



Town of Hollis

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

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

November 15, 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: J. Mook; J. Peters.

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

1. CALL TO ORDER – 7:02 PM. B. Moseley led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, all remained standing for a moment of remembrance for Attorney Gerald Prunier, who passed away recently. B. Moseley stated that G. Prunier, a long-time resident of Hollis, came before this Board many times. He was always good at stating the facts, and keeping reality in mind. We will all miss him.

B. Moseley and the Board in general congratulated B. Ming on his election victory last week, winning a seat as State Representative.

R. Hardy will be voting in place of J. Mook.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:

October 18, 2022: **Motion to approve** – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by C. Rogers; V. Mills abstained. 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.

K. Anderson brought up that there is a conflict regarding the Planning Board's December meeting, scheduled for the second Tuesday of that month, on December 13. The Budget Committee is also scheduled to be in the Town Hall Meeting Room at that time. Staff recommended pushing the Planning Board meeting out to the next week, Tuesday December 20th, which would in fact be the Board's normal, third-Tuesday-of-the-month meeting time.

Motion to move the Planning Board's December meeting from December 13 to December 20 – motioned by V. Mills, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

K. Anderson mentioned that Tom Mercurio, long-time Septic Inspector for the Town of Hollis, has submitted a resignation for early December. Staff will be working to fill the position; K. Anderson can fill the position, as he is qualified to do so. T. Mercurio reviews all septic designs for compliance with the Town of Hollis's standards, which are stricter than State standards, and he also observes all test pits that are done for the purposes of subdivisions. Further discussion will be done with the Select Board and Town Administrator regarding the details moving forward.

The Board in general agreed with K. Anderson filling in the Septic Inspector position. R. Hardy stated that we are fortunate that we can handle the vacancy this way.

4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS: None.

5. CASES:

- a. **File PB2022:016 – Final Review:** Proposed development of an existing 40.4 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.**

K. Anderson stated that this application proposes to subdivide a 40.4 acre site into 13 single family home lots. This project has been before the Board several times, and a HOSPD design was agreed upon. The site has frontage on both Depot Road and Rideout Road (Scenic), along with fronting on the Nashua River. The site has been redesigned to reduce regrading, including maintaining a 100 foot buffer along Rideout Road. All lots have access to open space, including along the river.

The Applicant has provided sufficient plan detail to prove that 13 lots can be subdivided in a conventional method, therefore the Applicant has the right to 13 lots in a HOSPD design.

This project will require several State approvals, including subdivision, a NHDES alteration of terrain permit, NHDES shoreland permit, and a NHDOT driveway permit.

The existing use of the property is as a gravel pit and a landscape material yard. Per requirement of RSA 155-E, the entire gravel pit site will have to be re-vegetated as part of this application.

K. Anderson further stated that the Applicant has submitted responses to all of the questions and issues that were brought up at the last Planning Board meeting; Staff feels that they have been sufficiently addressed.

There are three waivers that are being requested as part of this proposal – the first is to reduce the open space from 40% to 33.2%; the second is to allow the radius of the cul-de-sac at the end of the road to be reduced in size; the last is to allow fills greater than four feet that occur more than once along 1000 feet of the road.

There are a number of Staff recommendations, should the Board choose to approve the application:

- Prior to recording, all required state permits shall be obtained, including: State Subdivision, NHDOT driveway, Alteration of Terrain, and State Shoreline.
- Documents shall be submitted detailing the protection of all open space areas depicted on the plan.

- Common driveway easement documents shall be provided for Lots 11 & 12.
- Prior to the plan being signed, any outstanding concerns related to the proposed landscaping/restoration plan shall be addressed.
- Easement documents for all public drainage areas and cistern areas shall be submitted.
- Amend the recording plan to clearly note a no-cut buffer on Lots 11 & 12 with a cross hatch over said Lots, 100 feet from Rideout Road. Said no-cut buffer shall be noted within the Lots' deeds.
- Public access (residents of the development) to the Nashua River shall be noted in the deeds to Lots 48-2 & 48-3.
- Finalize Fire Department comments of proposed cistern design.
- Prior to any site work or tree clearing, a preconstruction meeting shall occur with Town Staff and Inspectors.
- Prior to any site work, proper site security/bonding shall be in place.

B. Moseley stated that there had been a number of administrative notes from the last meeting, and asked if they had been satisfactorily accomplished. K. Anderson replied yes; a detailed response memo was sent back, and he does feel that the notes have been addressed satisfactorily.

Applicant: Randy Haight, from Meridian Land Services, for CFC Development. Stated that the plan now reflects that they have moved the cistern to the location requested by the Fire Department. They have enhanced Note 6 regarding the flowage. Everything is pretty much in place. They do have the waiver requests, which are mainly generated by the HOSPD design, versus a conventional design. As far as adding the no-cut zone for Lots 11 & 12, they have no problem and would be happy to do that. The Fire Department had also asked that they not propose large trees, or what could become large trees, within 50 feet of the cistern, so they have moved some of that proposed vegetation. The trees that they had had in the cistern area were to address the Board's request for some screening looking from Depot Road down into the site, but they can do some smaller shrubbery to accomplish that. He stated that his understanding is that there was a name submitted to the Select Board for the proposed road, and asked if that had been established. K. Anderson answered that the Select Board has not yet voted on it; it was not on the agenda for the recent meeting.

