Plan at the 02/15/2022 meeting, he has prepared the following draft conditions of approval:

1. A Certified Wetland Scientist Stamp be added to plan.

2. A stump disposal area be noted on Lot 48.
3. The proposed home shall be served by underground utilities.
4. Owners' signatures shall be added to the plan.
5. The applicant shall obtain a driveway permit from NHDOT.

Motion to accept the application – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

Applicant: Brad Casperson, with Meridian Land Services, for John Halvatzes. Agreed with M. Fougere's summary of the application, and stated that there isn't too much further detail beyond the convoluted between the variances. He believes that a DOT driveway permit already exists, and that it is noted on the plan. They do not object to any of the other conditions. Regarding buildable area, the purpose is to provide adequate soils and land for development. The abutting lot is already developed and has been since 1989; they have gotten building permits, septic approvals, and this lot is essentially deemed buildable. As part of this application they have included a proposed sewage disposal plan for a 3-bedroom home which was done pre- the lot line adjustment. Their purpose is to show that the lot meets the buildable area requirements although a variance was obtained for the building-box area. Several waivers have been submitted, mainly out of caution as both lots are believed to be existing, non-conforming lots. The transfer of land will not make either lot less conforming, while also being compliant with the variances that have been obtained. The acceptable land for each lot is entirely separated by wetlands.

M. Fougere mentioned that much of the application has to do with providing information on adjoining properties, such as the location of buildings, septic systems, wells. They note trails within 100 feet, open space within 100 feet, unique features, utilities.

K. Anderson asked for clarification; the ZBA has deemed these both buildable lots, through the appeals process; how should such a list of waivers be approached?

D. Petry asked about the test pits – are they perked for a septic system? Did the Town septic inspector witness these test pits? Applicant was not certain of the answer. D. Petry stated that we do need to confirm whether the test pits have been properly witnessed.

C. Rogers asked about the total frontage on Broad Street; applicant answered that with the addition of 16.5 feet, the frontage would result in 128.5 feet. 200 feet is required.

D. Petry pointed out that the frontage can't be questioned at this point, because that's what the Appeals Board approved. The variance was initially denied based on not having enough frontage.

E. Clements mentioned that although the ZBA granted relief of the building box, they still cannot violate the wetland buffer.

Public Hearing.

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. Asked about the waivers that are being requested, in order to have a meaningful understanding of the application.

There being no further public speakers, B. Moseley subsequently asked the Board, regarding the numerous waivers, how much detail they felt should be documented for the purpose of proceeding with the Public Hearing so that the public is informed?

D. Cleveland responded that there are indeed a number of waivers, which can be read off, but they don't really apply to a simple lot line relocation.

B. Moseley asked that we do go through the gist of the waivers.

M. Fougere read off the waivers, including a request for additional studies waiver, which is not applicable as it only applies to major subdivisions; a waiver having to do with the lot line being perpendicular to the street for at least 100 feet: but this lot line is existing, has been there since 1965, and can't be moved – the abutting property lot line is also existing, and cannot comply with that requirement; asking for a waiver for existing buildings within 200 feet of the proposed subdivision, any existing easements within 100 feet of the proposed subdivision, existing private and public trails within 100 feet of the proposed subdivision, parks and open space within 100 feet of the proposed subdivision, unique features on the entire property, location of existing and proposed utilities, existing utilities within 100 feet of the proposed subdivision, location and dimension of all existing buildings, wetlands and wetland buffers, existing septic system leach fields within 200 feet of the proposed subdivision, existing water supply wells or springs within 200 feet of the proposed subdivision, existing roads within 200 feet of the site; asking for a waiver on the closure; as far as the site distance, they have a DOT permit, so that is not necessary. The closure is necessary for the lot line, not for Lot 48.

D. Petry asked in regard to similar submittals for lot line adjustments, have we waived all such items previously, or have we asked the applicant to put them on the plan? E. Clements replied that in the past we have usually granted waivers for things such as detailed topography, especially if the lot that is giving the land is large; it's not unusual to grant waivers for details on the giving lot.

D. Petry responded that he is somewhat concerned, as these are a lot of waivers, considering how this parcel came before the Board. He would not be in favor of waiving the wetland delineation, for one: that needs to be on the plan. It needs to be complete. As this is not a major subdivision, he can see how some waivers could be granted – but we should treat this like any other application, and require some of the listed items to be included.

M. Fougere clarified that the two-acre Lot 48, which is to be the buildable lot, does have all wetlands flagged. The wetland buffer has also been delineated.

Applicant clarified the proposed location of the well, as shown on the plan.

M. Fougere further clarified that the waiver being requested regarding the wetlands is for the mother lot, the larger lot giving the land, and not for the buildable lot, which does have the wetlands delineated: and that that is a normal request.

