



**Town of Hollis**

7 Monument Square  
Hollis, NH 03049  
Tel. 465-2209 Fax. 465-3701  
[www.hollisnh.org](http://www.hollisnh.org)

**HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**April 21, 2026 – 7:00 PM Meeting - Town Hall Meeting Room**

**MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING BOARD:** Bill Moseley, Chair; Doug Cleveland, Vice Chair; David Petry, Ex-Officio for the Selectmen; Julie Mook; Benjamin Ming; Virginia Mills; Mike Leavitt; Alternate Members: Richard Hardy; Victor Orlando.

**STAFF:** Kevin Anderson, Town Planner & Environmental Coordinator.

**ABSENT:** B. Moseley.

**1. CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 PM.** D. Cleveland called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

V. Mills stated that she will be recusing on File PB2022-015 and on File PB2025-011. D. Cleveland stated that V. Orlando will be voting in place of V. Mills on those cases at this meeting.

D. Cleveland further stated that R. Hardy will be voting in place of B. Moseley at this meeting.

**2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES:**

March 24, 2026: **Motion to approve** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by M. Leavitt. Motion passed, with V. Orlando abstaining.

**3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:**

a. Agenda Additions and Deletions: K. Anderson asked whether the Board would consider moving File PB2026-004, Scenic Road Hearing for Eversource, to first on the agenda. The Board was in agreement.

b. Committee Reports: none.

c. Staff Reports: none.

d. Regional Impact: none.

**4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS:** None.

**5. CASES:**

- 45 a. **File PB2026-004 – Scenic Road Hearing (RSA 231:158):** Eversource tree trimming request and  
46 removal, South Merrimack Road. **Application Acceptance and Public Comment.**  
47

48 K. Anderson stated that we do not have a formal acceptance procedure for such applications; this is  
49 more of an informational meeting to let the Board know that they will be doing tree trimming along  
50 South Merrimack Road. There are some trees that have been noted and delineated. This is pretty  
51 much an annual request from Eversource.  
52

53 Applicant: Alison Marcotte, utility arborist for Eversource Energy. Stated that they are proposing to  
54 remove 23 trees and do some trimming along 22 poles on South Merrimack Road. They are  
55 upgrading the poles because there are two cell phone sites that need to run fiber optic wire between  
56 the poles.  
57

58 Per a question from D. Cleveland, A. Marcotte stated that the work will span from house 22, South  
59 Merrimack Road, to house 200, a distance of about two miles.  
60

61 Per a question from K. Anderson, A. Marcotte stated that the poles will be going up to 45 feet. They  
62 are currently 40 feet. Another Eversource representative stated that at the current height of 40 feet,  
63 they stick out of the ground about 34 feet; at 45 feet they will stick out of the ground about 38 feet.  
64

65 K. Anderson asked whether they will be adding arms to the poles, and therefore doing more tree  
66 trimming than usual. A. Marcotte answered no; it is as-built, so the poles that are out there are just  
67 being replaced with taller poles so that this third-party contractor can run their fiber optics for the cell  
68 towers.  
69

70 Per a question from D. Cleveland, A. Marcotte stated that everything will be chipped the same day as  
71 it is trimmed, and they will do their best to remove all wood the same day also. It may sit for a day or  
72 two, but no longer than a week.  
73

74 R. Hardy stated that some residents had a private bar-way gate on Samuels Way removed by  
75 Eversource, and have had difficulty in getting it replaced. He asked for a telephone number for an  
76 individual from Eversource who could address that problem, other than the regular Eversource  
77 number. A. Marcotte answered that she could give R. Hardy her number, and she can try to contact  
78 the associate who can help with this issue. 603-634-3289 is her office number. She stated that she  
79 recalled hearing that a lock was cut off, and that a new lock needs to be put on. R. Hardy stated that it  
80 has been over a year or so.  
81

82 A. Marcotte confirmed that residents can use that same phone number, her office number, if they have  
83 concerns or questions.  
84

85 D. Petry asked what the definition of ribbon trees is. A. Marcotte answered that ribbon trees are those  
86 that are marked for removal; they have blue and white checkered tape put around them. D. Petry  
87 asked how large some of these trees are, and whether they are mostly dead or simply in the way of the  
88 new poles. A. Marcotte responded that they are probably within the size range of 12-18"; some might  
89 be in decline, and some are marked for removal because they would be in the way of setting the new  
90 poles.  
91

92 D. Cleveland asked whether they are all different kinds of trees. A. Marcotte answered yes, it is a  
93 variety – maples, ash trees, pines. She added that they have discussed the removals with all abutters;  
94 they have been notified, and are aware.  
95

96 Per a question from D. Petry, K. Anderson stated that no questions have come in to the Town Hall  
97 regarding this work as yet.  
98

99 **Motion to accept and approve the application, File PB2026-004** – motioned by D. Petry, seconded  
100 by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

- 101  
102  
103 b. **File PB2022-015 – Final Review:** Proposed development of three lots totaling 36.084 acres located  
104 on Silver Lake Road into a 40-unit (separate residential structures) Housing for Older Persons  
105 condominium. Owner: Raisanen Homes Elite LLC, Applicant: Fieldstone Land Consultants PLLC.  
106 Map 41 Lots 25, 28 & 44, Zoned Residential/Agricultural (R&A). **Continued Discussion, Public**  
107 **Comment Closed.**

108  
109 K. Anderson stated that the Applicant requested to be continued to this meeting to give us an update  
110 on some of the remaining reports that were requested.

111  
112 Applicant: Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer with Fieldstone Land Consultants, for Toddy Brook  
113 Estates. Stated that since their last meeting with the Board, the 72-hour flow test has been completed.  
114 It is his understanding, from talking with the consultant who did the tests, that the results are good,  
115 but they are still collecting data from all the wells that were being monitoring. They hope to have a  
116 report submitted in time for the Board’s next hearing. He has also been in communication with the  
117 Town’s third-party consultant, Frontier Geoservices. They did visit the site and looked at the  
118 operations of the study. The State also visited the site during the study. He looks forward to  
119 providing the Board with this data, and with the report, hopefully for the next meeting. He requested  
120 to have the application continued to the Board’s next meeting.

121  
122 K. Anderson stated that when he gets the data he will review it and write a Staff memo including any  
123 concerns that he has.

124  
125 R. Hardy asked whether a number has been assigned by the State for this. C. Brannon replied that  
126 there is a permit number; that should be on file with the Town. He will be happy to provide that, but  
127 does not have it with him this evening. The State has approved the location for the wells, and they  
128 have also approved the study for the wells to be tested.

129  
130 **Motion to continue File PB2022-015 to the Board’s meeting on May 19, 2026** – motioned by R.  
131 Hardy, seconded by V. Orlando; motion passed unanimously.

- 132  
133  
134 c. **File PB2025-011 – Final Review:** New residential subdivision for 35 new residential homes on a  
135 new road connecting Deacon Lane and Proctor Hill Road (Route 130). Owners: Raisanen Homes  
136 Elite, LLC., Applicant: Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC., Map 17 Lots 5, 8, & 9; Zoned: Rural  
137 Lands (RL). **Continued Discussion, Public Comment Closed.**

138  
139 K. Anderson stated that at the conclusion of the last meeting, the Board requested that the additional  
140 information that VHB provided, the revised traffic summary, be reviewed by our peer review  
141 consultant, GPI. That information was sent, they finished their review, and a representative from GPI  
142 is here to speak to the Board about their review and their comments.

143  
144 K. Anderson also stated that in terms of new information submitted, Fieldstone submitted new revised  
145 sight distance plan and profiles, addressing some of the concerns that the Board has spoken about.  
146 GPI provided a final review comment letter, closing out a lot of those remaining items.

147  
148 K. Anderson did reach out to DOT and spoke with Zach Roller on the phone. In particular, he wanted  
149 ask Z. Roller some of the questions that the Board had in regard to traffic-calming measures and what  
150 the State’s take was on traffic-calming measures. The State is really not against them, but as far as  
151 they are concerned this application was complete enough to initiate and to issue a permit. Any  
152 consideration for traffic-calming measures would be a request from the Town. If the Town asked for

153 additional signage, the cost of the signage would be the burden of the Town. We could pass that cost  
154 down to the Applicant, but future maintenance of those signs would be a burden of the Town. He and  
155 Z. Roller talked about adding signage, speed signs, blinking lights. All of those would be the burden  
156 of the Town to implement.

157  
158 K. Anderson stated that one of the things he and Z. Roller spoke about in depth was reducing the  
159 speed on Proctor Hill Road. That would require a speed study to be conducted. Z. Roller warned that  
160 a lot of times speed studies on rural roads such as this one actually result in increasing the speed,  
161 because there are not a lot of residential houses in the area.

162  
163 K. Anderson stated that we still have the opportunity to implement traffic-calming measures; we can  
164 seek those further in detail.

165  
166 Rebecca Brown from Greenman-Pederson, Inc. (GPI). Stated that she would give the Board a brief  
167 rundown of what they have reviewed to date, where everything is at, and what their remaining  
168 outstanding comments are. She stated that they did conduct a full review of the Applicant's initial  
169 traffic study. In general, they agreed with their study area, the scope, the time periods that they  
170 studied. They also agreed with how they projected traffic volumes out to a future year. They  
171 projected traffic out to a 2027 opening year, and a 2037 design year. GPI also agreed with how they  
172 estimated the traffic that would be generated by the proposed development, and how that traffic  
173 would be distributed on the surrounding area roadway network based on a journey-to-work model  
174 that they had prepared. GPI also concurred with the capacity and queue analysis that they performed  
175 to study the traffic operations at the study area intersections, which included the intersection of  
176 Proctor Hill Road with the site driveway, Deacon Lane with the site driveway, and Proctor Hill Road  
177 with Rocky Pond Road. Overall, the analysis did show good levels of service at all of the  
178 intersections – the one exception to that being exiting and taking a left-hand turn out of Rocky Pond  
179 Road onto Proctor Hill Road, where that was anticipated to operate at a level of service F both under  
180 no-build and build conditions: so, not as an impact from the project itself, but based on background  
181 growth over the future year projections. They did take a look at what is known as the volume-to-  
182 capacity ratios, which is basically comparing how much traffic is passing through the intersection to  
183 how much traffic can get through an intersection. When that volume-to-capacity ratio is less than 1,  
184 there is adequate capacity for traffic to be able to get through. In this case, it was well below 1: so  
185 despite there being a level of service F there, there is adequate capacity for people to get out. They  
186 just have to wait a little bit longer than someone would anticipate waiting at an unsignalized  
187 intersection. The queues there are not anticipated to exceed six vehicles, so they are not going to  
188 extend far back and block Deacon Lane or residential driveways in the surrounding area.

