



Town of Hollis

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

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

August 16, 2022 – 7:00 PM Meeting - Town Hall Meeting Room

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; Mike Leavitt.

ABSENT: Richard Hardy; Jeff Peters.

STAFF: Kevin Anderson, Town Planner & Environmental Coordinator; Mark Fougere, Planning Consultant.

1. CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 PM. B. Moseley led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Moseley stated that the voting members will be the Regular members at this meeting.

2. AMENDMENT OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

Amendment of June 21, 2022 meeting minutes. K. Anderson stated that there was an omission in the Non-Public Section of the minutes from the June 21, 2022 meeting. He has added the information, and sent it to Planning Board members for review. The omission had to do with which members made motions and seconded them. **Motion to accept the amended minutes of the June 21, 2022 meeting** – motioned by V. Mills, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed.

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

July 19, 2022: **Motion to approve** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed.

Non-Public Session minutes, July 19, 2022: J. Mook pointed out that V. Mills was not present at that meeting, but is listed as being present. That change has been noted. **Motion to approve the minutes as amended, and to keep the minutes sealed in accordance with RSA 91-A:3, II(1) Legal** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D. Petry; motion passed.

4. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:

- a. Agenda Additions and Deletions: M. Fougere stated that the first case on the agenda, **File PB2022:009 – Design Review** will need to be continued until the September Planning Board meeting as Staff is still reviewing the plans. Also, **File PB2022:012 – Lot Line Relocation** has been withdrawn by the Applicant, and they do not wish the case to be heard. Staff has had verbal

communication with the Applicant to that effect, and are anticipating and will pursue written communication, in addition, for documentation.

b. Committee Reports: none.

c. Staff Reports: **Zoning Determination: Age Restricted Housing.** B. Moseley stated that this stems from the couple of Non-Public Sessions that the Board has held during previous recent meetings, including meeting with Town Counsel Attorney Chris Drescher on July 19, 2022. B. Moseley read the Staff Report, as below:

To: Hollis Planning Board
From: Mark J. Fougere, AICP Town Planner
RE: Approved Petition Zoning Article; Amendment Six
Date: July 26, 2022

As the Board may recall, Mr. Garruba filed a zoning petition article (Number 6) this past year. A public hearing was held on the proposed amendment and the question was placed on the 2022 zoning ballot. Against the recommendation of the Planning Board, Hollis voters approved the zoning change in March.

AMENDMENT (6) ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT (2) AS PROPOSED BY RESIDENT PETITION FOR THE TOWN OF HOLLIS ZONING ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION XXI: DEFINITIONS For the purpose of this ordinance, certain terms or words used herein are defined as follows:

SUBDIVISION: The division of a lot, tract, or parcel of land into two or more lots, plats, sites, or other divisions of land for the purpose, whether immediate or future, of sale, rent, lease, transfer, condominium conveyance, or building development. It includes a re-subdivision and, when appropriate to the context, relates to the process of subdividing or to the land or territory subdivided. The division of a parcel of land held in common and subsequently divided into parts among the several owners ~~shall~~ **must** be deemed a subdivision. **The division of land for the purpose of developing Housing for Older Persons or other development types of more than one dwelling unit on a single lot must be deemed a subdivision.**

NET TRACT AREA: The net tract area of the parcel is determined **based on the pre-development conditions** by subtracting the total area calculated for wetlands, surface waters **including man-made surface waters**, hydric soils, flood plain, road rights-of-way, and altered/unaltered slopes greater than 25% from the total (gross) tract area.

SECTION IX: GENERAL PROVISIONS

0. DETERMINATION OF DENSITY FOR CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENTS. The number of permissible dwelling units in a condominium subdivision shall be the same as that which would be applicable for a conventional subdivision of the contemplated housing type. Similarly, any buildings proposed to be built as part of a **Housing for Older Persons development or any other type** condominium development, shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the Building Area requirements set forth herein. **It is required that each building must have an exclusive non-overlapping building area in order to demonstrate compliance.**

Attorney Drescher has reviewed the adopted changes outlined in amendment 6 and has significant concerns as they relate to the amendments adopted to Section 0. The intent of this section was to require a building area (100 x 200) for each proposed age restricted home similar to the requirements of a conventional subdivision. Attorney Drescher believes that when reading the Housing for Older Person's ordinance as a "whole", the intent was to provide relief from standard zoning requirements and therefore they are not considered a "conventional subdivisions". The Older Person's ordinance includes specific Purpose statements and Standards that exempt Older Person's developments from many of the standard requirements of a conventional subdivision.

Given these substantial flaws, it is Attorney Drescher's opinion that the amended provisions in Section 0 are unworkable, vague, and ambiguous and therefore unenforceable. Should any Older Person's application come before the Planning Board, the new requirements outlined in Section 0 should be ignored.

B. Moseley commented that the zoning ordinance was approved by a 70% vote in 2017. The amendment would only have applied to new projects, and would not have applied to the Toddy Brook project which was submitted prior to the proposed amendment. The Planning Board can only enforce legal actions, and the Board therefore consults with Town Counsel whenever there is a question. The Board wants to do whatever it can to keep the Town from going into litigation. Therefore, the Board cannot do anything, or support anything, that the Town Counsel cannot defend.

d. Regional Impact: none.

5. SIGNATURE OF PLANS:

None.