Staff stated that they are satisfied with the progress on the application.

R. Hardy has looked at the landscaping for the plan, and stated that his main concern had been the appearance of the entrance. His opinion is that the rural character is not going to be affected at all, because the driveway has been in place for so many years and the plants have filled in. He doesn't believe that it's going to be visible from the road at all. He mentioned that the Applicants have submitted a conceptual plan for tree planting along the cul-de-sac; that might change a little bit, based on where driveways are, but at some point in the near future the Board may want to evaluate that. In terms of the reclamation of the gravel pit, R. Hardy would suggest using some evergreens on the northern side of the property where the majority of the open space is located, to further define that space and make it more private and useable for the community – as opposed to just the back yards of the abutters of that space. It could be smaller plantings, as has been done on a number of other projects.

R. Haight responded that they are more than happy to work with R. Hardy on the landscaping.

V. Mills pointed out that Staff had questioned who would be managing the open space, whether it would be homeowners or the Town, and asked if that had been determined. R. Haight responded that homeowners will be managing the open space; they will all be owning an equal share of the open space.

B. Moseley asked Staff if they have any concerns regarding the waivers. K. Anderson replied that

no, he does not believe that they do. He believes the waivers are all appropriate, given the open space design that the Board has recommended.

M. Fougere added that this is a unique site, as an old gravel pit. It's going to be a benefit to the neighborhood the way it is being reused. To make the project work to everyone's benefit, he thinks all three waivers are very reasonable.

The Board in general was satisfied that the waivers are appropriate.

D. Petry stated that he believes they have demonstrated that the waivers are in the best benefit of both the Town and the Applicant.

The Board voted on each waiver individually:

1. This waiver deals with Town of Hollis Zoning Ordinance Section XX.5.d.(v), to allow for a reduction in required open space area from 40%, 16.16 acres, to 33.19%, 13.41 acres.

Motion to approve the above waiver – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed unanimously.

2. This waiver deals with Town of Hollis Subdivision Regulations Section IV.7.B.1, to allow for having a right-of-way radius, center to outside edge, of 85 feet, and pavement radius, center to outside edge, of 71 feet, where 150 feet and 135 feet are required respectively.

Motion to approve the above waiver – motioned by V. Mills, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed unanimously.

3. This waiver deals with Town of Hollis Subdivision Regulations Section IV.7.F.2, to allow for greater than four feet of fill, in more than one occurrence within 1000 feet along the proposed road.

Motion to approve the above waiver – motioned by C. Rogers, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

Per final discussion of the application, K. Anderson amended the Staff recommendations to add that the road name be as selected by the Select Board.

M. Fougere stated that we have received recent correspondence from the Post Office, relative to some new requirements they are rolling out that mandate one location for future mailboxes. It is suggested that the developers/future owners reach out to the Post Office sooner rather than later, to work that out. Another project in Town got a waiver, and did not have to provide one location, but it will have to be dealt with in some manner – including who will have to maintain the location. This is a new policy that the Post Office is putting in place throughout the country, and is not unique to Hollis.

R. Haight confirmed that he has an understanding of the above requirement.

Per a question from D. Cleveland, M. Fougere confirmed that the new Post Office requirement is to apply to all new development.

Motion to approve the application, File PB2022:016, incorporating all Staff recommendations – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by R. Hardy; motion passed unanimously.

6. OTHER BUSINESS:

- 207
208 a. **Discussion of Administrative Rule.** Bella Meadows - South Depot Road: Request by Raisanen
209 Leasing, LLC to rent/lease a Workforce Housing Unit under provisions provided by the Hollis
210 Planning Board, Workforce Housing Administration, Compliance and Monitoring Rules; Assurance
211 of Continued Affordability.

212
213 M. Fougere stated that in 2020 the Planning Board approved the South Depot Road 32-unit Bella
214 Meadows condominium community; 10 of the units were set aside as Workforce units. As required
215 by Town Ordinance, these Workforce Housing units are restricted by recorded covenants with sales
216 prices limited by Statutory definition. All market rate units have been sold and 7 Workforce
217 Housing units have been sold. The Applicant is requesting the ability to rent/lease one of the
218 Workforce Housing units, with rents/income limited to those specified under the Workforce Housing
219 Statute. The income of the perspective tenant has already been verified by the Income Verification
220 Agent.

221
222 The Planning Board has the ability to allow such a rental arrangement under provisions of its
223 Workforce Housing Administration, Compliance and Monitoring Rules: Assurance of Continued
224 Affordability, which states "The Planning Board may allow for the leasing of an affordable unit if
225 the owner presents reasonable facts justifying such action including: job relocation, an inability to
226 sell the unit within a reasonable time period (120 days), financial difficulties or other related facts.
227 Any such leasing shall be overseen by a third party entity to review the income eligibility of any
228 tenant".