189  
190 R. Brown stated that some of the additional information that they did request as part of their review  
191 included some further breakdown of the crash data that was provided. Essentially, the provided crash  
192 data was somewhat vague and really just gave a total number of crashes. They asked for a breakdown  
193 by the type of collision so that GPI could understand a little bit better what might be causing some of  
194 the collisions. What they saw was that about 40% of the collisions along Proctor Hill Road involved  
195 vehicles running off the road or colliding with a fixed object along the road such as a tree or a sign.  
196 Also, about 2/3 of the crashes occurred in the wintertime – which seems to indicate that people are  
197 traveling too fast for the roadway conditions.

198  
199 R. Brown further stated that some additional information they requested included vehicle turning path  
200 analysis, to make sure that fire trucks, trash pick-up, and delivery vehicles will be able to navigate  
201 through the neighborhood safely. The Applicant did provide that just for a fire truck – however, a fire  
202 truck has a more conservative turning path than a trash truck or a delivery vehicle, so they do think  
203 that there is adequate maneuvering space throughout the site for those vehicles. GPI also asked the  
204 Applicant to provide some additional intersection sight distance plans for the driveway intersections  
205 with Proctor Hill Road and Deacon Lane, which they did provide and which do show that there are  
206 adequate sight lines there for the movements that are being proposed. As the Board is aware, on

207 Proctor Hill Road that intersection will be restricted to a right-in, right-out movement – so they are  
208 not required to provide adequate sight lines to the west.

209  
210 GPI also did ask the Applicant to review potential traffic-calming measures, along both Proctor Hill  
211 Road and Deacon Lane, as well as along the subdivision roadway itself. They have proposed to  
212 install some signage on the subdivision road itself, including some speed limit signs, some  
213 neighborhood signage. Out on Proctor Hill Road and Deacon Lane they are proposing some  
214 “intersection ahead” warning signs to let drivers know that that new intersection is there now. The  
215 one recommendation that GPI did have is that because both subdivision roads meet Deacon Lane and  
216 Proctor Hill Road on curves, they recommended that the Applicant use a slightly different sign than  
217 what they had proposed and that would show an “intersection on a curve ahead” warning. In addition  
218 to those measures, GPI also recommended some supplemental traffic-calming measures. These  
219 would mainly include signage along Proctor Hill Road to alert drivers to some of the more substantial  
220 curves in the area of the site driveway, and the installation of curve chevrons – the yellow and black  
221 arrows that one sees while traveling around a curve. Curve chevrons are typically used along tighter  
222 curves.

223  
224 R. Brown stated that some of the additional things they have down the line, which have not yet been  
225 provided, include that they had requested that while the Applicant did provide intersection sight  
226 distance for each of the driveways and intersections along the subdivision roadway, they have not  
227 provided diagrams for stopping sight distance. The reason that stopping sight distance is important is  
228 that it really applies more for a vehicle that is coming up to a driveway: if another vehicle is stopped,  
229 waiting to make a turn into that driveway, you need to be able to see that vehicle stopped in the  
230 roadway. The height requirements are a little bit different between intersection sight distance and  
231 stopping sight distance. Because this roadway is curving, and there are hills there, it is important to  
232 make sure that there is adequate stopping sight distance.

233  
234 R. Brown stated that the additional traffic-calming measures they recommended are partly  
235 recommended because of what the crash history is showing, that there is a high number of run-off-  
236 the-road crashes; there is a high number of crashes that are occurring in winter months. To go along  
237 with that, they recommended that the Applicant do some clearing of vegetation within the right-of-  
238 way and on the property itself, near the driveway on Proctor Hill Road. What that is partly intended  
239 for is to extend the sight lines as far as possible, but also to reduce that thawing-and-freezing effect  
240 that happens in the wintertime. Particularly where the driveway is so sloped, there is a potential for  
241 melting runoff to come down into the roadway and then freeze at the bottom of the driveway  
242 overnight. They want to make sure that that area is clear of as much vegetation as possible, so that it  
243 maximizes the sunlight on the roadway and reduces the thaw-freeze effect.

244  
245 R. Brown stated that the last outstanding item they have is that they had recommended that the  
246 Applicant provide a location for a bus stop on the site. Currently, they don’t yet know where their  
247 bus stop is going to be; they are still working on determining that. If they do provide a bus stop along  
248 the site roadway itself, GPI would recommend that the Applicant also provide a shelter there and a  
249 pad, or pull-off area, where parents can sit in their vehicles and wait for the bus so that kids are  
250 protected during inclement weather conditions.

251  
252 K. Anderson stated that R. Brown had mentioned sight distance internal to the site, and the difference  
253 between intersection and stopping sight distances. Our ordinances are worded a little bit vaguely,  
254 speaking of all-season safe sight distances. He asked whether there is a good indication that we  
255 should be requesting a whole additional set of sight distance plan and profiles, to verify – not only to  
256 close out our ordinance’s requirements, but to ensure safety on the road.

257  
258 R. Brown responded, stating that the ordinance we currently have does call out that all-season safe  
259 sight distance, which is consistent with what NH DOT uses for their all-season safe sight distance and  
260 is also consistent with what AASHTO calls intersection sight distance. The ordinance does say that

261 the Planning Board has the right to review sight distances in a separate section. Although it only calls  
262 out specific requirements for the intersection sight distance, it does list that you can review sight  
263 distances – in this case, it may be applicable to look at stopping sight distance. In many instances we  
264 only look at intersection sight distance, because for a flat roadway intersection sight distance tends to  
265 be the critical factor. In this case you have more rolling terrain, and stopping sight distance can be a  
266 concern there.

267  
268 D. Cleveland stated that he had a question regarding the right-turn only, and particularly the right turn  
269 going out onto Proctor Hill Road. R. Brown confirmed that she has driven that area, and is familiar  
270 with it. D. Cleveland stated that, assuming that the project is built, if you have a right turn only, and  
271 you have to drive up Proctor Hill Road approximately a third of a mile before you find any place that  
272 you can turn around and then drive back toward the center of Town – which is probably where 95%  
273 of the traffic would be going – . When you drive up to the top of Proctor Hill Road, where do you  
274 think people would be turning around to go back toward the center of Town? He asked whether GPI  
275 looked at that at all, as to where, and how that would possibly be impacted, or how it would affect  
276 traffic.

277  
278 R. Brown responded that they hope that people will not do that; one of the benefits of this project is  
279 that it's residents, who are familiar with the area – as opposed to something like a retail development  
280 where people might not know how to get around and out a different way. Residents are going to  
281 know that they can't take that left-hand turn out. For a resident who wants to head east along Proctor  
282 Hill Road, they would actually drive north on the subdivision road, come out on Deacon Lane and  
283 down Rocky Pond Road, and take that left-hand turn onto Proctor Hill Road from Rocky Pond Road  
284 – instead of going out, taking the right-hand turn, trying to turn around somewhere, and come back.

285  
286 D. Cleveland stated that he thinks that in some people's views that is wishful thinking. It would also  
287 put a considerable amount of traffic onto Deacon Lane, which we know the residents of Deacon Lane  
288 are not happy about. He asked whether R. Brown had given thought to the impact to Deacon Lane,  
289 not to mention Rocky Pond Road.

290  
291 R. Hardy stated that he has two questions; the first one is about the whole process of the intersection  
292 design. Initially, he thinks the Planning Board indicated that on Proctor Hill they would like a design  
293 such that traffic could turn either way, in both directions. He asked what parameters or safety  
294 concerns the State would consider that would mandate, on the exit, only a right turn, and not a left  
295 turn.

296  
297 R. Brown stated that the Applicant doesn't mention in their report ever having analyzed a left-turn-  
298 out scenario. They went with a right-in, right-out because they don't have adequate intersection sight  
299 distance looking to the west from the driveway. Someone who is coming out of the site roadway and  
300 wants to take a left, looking to their right-hand side they do not have enough sight distance there to  
301 see oncoming traffic in that direction. That is primarily why the Applicant recommended the right-in,  
302 right-out condition, and DOT did support that as well.

303  
304 R. Hardy asked whether there is no way that they could create that sight distance, on that property. R.  
305 Brown answered that there may be ways for them to create that sight distance, through clearing of  
306 vegetation – she doesn't know whether that would go over any private properties, or whether it would  
307 require a sight-line easement, but it would require the Applicant to go back to NH DOT.

308  
309 R. Hardy stated that, so, as far as R. Brown can determine, the Applicant never requested that because  
310 of the sight lines. R. Brown confirmed that as the case, as far as she knows, stating that the Applicant  
311 would have to answer as to whether they ever tried to get it – but it was proposed in their reports as a  
312 right-in, right-out on the basis that they didn't meet sight lines in that direction.