6. CASES:

- a. **File PB2022:009 – Design Review:** Proposed development of an existing 41.16 acre gravel pit on Depot & Rideout Road into a Major HOSPD Subdivision with 13 single family lots, Owner: Douglas A. Orde, Applicant: CFC Development, Map 9 Lots 47, 48, & 51, Zoned R & A and Recreation. **Continued Board Discussion.**

As M. Fougere mentioned above, this case is to be tabled until the Board's September meeting.

Motion to table File PB2022:009 until the next Planning Board meeting, September 20, 2022 – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed unanimously.

- b. **File PB2022:013 – Final Review:** Proposed development of an existing 45.16 acre parcel located at 79 Witches Spring Road into a Minor Subdivision with 3 single family lots, Owner: Marie Chamberlin, Applicant: Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC, Map 46/52, Zoned R & A. **Application Acceptance & Public Hearing.**

K. Anderson stated that the proposed final application is to subdivide Map 46 Lot 52 into three residential lots. The existing parcel is 45.16 acres in size, and has 2,427 feet of frontage on Witches Spring Road. The subdivision will result in three lots, ranging from 10.1 acres to 22.5 acres. The eastern boundary of this property used to be the former Mooar Hill Road, which was discontinued by Town Meeting in 1954. We are in discussion about this, but the Applicant has agreed to note the public's right of access over the old right-of-way that leads to Town conservation land on the south

side of the property. The Applicant is requesting a waiver from Section IV.1 subsection F, Additional Studies. Additional studies would be drainage, wildlife, traffic, etc., which really wouldn't apply in this circumstance. The Applicant is requesting the waiver as part of his due diligence. Additional studies are typically required for major subdivisions of six or more lots; however, the Board does have the authority to ask for additional studies.

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

M. Fougere pointed out, as mentioned by K. Anderson, that this site is bounded by the old Mooar Hill Road which was discontinued in the 1950s. Near to it is a 78-80 acre parcel of land that is owned by the Town. Under statute RSA 231:43, when a road is discontinued by Town meeting vote, properties that have used that road for access retain easement rights. It is Staff's position that access rights are available over the right-of-way leading to the property that the Town owns. They are requesting that a note be added to the plan stating this. In talking to one of the surveyors this afternoon, however, the surveyor had concerns about adding such a note to the plan, and wanted to see a legal opinion relative to the matter. Based on his own knowledge and background, and case law into which he has looked, M. Fougere does believe that the Town has access rights – and it is important to place such a note on the plan so that any future owner of the lot that abuts the former Mooar Hill Road does not put up a fence or something to block that access, leading to conflict. It's an important issue to flush out at this point. B. Moseley concurred.

Applicant: John Lefebvre, from Fieldstone Land Consultants. Stated that he is here to present a 3-lot minor subdivision for Tax Map 46, Lot 52 on behalf of their client, Marie Chamberlin. The total area of the parcel is 45.16 acres. They have around 2,500 feet of road frontage. The property is located at 79 Witches Spring Road, and lies within the residential and agricultural zone. The minimum lot size for conventional lots is two acres, with 200 feet of frontage; 1.5 acres of the two acres needs to be contiguous acceptable land. The minimum building setbacks include 50 foot front, 35 foot side and rear, and 100 feet for wetlands. All proposed lots exceed the minimum size for contiguous upland soils exclusive of wetlands, ledge, group 4 soils, and slopes greater than 25%. Buildable areas, 4k boxes, and proposed wells have been shown on the plan. All driveways presented either meet or exceed the minimum required site distance. The nearest fire suppression resource is a cistern, located 1,600 feet east of the parcel on the northerly side of Witches Spring Road.

M. Fougere commented that the Fire Department reviewed the plan, did not have any comments, and concurred that no cistern fee would be needed.

J. Lefebvre stated that as part of this plan they are requesting a waiver from Section IV.1 subsection F, Additional Studies. This section of the regulation is noted to apply to major subdivisions with six or more lots; because the checklist does not differentiate between major and minor, and due to the large size of the parcels proposed, they ask the Board to consider the waiver.

J. Lefebvre mentioned that they have received some Staff Report comments outlining a few issues, which he will go through. The question was raised regarding a wetland area on proposed Lot 46-52-1. One of Fieldstone Land Consultants' senior wetland scientists went out and re-reviewed the area. He noted that they have to review the wetland for the criteria identifiers present per the Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual, along with the Northeast Regional Supplement. There were not the proper indicators in this area. The soil is sandy, gravelly soil, excessively drained, and above the water table. It was also mentioned that there is a potential ephemeral stream that comes down the side of the property; when they delineated the wetlands, they did not see an active ephemeral stream. There are no setbacks for an ephemeral stream, they did not include it on the plan, but nor did they see it present when they did the fieldwork.

J. Lefebvre stated that another item brought up by Staff is that a buildable area needs to be shown on proposed Lot 46-52; they have now added that buildable area. It was also pointed out that the gross area and dry area shown on proposed Lot 46-52 appeared to be flipped; that was a mistake in which the wet area had been deducted from the overall parcel and not from the proposed parcel, and has now been revised. Staff had additionally noted that the buildable area on proposed Lot 46-52-2 appeared to contain slopes in excess of 25% – they have now moved the buildable area box to a different location on the plan.

