



Town of Hollis

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

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 19, 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; Mike Leavitt.

ABSENT: Kevin Anderson.

STAFF: Mark Fougere, Town Planner.

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

After reviewing the Hollis Planning Board meeting regulations, B. Moseley reminded the public and the audience at large that the Planning Board is empowered to ensure that all applicants are afforded due process on their cases. Although members of the Board may personally have an opinion one way or another about a case, the members are sworn to review each case without bias and to make any rulings or judgments in accordance with how they interpret the Zoning Ordinance and other Federal, State, and local regulations. Even though the Board or its members may not like a case, they still have to afford proper due process to every case that is heard before the Board.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

March 15, 2022: **Motion to approve** – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed.

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

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

4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS:

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.

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

46 unanimously.

47
48
49 **5. CASES:**

- 50
51 a. **File PB2022:001** – Proposed site plan amendment to accommodate a special event use to an existing
52 Bed & Breakfast on a 2.10 acre mixed use property, 162+162A Broad Street, Owner & Applicant:
53 Timber Post Bed & Breakfast LLC, Map 54 Lot 17, Zoned R&A. **Application Acceptance and**
54 **Public Hearing February 15th, application tabled from March 15th.**
55

56 M. Fougere stated that an updated site plan has been submitted, along with a letter from a septic
57 designer which addresses the concerns raised by the Board relative to the capacity of the septic
58 system to handle the existing use along with any future use during events which may occur. The
59 letter was stamped by the engineer. K. Anderson, unable to attend tonight, sent an e-mail indicating
60 that his questions were satisfied by these submissions. Staff also submitted to the Board a letter
61 received from an abutter at 15 Crestwood Drive, raising some concerns.
62

63 Applicant: Vivian Girard, 162 Broad Street, for Timber Post Bed & Breakfast LLC. Applicant
64 mentioned that the new site plan eliminates three parking spaces that had been on a questioned
65 incline, leaving 22 parking spaces – which is sufficient to meet the needs of any proposed 50-person
66 events to be held on site.
67

68 B. Moseley distributed to the Board a list of 12 items, based on the Staff Report for this case, for the
69 Board to consider and draw to closure:
70

- 71 1. Does the Board have any opinion or thoughts regarding any on-site screening that might be
72 necessary, in addition to what was observed on the site walk, March 15?
73

74 The Board had no further comments, indicating that the existing screening was sufficient.
75

- 76 2. & 3. On the aisle way to the west of the site, sweeping around the leach field to the back of the
77 barn area, there had been questions regarding the material that should be used on that aisle way
78 and also on the aisle's proximity to the leach field.
79

80 Applicant commented that there is actually greater room for the aisle than what she had initially
81 flagged.
82

83 D. Petry pointed out that the site plan lists the “approximate location” of the leach field and other
84 features; Applicant referred back to the septic plan for the site, which shows exactly where the
85 leach field is. D. Petry questioned why that information wasn't included on the site plan, as they
86 are critical measurements.
87

88 B. Moseley concurred, and clarified to the Applicant that those measurements need to be included
89 on the site plan particularly since members of the Board have had questions regarding the
90 proximity of traffic to that leach field.
91

92 R. Hardy mentioned that he and K. Anderson had had concerns about the material and the pitch of
93 the aisle way – there is no grade on it, and it is grass. In wet conditions, that will get slippery; it
94 really should have another material on it especially if it's going to be used for emergency access.
95 R. Hardy suggested a minimum of gravel, if indeed the aisle is deemed acceptable in that location.
96 It should be comprised of something substantial enough for an emergency vehicle.
97

98 Applicant stated that in fact emergency services have indicated that they would not want any
99 emergency vehicles on any of the grass area at all. R. Hardy asked what would then happen if the

other access is blocked? Applicant responded that the other access will not be blocked, considering the use of cones and directed parking.

B. Moseley indicated that it would be difficult to guarantee that the primary access is always open, and if an emergency does occur it will be a worst-case scenario. He reiterated R. Hardy's recommendation of gravel for the aisle way.

Applicant asked how much of the area should be graveled – it is all grass, currently. B. Moseley said that the aisle way, at least, should be gravel. R. Hardy added that the aisle does pitch unusually, is not graded flat like a driveway, and it should be graded as a constant slope. He suggested that just the travel pathway be graveled.

B. Moseley concluded that the Board will address whether the aisle way is allowed to begin with after the site plan has been updated.