229
230 The Applicant has submitted a letter detailing the challenges that have occurred over the last year in
231 selling the Workforce Housing units, and requests permission to rent a single Workforce Housing
232 unit. Out of privacy concerns, the Applicant's name and address is not being disclosed.

233
234 M. Fougere further stated that Staff believes the application is in order, and the only
235 recommendation they have is that if the Board is inclined to approve the application, the Applicant
236 shall submit a new Rental Compliance Certificate to the Planning Department should the lease be
237 extended beyond November 30, 2023.

238
239 Applicant: Tom Raisanen with Raisanen Leasing, LLC. Stated that they would like to see if they
240 can get the unit rented. As the letter mentioned above indicates, the Applicant lives in Town, has
241 two kids, and would like to keep the children in the Hollis school system and in Town. He agreed
242 with Staff's outline of their application.

243
244 B. Moseley asked if it is Staff's opinion that the Applicant is in compliance with all of the rules put
245 forth during the Workforce Housing discussion. M. Fougere answered yes.

246
247 R. Hardy stated that the application seems pretty straightforward, and the Board generally concurred.

248
249 V. Mills pointed out that there is plenty of documentation.

250
251 D. Petry asked if this is permitted under the rules that the Planning Board approved. M. Fougere
252 confirmed that the administrative rules were fully vetted as presented to the Board, and adopted July
253 16, 2019. D. Petry further asked if it is Staff's opinion that a variance or CBA application for
254 exception is not required; M. Fougere stated that that is correct. D. Petry stated that we approved
255 this site assuming that all units would be sold to individuals. We did not anticipate that we would
256 have any rental issues. The Applicant has not shown that they have hardship, here, and the fact that
257 they can't sell the unit is not the Planning Board's problem. He is not in favor of this.

258
259 T. Raisanen replied that there are three units left, and it is one unit currently under discussion; they
260 are not talking about 10 or 12 units.

Motion to approve the application – motioned by C. Rogers, seconded by R. Hardy; roll call vote passed with D. Cleveland, B. Moseley, R. Hardy, V. Mills, B. Ming, C. Rogers in favor, D. Petry opposed.

b. **Workshop Discussion.**

(i) Potential Zoning Changes.

M. Fougere stated that he has finalized the Sign Ordinance amendments as discussed previously, and e-mailed them to Planning Board members.

Staff is also recommending that we re-approach voters about moving the drainage requirements out of Zoning and put them into our Subdivision and Site Plan Regulations. As last year, Staff feels that this is an appropriate way to address those requirements. A full drainage regulation has been drafted, which Staff will recommend be adopted going forward – it will make it easier to deal with drainage issues, will reduce disturbance to the environment, will increase water quality, and will be better overall for the quality of Hollis’s rural character. The regulations that are in place now are driving very large detention basins – they do not need to be that big to satisfy safety issues and protect property. Rural character always comes out as a major issue on Master Plan surveys, etc., and he would like to educate the voters so that they are not misled by misinformation relative to this proposal. If we reach out again and provide some facts, hopefully the facts will overcome the misinformation. Staff thinks that this should go to Public Hearing.

B. Moseley asked K. Anderson if it was correct that, before he joined the Planning Board and then the Planning Staff, he had a lot of experience with drainage requirements, and asked him to speak to the comments above.

K. Anderson stated that that was correct, and stated that first and foremost as a driving factor is the situation of the drainage within a certain distance of a wetland conservation overlay district. Water naturally seeks to go downhill, and downhill is going to be wetlands. It was the previous review engineer who made the determination that all water leads to drainage, all drainage leads to wetlands, and therefore we need to adhere to this section of the Zoning Ordinance which didn’t allow for any increases and was very strict on what had to be modeled and designed. What it led to was designs that were in excess of what is necessary. Indeed, they would be in excess of State standards, in his opinion, for what was actually being built – such as a single-family house. There are several examples of oversized basins throughout Town that are meant to uphold one criteria that is in the Zoning Ordinance.

B. Moseley asked if there was any consistent percentage by which the basins are oversized; K. Anderson and M. Fougere answered that every site is unique, K. Anderson adding that that is the leading reason why they want to move this from Zoning into the Subdivision Regulations. Every site needs to be considered for its unique qualities, including how water should be taken into account, how it should be moved throughout the site, and how to meet the requirements for clean water. We’re trying to do the best for the environment, each site is unique, and that’s why we need to look at it that way.

M. Fougere added that bigger isn’t better. It depends on what works and is required to get the job done – the job being to maintain adequate drainage and deal with water quality, quantity, rate of runoff, to eliminate downstream impact. All of those issues come into play.

K. Anderson pointed out that the current system has less to do with the environment and more to do with trying to get a project approved – and that is how these things are being viewed, and overdesigned. The emphasis should be on the environment, as opposed to a timeline.