Another point by Staff was that the driveway plan and profiles need to be submitted for the lots; J. Lefebvre stated that two of the driveways are already present on these lots – one of them serves the existing house. The other, long driveway shown on proposed Lot 2 was actually built by the State of NH when they were constructing Route 101: they used is a gravel access haul road, and it has been in place for years. It meets the requirements for safe site distance. They would like to utilize those two existing driveway locations. The third driveway location would be on proposed Lot 1. There are gentle slopes onto this lot, and great visible site distance in both directions. They do not feel that there is a need for a plan and profile for that driveway location – it would be a short driveway, just coming into the spot where they’re building.

J. Lefebvre stated that test pit data was missing for Lot 46-52-1. He stated that they did do test pits with Tom Mercurio, as well as additional test pits on Lot 2; the septic designer who witnessed the test pits left for vacation this past Friday, took the book with him, and they were not able to put the notes together – so while they have performed test pits, they are not currently on the plan.

Staff had mentioned that clarification needed to be made regarding notes 5 and 18 on the plan. J. Lefebvre said that the two notes describe different things – they note that the boundary is the result of a survey performed by their office; they also note that the contours are the result of Lidar. It was in fact only the boundary that was determined by Lidar, and not the boundary and topography, as originally on the plan, so J. Lefebvre has now made that correction to the plan.

J. Lefebvre acknowledged that note 11 on the plan needs to be revised to state “All lot corner monuments shall be set prior to recording”. That correction has now been added to the plan.

Staff asked the Applicant to provide documentation for the right of way granted to Michael Glover as stated in note 14 on the plan; J. Lefebvre brought that documentation, as on the last page of the current Deed, to this meeting for Staff and the Board to review.

J. Lefebvre stated that they have now added the block for the owner’s signature on the plan, as requested. On the final plan there will be an owner’s signature.

J. Lefebvre stated that those were the notes he received from Staff, and asked for Board comments and questions prior to addressing the issue of the former Mooar Hill Road.

B. Moseley asked Staff about the point regarding the potential ephemeral stream, as above. K. Anderson stated that he found it to be very obvious when he was on site, and he thinks that it should be noted on the plan. It does not have setbacks; it is not a wetland. Ephemeral streams do not intercept seasonal high water – however, it is a feature which is important to the area. The fact of the ephemeral stream led K. Anderson to question whether there was a wetland down at the intersection of Mooar Hill Road and Witches Spring Road: the Applicant has indicated that there is not a wetland in that area, and K. Anderson is satisfied with their explanation.

Regarding the remainder of the Staff comments to the Applicant, K. Anderson said that they do all seem to have been addressed. The building boxes have been shifted to areas in which they are compliant. The plan notes have been corrected as requested. In terms of the driveway plan and profiles, he believes that it is up to the Board to make that determination. It is a requirement to show

plan and profiles for each lot – while it might be obvious that these are going to be pretty flat, that is the Board’s decision to make.

In terms of the test pit data, K. Anderson pointed out that it is a requirement that they be on the plan. If they were in fact witnessed by Tom Mercurio, then the test pits will be compliant. Without the data in front of us, though, we cannot verify anything about them.

M. Fougere mentioned that one of the things that will need to be addressed is rural character, and the Rural Character Ordinance, in terms of what type of provisions are going to be proposed for the properties – be it a no-cut buffer along the street, or plantings, or other provisions.

C. Rogers asked for clarification as to where the driveway is located on proposed Lot 1; it was shown to be in the middle of the lot.

D. Petry stated, with respect to Lot 46-52, that there is already an existing house on the lot; why did they show another buildable area on that lot? J. Lefebvre answered that it was shown because it is required by the checklist. D. Petry then asked if there is any further subdivision planned for these three lots. J. Lefebvre answered that no, there is not; they simply have to show buildable areas on the lot. D. Petry said that we therefore need a note on the plan stating that there is no further subdivision allowed. J. Lefebvre asked why that note would be appropriate, and D. Petry answered that we could have a situation in which the application is approved as a minor subdivision and later becomes a major subdivision. For a major subdivision, there are open space requirements. We want to make sure about the intent for this area: is the intent to further subdivide this, later on? J. Lefebvre stated that there is no intent to subdivide this, further on. D. Petry pointed out that in that case there should be no issue with adding the note to the plan. J. Lefebvre stated that there is an issue, as that would be taking away the owner’s right to subdivide in the future, should they want to. D. Petry stated that open space requirements may then play into this.

M. Fougere stated that the concern is that, under our ordinance, a major subdivision of six lots or more is required to be a HOSPD. What has happened in the past is that large parcels have been chipped away at in small increments to avoid that requirement.

J. Lefebvre suggested putting a note on the plan stating that any further subdivision resulting in six lots or greater would be considered a major subdivision, so that that is noted on the plan – but to disallow that subdivision would be taking away their rights in the future.

D. Petry stated that further subdividing the property would impact the ability to meet the open space requirements. He wants to make the applicants aware that if they decide to further subdivide in the future, they’re going to have to meet the new requirements. J. Lefebvre stated that he would be happy to put that note on the plan.