4. MS4 requirements. M. Fougere summarized that the MS4 concerns largely boiled down to whether there would be a gravel parking area out back: that would possibly change the surface configuration, and result in the need for drainage analysis. If the area stays grass, drainage analysis would probably not be necessary under MS4. MS4 requirements would similarly need to be addressed if there was going to be long-term storage of vehicles. There is the possibility of limiting vehicle parking to three days/nights, maximum.

D. Cleveland stated that he didn't see a need for the entire grass back area to be graveled, as the number of events projected per year would lead to a relatively minimal use. It would be better to leave it as grass.

5. Propane tank protection. B. Moseley pointed out that on the updated site plan, boulders to protect the propane tanks are indeed shown.
6. Updated parking spaces. M. Fougere indicated that the new parking space layout as shown on the updated site plan mitigate the concerns regarding parking spots on the previous plan.

7. Sanitary facilities. With the stamped letter from the septic designer, as above, this question has been resolved.

8. Parking for horse, snowmobile, and other trailers. Applicant stated that the few trailers which have been hosted in the past have been parked such as to take up spots 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the new site plan. B. Moseley added that the Board had previously suggested limiting trailer parking to three nights, maximum, which would allow for a long weekend. Applicant and the Board showed agreement with that limitation.

9. Parking space size adequacy. C. Rogers raised concerns about the spaces being too tight, as noticed on the site walk March 15: spaces numbered 13-22 should have half as many spots. He is not concerned about spaces 1-8, as there is room to back around in that area. He suggested making the spots listed as 13-17 into three spaces, and the spots listed as 19-22 into two spaces, leaving the handicap parking spot 18 where it is.

D. Cleveland mentioned that the parking spaces as shown would largely depend on the size of the vehicles; if they were all compact cars, the spaces as numbered would probably work – but larger pick-up trucks or SUVs would be very tight. However, the spaces aren't paved or marked off, so with someone directing the parking there is flexibility; it could be a variable number. B. Moseley pointed out, though, that the site plan should reflect what the Board is approving. D. Cleveland added that the site plan probably indicates the maximum possible spaces, whereas the realistic minimum may be what C. Rogers suggests.

M. Leavitt suggested that indicating a general parking area on the site plan, rather than designating specific numbered spots, could be a solution.

D. Petry pointed out that not numbering spaces would open up the whole issue of just how many cars could be parked there. Each space needs to be 9' by 18'. Reasonably, he suggests limiting spaces shown as 13-17 to four spots, and spaces shown as 18-22 to another four spots. The parking spot that concerns him the most is 12, as it is not practical where it is and does not leave room for backing up. He recommends eliminating space 12.

M. Fougere added that without a paved, marked parking area with lines designating the spots, doing 9' spaces doesn't work.

B. Moseley further added that there still has to be a car-count, in case there is any violation.

Per clarification from B. Ming, the handicap space will be marked and designated. Also, the existing total areas currently marked as spaces 13-17 and spaces 18-22 will remain the same – the number of spaces in each will, however, be reduced from five to four, and the plan will be renumbered accordingly.

The Board concurred with D. Petry's recommendations.

10. A question had been brought up regarding the curb cut. M. Fougere stated that based on the DOT permit for this property, the official curb cut is actually the western curb cut.

Applicant stated that she had been told she could have either driveway curb cut, as long as the other was shut down. Since the eastern curb cut was in use prior to her ownership of the property, she left it as-is. She is trying to seed the former, western curb cut with grass. Applicant will supply the letter she received regarding this matter to Staff and to the Board. M. Fougere will consult with the DOT; the permit on file shows the western driveway as being the one with approval.

11. The Zoning Board of Adjustment's conditions for approval need to be listed on the site plan.

12. Site-plan detail. B. Moseley stated that we need a definition of the distances around the leach field and the aisle way; the parking spaces need to be updated; the curb cut needs to be resolved; the ZBA conditions need to be added.

- An additional concern was raised regarding the ZBA's approval for hosting up to 50 people; D. Cleveland pointed out that apparently there haven't been more than 30 people hosted previously, with that number expected to remain constant for future events, so it shouldn't be a problem.

J. Mook brought up that if 50 people are allowed, events of 50 people could occur. If the Board wants to limit the number of people allowed at events to 30 because that is the precedent, then that number should be officially changed. She suggested balancing the number of event attendees with the number of parking spaces, and with the frequency of events. She feels that 50 is not a comfortable number. Perhaps 35 or 40 people would be appropriate.