R. Hardy stated that he is very much in favor of these changes. Over time we have seen a number of projects, going back 20, 25 years, that were overdesigned. Once the Town accepts a road, they're responsible for maintaining these, and they've never been maintained. The larger ones have 3-6 inches of riprap on the bottom, and there is no way to maintain them mechanically. If they're grass, and smaller, they can be maintained. Over time, the larger ones are much less effective than smaller ones which could be maintained on a regular basis. We've done a disservice to the Town in those areas. We didn't consider how they were going to be maintained, and the Highway Department at the time didn't either. This will be a much better situation for the Town. In addition to the points brought up by Staff, this will be better in that drainage will only work well if it's going to be maintained.

K. Anderson confirmed that in most cases the maintenance falls to the DPW, which is struggling right now to keep up with their existing workload – never mind the complicated nature of maintaining these basins. It's the Town's responsibility, and not only the State, but also the Federal government, are coming down on towns for maintenance. We don't have the means, the equipment, or the personnel to take care of them. They need to be manageable. They need to be designed to treat stormwater, and sized appropriately. We don't need to over-disturb, and tear apart a lot, just to meet a requirement that's in our ordinance. Drainage should be sensible to the site itself. In Hollis we have minimum two-acre lots; there are open space lots, too, but the majority of lots are lawn, and forested. We create exceptional, 100-foot buffers along many roads, which maintain forested areas. We want to minimize the amount of disturbance associated with drainage, as far as the basin goes. Runoff really isn't polluted from single-family houses, other than fertilization and that type of thing. Basins need to be sized appropriately for their particular site.

B. Ming asked Staff what they thought the community did not understand about this issue, to not pass it during the vote this past spring. The points that have been brought up are very compelling to those on the Board, but obviously something wasn't understood. K. Anderson replied that one perception is that one more level of review must be better – so if something has to go to the Zoning Board, it must be a better process. Bigger is also thought to be better, so for stormwater it must mean that a bigger basin will treat it better. He does not know that those are appropriate arguments. He would like to move the Town of Hollis into a design that meets the sites, rather than an ordinance. We need to treat on an as-site basis, while meeting State and local regulations.

D. Petry stated that this is another case in which we did try to get this changed last year, and there was a lot of misinformation sent out by certain individuals in the public because they characterized it as the Planning Board giving up control. However, the reason that we are moving this to Regulations is because of rural character: and because of over-enforcement, and over-regulation. A great disservice has been done to this Board and to Staff by characterizing this incorrectly, and scaring the public into not voting in favor of this change when clearly it wasn't explained as to why we were doing it. On our side, we need to do a better job, this year, of educating the public as to why we're doing it.

R. Hardy stated that a lot of citizens aren't aware that we have a consultant who is our resident engineer, who also reviews all of the drainage calculations. There is that check that happens before a case even comes to the Board for a final decision. Being unaware of that could have been part of why the proposal wasn't initially successful.

M. Fougere concurred; there are a number of eyes that look at each application before they go to the Board – we don't just accept everything that comes through the door.

B. Moseley added that our consultant, Town Engineer Mike Vignale, is very accredited – as is Kevin Anderson.

Motion to move the proposed zoning change to Public Hearing – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

M. Fougere stated that the next proposed amendment has to do with the Wetland Conservation Overlay Zone jurisdiction – existing lots. This has to do with lots of record that are in Town – no 100 foot buffer on an existing lot of record that was subdivided years ago. There is an exception in the ordinance right now that allows those lots to be developed with review by Staff and, if necessary, the Planning Board. All this does is clarify that this ordinance shall not prohibit the construction of a principal and accessory structure on a “lot”, vs. an “unimproved” lot. So, if it was a small lot that had a structure on it, it wouldn’t apply; we had an application that had to go to the ZBA this year, which was approved, for that site to be able to see some form of development. This change would be to treat all grandfathered properties the same. We don’t have a lot of these in Town, but this would keep them on the same, level playing field. We would just be removing one word.

B. Moseley stated that this amendment is mostly administrative in nature.

B. Ming pointed out that the word “an” would additionally have to be changed to “a”, to avoid future confusion.

Motion to move the proposed zoning change to Public Hearing – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.

M. Fougere stated that the next proposed zoning amendment is to delete Housing for Older Persons in its entirety. This is pretty straightforward, but we would have to go through a number of different sections as there are references to Housing for Older Persons in various places throughout the ordinance.

B. Moseley stated that we currently have three Housing for Older Persons developments in Town. It’s not as if the Town does not have these developments already in place.

V. Mills stated that she is in favor of putting this proposed amendment before the voters, although there were a couple of comments in the Planning Board minutes from the meeting at which this change was initially discussed that she believes are incorrect. First among those is that these units are all priced exorbitantly. Yes, if you choose one of the larger units with all the bells and whistles and upgrades, they are pretty pricey – but she and her husband bought one that was a 1400 square foot ranch, and they wouldn’t be there if the pricing had been exorbitant. Another comment was that there weren’t people from Hollis moving into these units; she herself has about ten friends in the Housing for Older Persons community who are all from Hollis, some of whom are long-time residents who were delighted to be able to stay in Town.

M. Leavitt pointed out that the current explanation for this change says what we propose to do, but doesn’t say why – and the public is going to want to know the answer to that. Why have we decided that we don’t want to do this anymore?

B. Moseley stated that we are planning on producing a Voter’s Guide this year, and will put that data in; unfortunately, we cannot put the ‘why’ on the ballot.