313

314 R. Hardy stated that his second question concerns the bus stop. R. Brown had mentioned that the  
315 Applicant would have to project where a bus stop would be located in the development. He looks at  
316 it in terms of how, if the project were to go forward, that would also impact Deacon Lane. There is  
317 nothing that says those cars can't drive down, take a right onto Deacon Lane, and have the children  
318 board the bus there; he doesn't believe there is a way that you can mandate this.  
319  
320 R. Brown added that it sounds like that is what the Applicant is currently proposing – that they utilize  
321 the bus stop at the end of Deacon Lane.  
322  
323 R. Hardy stated that R. Brown suggested there be a pad, a shelter, and a pull-off lane. R. Brown  
324 stated that that is correct, if the bus stop is on the site roadway. R. Hardy asked how that would  
325 happen, if the Applicant isn't even considering a bus stop.  
326  
327 R. Brown stated that the Applicant is still determining where that is going to be; they are in talks right  
328 now with the bus company as to where that bus stop would be located. If it is located along the site  
329 roadway, GPI recommended that they provide either a shelter with a pad there, so that if students are  
330 walking they have a safe area where they are covered. It is their experience that if you do not provide  
331 that, you get a whole line of cars sitting there with kids waiting in their parents' vehicles until the bus  
332 arrives when there are inclement weather conditions.  
333  
334 R. Hardy asked whether, in R. Brown's opinion, she thinks that would happen on Deacon Lane as  
335 opposed to within the development, on Proctor Hill Road. R. Brown said no, that was a  
336 recommendation if the bus stop is on the subdivision roadway – that they design the subdivision  
337 roadway to accommodate a pullout area for a few parents to wait for the bus.  
338  
339 R. Hardy stated that he doesn't think, practically, that if someone lives beyond that pullout area, and  
340 they're going to take a right, and then a right onto Deacon Lane to go to work anyway, they're not  
341 going to end up leaving the children at the end-of-Deacon-Lane bus stop. He asked how you would  
342 propose that the Applicant do a pull-off and a structure there, and whether there is enough room for it  
343 there.  
344  
345 R. Brown stated that she thinks there actually already is a small pull-off at the end of Deacon Lane.  
346  
347 R. Hardy asked whether that has to be considered, as part of the proposal. That could really affect the  
348 traffic on Deacon Lane, because it hasn't been structured for that amount of traffic for bus pick-up.  
349  
350 D. Cleveland stated that currently the bus does not go up Deacon Lane. R. Hardy concurred, stating  
351 that that is his point. He has seen the cars there. If there end up being a lot more cars there, where do  
352 they go? Where do the kids go? Where is the structure? Is the road wide enough? Does it have to  
353 be widened?  
354  
355 V. Orlando stated that he had a question on the stopping sight-distance, which R. Brown mentioned  
356 still had to be provided. He asked whether that is just for the intersections, or whether it includes the  
357 intersections with the driveways as well. R. Brown responded that GPI recommended that the  
358 Applicant provide it for the driveways and intersections along the subdivision roadway. Where the  
359 traffic volumes are going to be so low, along the roadway, it's unlikely that someone is going to be  
360 encountering the need to stop for traffic coming in the other direction – so stopping sight-distance at  
361 the site driveways is not as critical for them to provide. They have provided intersection sight  
362 distance: so there is enough sight distance if someone is coming out of the driveway to see oncoming  
363 traffic in either direction. It's highly unlikely, given the number of units and the low volume, that  
364 someone is ever going to need to stop, to wait for traffic to clear, to turn into their driveway.  
365

366 V. Orlando stated that, so, even though it is requested for the driveway intersections, it's mainly for  
367 the intersection on the roads in the development, and on Proctor Hill and Deacon Lane. R. Brown  
368 confirmed that that is correct.

369  
370 D. Cleveland asked what R. Brown's thoughts are in regard to a coordination meeting between GPI,  
371 NH DOT, the Applicant, and C. Brannon, in regard to these different ideas regarding traffic calming,  
372 design features, and so forth. Is that something that she thinks would be useful and productive, to  
373 work out some of these concerns?  
374

375 R. Brown replied that it could be, although it sounds like there have already been some discussions  
376 with DOT about the traffic-calming measures – and they are somewhat deferring back to the Town to  
377 request those additional measures, if desired. K. Anderson added that he thinks that is correct; his  
378 conversation with DOT was very generalized, to understand how the measures are interpreted and/or  
379 accepted by the DOT. They would entertain any requests from this Board and this Town. If this  
380 Board is going to ask for additional signage, we can go back and ask the Applicant to prepare the plan  
381 and subsequently re-submit to DOT, and have different reviews done. There has also been discussion  
382 about reducing speed limits, and about blinking lights. He was not in a position to discuss with DOT  
383 a decision from this Board because one had not yet been made. He stated that he personally doesn't  
384 know what the benefits would be on some of the requests that could be made, but it is not his  
385 decision. We all have our safety concerns in regard to this intersection, and ultimately the Board has  
386 to decide the next step.  
387

388 In regard to the intersection on Proctor Hill Road, D. Petry asked R. Brown what her recommendation  
389 is for ensuring that people don't take a left and go east on Proctor Hill. To what extent do we have to  
390 design that intersection, beyond just signage? Because signage is not going to do it.  
391

392 R. Brown responded that the Applicant has already designed it by channelizing the right turn, so that  
393 traffic is directed to the right. There is a large island in the middle of the driveway as you reach the  
394 end, which curves off and makes it quite difficult for somebody to make a left hand turn out – not  
395 impossible, but it makes it a lot more difficult for them to do.  
396

397 D. Petry stated that we need to make it impossible, and asked what we would have to do to make it  
398 impossible for someone to turn left there. R. Brown answered that for a passenger car, it's almost  
399 impossible to make it impossible. Passenger cars can turn a lot more easily. D. Petry asked about  
400 making the island taller; R. Brown stated that the height of the island isn't really the factor – it's the  
401 deflection of the island, and whether it gets the car straight on with traffic. They could design the  
402 island to deflect it a little bit more, to get a vehicle more straight on with traffic. The more you do  
403 that, though, the harder it becomes for someone to see that traffic to their left hand side, because they  
404 are turning and looking back over their shoulder – so you start needing to provide an acceleration lane  
405 at that point so that they are moving up with traffic, and then moving over.  
406

407 K. Anderson stated that he is not familiar with standards for a deflection angle, and asked if there are  
408 criteria for this scenario. In this case, looking at what has been designed, he would call it pretty close  
409 to 90 degrees; it's not deflecting very much. Maybe the angle is closer to 70 degrees than to 90. Is  
410 there a standard? Is this something on which we could request additional review to be done? He  
411 stated that there has been a lot of discussion about the habits of individuals who are going to make  
412 left-hand turns, and it is an on-going concern of this Board. Is there a standard such that we could  
413 force this to be angled more, acknowledging that we don't want to reduce the left-hand sight distance,  
414 either?  
415

416 R. Brown replied that, in looking at the radii and everything shown on the diagram, it looks like the  
417 Applicant is meeting what DOT has for their standards, for deflection. They have also gone through  
418 DOT review – so it is likely meeting all of DOT's standards for that deflection, and for having a very  
419 tight radius on the inside of that island and a wider radius on the outside, so that it kind-of guides the

420 car in that direction. Any changes to this will require them to go back to DOT. She also does not  
421 believe that they have much right of way to be able to deflect that any more; they're really  
422 maximizing their deflection capabilities there.

423  
424 K. Anderson stated that R. Brown had briefly mentioned acceleration lanes, and/or some sort of  
425 merging capabilities. He asked what the trigger is for that. He looks at this road and notes that  
426 you're going to be making a right-hand turn up a 10% grade, with a road facing due north that we  
427 know freezes in the winter. Is there some level of security that the Board can have that vehicles are  
428 going to be able to gain traction and get up to speed in a timely manner, going up that hill, without the  
429 need for an acceleration lane or anything like that? He added that he understands that it meets the  
430 DOT criteria – they reviewed it – but asked whether there is any standard that R. Brown could speak  
431 to.

432  
433 R. Brown replied that she doesn't know what the standard is for when an acceleration lane would be  
434 required here; she would have to take a look at that and get back to K. Anderson.

435  
436 D. Cleveland pointed out that unless there is a barrier preventing anyone from getting on the other  
437 side of the road and making a left turn from there, they could do it that way. The natural tendency for  
438 a lot of people is going to be to make an illegal left turn, especially if they don't see any cars coming.  
439 Why bother to go all the way up through the development, all the way down Deacon Lane, all the  
440 way back through Rocky Pond Road, when it's so much shorter to just zip out where nobody is  
441 looking? Even making a right hand turn, going up to Austin Lane, turning around and coming back  
442 down again is still quicker than going all the way out Deacon Lane.

443  
444 R. Brown stated that the Applicant has proposed signage as you come up to that intersection that says  
445 "No Left Turn" so that people know they are not supposed to go to the left-hand side of that island.  
446 They have proposed, on the island itself, a "Keep Right" sign, which is what you would typically do  
447 for a standard. As far as extending that island further back, there is going to be a point at which  
448 someone has to make a decision as to which side of the island they're going to go. If someone really  
449 wants to do it illegally, it doesn't matter how far back you extend that island. You could extend some  
450 striping back a little bit further to make sure that people are aware – more for unfamiliar drivers, than  
451 anyone else. She does not feel that they have to extend the island any further back.

452  
453 D. Cleveland indicated that the design would work if everybody complies with the striping, the signs,  
454 the laws, the regulations, and stated that he thinks there is some concern here that a lot of people  
455 won't obey the law. They will take the easy way out and make a left turn illegally.

456  
457 R. Brown stated she thinks that for the drivers who live in this neighborhood, they are going to know  
458 the danger they're creating by doing that because they face the potential for a head-on collision if they  
459 attempt it. They won't have the sight line to see that on-coming traffic, to know whether or not it is  
460 safe.