D. Petry asked how the ZBA arrived at 50 as an appropriate number of event attendees, and suggested that it may have been because the Fire Chief showed that if the number exceeded 50 there would be additional requirements and regulations for this size house, regarding how many people may be inside the house at one time for an event. If we want to understand what an appropriate number of attendees would be for an outdoor event, as opposed to the safety capacity of the house, then we need to get something on record from the Fire Chief directly. He would like Staff to contact the Fire Department

and State authorities as appropriate, and ask about how we got to the determination of 50 people. We need to have it on record as to how we arrived at that number, and whether that number is appropriate for this site. The ZBA should have asked these questions.

M. Fougere consulted the ZBA meeting minutes, which stated that per the State Fire Marshall, any event under 50 people did not require an assembly permit.

C. Rogers pointed out that as we are losing about 20% of the parking spaces, 40 should be the new number for allowed event attendees.

D. Cleveland concurred with J. Mook's and C. Rogers's comments, stating that if we split the difference between 30 and 50 we would arrive at 40.

The Board generally agreed, prior to hearing from the authorities, with the number of 40.

Applicant explained that during the application process with the ZBA, they did an on-site evaluation with the Fire Department. Per the Fire Department's inspection, the house's square footage and existing safety features qualify the building for 55 people at one time. Understanding that any event hosting more than 50 people, indoor and/or outdoor, would require an assembly permit, Applicant determined to limit gatherings to 50 people or fewer.

Applicant also pointed out that most events have families coming in one car together, and attendees generally carpooling and arriving together in fewer vehicles, so even with the number of parking spaces being restricted she does not feel that the total number of allowed event attendees should be restricted to under 50 – particularly considering that the total number includes children.

B. Ming asked if there have been cases in which the Board has considered capacity for events and sites in the past, as that thought process might be of use in this case; neither Staff nor other members of the Board could think of any offhand. M. Fougere pointed out that every site is unique, however, and must be considered separately.

D. Petry mentioned that for this application to even have gotten to this point needed a variance; the site is in an R&A zone. There are neighbors and abutters. This is being approved by exception; this is a neighborhood and is not a business district. We have to take that into consideration when we put down conditions.

As this application will need to be tabled once again, which will run up against the 65-day limit for the Planning Board to review the plan under the State statute, Applicant V. Girard granted the Board permission to extend the review period.

Motion to extend review and table File PB2022:001 until the next Planning Board meeting on May 17, 2022 – motioned by B. Ming, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed unanimously.

- b. [File PB2022:004](#) – Proposed lot line relocation plan between two adjoining properties, Owner/Applicant Dana Rasmussen, 3 Johns Way, Map 13 Lots 68 – 5 & 6, Zoned Residential/Agriculture. **Application Acceptance March 15th, tabled from March 15th.**

M. Fougere stated that at the request of the Board, an additional sheet was added to the plan, showing the landscaping for these properties. The applicant did make a minor change to the shape of the property, making it a wider strip of land going from north to south – it's now approximately 70'. M. Fougere reached out to Counsel about the ability to encumber the lot with a no-build area even though both pieces of property are owned by the same person; Counsel did not feel that that is a

problem at all from a legal standpoint and didn't see any objection. The applicant is still requesting a waiver from the lot shape provision in our subdivision regulations.

B. Moseley asked to clarify: Town Counsel rendered the opinion that they could meet their overall objective with a designated no-build area? M. Fougere responded yes.

B. Moseley also asked about the plantings update for the property, now included on the second sheet of the plan – M. Fougere responded that we still need to get out and do an inspection on the plantings, which is part of the building permit approval. The Board amended the planting plan last year/a year and half ago, and it has been installed but not yet inspected. The Town's landscaping expert will be the one to do the inspection, and R. Hardy will accompany them.

Applicant: Randy Haight, from Meridian Land Services, for Owner. Confirmed that they have revised the proposed lot shape, to widen the mentioned strip of land. They have also separated the topography and soils information, as well as the plantings, to the second sheet of the plan. He mentioned that this existing lot already has 2.7 acres restricted from building; the new lot lines would not change the function of the lots. They understand that more regular-shaped lot lines are typically what the Board is looking for, but in this particular case because the lot is already encumbered by the previous subdivision plan, with 2.7 acres of the land being unbuildable, they believe that the lot-shape waiver request is not unreasonable in this circumstance. Another change that they made in the proposal was to widen and consolidate the building area within Lot 5 so that it has a larger building area that allows for the potential house to have a nice yard while keeping the two houses separated. The whole reason for the plan, as previously discussed, is for preservation of the western view-scape of the existing house on Lot 6.