B. Moseley concurred that that made sense – they won’t be able to just subdivide blindly.

Regarding the Mooar Hill Road situation, J. Lefebvre stated that before getting into a debate about what rights exist, where, and how, he would like to present a possible solution for both interests. What he was asked to add was that the public has the right to pass and re-pass over the former Mooar Hill Road right of way. Mooar Hill Road was discontinued in 1954. There is a statute that says that should you need to have access to your property, and that was your form of access, the discontinuance cannot take away your right to access. To say that the public has the right of access, however, they do not believe is true. If they add a note to the plan stating that the public has the right to use that access, and the Town then sells their parcel of land, would the public still have the right of access? The answer is no. What is true, and what they could add as a note, is that private rights may exist for the former Mooar Hill Road right of way, per the RSA. They do not want to add an easement, as it would be accepting liability on the property.

J. Lefebvre further stated that if the Town was to use the former Mooar Hill Road access they would be using it as an entity – using it as a form access to their property, not as a form of recreation in a public trail. So, if they say that private rights may exist for the former Mooar Hill Road right of way, per the RSA, he believes that that would cover the interests of both sides.

M. Fougere read RSA 231:43, paragraph III: “No owner of land shall, without the owner’s written consent, be deprived of access over such [discontinued] highway, at such owner’s own risk.” The concern is that we do not want the owner of proposed Lot 1 to one day decide to put a gate across that would prohibit access. Per K. Anderson’s walk of the site, it does appear that it has been used by the public to gain access to the open space that is out back. M. Fougere suggested that legal counsel should weigh in on the issue. His concern is that the public should not be denied access to that land, which was either donated to or purchased by the Town.

B. Moseley suggested that a course of action would be to have the Applicant submit in writing their proposed language for the note, and Staff would have Town Counsel review that note. M. Fougere agreed; in the language proposed, he is concerned about the word “may”.

J. Lefebvre stated that this subdivision is not going to change any rights – they’re not proposing any, and they are not taking any away. If the Board is concerned about the owner being aware of rights, their proposed note covers that. The Applicant, on their part, does not want that area being used as a trail head, and having the public park there. That’s not what the RSA allows. Additionally, if easement access is granted, they can only grant it on their half of the former road – so people could only walk on one half of the road, and not the other. People using the access would construe the land to be public in areas where it is private. There would be so many issues that to state that the public has access, he feels, would require a legal opinion. He also feels that a lawyer would be stumped, and that the issue would have to go to court – and he doesn’t know if such a consideration is really applicable to this case. B. Moseley pointed out that it’s applicable to the case if the Board says that it is applicable, and the Board agreed in general with having Town Counsel weigh in on the situation.

M. Fougere added that, from a legal standpoint, they do not need to add a note. The public has the right to use the entire old right of way, not just on the Applicant’s side, but on the abutter’s side as well.

J. Lefebvre pointed out that no similar action was taken in regard to earlier abutting subdivisions, also along the former Mooar Hill Road.

Public Hearing.

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. Stated that he felt that review of the plan set by Staff was done very well, and appreciated details brought up by K. Anderson. Stated that he himself reviewed the plan just after the deadline for submittal of materials, which was three weeks ago. Sitting in the audience at this meeting, however, he noticed a new plan set being handed out, an easement document and a legal position for the roadway being handed out, which he as a member of the public was never given a chance to see. With the deadline for submitting materials having passed – especially for a final application such as this one – to hand out important documents right at the meeting indicates that those documents need to be made available to the public, and this Public Hearing needs to be continued to the next Planning Board meeting so that everyone has a chance to review all materials. J. Garruba also approved of the decision to consult with Town Counsel on the current case.

Applicant rebuttal: John Lefebvre, from Fieldstone Land Consultants. Stated that the additional documents he supplied at this meeting were documents he had been asked to supply: a copy of the

deed, which was cited on the plan, and a copy of the abutting subdivision plans as they may have additional merit to this case. There was nothing secret.

Public Hearing Closed.

Comments from the Board:

D. Petry stated that, relative to the comments made, as is the Board's practice, even though there may not be another Public Hearing on a case, the public is always invited to send e-mails or letters to the Board for additional comment. Even though a Public Hearing may not be extended, that does not mean that the public cannot have input regarding an application.

B. Moseley brought up discussion point issues for this application, starting with rural character regarding the two potential new properties, and asked if the Board wanted to impose a no-cut buffer of any sort.

J. Mook stated that in general she would say yes regarding a no-cut buffer, but that it is hard to say without having seen the property. B. Moseley answered that there is always opportunity for a site walk. J. Mook further mentioned the ephemeral stream noted by K. Anderson, as well as landscape elements that the Board tends to notice on site walks – such as rock walls, and the old trees R. Hardy is able to point out.

The Board generally concurred with J. Mook.

D. Petry pointed out that a site walk would be appropriate especially because the application was sent to Final Review without Conceptual or Design Review. This could have been avoided had there been some earlier discussions.

B. Moseley asked if meeting at the site at 5pm prior to next month's Planning Board meeting, Tuesday, September 20, would give the Board enough time to view the area. K. Anderson said yes, but pointed out that particularly on the Mooar Hill Road side the foliage is extremely thick. It will be hard to see much of the land without making way through heavy brush.

M. Fougere asked what specifically the Board would like to see on the site walk; J. Mook responded that they'd be looking for how much of a set back or no-cut buffer might be needed, and if there are other elements of the site that should be noted. K. Anderson stated that rural character can be dealt with from the Witches Spring Road side, if that is the Board's main concern. M. Fougere added that the Board could meet at the Mooar Hill Road side, and the Applicant could flag the driveway locations so that the Board could see where they'd be. B. Moseley added that he'd like to see the ephemeral stream, as well.