The Public Hearing is anticipated to be held at the December Planning Board meeting, December 20th. The deadline for zoning changes will be in early February – so there will be time to make amendments, if necessary, at the January meeting of the Planning Board.

In response to a question from R. Hardy, M. Fougere stated that yes, the Voter’s Guide will give some history regarding why the Planning Board is offering this change, explain how many units we have in Town already, go over the controversy of the development that was just denied by the Board.

Motion to move the proposed zoning change to Public Hearing – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed unanimously.

M. Fougere stated that the fourth proposed zoning amendment has to do with the setback requirement in the Rural Land Zone, which is basically on the northwest side of the community. The front setback would be increased from 50 to 100 feet. There will be a provision grandfathering pre-existing homes. Preserving the scenic nature of the area is the main reason for this proposal.

B. Moseley pointed out that many of the roads in that region are designated Scenic Roads, which already have a mandated setback of 100 feet.

Motion to move the proposed zoning change to Public Hearing – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.

The next proposed zoning amendment is the Sign Ordinance. M. Fougere stated that the main purpose of these changes is to attempt to be compliant with a Supreme Court decision which states that content cannot be regulated. He has re-written the ordinance such that it is tied to use of the property, such as agricultural use, or to the zone – commercial zone, industrial zone – and framed in that way so that we are not regulating the sign content, we’re regulating based on what is happening on the property. He is also recommending that we delete the section allowing for subdivision signs; they are not attractive, require upkeep, and don’t add to the character of the community. The rest of the changes to the ordinance are simply tweaking the language to attain compliance with the Supreme Court decision. We are not changing the sizes, or the requirements.

D. Cleveland asked to confirm that this does not apply to political signs; M. Fougere confirmed that it does not. The State Statute deals with that issue.

The Board in general agreed that they are comfortable with the drafted changes to the Sign Ordinance.

Motion to move the proposed zoning change to Public Hearing – motioned by V. Mills, seconded by C. Rogers; motion passed unanimously.

K. Anderson stated that he has received a request to correct the ordinance for Bed and Breakfasts, with some documentation, from Vivian Girard; it is not in the fashion of a petition. He needs to look it over, check relevant RSAs, and then meet with V. Girard to better understand what she recommends.

B. Moseley stated that the Board will keep that in mind.

D. Petry stated that his direction on it is that if it does not follow the format of a petition warrant article, he would consider it just public input. He further stated that Bed and Breakfasts are Bed and Breakfasts. They are defined in the RSA, and they need to follow those rules. We do not want boarding houses in Hollis. We can have more Bed and Breakfasts, but not boarding houses or apartments.

RECESS from 8:20pm – 8:25pm.

(ii) Master Plan Update.

K. Anderson stated that the Board has gone through the 2016 Master Plan questions, and marked

477 them up. Board members have also submitted potential survey questions for discussion, as has
478 Town resident Joe Garruba.

479
480 It was determined that the questions would be read by those who submitted them; if there is no
481 further discussion on a given question, it will be considered a viable question for the survey.

482
483 As J. Mook is not present at this meeting, K. Anderson read her submitted survey questions:

- 484
485 1. "Would you support increasing the 200 foot minimum road frontage requirement for new lots
486 along Hollis's major roads such as Broad Street or 122?" (Yes or No.)
487
488 2. "Would you support increasing the minimum road frontage requirement for new lots on *all* roads
489 in Hollis?"
490
491 3. "Would you support increasing the 50 foot minimum front yard depth or setback requirements for
492 lots along Hollis's major roads such as Broad Street or 122?"
493
494 4. "Would you support requiring the minimum road setback proposed in a new development
495 designed to be deep enough to limit or hide the development from the roadway view?"
496

497 R. Hardy stated that he does not disagree with these questions, but had one concern: are we setting
498 ourselves up for problems if we pick out specific roads, without defining them? K. Anderson agreed,
499 and there was general consensus to strike the references to specific roads.
500

501 M. Fougere stated that his concern regarding the last question above is that we have a Rural
502 Character Ordinance in the community already, the main purpose of which is to deal with this issue.
503 You're never going to hide development with a setback. This might be creating an expectation that
504 that's something that can happen.
505

506 R. Hardy agreed with M. Fougere; there is nothing that can ensure the longevity of a planting or an
507 existing forest, etc., because they can change naturally.
508

509 There was general consensus to strike question #4, above.
510

511 V. Mills read her submitted survey question:
512

513 "Do you support the Town exploring the feasibility of a limited and targeted public water supply to
514 service municipal buildings, schools, and in-town businesses?" (Yes or No.)
515

516 D. Petry stated that he respects the submission, but feels that this is a bad question. We already have
517 enough people moving to Town who expect additional services. We can ask the question, but what
518 is our reason for asking it? Are we going to recommend changing something in the ordinance?
519

520 V. Mills responded that she anticipated his concern, as that has been a concern all along. That is
521 why she tried to frame the question as really being limited and targeted, just to those specific areas in
522 Town, Town Hall, schools. The reason she thought of the question is that the Town has grown; we
523 now have four schools, and she has heard the stories about wells not being sufficient, the water lines
524 being ancient. She knows from working in the Town Hall that were numerous times that they had
525 no water, and had the DPW bringing in buckets so that they could flush toilets.
526

527 D. Petry stated that the Select Board recently initiated a water feasibility study to get the Town off
528 the school system's water system, for those various reasons. As part of that process it was very
529 deliberate that they called it a non-community water system, so that it just services Town buildings –
530 and then the school would be on their own system. He hopes that the study will have a good

outcome, so that this question may not be necessary.