Dana Rasmussen, 3 Johns Way, Owner. Stated that the other point he'd like to make is that the view-scape also provides a benefit as one comes up Depot Road; it keeps a clear view which maintains the aesthetic value of the Town. Preservation of the view-scape would be a benefit to him, as the homeowner, but also to the community as a whole.

B. Moseley pointed out that whenever the Board deals with situations such as non-standard lot sizes it might not seem like a big deal on one particular case, but it does open a can of worms, potentially, and a slippery slope for future cases. We already have some interesting lot layouts in the Town of Hollis, which came into being previous to the current Board. He personally thinks that if an attorney could write something into the appropriate paperwork to accomplish the stated objective, that would be the easiest and most expeditious way to do it – but he invites further comment from the Board.

V. Mills concurred with B. Moseley's point of view, which she asked about at the Board's last meeting, regarding whether the intention could be accomplished that way.

R. Hardy stated that the proposed layout is incongruous with other subdivisions, and with this subdivision originally. This original subdivision layout was an approved plan on which the Board spent a lot of time. It seems as though the point of the new proposal can be accomplished in another manner, without disrupting and changing an approved plan. If the Board approves this change, they could be amending every lot, forever, going forward.

J. Mook, C. Rogers, J. Peters, D. Petry, B. Ming and M. Leavitt concurred with the previous statements.

At B. Moseley's request, M. Fougere confirmed that his conversation with Counsel indicated that yes, the Applicant as owner of the property can encumber it any way that he chooses to restrict the building area and accomplish the same goal.

314 Applicant: Dana Rasmussen. Responded that they did look into a legal encumbrance to accomplish
315 their goal, and he agrees that it is potentially an option although it's less desirable. Laws and
316 interpretation of the law change on a regular basis. The only firm way to protect that view-scape is
317 by changing a lot line. He does not want to be subject to legal interpretation two years down the
318 road, when a builder of a house at the site contests the no-build easement or covenant as a legitimate
319 authority over the invested new owner of the lot. He further added to R. Haight's point that with the
320 new revisions to the plan they have made the buildable lot more normal to a building site. The
321 buildable location of the home is consistent with normal lots that we see in Town.

322
323 B. Moseley stated that, however, down the road the Board does not want to deal with issues in which
324 people contest other lots and propose further irregularities.

325
326 **Motion to approve a waiver of the Town of Hollis, New Hampshire Subdivision Regulations**
327 **Section IV.2.A, pertaining to Design Requirements, lot shape requirements: "Where new lots**
328 **and lot lines are created, resulting lot shapes shall be reasonable and compact."**– motioned by
329 V. Mills, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion failed unanimously.

330
331 **Motion to approve the application** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion
332 failed unanimously.

- 333
334
335 c. [File PB2022:005](#) – Proposed plan revision relocating an access easement to properties,
336 Owners/Applicants Charles Svirik & Evanthis Aretakis, 22 & 24 Beckys Place, Map 28 Lots 4 & 5,
337 Zoned Rural Lands. **Application Acceptance March 15th, tabled from March 15th.**

338
339 M. Fougere stated that the typos on the reference plan have been corrected. Staff's recommendation
340 is that if the Planning Board is inclined to approve the plan, a draft condition of approval be that
341 proper access easement documents shall be recorded with the plan; copies of signed documents shall
342 be forwarded to the Planning Office.

343
344 Applicant: Randy Haight, from Meridian Land Services, for Owner. Reiterated that he corrected the
345 numbering of the original easement plan to 29613, and included the easement plan in the updated
346 application for reference. The Applicant would also add a granite numbering monument marker for
347 the driveway. Applicant has checked with DPW relative to the street numbers, and whether the new
348 location of the driveway will make any difference; the answer is that the assigned numbers will
349 remain the same.