The site walk was set for 5pm, Tuesday, September 20. The Board may park along the wide grass shoulder on the south side of Witches Spring Road.

Regarding other items that will need to be resolved, B. Moseley pointed out that the Board will need the test pit data; the driveway plans and profiles will need to be submitted before the next meeting; the Board will need to review the 'no further subdivision without meeting the open space requirements' note; Town Counsel's advice will be sought regarding the former Mooar Hill Road and access, as above.

Motion to table File PB2022:013 until the next Planning Board meeting, September 20, 2022, at which the site walk will be discussed – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

7. **OTHER BUSINESS:**

Master Plan – Survey Questions.

B. Moseley recommended that discussion of the Master Plan be kept to no more than one hour per meeting, in the interest of time and so that the Board does not get worn out or burned out with it. He also suggested that we begin with the old Master Plan questions and review those before moving into the new questions that Board members have submitted.

K. Anderson stated that this is a living document, and we will try to make edits as we go through it. There is no reason for all issues to be answered tonight. We will start with the questions from 2016, and strike out those that are irrelevant – questions that deal with the school system, for instance, as they can send their own questionnaire. He also pointed out that we do want people to answer these questions, and when they get cumbersome people are less likely to want to be involved.

M. Fougere pointed out that the questions from 2016 were very similar if not identical to the questions from the major Master Plan update in 1998. The thought at the time was to see how much opinions had changed from 1998 to 2016. These questions have been around for awhile, and some are rather obvious. Everyone knows that one of the most important things in Hollis is rural character, so a question about rural character is unlikely to gain us any insight; in every survey that's been done, rural character has come in at the top of importance to residents.

D. Petry added that starting with the existing questions and then supplementing them makes sense. We've had a lot of turnover in Town since 1998. People may or may not still think that rural character is the most important thing; certainly, the school system is.

K. Anderson asked if D. Petry felt that questions regarding the school system should be included; D. Petry stated that it's obvious that people move to this Town for the school system. The second most important thing may be rural character, and the set-up of the Town. The challenge we've had is that a lot of the people who have moved into Town have moved into new developments – which kind of goes against rural character. We need to make them aware that we have a Rural Character Ordinance, and ask if they want to see it tightened up, or if they want to see it changed at all. D. Petry further pointed out that there are two distinct groups in Town: one has been here for a very long time, with a lot of farmers. Some farmers have elected to subdivide their land, and some have not. This Town would not have grown to where it is now without some subdivision by farmers. He believes that we have done a really good job of controlled growth in our Town, and he would not want to see anything that would impact continued maintenance of two-acre minimums. Part of the challenge is that there is a balance – if we get too restrictive, to the point at which personal property rights are impacted, we will see a lot of people submit subdivision plans for fear of their rights changing. He believes that that is what has been occurring over the last five years. We have to be careful; there is a delicate balance here, with what we need to do in our Town. He would like the questions we ask to ferret out whether that is true or not.

D. Cleveland stated that we need to look at what the purpose is; what are we trying to do, here? This is the Master Plan for the Town, and we want the opinion of the Town's residents as to areas or things that, principally, the Planning Board might have an interest in or control over, as well as other Town Boards and Committees. There are a lot of questions in the previous survey that he believes we can delete, that are either no-brainer questions or questions that people don't care about – so why ask the question? We can streamline the survey in that way.

Old Master Plan questions.

1. Who is the respondent, male or female?

The Board in general felt that this question was irrelevant.

B. Ming pointed out that this question included a second column regarding household size; do we want to continue to include that information? D. Petry said that if there is not a question specifically about household size, we can add that. Question 24 does ask about the number of children in the household, which may cover the issue.

It was agreed to strike Question 1.

2. How many years have you lived in Hollis? 0-2, 3-5, 5-10, 10+.

It was agreed that there is a need for this question. B. Moseley stated that this information will definitely help to interpret the data. J. Mook added that this also lets us know if these are newer residents who are more interested in urban issues, or not.

3. How long do you expect to reside in Hollis? Less than 10 years, or greater than 10 years.

It was agreed to strike question 3.

4. What reason would make you leave Hollis? Change of job, retirement, cost of living, children will be out of school, other.

Most of the Board felt that this question provides valuable information. D. Cleveland stated that the previous results of this question showed percentages that were relatively even across the board, so it may be helpful in that regard. J. Mook stated that for each question being considered, she asks what we are going to do with the answer. What information does it give us, in order to make some decision? M. Fougere concurred, and added that the whole point of these questions is for guidance, particularly on land-use issues. Every question needs to be considered thoroughly in order to get answers to questions that the Board has. J. Mook asked what we might get from the answers to this question – what does this help us to determine? B. Ming answered that if people would leave Town because of retirement or cost of living, it indicates that it's too expensive; if they would leave Town because their children are out of school, it indicates that there isn't enough value. D. Petry added that the survey is not just for creation of ordinances; it's for facilities, it's for infrastructure. It's to decide what to do. The fourth item in this question is the main reason why people leave Town: their children graduate from high school, and they leave. They sell their house. It happens all the time, and the turnover is incredible. And the expectation of the new residents moving in, wanting services, is increasing. As a Selectman, some of the requests that he gets are pretty amazing: trash pick-up, streetlights throughout the entire Town, sidewalks throughout the entire Town. J. Mook stated that she does not object to leaving this question in, but we have to ask how we are going to use the data – and that applies to every question. D. Cleveland added that it is interesting to see the answers to a question like this; it's interesting information to have. V. Mills agreed, and stated that it may be interesting to compare answers to this question, now, to previous answers – she thinks we're going to see some changes.