V. Mills answered that D. Petry's information addressed the concerns that led to the question, and she now withdraws the question.

B. Moseley read his submitted survey questions:

1. "Do you feel that ground-mounted solar panels should require Planning Board approval?"
2. "In more rural areas in Town, do you feel that single-family dwellings should be required to be on larger lots than the standard two-acre size?"
3. "Are you in favor of small house lot sizes, if the development makes provisions for a large open space directly accessible by every property?"

Changes B. Moseley further recommends in the survey questions from 2016:

- Question 8 did not address Workforce Housing as one of the options.
- Questions 15 and 16 talked about road chemicals, and he wonders whether that is still applicable.
- Questions 25 and 26 need property tax percentages to be updated.

B. Moseley asked if there was history as to why road chemical questions were asked on the last survey; D. Petry answered that there had been a practice of requiring some new developments, based on proximity to wells and other developments, to treat winter road conditions with sand, and not salt, and that may be where that came from. We do have some subdivisions in which salt is not allowed, but over time residents in those subdivisions have complained about the sand not being adequate and adding salt anyway.

R. Hardy asked, regarding B. Moseley's first submitted survey question, if that would be for any size project. B. Moseley replied that he would like to get a feel for the current opinion of Town residents, what with the "Green New Deal" getting more publicity.

K. Anderson added, regarding solar panels, that the Building Department gets 2-4 applications for roof-mounted solar panels a week, easily, and he can think of only two applications for ground-mounted solar panels – so, percentage-wise, it's a low amount of applications; that could be due to the requirement that they have to come before the Planning Board for approval.

R. Hardy pointed out that we are suggesting that we ask Town residents about growth, setbacks, screening, etc., and then, if there is concern for increasing solar panel use, which there is likely to be, how do we justify some of these other things that we're asking people to do for the visual integrity of the Town?

K. Anderson responded that, as a resident of the Town, he does like the fact that ground-mounted solar panels do go before the Planning Board; the Board gets a chance to view that particular site's constraints. We get input as to sight lines, visibility. R. Hardy concurred.

D. Petry also concurred with K. Anderson, stating that because of rural character, if we did not have that requirement we would have a lot more issues.

M. Fougere added that the lack of the requirement was what drove the Planning Board to start regulating it – they were popping up all over people's front yards.

585 B. Moseley stated that, learning the history, now, he is ok with striking that question.
586

587 D. Petry stated that we have to be careful that we're not leading the witness, so to speak, with some
588 of these questions. Some of the public-input questions he thinks are inappropriate. This is a Board
589 decision, this is a Board action; it is our responsibility to make good on the Master Plan. Input that
590 comes from the public regarding survey questions should be taken under advisement, but we should
591 not be voting on them or discussing them in his opinion. It's not appropriate. We have to be careful.
592 We have a lot of people in Town who don't know the history of the ordinance, who don't know the
593 history of the Town, they don't know how our ordinances have been developed over time, and he
594 thinks that if we ask certain questions that get a, say, 75% response in a particular direction – what
595 are we going to do with that?
596

597 Regarding B. Moseley's point about the 2016 survey questions 15 and 16, D. Cleveland mentioned
598 that the Board had previously decided to delete similar questions. B. Moseley responded that he
599 would be fine with deleting those, too. D. Cleveland further mentioned, regarding 2016 survey
600 questions 25 and 26, that the Board had discussed re-writing 25, and deleting 26. B. Moseley
601 concurred that in light of that discussion, yes, he defers to the edits that were agreed upon.
602

603 As D. Petry is calling in remotely to this meeting, K. Anderson read his submitted survey questions:
604

- 605 1. "What I like about Hollis – please rank your top three: Rural lifestyle; School system; Job
606 opportunities; Open space; Shopping opportunities; Outdoor recreation; Housing; Other."
607
- 608 2. "What I dislike about Hollis: Lack or loss of rural lifestyle; School systems; Job opportunities;
609 Lack or loss of open space; Lack of shopping opportunities; Outdoor recreation; Lack of affordable
610 housing; Other."
611
- 612 3. "Are you satisfied with the services provided by the Town?"
613
- 614 4. "What services would you like to see that are not currently offered in Town? Please provide
615 specifics."
616
- 617 5. "Would you like to see any changes to the following Zoning Ordinances (if so, be specific with
618 proposed changes): Rural Character, Workforce Housing, Housing for Older Persons, Sign
619 Ordinance, Open Space Land Development, Home-Based Businesses."
620
- 621 6. "Do you think that recreational facilities are adequate in Town?"
622
- 623 7. "Do you think we have too many petition warrant articles by residents who have personal
624 agendas?"
625
- 626 8. "Do you understand the Planning Board recommended changes that are put forth every year on a
627 Town ballot?"
628