461  
462 J. Mook stated that she noticed in GPI's report from April that they mentioned that 40% of the  
463 crashes are in the area of this proposed driveway. That is before there is any additional access point  
464 to that road. She asked R. Brown to speak to the point that this half-mile section is already  
465 responsible for 40% of the accidents that occur there. How would adding an additional access point,  
466 in R. Brown's opinion, affect the possibility of increased traffic crashes?

467  
468 R. Brown stated that the crashes that are happening, that 40% of the crashes they reported along  
469 Proctor Hill Road, are run-off-the-road crashes in the vicinity of the driveway. They are on that  
470 curve, and about 2/3 are happening in the wintertime – a high number of cars running off the road in  
471 the wintertime. One concern that GPI had was that, because they are not providing the sight line to  
472 the west, there is the potential that if a car is coming down the driveway in the wintertime, they could  
473 slide out into the road and there is not that sight line provided there for people to stop – but with the

474 channelization, and that island in the middle, that will help to deflect a car if it does start to slide, so  
475 that it doesn't slide right out into the intersection. That channelization island kind-of plays two roles,  
476 there.

477  
478 R. Brown further stated that the intersection-on-a-curve warning signs that they have recommended  
479 will help to alert people to the fact that they should slow down as they go around that curve because  
480 there is traffic that is going to be coming out. There are currently no curve chevrons around this  
481 corner to alert people about which way the roadway is curving, and that there is a curve there. There  
482 are no curve warning signs at all in this area – so those are a couple of things that they have  
483 recommended, to help alleviate some of these crashes that are occurring: providing that curve  
484 warning signage before you even get to the curve, with an advisory speed placard right below that  
485 sign that would tell you what the safe travel speed for that curve is, and then, going around the curve,  
486 it would be supplemented with the chevrons on the side of the road.

487  
488 J. Mook stated that there doesn't appear to be much that is going to ensure that this section of the road  
489 is safer. She stated that R. Brown is mentioning all of these things because that section of the road is  
490 relatively unsafe. Whether it's the weather, whether it's the curve, whether it's the slope of the hill,  
491 accidents are happening there. Adding an intersection to that road is going to be a problem. She  
492 stated that it didn't make it into R. Brown's data because it happened over 20 years ago, but the  
493 community has witnessed a fatality on that hill and it was a high school student. One can imagine  
494 that this development is going to have high school students going to school. Not all people think  
495 things through to the end, and there may very well be someone at 7 o'clock in the morning thinking  
496 that they're going to do something that they really shouldn't despite the fact that there is a sign or a  
497 stripe on the roadway. We as a Board have to decide whether we are making this situation unsafe for  
498 our residents and for others who are traveling that road. She stated that she hasn't really heard  
499 anything that has convinced her that it is going to be a safe situation.

500  
501 V. Orlando asked R. Brown to speak to the safety, or the dangers, for the cars coming from the east  
502 into the entrance, in terms of sight lines. For example, he could easily foresee a car pulling out of the  
503 entrance and breaking down there. What does the sight line look like, in terms of a car pulling in, to  
504 be able to stop in time to not hit something that is already in that area?

505  
506 R. Brown stated that there is a mound that likely would block sight lines in that scenario.

507  
508 V. Orlando stated that if we take that a little bit further, and we have a residential neighborhood with  
509 kids riding their bicycles up and down the street, he can infer that it would be difficult for a car  
510 pulling into that neighborhood to see the child on the bicycle and be able to stop in time. He asked  
511 whether that is something that R. Brown could envision happening in that area.

512  
513 R. Brown replied that she could see that happening in that area; it could potentially be difficult for  
514 someone as they are coming around that corner to see someone. The channelization there, although it  
515 is done partly to prevent people from taking left-hand turns into that driveway, actually contributes to  
516 a higher turning speed around that corner.

517  
518 B. Ming asked whether there were any suggestions for a sign indicating an upcoming intersection –  
519 not curves, not a neighborhood, but an intersection. R. Brown replied yes, they are currently  
520 proposing intersection signage. GPI recommended that they change that; what the Applicant is  
521 proposing is something like a T-shaped intersection sign, and GPI recommended that they change it  
522 to an intersection-on-a-curve sign so that it shows you both that the road is curving, and that there is  
523 an intersection on the curve. B. Ming stated that he drives that road every day, and you come to this  
524 point really quickly when you drive around the curve. He wanted to echo what the other Board  
525 members have said: this is a dangerous part of that road.

526

527 D. Cleveland asked whether it was the Board's consensus that they agree with all of the mentioned  
528 traffic-calming measures, and that this should be discussed between the Applicant and DOT.  
529

530 K. Anderson stated that if the Board wants a particular traffic-calming measure, they will need to  
531 request it specifically. Possibilities include signage, lights, a reducing speed limit sign. There are  
532 options out there, and they do not need to be determined at this meeting. There are still outstanding  
533 plan comments that need to be addressed.  
534

535 K. Anderson further stated that it would appear that all the work that has been done by VHB falls in  
536 line with the guideline requirements of DOT. There are some possibilities for additional requests, be  
537 it signage, or other things. If we are going to request those, we need to be specific.  
538

539 B. Ming asked whether the Board needs to be specific in terms of location, or simply in terms of type.  
540 K. Anderson answered that they need to be specific in terms of the type. DOT is going to be  
541 reviewing this plan set, and they are going to be looking for a final decision from this Board. They  
542 have issued a permit; this is an approved location in DOT's eyes. If the Board wants additional  
543 signage, they will need to be specific about it. If they want to go down the route of asking for speed  
544 reduction in this area, they will need to specifically request that and then it can be done through the  
545 Applicant.  
546

547 D. Petry recommended that K. Anderson draft a list of his concerns, a list of GPI's concerns, send it  
548 to the Applicant's representative, C. Brannon, and let him prepare responses for the Board's next  
549 meeting at which they can talk through every one of those elements. After C. Brannon provides  
550 answers, D. Petry thinks that this Board needs to decide whether, between this Board and the Select  
551 Board, we are going to send a letter to the State regarding our concerns – because this intersection is  
552 not safe. He does not care what anybody says, or what traffic-calming measures they are going to  
553 propose; this is a bad intersection – and he doesn't know why everybody is afraid to say that.  
554

555 D. Cleveland stated that he thinks they've all said that, to which D. Petry responded that nobody has  
556 said that it is a bad intersection and we should not propose it. D. Petry added that, quite frankly, if  
557 this were to be approved, and that intersection were approved, who would be liable if something were  
558 to happen there? It's not the State, it's not the developer – it's the Town.  
559

560 Per a question from V. Orlando, it was clarified that the stopping sight distance on which we are still  
561 waiting is for the individual driveways.  
562

563 K. Anderson had some questions for the Applicant's representative, C. Brannon.  
564

565 Applicant: Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer with Fieldstone Land Consultants.  
566

567 K. Anderson asked whether, when the Applicant submitted their application to DOT, it was a full,  
568 uncontrolled intersection, with left turns and right turns, or whether it was always designed and  
569 submitted to DOT with right-only turns.  
570

571 C. Brannon responded that we actually had a meeting here in this building, and we talked about  
572 everybody's desire to have it be a full-access intersection. DOT was here. The intent was always for  
573 this to be a full-access intersection. It was reviewed with DOT that way, in the scoping meeting.  
574 When the traffic study was completed, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed exceeded DOT's normal sight  
575 distance requirements so they deferred to an AASHTO standard at that point. The intersection sight  
576 distance to the west met DOT's 440 feet, but it doesn't meet the AASHTO standards. DOT said right  
577 out of the gate that this intersection will need to meet AASHTO standards, and because of that it will  
578 be permitted as restricted access.  
579

580 K. Anderson summarized that it was DOT that made the decision to make it a right-in, right-out  
581 intersection. C. Brannon concurred.

582  
583 C. Brannon stated that we did have a full discussion; he thinks the Fire Department and Police  
584 Department were in attendance, along with K. Anderson, Planning Consultant Mark Fougere,  
585 members of the Planning Board including D. Cleveland. There was a very transparent dialogue with  
586 the DOT, stating what the goal was from the developer's side and certainly from the Town's side.  
587 This process has unfolded based on the data, and on what DOT is willing to permit on their highway.  
588 He stated that the Applicant met DOT's initial standards, but to the point about the speed – be careful  
589 of the speed study, because it might yield that the speed should be higher. That is probably because  
590 of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, and how people travel the road.

591  
592 C. Brannon stated that he wanted to clarify a few things. There is no formal requirement in the Town  
593 regulations for bus stop design – and frankly, they don't get to determine where a stop is. They have  
594 reached out to the bus company, to see if this subdivision would change how they access and service  
595 the development. There is a strong likelihood, if they can get someone to talk about this plan, that  
596 this proposal would improve bus traffic through the neighborhood because a bus could conceivably  
597 enter this intersection, take a right-hand turn into the development, and then drive down through  
598 Deacon Lane. If that was the desired path, the Applicant would provide a bus stop location per the  
599 recommendations on site. They are not stating that they are not willing to do that; those things  
600 sometimes are actually determined as a condition of approval because the bus companies don't really  
601 evaluate subdivisions until they are approved. That has been his company's finding, in terms of  
602 developments. They have done developments of higher density in Town, and they have never done a  
603 bus stop as part of the planning process. In the same vein, this Town has never required stopping  
604 sight distance on any subdivision that he is aware of, at any intersection, for driveways. He stated  
605 that they have provided what is required for Hollis's regulations, they have proven every single one of  
606 the lots, and they have submitted that. It doesn't mean that they're not necessarily willing to look at  
607 that, but that would be a standard that this development would be evaluating that exceeds any other  
608 subdivision that has been approved at this Board. He thinks that that is why K. Anderson wants to  
609 look into that a little bit more, because we did talk about that not being supported by the Town  
610 regulations – which is why they didn't submit it as part of a formal submission.