5. What is your age?

It was generally agreed that this is a relevant question.

6. The things I like most about living in Hollis: geographic location, rural lifestyle, school system, shopping opportunities, housing availability and cost, outdoor recreation opportunities, access to open space for recreation, other.

J. Mook stated that we should have a question like this, but figure out exactly what that question should be later on in this process as there have been some suggestions. We should keep this question, but it needs further work. D. Cleveland suggested that the eight categories given in this question could be

streamlined. J. Mook suggested that, in regard to rural lifestyle, maybe we could be more specific. K. Anderson stated that questions such as this seem entirely too complicated. “Do you think Hollis has enough recreational opportunities?” would be a question.

7. The things I dislike most about living in Hollis: its growth rate, loss of rural lifestyle, the school system, its road conditions, lack of shopping opportunities, lack of recreation and entertainment, lack of housing at reasonable prices, lack of public transportation, other.

B. Ming stated that he liked K. Anderson’s note on question 6: make each item its own question, with approve or disapprove, yes or no answers.

As with question 6, it was agreed to keep this question but fine-tune it.

8. Check the response which best reflects your opinion regarding the amount of each of the following housing types in current housing supply: single family on two acres, single family on less than two acres, one- and two-bedroom apartments, three- and four-bedroom apartments, duplexes, elderly housing, mobile homes, rental homes.

The Board generally agreed that this question is overwhelming; it’s too much in one question. Perhaps it should be a question about lot size. J. Mook pointed out that a question regarding senior living would be important. In general, it was agreed that this question should be reworked, and should not be included in this form.

9. Which statement best expresses your opinion of the following: light industrial development, residential growth, commercial growth – too fast, about right, too slow, don’t know.

B. Ming stated that the growth question is important, but he doesn’t know if this is the right way to ask it. D. Cleveland pointed out that, looking at the results of the last survey, “about right” was almost overwhelmingly the most common answer. In general, the Board concurred that they would like to make this question simply about growth.

10. How do you feel about the Town encouraging expansion of the following commercial activities in Hollis: supermarket, grocery/convenience store, banking, restaurants, hardware store, medical services, dental services, entertainment, computer software/services & communications, light industry, home businesses, child/elder daycare, other.

D. Petry stated that he would change the way we’re asking this question, to say ‘Do you feel that the following categories or activities are sufficient?’, and then have them answer yes or no. He does not feel that we should be encouraging expansion. B. Moseley stated that if we look at the question, if people answer that they encourage the expansion of medical services, what role does the Planning Board have in that? We have a role in that we make sure that there is suitable space available for it, but how would we bring in more doctors? We don’t have a lot of control on these specifics. M. Fougere added that we provide for the zoning to allow it to happen. J. Mook mentioned that respondents on the previous survey indicated that restaurants have the highest inadequate supply, in Town. She does think that the Planning Board can impact whether restaurants can be in Town, due to septic and other issues. If there are things that the Planning Board can do, then maybe adding some questions to follow up with that would be appropriate. D. Petry stated that the thing that has changed from 1998 and 2016 is the technology for septic systems – that has changed a lot, so if someone really wanted to invest on putting a restaurant in, they probably could do it now, without issue. Buckley’s put a café in, where there had been a bank. A restaurant could have gone in where the surgical facility went in, in the former Harvest Market. He does not think that we’re precluding it – it’s a matter of whether there are enough potential customers to make it viable. J. Mook stated that the Master Plan is also a vision, and the community’s vision may include restaurants. Residents might not be able to open a restaurant, but they’d like to go eat in one. She added that in general she doesn’t like this question, but there is some information that we did get back from the

last survey. B. Mosley stated that he'd like to look at it from the standpoint of what we can provide to support certain things, but to get specific on some of these items is moot.

In general, it was agreed to rewrite this question in more of a yes/no format.

11. Would you be in favor or improved wireless telecommunications service in your area of Town, even though a cellular tower or other structure may be visible from your property?

The previous response to this question was relatively evenly split, with 52.19% answering yes and 47.81% answering no. D. Petry pointed out that this question was asked before we had the second cell tower in Town. There are not many dead spots in Town. We also already have a wireless tower ordinance; he does not know if there is a value in asking this question. Technology is changing, too, so the signals have gotten a lot stronger than they used to be. D. Cleveland pointed out that with the results on the previous survey split so closely, this is clearly a controversial issue. M. Fougere stated that what surprised him regarding the application on Howe Lane was the number of people who showed up in favor, who wanted it.

In general, it was agreed to strike question 11.

12. Which of the following types of renewable energy would you consider installing on your property: rooftop solar systems, ground mounted solar system, wind turbine.

M. Fougere pointed out that we now have an ordinance that impacts this question. In general, the Board did not see a need for this question. J. Mook stated that there can be questions about solar energy, but not this one.

It was agreed to strike question 12.

13. Would you be in favor or a larger scale ground mounted solar energy system being permitted in Hollis with approval of the Planning Board?