350
351 **Motion to approve the application, incorporating the Staff recommendation** – motioned by C.
352 Rogers; seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

- 353
354
355 d. [File PB2022:006](#) – PB Wavier request to grant relief from Note 15 on the approved William Corosa
356 Rev. Trust and David & Darci Kovalchek subdivision plan which requires a 50' no cut buffer along
357 the front of the property, Owner/Applicant Elizabeth Smith, 60 Nartoff Road, Map 26 Lot 5-3,
358 Zoned R & A. **Application Acceptance March 15th, tabled from March 15th.**

359
360 J. Mook is recused on this application; R. Hardy will be voting in place of J. Mook.

361
362 M. Fougere stated that the plan has been amended; the Town's landscaping expert met at the site
363 with the Applicant's landscaper, amending some of the suggested plantings. The Town landscaping
364 expert also sent a letter dated April 13 detailing his findings and his recommendations for bonding –
365 which match the submitted bonding amount of \$8,200 that the Town will keep for the next three
366 years to make sure that the plantings stay in place. He believes that the revised plan is much more in
367 keeping with what the Board was looking for. M. Fougere spoke with R. Hardy earlier today, who

had some minor comments: the key needs to be updated with a corrected species name, and the planting specs need to be incorporated, as on previous applications.

Applicant: Attorney Gerald Prunier, for Owner. Stated that they have worked with Staff and the Town landscaping expert; they agree with the plan and with the bonding amount.

B. Moseley added that he and M. Fougere have spoken with the Fire Chief – they are looking at installing the cistern sooner rather than later, which is why there is no forestation over the cistern area.

B. Moseley also stated that he'd like to add as a stipulation that once the plantings are in place the drainage be checked. M. Fougere said that yes, the site has been checked and the plan reviewed; they want to make sure that these plantings are not going to impact the Nartoff Road drainage.

D. Petry pointed out that the waiver request has not been withdrawn; as a result, the Board would have to vote on the waiver request and then on the application plan. As an alternative, the Board asked the Applicant to withdraw the waiver request. Applicant G. Prunier agreed to withdraw the waiver request.

Motion to approve the application's plan for landscape replanting, with the stipulation that the drainage be reviewed when the work has been done, and also that the plan be updated with the corrected key and the addition of the planting specs – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed.

- e. [File PB2022:007](#) – Proposed Site Plan amendment to establish a child day care operation within an existing 1,200 square foot building, Owner 22 Proctor Hill Road, LLC Applicant Emalee Trudell, 22 Proctor Hill Road, Map 52 Lot 12, Zoned A&B. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere stated that this site plan amendment is to outline a proposal to establish a day care facility on the subject site. This use is allowed by Special Exception and the applicant received approval from the ZBA on March 24, 2022. The ZBA approval was conditioned with one stipulation: The maximum number of students enrolled at the daycare at any given time shall not exceed 20.

The center will operate from 6:30 AM to 6:30 PM, M - F. Including the owner, 4 staff will work in the child care center. The center will occupy 1,200 square feet of the front building. The second story, 1,200 square feet, is presently occupied by office space. The rear portion of the building is presently occupied by the building owner who operates a karate studio, which the Board approved a few years ago. Pick up times at the day care are staggered, spreading out the impact with the existing uses on the property.

Site plan Regulations required a minimum of 6 parking spaces for this use and 8 will be designated. There are presently a total of 48 parking spaces on the property which provides ample spaces to accommodate the various uses on the site.

If the Planning Board is inclined to accept and approve the plan at the 04/19/2022 meeting, Staff has prepared the following draft condition of approval: Amend site plan to note that the day care requires 6 spaces and the existing office space requires 3 spaces; both in the note section and on the site plan.

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

Applicant: Emalee Trudell, 870 West Hollis Street, Nashua, NH, with Bennett Chandler, 6

Wildwood Drive, Brookline, NH, her step father, who is assisting with the permitting and approval process. E. Trudell stated that she has been working on the application process since September, with multiple reviews by informed/involved parties, and she is very serious about doing everything correctly. B. Chandler concurred with M. Fougere's summary of the application, and added that they also employed an outside life-safety consultant to do an analysis on the site – and applied for a building permit based on that.

B. Moseley pointed out that one concern is the fact that the day care will occupy a forward portion of the building, with an outdoor playground in the back. He asked the Applicant to go over the safety precautions that will be taken when moving the children between portions of the site, especially as the site is so close to a busy road. E. Trudell and B. Chandler responded that, as included in the plan, they are installing a rear door to the building for access to the back walkway and from there to the playground. They will also use mechanisms such as a walking rope that the children have to hold on to, with teachers at each end. The playground is fenced-in.