611  
612 C. Brannon further stated that when it comes to sight distance at this intersection, he would disagree  
613 with some of the representations this evening. With all due respect, people probably aren't as  
614 intimately aware of what is designed here. There is not a berm between that intersection and the sight  
615 distance to the east. They could grade that out and provide more clearing, if that is desired, but that is  
616 a drainage swale – which means that that elevation is below the road. It is lower, so there would be  
617 increased visibility. The visibility in that direction is very long; he thinks that in the sight distance  
618 profile they provided, they stopped at 560 feet. There is great visibility looking to the east. He does  
619 not see that same concern, which may have been represented, there.

620  
621 He stated that certainly, if you get into the site further, you start contemplating that hill a little bit. At  
622 that point, it's no different than any other intersection that they have ever designed in Town. You're  
623 turning into a development, you're starting to gain visibility as you make that turn, and you're starting  
624 to climb that travel lane. There is no standard for evaluating that. They meet all the geometric  
625 standards, they meet all the sight distance requirements. They are happy to look at it if it is a concern,  
626 but that certainly has not been something expressed to date.

627  
628 C. Brannon stated that it has been a pleasure working with GPI on the review of this project; he thinks  
629 they were very thorough. They do have a number of recommendations in their last letter, which he  
630 understands is a lot more signage being added. They are happy to make those revisions, as suggested.

631  
632 As there were no more questions from Staff or the Board at this point, D. Cleveland stated that we  
633 just need to continue this case to the Board's next meeting.

634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686

K. Anderson stated that he will prepare a more detailed letter regarding some of the recommendations. He will reach out to C. Brannon to work through them, and they will present some additional options. There are remaining comments on the plans, to be addressed.

D. Cleveland stated, to sum it up, we all agree that it's not a highly desirable intersection, and we think it's really dangerous. He thinks the best that C. Brannon could do is to implement all of these traffic-calming measures that we've been talking about, to try to minimize the hazards.

C. Brannon stated that he is happy that K. Anderson had an opportunity to talk with Z. Roller in regard to some additional, potential traffic-calming elements on the State highway. The Applicant has reviewed those, and are willing to work with the Board on implementing those – but he thinks that K. Anderson and R. Brown touched on it: ultimately, DOT has permitted the intersection, so it's up to this Board to determine what practice, if any, in addition to what has already been proposed, they want to see. Then we can talk about that detail, and how it gets implemented into the plan. He requested to be continued to the Board's next meeting.

**Motion to continue File PB2025-011 to the Board's meeting on May 19, 2026** – motioned by D. Petry, seconded by V. Orlando; motion passed unanimously.

- d. **File PB2025-019 – Design Review:** 3-lot minor subdivision, Ridge Road, Owner/Applicant: Cutter Place Properties, LLC, Map 13 Lots 12, Zoned: Town Center and Residential & Agricultural (R&A). **Continue with discussion, Public Comment Closed.**

K. Anderson stated that at 5pm today the Board had a site walk of this property. They had a good opportunity to walk the entire site with the Applicant's representative. They looked at several different driveway locations. Initially, it was proposed to have three separate, individual driveways to access the three lots on the parcel. The Board has asked for shared driveways for both of the lower two, and utilizing the existing farm road up through the property. Ultimately, the idea at this meeting is to move this application to Final if they meet all of the Board's criteria, and to give the Applicant a recommendation as to a particular shared driveway configuration – or whether we want to go with a common driveway for three lots: three driveways off of one access point.

D. Cleveland stated that there are four different driveway plans that have been provided.

K. Anderson suggested that the Board also discuss some screening, maybe some no-cut buffers to give the Applicant an idea of where we want them to go for their final submission.

Applicant: Brad Casperson, professional engineer with Meridian Land Services. Stated that, beyond what K. Anderson mentioned, he did want to touch on the vernal pool. They had their certified wetland scientist go and revisit the site. He inspected the wetlands and, to summarize what he noted, this wetland is not a vernal pool primarily because the area cannot retain surface water because of its physical characteristics. Basically, there isn't enough ponding depth with how the bottom of the wetland sits vs. where the actual outlet culvert sits – so there is just not enough ponding to support a vernal pool.

Regarding the driveway options, D. Cleveland stated that his personal preference right now is the plan labeled E-5, with one common driveway.

V. Orlando concurred, stating that he likes that one the most as well. He stated that, on the site walk, D. Petry brought up that it puts the cars out such that, for the house across the street, you don't have to worry about the driveway interference. He asked whether there would have to be a variance for

687 three lots on one single driveway. K. Anderson answered that it would be a waiver request, to  
688 approve three driveways off of a single access point.

689  
690 R. Hardy stated that he thinks the one common driveway would be a more natural approach. He  
691 believes there would be less grading required, and he agrees with the comment that it puts traffic to  
692 the east side of the property rather than the west side. He also thinks that that would cause less visual  
693 degradation to the fields, because the homes would be above that ridge a little bit and it seems like a  
694 very natural presentation.

695  
696 V. Mills concurred with R. Hardy and V. Orlando. She stated that that is the benefit of a site walk:  
697 you can get out and walk the land. She thinks that the one common driveway option definitely has  
698 the least impact, and it flows nicely. She is 100% in favor of that option.

699  
700 J. Mook, B. Ming, D. Petry, and M. Leavitt concurred.

701  
702 D. Cleveland stated that it sounds like the Board is unanimously in agreement on the driveway plan,  
703 E-5.

704  
705 K. Anderson stated that when the submission comes in, he will get our Fire Department and Police  
706 Department's input on the configuration.

707  
708 D. Cleveland stated that he thinks the Board was also inclined to ask for the minimum amount of any  
709 clearing. They would like to preserve as many of the peach trees as possible, not clear-cut, and  
710 minimize any other clearing by the road.

711  
712 B. Casperson stated that he thinks that all of the vegetation for the curb cuts would remain, and  
713 everything within the wetland buffer – there is that treed area, which contains the wetland. He is sure  
714 the intent is to keep as many peach trees up at the top as possible, but if there is a house construction  
715 that requires them to be removed, or if it doesn't comply with certain requirements like septic – we  
716 can't have trees or any rooting materials for the septic they design, or stormwater. But the  
717 vegetation along the frontage and the wetlands is not intended to be touched.

718  
719 R. Hardy commented on the peach trees, stating that he doesn't think that should be a strong  
720 argument for saving them; we can all see what happened to Woodmont, east. All the apple trees they  
721 saved are almost non-existent, now, because different owners didn't take care of them. From his  
722 personal point of view and from a farming perspective, if an owner isn't dedicated to taking care of  
723 them it's not going to be of any aesthetic benefit in five or six years.

724  
725 V. Orlando stated that he is good with the Applicant protecting the trees in the corner that they are not  
726 touching, and in the road area. He thinks that is reasonable. Obviously where the driveway has to go  
727 in, they will be cut down.

728  
729 K. Anderson stated that the Board will need a motion to move the application to Final, to close out  
730 Design Review. He suggested that the motion include an ability such that when a plan is submitted to  
731 him, he and R. Hardy can sit down and have an informal discussion about landscaping or vegetation  
732 buffers.

733  
734 **Motion to move File PB2025-019 to Final Review, with the ability to discuss landscaping with**  
735 **Rick Hardy when the plan comes in** – motioned by V. Orlando, seconded by J. Mook; motion  
736 passed unanimously.

737  
738 e. **File PB2026-003 – Design Review:** Project is located in both Hollis and Amherst. Site plan for a  
739 contractor yard, 30 Northern Boulevard, Amherst. Owner/Applicant: Golden Valley Way Holdings,

K. Anderson stated that this project is unique; all of the improvements are being constructed in Amherst. Geographically, this property comes in from the northern section of Hollis, on the north side of Witches Brook. The proposal for the site improvements in Amherst includes a 10,000 square foot shop building, a little over an acre of paved area. As part of the application they are proposing to fill in flood plain areas in a corner of where the proposed building is going. Subsequently, to handle all of the improvements in Amherst, the proposal is utilizing the upland area in Hollis to locate their stormwater management area, excess soil stockpile area, and what is referred to as compensatory storage – when you fill in a wetland you need to hollow out another area of the same elevation and volume to retain that flood volume. That flood compensatory storage work will be conducted in Hollis. As far as the jurisdiction of the Town of Hollis goes, there are really no site plan improvements. We are really just dealing with stormwater, a stockpile area, and this compensatory storage. Both of the last two items are within our 100 foot buffer adjacent to Witches Brook, so we have multiple levels of ordinances to review. We are in the aquifer protection overlay, the wetland conservation overlay, and the floodplain overlay. The project is in its infancy, in Amherst; they have met conceptually. In Hollis, this is a design review meeting because the application was sufficient. The Applicant was not present for the Conservation meeting, so they had to re-schedule that meeting. We are at the beginning stages of this project.

Applicant: Jason Hill, with T.F. Moran, for the owner and the Applicant. He showed an aerial view of the site, stating that it is the sand pit on the right-hand side of Northern Boulevard in Amherst. It is in the Bon Terrain industrial park vicinity, but the southern tip of it extends into the Town of Hollis. There is no frontage in Hollis, there is no existing access in Hollis; it's just land. It's about 2.5 acres of primarily disturbed land, with the exception of the wetland area around the Brook. Most likely it was used for sand and gravel to develop Bon Terrain. Even within the wetland buffers, a lot of the site has been cleared, and it is just a sand pit area, an open area. There are existing stockpiles of material that was left. All of the physical improvements, with the exception of the pond area, are in Amherst – the building, the yard, the small parking area, septic.