M. Fougere mentioned that there is one on Ridge Road which is hardly visible. J. Mook stated that with government credits for solar energy, it's going to be part of our future whether we like it or not. D. Petry stated that he thinks this question should stay in, because if the majority of the people say "no" then it supports our position on what we have been doing. J. Mook pointed out that in the last survey, 71.39% said "yes". D. Petry added that that was six years ago, however. K. Anderson stated that, in his opinion, people's responses indicated that yes, they want to have solar panels – but not in their backyard. D. Petry stated that maybe we need to reword this question. D. Cleveland agreed that a lot of these things depend upon how you ask the question.

It was generally agreed to keep this question, but to reword it.

14. How do you rate the following services/facilities in the Town of Hollis: police protection, fire protection, emergency ambulance services, preserving scenic roadsides, summer road maintenance, winter road maintenance, winter snow removal, recreational facilities, public library, Planning Board, zoning enforcement, traffic flow/control, solid waste disposal, recycling facilities, general government (Town Hall).

D. Petry stated that he feels that this question is valuable; B. Moseley and K. Anderson stated that they believe it is too complicated. K. Anderson stated that we are inviting a person to answer these questions in their free time, and there are 15 different boxes on this question alone to think about and rate. D. Petry stated, though, that people in Town sometimes have strong opinions; this is one question that he believes they would take the time to answer, and it would be good to know where we stand on a lot of these items. If we don't ask this question as part of this process, it should probably be asked as part of a

Select Board process. J. Mook asked, as above, what we are going to do with the answers once we get them. In concurrence, K. Anderson asked how the Planning Board is going to regulate police protection, for instance. B. Moseley agreed; it may be a good question in general, but how does it affect the Planning Board? This has not been the case in previous responses, but suppose one of the listed services comes back rated poorly? What would we do with that information? D. Petry responded that we'd send that information to the Select Board, for them to deal with. He reiterated that he believes the question does need to stay in the survey. D. Cleveland agreed with D. Petry – a lot of these questions don't only pertain to the Planning Board, but may be important to other Boards or Committees in Town. D. Petry added that questions like this could be important for future planning, expansion, infrastructure, facilities. J. Mook pointed out that the response regarding preserving scenic roadsides was less satisfactory – so some of these items point to things that the Board can impact.

It was generally agreed to keep the question but edit/fine tune it.

15. When weather conditions warrant, would you prefer the Town adopt the use of road deicing agents which are more environmentally friendly than rock salt?

B. Moseley asked what the history behind this question was – had other deicing agents been used in the past? D. Petry answered that many of the approved subdivisions were approved with the use of no salt, only sand, as a deicing agent, due to concerns over the water supply and the environment. Therefore, some subdivisions are sand only – but then you get an ice storm, and the residents get upset because the roads are too icy, and they only have sand on them. It's a situation in which you have to weigh what was required, versus safety. D. Cleveland added that another problem with sand, in his own personal experience, is that when they sanded the road he lives on, by spring it almost looked like a dirt road because there was so much sand on it. In such a case, the sand gets into the lawn, killing grass, and so on. He pointed out that the alternative to using rock salt, aside from sand, is to use calcium chloride and other chemicals – but it's a lot more expensive. Do the taxpayers want to pay the extra cost? J. Mook and B. Moseley answered that that is in fact a follow-up question that was asked. J. Mook pointed out that if you have to balance such costs against educating your children here in Town, there are a lot of balls in the air. When it comes to voting at Town Meeting, they make their priorities something different than the roads. It's hard to know how to act on these things, when it comes to spending the money. B. Moseley asked if this is more of a DPW/Selectmen question? D. Petry answered that he thinks it had to do with what we were going to require in subdivisions.

It was generally agreed to strike question 15, as well as the follow-up question 16.

17. How important to you is the preservation of the following Town resources: agriculture, groundwater supply, wetlands, wildlife habitat, forests, open fields, historic sites, conservation land, scenic roads, greenway/trail system.

It was generally indicated that respondents found all of the questioned elements very important. J. Mook stated that the Board tries to preserve all of them to the best of its ability. K. Anderson pointed out that a lot of these elements are regulated by the State, outside of the Town's jurisdiction. D. Cleveland mentioned that he wouldn't even ask the question because it's a no-brainer. C. Rogers stated that it should be asked in the context of whether residents would support preservation of these elements if it incurred a tax increase, and indeed, that is the next, follow-up question.

It was generally agreed to strike question 17.

18. From question 17 regarding the preservation of Town resources, would you be willing to have local taxes used to help preserve that resource?

D. Petry stated that he thinks that this question should be kept, but reworded. A lot of these things we can't do without land purchases, or tighter zoning, or whatever.

It was agreed to keep question 18, but reword it.

19. From question 17 regarding the preservation of Town resources, would you support changes to the Town's zoning ordinance that would help to preserve the resource?

M. Fougere pointed out that our zoning covers almost every one of these issues, already. D. Petry stated that Town voters are blindly doing this now, based on petitions that they don't understand and that are written very poorly – as opposed to the Planning Board addressing those issues the right way, and vetting them. It was generally pointed out that on the last survey, answers were overwhelmingly “yes” in every instance. J. Mook stated that there may be questions we can ask that are more specific to some of these issues.

It was generally agreed to strike question 19.