C. Rogers asked if there were any precedence for granting a waiver of this magnitude on the frontage? M. Fougere responded that the frontage is the reason that this lot sat unbuildable since 1986; in order to build on it, they went to the ZBA and were granted a building box variance but the frontage was not granted a variance. The owner appealed to the Housing Appeals Board, which overruled the ZBA and granted the variance.

As the waivers have now been explained, the Public Hearing was invited to continue.

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. Thanked the Board for explaining the waiver requests. Asked that waiver requests be posted with the information regarding applications on the website, in future, for the public to fully understand the applications.

Applicant had no rebuttal.

Public Hearing Closed.

Comments from the Board:

D. Petry stated that, regarding the septic system, it needs to be validated: we need to know that our inspector witnessed the test pits. Without that, we can't move forward. Applicant stated that the test pits were dug at the end of 2018; he believes the septic plan was approved by the State, but not necessarily by the Town.

K. Anderson pointed out that, with the well location included on the septic portion of the plan, and with wetlands in that region of the property, he'd like to see that the well is sited correctly, and not in the wetlands.

B. Moseley asked if a summary of the comments would be that we need to see an approved septic plan? M. Fougere responded that we need to know if our inspector witnessed the test pits, to make sure that they meet our requirements versus just the State requirements.

D. Petry pointed out that, particularly with the unusual nature of the lot, and with it being a typical part of application approval, it seems reasonable to ask for an approved septic plan.

B. Moseley summarized the need for proof that our inspector witnessed the test pits, and for an approved septic plan: the Board will table the application until such time those are obtained.

M. Fougere added that in that time, he will go over the waivers in further detail with the applicant to dismiss those that are not applicable, and to get some of the others onto the plan, so that the list of waivers is smaller.

Motion to table PB2022:003 until the next Planning Board meeting, March 15th, for the purpose of clarifying the septic plan and the waivers – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

RECESS from 9:10pm – 9:20pm.

6. OTHER BUSINESS:

- a. The Town of Hollis Volunteer Handbook for Appointed and Elected Officials.

B. Moseley stated that if everyone has reviewed the Handbook, they should now sign and date the acknowledgement page for collection and return to the Town Hall.

- b. Master Plan Update.

M. Fougere stated that we have had the Master Plan Update tabled for some time, and that in that time there have been some inputs: V. Mills has updated information relative to public, paratransit, and community transportation; J. Mook has drafted a section on preserving the Town's rural character; D. Petry has comments on sections throughout the document. Once we go over the input and new material, if there is concurrence, the changes can be incorporated into the document and we can have a Public Hearing at next month's Planning Board meeting to get public input on the Master Plan with the goal of adopting it. M. Fougere acknowledged that there has been discussion regarding some dated material in the document, of which we are aware; this has been a rolling project that took some years to complete. Some of the demographic data is dated. Given that the census data is still being compiled, what he suggests is that we recognize that, and once the census data is published Staff will update the demographic and housing section to reflect the most recent information available.

V. Mills has been in contact with Janet Langdell of the Souhegan Valley Transportation Collaborative, a grassroots group that provides bus service for individuals who need help getting to medical appointments, shopping, and things of that nature. Janet has assisted in providing an update for the Master Plan chapter on Alternative Modes of Transportation. The Board appreciated the information, and agreed regarding including it in the Master Plan Update.

J. Mook stated that given that the title of the Master Plan has to do with rural character, in re-reading the 1998 Master Plan there seemed to be a lot of work put into defining what rural character is. She has put together a draft regarding what the Town has already accomplished and pointing to some of the recommendations that have been made concerning maintaining rural character. M. Fougere pointed out that maintaining rural character is indeed a number one issue for Town residents, and E. Clements agreed that it is a good preamble to explain what Hollis is, and what is important to Hollis. Staff will check with the Town's Boards and Commissions to see that they agree with how their positions are stated in the representative paragraphs.

D. Petry had edits throughout the document, including corrections, minor additions, recommending removal of some of what NRPC had drafted that does not pertain to Hollis, clarifications, removing redundant statements.

D. Cleveland also had some helpful copy edit corrections to the document.

E. Clements will update the Master Plan draft based on tonight's comments, and the Board is very grateful for the work he has done in putting the whole document together.

As Assistant Planner Evan Clements will be leaving Hollis in the coming weeks, the Board and Staff thanked him for all of his work serving the Board and the Town over the past few years with a round of applause and much appreciation.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn at 10:14pm: motioned by C. Rogers, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Aurelia Perry,
Recording Secretary.

NOTE: Any person with a disability who wishes to attend this public meeting and who needs to be provided with reasonable accommodation, please call the Town Hall (465-2209) at least 72 hours in advance so that arrangements can be made.