J. Hill further stated that as he understands it, the pond itself is permitted by right in the wetland protection district, so it is subject to site plan approval. The project is subject to Amherst site plan approval. The Applicant has filed the final approval hearing application, and J. Hill is meeting with them on May 6 to get approved. They need an AFT permit from DES, a Shoreland permit from DES, and septic approval. With regard to the floodplain mitigation, he stated that a portion of the building is situated such that fills a portion of the floodplain. The compensatory mitigation is to replace the volume of storage that is occupied, to mitigate an equal volume. They originally planned on doing it in the purple space on a diagram shown to the Board, because it was a good place, nice, natural – it was already cleared, primarily, and appropriate for the use, but they have other appropriate locations, and, given the regulatory complexity in Hollis, they're going to amend that and move it to Amherst, along with the stockpile. They anticipate that there is going to be a net cut excess, so they are allowing for storage of the cut on site, to minimize the trucking and the export. They will be removing those features, and are now just talking about a pond. The pond will be a bio-filtration system. The total scope in Hollis is limited to that bio-filtration system at this point. Their next submission will include those amendments – the floodplain mitigation and the stockpile are being relocated. They plan to meet with the Conservation Commission in the near term, seeking support for this. There will be another small, kidney-shaped basin in Amherst, for additional runoff: a small pond, similar style. The yard area in Amherst is going to be paved, for a small fleet of vehicles, trailers, and equipment for the company. In Hollis there will be no light proposed, or impervious area, or buildings. There will be some landscaping in the basin itself; they have some plantings, some shrubbery, to assist in the treatment of the stormwater. They are looking to start work this summer.

793 K. Anderson stated that his next step, after J. Hill presented the proposal, was to go into a detailed  
794 review of the zoning requirements and what this Board's direction is, from our zoning ordinance.  
795 This is the first he has heard that we are not going to have the compensatory storage or the stockpile,  
796 so that changes some of the complexity of the project – we are now limiting it to stormwater.  
797 Stormwater is an allowed use, per our ordinance, in the wetland conservation overlay. The majority  
798 of this stormwater pond is outside of the wetland conservation overlay – the 100 foot wetland buffer.  
799 That is something that this Board can speak about. This site has been disturbed and altered through  
800 its history. Alteration of terrain permits are for when you disturb over 100,000 square feet; this  
801 property triggers that, so there is a level of State review. Those permits have already been submitted  
802 to the State, along with a Shoreland permit – which is for disturbances within 250 feet of, in this case,  
803 Witches Brook. K. Anderson asked J. Hill whether both of those applications are going to get  
804 amended, if they are removing improvements depicted on the current application.  
805

806 J. Hill replied that the Shoreland would have to, because they are removing disturbance within the  
807 district.  
808

809 K. Anderson stated that it was premature to send those to begin with, but now they will have to be  
810 altered and amended. He will leave that up to J. Hill. J. Hill stated that he will update them. J. Hill  
811 also stated that the changes were just determined today; he would have kept K. Anderson in the loop.  
812

813 K. Anderson stated that there were variance requirements as part of improvements within the wetland  
814 conservation overlay, there was some directive that this Board needed to determine with approvals  
815 within the aquifer protection – but the removal of the compensatory storage and the stockpile will  
816 eliminate those two requirements.  
817

818 D. Cleveland stated that the infiltration pond is really the only thing that we are concerned with. K.  
819 Anderson stated that that is correct; it will, and has, triggered Conservation to look at this application.  
820 They are scheduled to be heard on May 20<sup>th</sup>. Revised plans will need to be sent, and brought to their  
821 attention. He would encourage Conservation to talk about the buffer that has already been disturbed,  
822 and/or any of the requirements needed for restoration, and/or the Shoreland permit associated with it.  
823 We're kind-of at a stalling point until we receive comment from Conservation, now that the flood  
824 storage and stockpile have been removed. Those were very complicated, in terms of how they were  
825 interacting between two towns.  
826

827 D. Cleveland asked whether the infiltration will be dry most of the time, whether it will only handle  
828 excessive runoff, heavy rain. J. Hill answered that it will be for any runoff, but also heavy runoff. It  
829 is a dry pond. The soils are actually rapid, out there, per the aquifer; they tested them. It is designed  
830 as an infiltration pond because they would promote infiltration where they can. Because of the  
831 rapidity, they put a filter soil which has been tested for treatment. They are going to put a filter soil  
832 beneath the basin, which will filter it before it actually goes into the groundwater table. It's a  
833 filtration system, followed by infiltration into the ground. This is a very efficient system, both in  
834 terms of how it handles water and the quality of treatment. It has high levels of removal of  
835 phosphorus and nitrogen. The pond will be dry most of the time. There is actually no proposed  
836 outlet; they intentionally designed it so there is no point discharge, to avoid working close to the river  
837 in the wetlands. This only has an overflow, such that when you have a 100-year storm above, it will  
838 overtop with an emergency overflow device and flow into the river. There are no new pipes sticking  
839 out into the river, from this design. J. Hill further stated that, in regard to preservation of the buffer,  
840 this design also has that built into it.  
841

842 Per a question from D. Cleveland, J. Hill clarified that by "river" he means Witches Brook.  
843

844 K. Anderson stated that in his review of the application and the applications that were submitted to  
845 Amherst, he was trying to get an idea of what is actually going to be constructed out there and what  
846 the property is going to be used for. It is noted in our application as a contractors' building, storage

847 area, parking, and a small fleet of paving trucks and trailers. Amherst Planning Board conceptual  
848 hearing notes that it is a paving company, a contractor building, a tractor yard that houses a fleet of  
849 trucks, a small amount of materials stored on site, a holding tank for washing vehicles, office space,  
850 and employee parking.

851  
852 K. Anderson asked what is actually being constructed in Amherst, and what the residual stormwater is  
853 that Hollis is going to receive. With the notations of a paving company, he assumes that this is going  
854 to be oil-laden runoff stormwater. How is this going to be treated, and eliminate any sort of harm or  
855 contamination to Witches Brook?

856  
857 J. Hill responded that the use for this is for a small paving subcontractor. There will be five or six  
858 people working in the building during the day, maybe a couple crews, a small fleet of trucks – under  
859 10. This is a small operation, although it hopes to grow over time. It is a small paving subcontractor,  
860 with a small fleet of equipment. He maintains his vehicles only at licensed, off-site facilities that  
861 wash, pressure-wash, and handle fleet maintenance. There is no intended pressure washing or fleet  
862 maintenance as part of this project that will occur on this property. There is also no seal-coating;  
863 there will be no seal-coating tanks stored, or seal-coating trucks stored. They are not using the  
864 property for any of those sub-activities. They are not proposing to do any washing of equipment or  
865 anything like that on the site. Even maintenance is not going to be performed in the shop. There is  
866 going to be no significant maintenance occurring, or storage of large amounts of kerosene tanks, or  
867 anything like that. J. Hill stated that he has discussed that specifically with the owner. It won't  
868 generate any more pollutant load than any light industrial type use that you could put on the site –  
869 therefore, the proposed bio-filtration system handles the proposed pollutant load that they are  
870 planning for from this process.

871  
872 D. Cleveland asked what might be running off into this filtration pond. Would there be asphalt-type  
873 runoffs? J. Hill replied that from his understanding, they clean the products on-site when they are  
874 paving, generally, and dispose of it on-site, or get rid of it at a facility. They don't bring it back to the  
875 shop. By the time they'd get it back to the shop it would be stuck, and they wouldn't be able to get it  
876 off. It would be cured, or in the curing process. The Applicant is not proposing to come back and do  
877 daily cleaning of any of the equipment on this property such that would require, or generate, any  
878 significant load of that stuff to the system. DES also looks at that, as part of the AOT process – the  
879 usage, and what they determine as a "high-load" site. Considering that this is a small-scale operation,  
880 it would not trigger a "high-load" classification, which would be prohibitive of certain types of  
881 practices.

882  
883 V. Orlando mentioned a previous set of plans that were recently approved by the Planning Board for  
884 another project, and that, when the engineer brought changes the night of the Board's hearing, B.  
885 Moseley stated that they would have to wait until the next meeting because changes cannot be  
886 accepted the night of the hearing. He asked whether this case is even something we should be  
887 looking at right now, if the plans have changed?

888  
889 J. Hill replied that they didn't change the stormwater pond.

890  
891 V. Orlando asked K. Anderson and the other Board members whether this is something we should  
892 even be considering or talking about, if these aren't the correct plans at the current time.

893  
894 K. Anderson answered yes, we are just finding out about the changes now – however, we have the  
895 ability to try to scope in where we need this to go. More particularly, if the Applicant is going to be  
896 going before the Conservation Commission, to give them the opportunity to prepare, or to be aware of  
897 what is necessary for Conservation. We are all aware of Witches Brook. From some previous  
898 applications we know that there are some pretty substantial environmental reports being done and  
899 discussed. We know about the natural trout breeding that occurs there. Vegetative buffers and  
900 diminished buffers are on his list of highest concerns, and he would hope that the Conservation

901 Commission would pick up on those. Stormwater management is allowed in our ordinance, as long  
902 as it is done in accordance with Alteration of Terrain standards. They are going to review this insofar  
903 as treatment, pre-treatment meeting all of the criteria, the filter management. When those finalized  
904 plans come back to us, there can be implemented inspection plans by this Board. We can do annual  
905 inspections; we do those on other sites here in Town. Is there a concern for the buffer, and do we  
906 need to verify that? There are a lot of other further steps, but at this point we are just having a very  
907 basic conversation.

908  
909 D. Petry added, to answer V. Orlando's question, that if the Applicant had shown up with new plans  
910 and handed them out at this meeting then no, we would not be talking about them tonight. We should  
911 be talking about what is in front of us.

912  
913 D. Petry stated that he has a couple of questions. He has heard a lot about what they are going to do  
914 here. This is a 10,000 square foot, 20-foot tall building. He asked whether it is correct that they are  
915 just going to store equipment here, and that that is all they will be doing. J. Hill answered that there  
916 are administrative offices in the building.

917  
918 D. Petry asked where the water supply is coming from, for this building. J. Hill answered that it is  
919 municipal water, from Pennichuck. Per another question from D. Petry, J. Hill confirmed that there  
920 are no plans to drill any wells on this site.