629 B. Moseley stated that his concern would be about question 5, in that it is left somewhat open-ended
630 regarding the ordinances. He thinks that that would be tough to get responses on. K. Anderson
631 added that we did address many of them this evening.
632

633 D. Petry responded that he is ok with striking that question; the reason he proposed it is that it is the
634 job of the Planning Board to make recommended changes to the Master Plan based on survey results.
635 We cannot just gauge what the public wants by a very small minority that either attends our
636 meetings or publishes things on social media. We need to hear from a broader audience from which
637 we don't normally hear. When we send out a survey like this, it goes to every resident in Town.
638 Every resident in Town may not have time to either watch or attend the Planning Board meetings,

639 but they certainly have the ability to receive a survey and read through it. His intent here is that he
640 would like to hear from the majority of the public – not the minority voice that might be skewing the
641 public opinion. That was his intent in drafting his proposed questions.
642

643 R. Hardy stated that much of D. Petry’s question 5 may be covered in other questions; he does not
644 see an issue with including it, but thinks that we might not ask the question that way. He asked if we
645 were going to group questions, based on their subject.
646

647 B. Moseley stated that K. Anderson had suggested that, once we have our pool of questions, we send
648 out questions one month that all cover one topic, questions the next month that all cover another
649 topic, and so on, so that they’re grouped in small bites that make it easier for residents to deal with.
650 This would also make it easier for us to interpret the results, and would keep the Master Plan in front
651 of us more efficiently.
652

653 It was generally agreed that to keep the concept of D. Petry’s question 5, as it does bring up
654 important points. M. Fougere stated that, regarding open space, for example, the HOSPD ordinance,
655 which has been in place for 20 years, has preserved hundreds and hundreds of acres of open space at
656 no cost to the taxpayer. There has been some pushback regarding that ordinance; people may not
657 realize that it has delivered hundreds of acres, if not thousands of acres, that will be preserved
658 forever, at no cost to the taxpayer.
659

660 D. Petry stated that there is a trade-off, as to what the majority of the Town residents want. He
661 wants to reach the majority of the Town residents. He does not want a minority dictating what we
662 do. However we word these questions, we have to try to maximize the number of survey responses
663 that we get. He doesn’t anticipate getting an 80% or 90% response, but hopes that we can get a
664 response from at least half of the people in Town.
665

666 V. Mills stated that she particularly concurs with D. Petry’s question 8; she believes that the Board
667 and Staff have done a great job of trying to explain what the questions are about, why we’re doing
668 them – but if we’re not reaching people and getting good responses, we may need help going
669 forward.
670

671 M. Leavitt read his submitted survey questions:
672

673 1. “Would you be in favor of the Town supporting electrification efforts to Town infrastructure,
674 such as solar arrays, and electric-based heating and cooling upgrades in Town buildings, to lower
675 long-term electricity costs?” (Yes or No.)
676

677 2. “Would you be in favor of the Town joining a residential community power program to reduce
678 Town residents’ electricity costs?” (Yes or No.)
679

680 K. Anderson stated that these would be good questions to keep in our general pool of questions, to
681 group appropriately as we look at each topic. He suggested presenting the questions to Town
682 residents via the website, so that one would know to go there on a monthly or bi-monthly basis to
683 answer rotating questions. One month might be questions on recreation, another month might be
684 about elderly housing. We would keep reminding residents to go to the website, in order to get
685 regular feedback. That would keep the Master Plan not only a living document, but current with
686 what is on applications before the Board at that time. This would get Town residents directly
687 involved and able to give input.
688

689 D. Petry pointed out that we would want to use a service such as Survey Monkey so that we would
690 get just one response per question per household. K. Anderson concurred. M. Fougere stated that
691 we have used Survey Monkey previously, and that it had served us well.
692

B. Ming read his submitted survey question:

“Should the Town explore the cost and benefit of buried utility lines along scenic areas, within the Historic District, or any other locations in Hollis?”

He stated that the question initially came from enjoyment of having a view of the trees and sky on his road, after moving to Hollis from the city, but following the big recent storm and power outages it is a practical consideration as well.

D. Cleveland mentioned that most of our new developments do have buried utility lines.

D. Petry stated that, to give an example of how some Town residents are thinking, he received an email from a new resident who wanted to know why we didn’t have street lights installed all over Town, and they wanted to know when we were going to do that. He believes that we have a problem in setting the right expectations with new residents. Sometimes they don’t understand the town they’re moving into. Between a welcome packet and realtors not really doing their job in telling people what Hollis is about, we have a gap.

R. Hardy asked if B. Ming would consider adding something to his question regarding bearing the cost of this individually. If we ask people this they’re all going to say that it’s a great idea – but are they all going to be willing to increase their utility rates by 50% or 100% in the center of Town?

B. Ming replied that that is why he worded the question as he did; he doesn’t know what the cost would be.

R. Hardy mentioned legal issues that occurred in Sudbury, Massachusetts as a point to consider – the cost was phenomenal when they tried to do something similar.