D. Petry stated that the application is pretty straight-forward.

J. Peters mentioned that the site has had children on it before; it was a former Montessori school.

Public Hearing.

There were no speakers on this application.

Public Hearing Closed.

No further comments from the Board.

Motion to approve PB2022:007, with the Staff recommended stipulations – motioned by B. Ming, seconded by D. Petry; motion passed unanimously.

- f. **File PB2022:008** – Proposed minor subdivision of an existing 6 acre lot into two lots, Owner/Applicant Donald J. & Kris L. Wuerdeman Rev. Living Trust, 28 Ridge Road, Map 13 Lot 10, Zoned R&A Rural Residential. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

M. Fougere stated that the applicant is requesting approval to subdivide an existing 6 acre lot into two, a 4 acre and 2 acre lot. The larger lot must remain at least 4 acres in size, as the applicant has a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit which, based on zoning requirements, requires the lot to have 4 acres. The site resides on Ridge Road which has been designated as a Scenic Road and therefore a 100 foot front setback is required. The applicant is noting that no disturbance of this 100 foot area will be permitted except for driveway entrance. The front lot line is not perpendicular to the street; the applicant is requesting a waiver from this requirement.

In terms of issues on the application, M. Fougere suggested that the Board should discuss if the proposed 100 foot non-disturbance buffer adequately addresses the requirements of the Rural Character Ordinance.

Also, as stated, the applicant has requested a waiver from Section IV2.G Design Requirements that states: "Property lines shall be perpendicular to street line 100 feet back from the street."

M. Fougere further suggested that a note should be added to the plan stating that all areas within the 100 foot wetland buffer area shall remain in their natural state and shall not become managed "lawn" areas. To limit existing vegetation loss, the proposed driveway should be located just east of telephone pole # 12.

M. Fougere added that if the Board is inclined to accept and approve the plan at this 04/19/2022 meeting, he has prepared the following draft conditions of approval: NHDES subdivision approval shall be required prior to lot recording; all lot pins shall be set prior to plan recording; prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, a \$7,500 cistern fee shall be paid.

D. Petry pointed out that this is a very similar issue to File PB2022:004, discussed earlier at this meeting.

In deviating from the Board's typical process, on this case it would be of interest to allow the Applicant to speak prior to a Board vote on whether or not to accept the application.

Motion to deviate from typical process, and give the Applicant an opportunity to make appropriate comment regarding the requested waiver – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

Applicant: Chris Guida with Fieldstone Land Consultants, doing business at 206 Elm Street, Milford, NH, for Owner. C. Guida apologized for requesting the waiver, and stated that they don't need it, per se, to still meet the requirements – they thought that it was important to request the waiver based on the homeowner's appeal to maintain use and control over more of the front of his property.

B. Moseley stated that with that the case, procedurally the Applicant would withdraw the request for the waiver, revise the plan, and come back before the Board in May.

Applicant withdrew the waiver request.

M. Fougere added that concerns the homeowners have about use of the front of the property can be taken care of through easement restrictions or encumbrances they could place on that area. The objective can be accomplished through legal means, rather than odd angles.

Motion to table File PB2022:008 until the next Planning Board meeting on May 17, 2022 – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

6. OTHER BUSINESS:

- a. The annual Volunteer Breakfast will be held Saturday, April 26, from 8 – 10am.
- b. B. Moseley mentioned that J. Mook had previously suggested that the Board keep the Town's Master Plan in front of us as a living document, and he'd like all to consider how we may do that and make it an efficient process.

J. Peters suggested that the Board could, for instance, spend the first 15 minutes of each meeting discussing portions of the Master Plan.

D. Petry stated that the first thing we need to do is get another survey out.

J. Mook mentioned that the point she made previously, and that she feels strongly about, is that if the Board reviews what some of the Master Plan goals and recommendations are, that we may or may not want to implement, we can use that information to guide questions on the survey.

B. Moseley concurred with those ideas, and reiterated that the big-picture thought is to keep the Master Plan as a living document, rather than shelving it once again.

530
531 **ADJOURNMENT:**
532

533 **Motion to adjourn at 8:53pm** – motioned by C. Rogers, seconded by J. Mook; motion passed unanimously.
534
535
536

537 Respectfully submitted,
538 Aurelia Perry,
539 Recording Secretary.
540
541
542

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