921  
922 D. Petry asked whether K. Anderson is aware that the Applicant is a foreign liability LLC. K.  
923 Anderson stated that he is not aware of that; he has heard a lot of rumors as to who it may or may not  
924 be. D. Petry stated that he just looked it up, so he has a lot of questions as to what is really going to  
925 happen on this site. He stated that Golden Valley Way Holdings, LLC was registered in New  
926 Hampshire on June 13, 2025 as a foreign limited liability company with an address at 15 Wasserman  
927 Heights, Merrimack. What is a holding company from California doing in Amherst, supposedly as a  
928 paving company? It doesn't pass the smell test.

929  
930 J. Hill stated that he was trying to get them on via Zoom tonight, because of the distance, and was told  
931 that the Town didn't have the capability to let them participate. He asked whether there is a way that  
932 we could make that happen. He would like that to happen for the next meeting, as it could help the  
933 Board with certain questions.

934  
935 R. Hardy asked for a copy of the Applicant's environmental study, insofar as the wildlife study. J.  
936 Hill replied absolutely, and apologized if it was not submitted. R. Hardy stated that he would like to  
937 know who did the study, and when it was done. He stated that Witches Brook is one of the top five  
938 producing volume trout streams in New Hampshire. It has been heavily studied by Fish and Game, as  
939 well as other entities.

940  
941 J. Hill stated that T.F. Moran prepared a study for NH DES Ecological Review, which is currently  
942 pending.

943  
944 K. Anderson stated that it was submitted as part of the online application. He asked whether it's not  
945 mostly a data check, through NHB. J. Hill stated that what is required is that you work with a new  
946 bureau, the Ecological Review Section, to identify and minimize impacts to any threatened or  
947 endangered species. They submitted that to the Town, and it is under review currently with DES;  
948 they are processing the application. They identified a couple of State threatened and endangered  
949 species within 1,000 feet, or something. They are going to provide the Applicant with any specific  
950 measures.

951  
952 R. Hardy stated that, then, Fish and Game hasn't weighed in on this at all. J. Hill responded that it is  
953 pending. They have identified things, and now they are studying what we need to do to -. R. Hardy  
954 asked what they have identified. J. Hill answered that it is not on site; it is within a vicinity of the

955 site. Plant species: licorice golden rod, state threatened. Northern blazing star, state listed  
956 endangered. Those are just habitats which are within a potential radius of the site. One vertebrate  
957 species, the eastern hognose snake, is state endangered, and then the spotted turtle, threatened.  
958

959 R. Hardy stated that, then, there is nothing about native brook trout. J. Hill stated that that is correct.  
960 R. Hardy stated that he thinks the Applicant is going to have some issues there. This is one of the top  
961 five native brook trout streams in New Hampshire, as recognized by Fish and Game. It is an  
962 ecologically valuable asset to our area, and it is one which the Town wants to preserve and protect.  
963

964 J. Hill stated that they are not working within the streams or wetlands. R. Hardy stated that they're  
965 impacting the streams because they have overflow going into the streams. They could potentially  
966 impact Witches Brook because they have an overflow area that can overflow in a 100 year storm.  
967

968 K. Anderson asked whether Fish and Game will be notified as part of the Alteration of Terrain permit  
969 procedures, and/or the Shoreland permit. J. Hill answered yes, for both. K. Anderson stated that,  
970 then, Fish and Game will review on both of those. He asked whether either of those State permits  
971 require Conservation comments to be submitted. J. Hill stated that he is not positive whether  
972 Shoreland does or not. AOT definitely does not, but the AOT permit is going to the ecological group  
973 that was set up for this exact purpose.  
974

975 K. Anderson summarized that a Board member is asking for a wildlife study to be done. Those are  
976 typically done by another, separate entity that is going to do a report on the site, going through and  
977 evaluating. The NHB and ecological data check report is a piece of that entire report. No study or  
978 report was done on this specific site. He does not know whether it is going to be further requested  
979 through the State permits.  
980

981 D. Cleveland stated that the 10,000 square foot building appears to have a roof-drain, draining right  
982 into this filtration area. All the water that accumulates on the roof of the building is going to be piped  
983 right into the pond. J. Hill stated yes, that is as it is currently planned. 2/3 of the paved storage would  
984 be drained into that area, as well.  
985

986 R. Hardy asked what the square footage of pavement is, overall. J. Hill answered that it is about an  
987 acre. K. Anderson stated the application gives the number as 55,757. It was clarified that that is  
988 more than an acre.  
989

990 J. Mook stated that this has been called a small operation, and questioned the need for an acre of  
991 paved area. She stated that that seems excessive. J. Hill stated that they have long trailers, and they  
992 don't want to do construction multiple times. The equipment and maneuverability is the rationale for  
993 the size and the layout of the yard. It is necessary for them to have practical use for their business. A  
994 smaller area would not allow them to be efficient in the way that they operate.  
995

996 V. Mills stated that you have the roof drainage and the drainage from the large parking lot all going  
997 into the infiltration basin. There was an emergency spillway going to the flood storage, and now the  
998 flood storage area is gone. She asked whether that is correct.  
999

1000 K. Anderson stated that at this point we don't have the correct plans. There is an overflow indicated  
1001 on the stormwater pond. The overflow is directed to the compensatory storage area, which is no  
1002 longer part of this application. Because we are dealing with plans that aren't correct and up to speed,  
1003 he doesn't know how much further the Board can go.  
1004

1005 J. Hill stated that every pond has an emergency overflow; it is a fundamental thing. It means that it  
1006 won't flood the site when you have a 150 year storm. This pond holds a 100 year storm, meaning that  
1007 there is actually no water predicted. You need a 150 year storm to have any water leaving it.  
1008

1009 V. Mills stated that her concern is that if this overflows, does it go to Witches Brook? J. Hill  
1010 answered yes. V. Mills stated that that is a concern.

1011  
1012 J. Hill stated that they have minimized that concern by designing the pond to have a very low  
1013 potential for overflowing. Alternative locations would be directed at abutting properties, where there  
1014 is essentially no discharge today. Witches Brook is a fourth-order river, so the amount of water to the  
1015 Brook during a 150 year storm compared to the volume of the floodway is like a drop in a bucket. At  
1016 that point he is concerned not about the amount of water, but about erosion. They have built a check  
1017 dam so that when the water floods out of the pond it has to flow 100 feet to get down to the river  
1018 because they put the pond as far away as they can. They have designed the system to minimize  
1019 erosion and minimize runoff.

1020  
1021 R. Hardy asked whether we can require a wildlife study at this point. D. Petry concurred that we  
1022 should do that now.

1023  
1024 D. Cleveland asked about the purpose of the other little pond, on the other side of the parking area. J.  
1025 Hill stated that it is the same idea, and K. Anderson stated that it is to capture runoff from the front  
1026 portion of the development, in Amherst. D. Cleveland asked whether that pond could be expanded to  
1027 have the same purpose as the proposed pond in Hollis, and keep everything in Amherst.

1028  
1029 J. Hill stated that there is not enough room in that area, and also that there are no natural outlets – so  
1030 if it overflows, it would just be flowing into the right of way which is not where the water goes today.  
1031 Today, any water that discharges from the site mostly goes to the Brook – and there is another brook  
1032 on the back side, that is in Amherst. They want to maintain the grading pattern of the site. They are  
1033 using the natural topography as much as possible, to minimize the cuts and fills. Therefore, the low  
1034 point is down in Hollis and it is appropriate to split the drainage.

1035  
1036 K. Anderson stated that on April 15 the Amherst Planning Board met to determine whether the  
1037 application had regional impact. He asked whether they made a determination on that. J. Hill  
1038 answered yes; they voted that it did have regional impact. K. Anderson stated that in that case we  
1039 will be notified for their May 6 Planning Board meeting. That meeting of the Amherst Planning  
1040 Board on May 6<sup>th</sup> is followed on May 13<sup>th</sup> by their Conservation Commission meeting. He believes  
1041 that a lot of what we can talk about in terms of questions and scope will be subsequent to those  
1042 meetings. This project is very much in its infancy.

1043  
1044 In regard to Golden Valley Way Holdings, LLC, V. Orlando stated that the primary person on the  
1045 LLC is Thomas Stanley. Thomas Stanley, his brother Joseph Stanley, and his father Cornelius  
1046 Stanley were convicted with multiple scams in New Hampshire in 2010, and in Connecticut in 2009.  
1047 Convictions include 11 felony counts of theft and theft by deception. They are barred from operating  
1048 a paving business in New Hampshire or Connecticut. They have been found to be operating similar  
1049 scams in Massachusetts, California, Nevada, Texas, Vermont, and Florida. That doesn't necessarily  
1050 mean that they can't build this building, but what he does question is the assurances that the site will  
1051 be used for the specific purposes that have been stated – for instance, the truck maintenance, the  
1052 equipment stored here, the materials and other things stored here. V. Orlando stated that the other  
1053 thing that is important to bring up is specifically on the seal coating stuff – they currently do own  
1054 multiple seal coating businesses, along with multiple other paving businesses, Verizon Paving being  
1055 one of them. It is quite a big list. He would want to see some very strong controls as to what is being  
1056 kept on the site, and what kind of maintenance work is being done so that it does not pollute the  
1057 Brook or the aquifer nearby.

1058  
1059 D. Cleveland stated that it sounds like we have some pretty serious concerns on this.