20. Rating Hollis Primary School: school building and facilities, teachers/administrators/staff, quality of education.

K. Anderson mentioned that this and the next few questions have to do with evaluating the schools; do we want to go through these? B. Moseley asked whether the school system itself sends out a survey. J. Mook said that they have, but she wasn't sure how recently. B. Moseley said that he struggles with this being on the Master Plan. Do we want to leverage our survey, or encourage the school system to be proactive and do a survey of their own? J. Mook asked whether we're going to go to the School Board with our survey results and say, for instance, that respondents don't like the teachers? However, knowing how many kids are in a household impacts our future. D. Petry pointed out that this is a way to get independent opinions on these factors in a manner that doesn't come from the schools; he is inclined to keep these questions. J. Mook stated that a lot of people responded that they don't know, because they don't have kids in school. You lose a third of the population, who doesn't even answer the question. D. Petry indicated, however, that those people are paying taxes, so they have a right to decide for themselves whether to answer – they should at least be aware. J. Mook responded that they're aware but they're not judging the quality, which is the question. D. Petry reiterated that he thinks it's good to get an independent survey on these items. J. Mook wondered if there was a better question that we could ask. D. Petry asked if this is in fact done from the standpoint of facilities planning, as to whether there are enough facilities or not? B. Moseley said that he would feel better if it took that stance more clearly. Right now, this is just a regular moratorium question on the school system. D. Cleveland stated that personally he would ask a more generic question about the quality of the schools.

D. Petry stated that question 24, Indicate the number of children in your household who are enrolled in each grade, according to the type of school, should be kept as that is information that we need. The Board generally agreed. M. Fougere pointed out that we already have the answer to this question as there is an enrollment census done every October. We know how many kids are in each grade, including those who go to private school – the School Board needs to know where every child is, whether public, private, or home-schooled.

Regarding questions 20-23, B. Moseley asked if a more generic question would be “Was the school system a driving factor in your moving to Hollis?” It was generally agreed to substitute that draft question, at this stage, for questions 20-23, and to keep question 24 for now.

25. Which statement below best expresses your opinion? (Note Town services are currently 26.59% of the total property tax bill; the county tax rate is 5.45%.) Check one box only: I feel that our property taxes should be reduced even if it means greatly reduced municipal services, I feel that our property taxes should remain the same even if it means slightly reduced municipal services, I feel that our property taxes should be increased only enough to maintain existing levels of municipal services, I feel that our property taxes should be increased in order to improve municipal services, Don't know/no

746 opinion.

747
748 J. Mook said that the trend, looking at the data, is to keep taxes at the same level or lower them. K.
749 Anderson suggested asking something like “Do you feel your taxes are being utilized for the municipal
750 services you are receiving?” instead. B. Moseley concurred – make it a much more straightforward
751 question. J. Mook asked, however, what if respondents answer “no”? What do we do with a “no”? D.
752 Petry stated that these such questions are more relevant to the Select Board, and the Budget Committee,
753 than they are to the Planning Board. B. Moseley asked, if we get the information in this form, what we
754 would do with it. D. Cleveland answered that he didn’t think we would do anything with it; these
755 questions are answered at the Town Meetings and School District meetings every year, with the warrant
756 articles. J. Mook suggested that more direct questions, such as “Are you willing to spend more to
757 purchase conservation land?” could be proposed. She also pointed out that responses are going to
758 depend on the state of the economy – people are going to respond to their current environment. D.
759 Cleveland pointed out that the reason Hollis looks the way it does is that residents have voted in favor of
760 the Town purchasing significant amounts of conservation land in the past, which has been shown to be
761 beneficial. B. Ming concurred that that context was important: not just asking if residents want to spend
762 money on conservation, but showing the money that was spent in the past, and what the result has been.
763 It helps to illustrate why to support such purchases in the future.

764
765 It was generally agreed to revise question 25, to make it more specific to what the Planning Board has
766 direct control over, and/or streamline the question toward procurement of conservation land.

767
768 26. Which statement below best expresses your opinion? (Note school services are currently 67.96% of
769 the total tax bill.) Check one box: I feel that our property taxes should be reduced even if it means
770 greatly reduced school services, I feel that our property taxes should remain the same even if it means
771 slightly reduced school services, I feel that our property taxes should be increased only enough to
772 maintain existing levels of school services, I feel that our property taxes should be increased in order to
773 improve school services, Don’t know/no opinion.

774
775 K. Anderson stated that he personally would like to re-write this question to say “Do you realize that
776 70% of your taxes go to the schools?” The results from the 2016 survey showed that most people were
777 in favor of reduced taxes, or increasing them only enough to maintain existing levels of school services;
778 more respondents were in favor of reduced taxes than were in favor of any increase. J. Mook stated that
779 this is what Town Meeting is for – where residents may debate, and get explanations or justifications for
780 items. B. Moseley said that he would strike the question, because we have the School Board meetings
781 regarding these issues.

782
783 It was generally agreed to strike question 26.

784
785 The final question, 27, “Please outline any issues, concerns, or other comments you may have relative to
786 living in Hollis”, was an open question for any further input from respondents.

787
788
789 **ADJOURNMENT:**

790
791 **Motion to adjourn at 8:56pm** – motioned by C. Rogers, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

792
793
794 Respectfully submitted,
795 Aurelia Perry,
796 Recording Secretary.

797
798 NOTE: Any person with a disability who wishes to attend this public meeting and who needs to be provided with reasonable
799 accommodation, please call the Town Hall (465-2209) at least 72 hours in advance so that arrangements can be made.