HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD SITE WALK NOTES TUESDAY, October 20, 2020 Final

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Moseley, Chair; Doug Cleveland, Vice Chair; Matthew Hartnett, Julie Mook, Rick Hardy

STAFF: Mark Fougere, Planner; Evan J. Clements, Assistant Planner.

TIME: 4:05 PM

WEATHER: Cloudy, 63°F

The Planning Board convened on Tuesday, October 20, 2020 at 4:05 PM to conduct a site walk for the proposed site plan of 82 Runnells Bridge Road Mixed Use Development.

<u>File PB2020:001</u> – Proposed Design Review, site plan application outlining the construction of a 4,500 square foot gas station and one apartment and an 8,000 square foot retail store on a 4.19 acre site, Map 5 Lot 28, 82 Runnells Bridge Road, Applicant and Owner Runnells Bridge Realty Trust, Zoned Commercial.

Also Present: Jason Hill, TF Moran, Kim (?), TF Moran, Mark Archambault, Maureen Baril

Chair Bill Moseley reviewed the procedural rules regarding site walks; specifically that a site walk is a public meeting and the public is welcome to attend, but no public input is allowed.

- J. Hill began by explaining the layout of stakes showing the building areas.
- R. Hardy state that the renderings that have been supplied do not accurately depict the characteristics of the abutting property and its relation to the subject property.
- J. Hill discussed the proposed 5'-10' buffer of evergreen and perennial shrubs.
- R. Hardy stated that the plantings need to be at least 8' tall.
- M. Fougere noted that a fence may be needed in addition to landscaping.
- J. Hill stated that they were open to adding a fence.
- B. Moseley asked if the site could be shifted to the west.
- J. Hill stated that the Savoy property is in the Aquifer Protection Overlay zone and owned by a different entity than the applicant. He explained that the Savoy property was purchased for the purpose of obtaining a grading easement.
- J. Hill stated that the design is restricted by the no waiver request from the Planning Board. He noted that he bypass lane could be converted to landscaping with a reduced aisle width waiver.
- M. Fougere stated that the shown plan is a no waiver plan as the Board wanted.
- R. Hardy asked for an exhibit showing the total impervious surface allowed on the site.
- B. Moseley asked about the controlling interest of the former Savoy lot to the west.

- J. Hill stated that the owner would need to speak to that. He stated that the wetland inhibits the use of the Savoy property.
- M. Fougere asked about the terrain cut along the east property line. Noted that a small 2' retaining wall could be added to increase the height of the screening.
- E. Clements noted the presence of monitoring wells left over from the hydrogeological study.
- J. Mook asked how the site will get power.
- J. Hill stated that power would be run from NH 111.

Kim discussed traffic along NH 111 and the site. He noted that the site would require 470' of site distance per NHDOT requirements.

R. Hardy stated that the site line plan does not show the existing or proposed vegetation.

Kim noted that the expanded turning lane would create some of the required site distance.

- B. Moseley stated that the inside curve would need to be cleared significantly to achieve the required site lines.
- J. Hill stated that NHDOT wants a 3:1 slope with grass for the shoulder.
- J. Hill stated that no wetland impact along the R.O.W. for grading. The retention pond will not infiltrate but will instead treat the water then drain to a outfall. There will be 2' of standing water in approximately 15% of the pond area by the outfall.

The site walk concluded at approx. 5:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Evan J. Clements Assistant Planner