1060  
1061 **Public Hearing.**

1062

1063 Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. Stated that he thinks it is critical that the public be given a chance  
1064 to speak when the actual plans are here, because reading those plans and finding out at the last minute  
1065 that they are wrong, and then to not have the opportunity to speak about the correct ones he thinks  
1066 would be a huge injustice. He stated that what he wanted to touch on was the question of  
1067 compensatory mitigation. That doesn't come out of our zoning regulations. He doesn't know  
1068 Amherst's zoning regulations; maybe they have a requirement for that? Or maybe it's coming from  
1069 the State regulations – but he thinks we need to know exactly what that is. What is the requirement  
1070 for compensatory mitigation? What damage is being done, and is the proposed compensatory  
1071 mitigation actually mitigating the damage? That would normally require a wetland functional  
1072 assessment, to evaluate what role the damaged wetland is serving, and then evaluate what the  
1073 proposed solution is providing so you can see if it's even reasonable to expect the compensation to  
1074 match the damage. He further stated that we also talked about changes that were submitted to the  
1075 State plans, and a lot of times the details like the stormwater report, the AOT report, that's where a lot  
1076 of the engineering details are, to go and verify things. So if something was submitted to the State  
1077 with this plan, and now at the last minute we hear there are changes, he doesn't think any of us can  
1078 continue until we have the updated plans from the State that represent what they are actually building.  
1079 We did hear about making special accommodations for the Applicants; he doesn't think we do that  
1080 for any of our other cases, and he doesn't suspect we should be having a special exception in this case  
1081 – so anybody that wants to speak before this Board can come to these meetings and have their  
1082 opportunity. He stated that we already talked about requesting a wetlands study; it sounds like that's  
1083 going the right way. The question he has about stormwater – normally you look at the stormwater  
1084 management plan, and you see where the stormwater is flowing to and from, and you pointed out that  
1085 it's coming off the roof on that huge building. We in Hollis have a specific set of circumstances that  
1086 have to be evaluated for that plan. Certain storms and, he thinks it's three cases we have to evaluate –  
1087 he doesn't know what the regulations are in Amherst.

1088  
1089 D. Petry mentioned to D. Cleveland that the speaker's two minutes were up.

1090  
1091 J. Garruba stated that so, he would like to know what was evaluated stormwater-wise. He thinks the  
1092 Board should find that this case has regional impact, so that it is cross-pollinated.

1093  
1094 Joe Connelly, Chair of the Conservation Commission. Stated that the Conservation Commission was  
1095 going to meet the Applicant at their last meeting – but apparently the Applicant was double-booked,  
1096 so they did not see them that evening. They are happy to meet the Applicant when they come talk to  
1097 the Commission in May; they are on the Commission's agenda for May. J. Connelly stated that he  
1098 will offer opinions at that time.

1099  
1100 As the Select Board Representative to the Conservation Commission, D. Petry made a  
1101 recommendation, stating that he doesn't think the Applicant should be coming before the  
1102 Commission until we have a full set of plans. Getting comments from Conservation is premature, if  
1103 we don't have all the documents.

1104  
1105 J. Connelly stated that they first heard about these folks about a month ago; he called one of the  
1106 Applicant's representatives and told them that typically they go to the Planning Board, the Planning  
1107 Board tells them to go to the Conservation Commission, and then they go to Conservation. If they  
1108 want to be on the Commission's agenda, that is fine. They can be on the agenda every month.

1109  
1110 D. Petry stated that it is pointless without the correct documents.

1111  
1112 J. Connelly stated that the Conservation Commission is not ever going to give the Applicant a final  
1113 answer until the Planning Board has invoked the Commission. Nevertheless, they are on the  
1114 Commission's agenda for May 20<sup>th</sup> as of this moment – assuming they get their documents in by May  
1115 6<sup>th</sup>, as requested.

1117 **Public Hearing Closed.**  
1118

1119 In terms of where the Board goes from here on this case, K. Anderson stated that we need all the  
1120 revised plans – at which point he can revise the Staff comments and memo to the Board. He will  
1121 keep the Board up to speed as far as the workings in Amherst to determine what the next steps are  
1122 from this Board.  
1123

1124 J. Mook asked whether we talked about an environmental study, and whether that is something that  
1125 the Board can act on tonight – or whether we should wait.  
1126

1127 K. Anderson recommended that the Board not act on any item until we have a full set of plans. For  
1128 all he knows, the pond may change and not even be in Hollis. Once he sees revised plans, and the  
1129 Board meets again, we can ask for wildlife studies, environmental studies, anything that we deem  
1130 necessary to fulfill our jurisdiction and our requirements.  
1131

1132 J. Mook stated that there have been some issues raised – she doesn't know if they are true or not –  
1133 about the legality of this group. She asked if there is anything that we can do to look into that. K.  
1134 Anderson answered that he has no avenue to look into that. He is sure that he will get some direction,  
1135 but as far as the ordinances go he doesn't have any way of leaning one way or the other.  
1136

1137 J. Mook asked whether it is something that the Select Board might discuss. D. Petry stated that they  
1138 might. J. Mook added that it is not necessarily the Planning Board's purview. K. Anderson  
1139 concurred.  
1140

1141 **Motion to continue File PB2026-003 to the Board's meeting on May 19, 2026** – motioned by J.  
1142 Mook, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.  
1143  
1144

1145 **6. OTHER BUSINESS:**  
1146

1147 **a. Master Plan update**  
1148

1149 K. Anderson stated that J. Mook took the opportunity to break down some of the information from  
1150 the Master Plan survey, and came up with some guidance which is in need of review and comment  
1151 from the Board. It is very in-depth. He asked, subsequent to this, what we are going to try to work  
1152 on for possible future zoning amendments or changes to our regulations. Separately from this  
1153 document, he was able to go through a list of vacant parcels in Town. The purpose of that was to try  
1154 to focus on potential zoning amendments because of the Master Plan updates. If we had a substantial  
1155 number of large-acre parcels that would substantiate changing open space regulations, maybe we  
1156 would focus on that. Should our efforts and time be more focused on buffer enhancements, or lot size  
1157 changes, or setbacks? In parallel to J. Mook and the Master Plan subcommittee's work, he was trying  
1158 to come up with some supporting information to help guide how we want to act.  
1159

1160 J. Mook stated that the subcommittee identified the main topics from the 600 residents who filled out  
1161 the survey and tried to organize the topics, because many of them were covered in several different  
1162 questions. They worked on putting everything together so that the Board could have an  
1163 understanding of the community's response to how they felt about protecting open space and farm  
1164 land, density of the acreage for house lots, and any concerns on HOSPD. She stated that K. Anderson  
1165 is providing information from the Planning Department which might feed into that. After talking  
1166 with K. Anderson, one thought that she had was that the Board could perhaps come up with a list of  
1167 suggestions as to what they might consider changing so that we can prioritize what we want to look  
1168 into. There is a lot, and we have to start somewhere. Some things might be quickly addressed, and  
1169 some might take a longer period to research.  
1170

1171 D. Petry stated that he thinks that makes sense. K. Anderson also has some suggestions for zoning  
1172 amendments, based on recent experience, and stated that he will share them with the Board for later  
1173 discussion.  
1174

1175 As an example, K. Anderson asked whether we are going to possibly re-vamp the entire Hollis Open  
1176 Space ordinance, in order to provide different opportunities and create different scenarios. If there are  
1177 still a substantial number of properties in Town that have the ability to be developed, and that fit that  
1178 criteria, then that would be a worthwhile effort. However, if there are just a handful of properties,  
1179 then he would say that our focus should be more on either creating buffers, or enhancing setbacks, or  
1180 doing some other aspect to fulfill the direction that the residents are giving us. He stated that, in  
1181 looking at the list of vacant properties, we do still have some parcels that are over 100 acres. We  
1182 have a lot more that are 20 acres and less.  
1183

1184 J. Mook pointed out that there are suggestions and ideas from Staff, and that the Board is not limited  
1185 to only what the community has said.  
1186

1187 K. Anderson stated that we can create specific zones, or areas of concern, such as with Witches  
1188 Brook. If we are adamant on protecting certain areas, we can create overlay zones or something  
1189 similar to enhance protection. There might be no reason for it if there are no remaining vacant parcels  
1190 along Witches Brook, but these are possibilities to consider.  
1191

1192 **b. Zoning Ordinance**  
1193

1194 K. Anderson stated that the Zoning Ordinance is live; all the changes have been made.  
1195

1196 **c. Development Regulations**  
1197

1198 K. Anderson stated that in line with what the Board is discussing, and at the suggestion of D. Petry,  
1199 he spent many hours on a document related to development regulations, combining our site plan and  
1200 subdivision regulations into a more homogenous document. He is looking for the Board's input on  
1201 the layout and flow of the document, and is working on figures and diagrams to add to the document.  
1202

1203 D. Petry commented that the document is laid out very well, and that the more detail that can be  
1204 added the better off we will be. Anything that helps to ensure that we get a compliant submittal, or  
1205 that tightens up loopholes, will be beneficial.  
1206

1207 K. Anderson stated that the document is modeled similar to Milford's, which is one of the first towns  
1208 in the area of which he is aware that produced Development Regulations. He also researched many  
1209 surrounding communities.  
1210

1211 D. Petry suggested adding a footnote to the document for applicants, stating that the document is  
1212 intended for both site plans and subdivision plans.  
1213

1214 K. Anderson suggested adding checklists to the document, as additional tools. He asked that the  
1215 Board members take their time to look the document over for other suggestions. He stated that he  
1216 thinks we are at the point in this Town at which we need to require a site plan – not just a septic plan,  
1217 or a glorified sketch.  
1218

1219 D. Cleveland thanked K. Anderson for all of his hard work.  
1220

1221 **7. ADJOURNMENT:**  
1222  
1223

1224 **Motion to adjourn at 9:40pm**– motioned by D. Petry, seconded by M. Leavitt; motion passed  
1225 unanimately.  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229

1230  
1231 Respectfully submitted,  
1232 Aurelia Perry,  
1233 Recording Secretary  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241

1242 NOTE: Any person with a disability who wishes to attend this public meeting and who needs to be provided with reasonable  
1243 accommodation, please call the Town Hall (465-2209) at least 72 hours in advance so that arrangements can be made.  
1244