B. Ming stated that he understands that buried utilities are more expensive, but the question is whether it’s worth it. People do come before this Board and say that the scenic areas and vistas matter.

B. Moseley recommended emphasizing the cost aspect; there could be dramatically higher costs to burying the lines. B. Ming agreed, and would not mind changing the wording of the question to point that out.

D. Cleveland mentioned that the question is about exploring the cost and benefit – it might not turn out to be feasible, but it could be explored.

R. Hardy read his submitted survey questions:

1. “Would you be in favor of increasing the annual funding for the purpose of purchasing land and increasing the amount of open, undeveloped land in Hollis?”

He stated that he asks the question as it seems like people think that we can just mandate it – but there is a lot of land that we can’t purchase, and maybe we should be thinking about it more, again.

2. “Would you be in favor of increasing the number of houses for the 55+ population?”

He pointed out that we have already addressed that and could probably strike the question.

3. “Do you feel that special event venues are regulated properly in the non-commercial zones?”

He mentioned that this question comes as a result of some of the more recent applications, which

include venues where that use might not have been originally intended.

D. Petry stated that he is good with those questions, and the Board generally concurred.

D. Cleveland read his submitted survey questions:

To preface his first question, he stated that the Town currently has contracts with both Charter Spectrum and TDS for TV, internet, and telephone services. The contracts were negotiated about ten years ago, and are up for renegotiation next year. The Cable Advisory Board will be renegotiating those two contracts.

1. “Do you currently have cable TV?” (Yes, TDS; Yes, Spectrum; No.)

He added that a number of years ago when Charter, which is now Spectrum, came to Town, and they were the only game in Town, there was a survey done by the Town regarding the quality of service by Charter – and there was an extremely heavy negative response. A lot of people complained about Charter in a lot of different ways. When Charter’s contract came up for renewal we were unable to come to an agreement with them, so the Select Board just renewed it for six months at a time and that went on for several years. Then TDS came along, put in fiber optics all over Town, and probably half of Charter’s customers left Charter for TDS.

D. Petry stated that the Select Board gets complaints about both services. When they went through the process mentioned above they tried to reach out to other providers – but the other providers were not interested in bidding. He agreed that it is a good question to ask, but doesn’t know what we’re going to do with the answers unless another provider is willing to come to Town.

2. “Are you satisfied with the currently available TV, internet, and telephone services in Hollis?”

3. “Do you think the Farley Building should be renovated and made available for Town services?”

He believes that the consultant looking into the Farley Building is going to deliver their report in early December regarding the whole renovation and cost of the structure to the Farley Building Committee, of which K. Anderson is Chair.

K. Anderson stated that he doesn’t think that it’s going to be a report with all of the findings; it’s going to be more of a time in which they can start getting better suggestions and guidance.

D. Petry wondered whether we should be segregating questions as to whether they are relative to the Master Plan, or relative what the Town should do as, maybe, part of a Select Board survey. These are valid questions, but are they going to cause us to make changes to the Master Plan? D. Cleveland answered that they probably won’t. They’re more informational.

D. Petry did point out that the Farley Building kind-of plays into Facilities/Planning, if we have a need in Town for space, and that building serves a purpose. Perhaps we could rework the question to ask what residents would recommend the Farley Building be used for.

B. Moseley stated that D. Cleveland’s question 3 partly depends on how the report comes out. By the time the survey is ready, there might already be something of an answer to the question. The concept is valid, but depending upon data presented in the next few months we might want to tweak the phrasing.

D. Petry and K. Anderson agreed that asking what residents suggest we use the Farley Building for could provide helpful input.

801 4. "Do you use the Town's multi-use trails?" (Yes, Beaverbrook; Yes, Town Forest/Conservation
802 Trails; No.)

803
804 5. "Do you support more Workforce and Senior Housing in Hollis?"
805

806 It was generally agreed that we have dealt with Senior Housing; B. Moseley mentioned that we still
807 have to keep Workforce in mind.
808

809 J. Garruba has also submitted questions for potential inclusion in the survey; B. Moseley asked him
810 if he would like to start to present the questions at this meeting, as the allotted hour for Master Plan
811 discussion was nearly up. J. Garruba answered that while he appreciated the offer he had not looked
812 at his questions since he submitted them two or three months ago, or prepared any remarks.
813

814 D. Cleveland pointed out that some of J. Garruba's submitted questions were indeed the same as
815 what some of the Planning Board members submitted.
816

817 J. Garruba stated that he had tried to pull relevant questions from the 2016 survey, but give them
818 more context so that Town residents better understood their implications.
819

820 K. Anderson recommended that the Board request to hold J. Garruba's submission as a pool of
821 questions to consider, as they do bring up valid scenarios and include information that the Board can
822 use. J. Garruba agreed.
823

824
825 **ADJOURNMENT:**
826

827 **Motion to adjourn at 9:13pm**– motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by M. Leavitt; motion passed
828 unanimously.
829

830
831 Respectfully submitted,
832 Aurelia Perry,
833 Recording Secretary.
834

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