



**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**  
**May 19, 2026 – 7:00 PM Meeting - Town Hall Meeting Room**  
**DRAFT**

**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:** D. Petry.

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

Following the Pledge, the group remained standing. B. Moseley asked that, with the Memorial Day holiday coming up, there be a moment of silence in remembrance of those who gave their lives for this country.

V. Mills stated that she will be recusing on the first two cases at this meeting, File PB2022-015 and File PB2025-011. Additionally, she stated that she lives in a condominium the open space for which is an abutter to the last case to be heard at this meeting, File PB2026-006, and so will recuse on that case as well.

B. Moseley stated that R. Hardy will be voting in place of V. Mills on those cases.

V. Orlando stated that he will be recusing from another case at this meeting, File PB2026-005.

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

April 21, 2026 site walk: **Motion to approve** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D. Cleveland. Motion passed, with R. Hardy and B. Moseley abstaining.

April 21, 2026: **Motion to approve** – motioned by V. Mills, seconded by D. Cleveland. Motion passed, with B. Moseley abstaining.

**3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:**

B. Moseley stated that he wanted to begin the meeting with a teaching moment, reminding the Board that we all need to keep an open mind until any case comes to a vote. Something could be presented that may change one’s mind. Also, when any information is presented to the Board, we can only review what is presented. If a Board member has a concern regarding the Applicant, or any information that is

46 not presented, they need to bring that up privately to the Planning Department and then we can decide  
47 how to proceed appropriately. We can only deal with information that is presented in front of the Board.  
48

49 a. Agenda Additions and Deletions: K. Anderson stated that there is a request to move the fourth item  
50 on the agenda, File PB2026-006, up to first this evening, due to a scheduling conflict. B. Moseley  
51 stated that the Applicant did bring the conflict to Staff's and the Board's attention well over a week  
52 ago.  
53

54 b. Committee Reports: none.

55 c. Staff Reports: none.

56 d. Regional Impact: none.  
57

58 B. Moseley asked K. Anderson to comment on the Amherst paving situation. K. Anderson stated that at  
59 the Board's last meeting they had an application that was in two towns, Amherst and Hollis. The  
60 Applicant has withdrawn the application from Hollis. There will be no work conducted in Hollis at all.  
61 Our jurisdiction to review at the Planning Board level is gone. He would encourage any interested  
62 parties or abutters in Hollis, if they want to, to speak to that application in Amherst. They can find the  
63 meeting information on the Town of Amherst website.  
64  
65

66 4. **SIGNATURE OF PLANS:** None.  
67

68  
69 5. **CASES:**  
70

71 a. **File PB2026-006 – Final Review:** Proposed plan amendment and lot line adjustment of Morgan  
72 Ryan Realty Trust subdivision, dated 10/23/1995, revised 3/12/1998. Recorded at HCRD, 3/30/1998,  
73 plan #29101. Owner/Applicants: John O'Neil (Map 42/6-5) and Pong Fenton (Map 42/6-6), Zoned:  
74 Residential Agricultural (RA). **Application Acceptance and Public Comment.**  
75

76 K. Anderson stated that there are two parts to this application. The first part is a plan amendment,  
77 and the second part is a lot line adjustment. The subdivision was approved back in 1998; it is at the  
78 tail end of Mooar Hill Road, closest to Truell Road. At the time of the subdivision there were  
79 restrictions placed on one of the lots – it was contaminated and referred to as 'the pig farm'. The  
80 State got involved and implemented some permitting requirements, groundwater monitoring  
81 requirements. All of those criteria have been met. The State has issued a release document, and that  
82 document has been recorded at the Registry. On the plan there is a note that says that this lot is not a  
83 building lot. The purpose of that note was because of the stipulations spelled out by the State. Since  
84 the State has cleared the lot, we need to remove this note from the plan – that is the plan amendment.  
85 The lot line adjustment is between two parties, John O'Neil and Pong Fenton, due to a mutual  
86 agreement.  
87

88 **Motion to accept the application, File PB2026-006** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by D.  
89 Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.  
90

91 Applicant: John O'Neil, owner of the O'Neil Family 2001 Trust. Stated that he is also an engineer  
92 and surveyor, and used to be a septic designer. He is currently a licensed professional engineer in the  
93 State of New Hampshire, in good standing, and a licensed land surveyor in good standing. He stated  
94 that he has provided a lot line adjustment that pertains to an agreement between himself and the  
95 adjacent lot owner, dating back 30-35 years. The portion of the property that was contaminated with  
96 nitrates, above 10 milligrams per liter, was cleaned up as a result of removing 40,000 yards of pig  
97 manure that had somewhat composted but was still virulent and contaminated with nitrates. They  
98 removed that and shipped it to Billerica, MA and Bedford for temporary dump caps that severely  
99 needed the nitrogen. The land was therefore reclaimed. He has been mowing it and keeping it in

100 good standing for the past 35 years or so; the nitrates were cleaned up about 10 years ago. He  
101 provided a new groundwater management study which was reviewed by the State of New Hampshire,  
102 and eventually led to a release on three parcels of property – one being State forest, one being the  
103 Pong Fenton property, and one being a portion of his property. As a result, they executed an option to  
104 purchase on this land. They are looking to have the Board accept a lot line relocation to put 10 acres  
105 in the back lot and 4 acres in the front lot. The front lot has a typical Town-diameter buildable area, if  
106 needed. There were multiple test pits at the time; the area where the house can go was never really  
107 impacted by the pig manure area in terms of contamination. An artesian well was dug, and proven to  
108 the State as part of the ongoing cleanup efforts. The groundwater has been clean for more than five  
109 years.

110  
111 **Public Hearing.**

112  
113 There were no speakers on this application.

114  
115 **Public Hearing Closed.**

116  
117 **Motion to approve the plan amendment, removing the note** – motioned by R. Hardy, seconded by  
118 J. Mook; motion passed unanimously.

119  
120 **Motion to approve the lot line adjustment associated with File PB2026-006** – motioned by D.  
121 Cleveland, seconded by J. Mook; motion passed unanimously.

- 122  
123  
124 b. **File PB2022-015 – Final Review:** Proposed development of three lots totaling 36.084 acres located  
125 on Silver Lake Road into a 40-unit (separate residential structures) Housing for Older Persons  
126 condominium. Owner: Raisanen Homes Elite LLC, Applicant: Fieldstone Land Consultants PLLC.  
127 Map 41 Lots 25, 28 & 44, Zoned Residential/Agricultural (R&A). **Continued Discussion, Public**  
128 **Comment Closed.**

129  
130 B. Moseley stated that when it comes time, they will have another public comment associated with  
131 this file.

132  
133 K. Anderson stated that no new information was submitted, but the Applicant is present to give an  
134 update regarding the State permitting.

135  
136 Applicant: Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer and Principal Owner with Fieldstone Land Consultants, for  
137 Toddy Brook Estates. Stated that since their last meeting with the Board, he has had an opportunity  
138 to review the community water system status with the consultant. They are told that they will have a  
139 memorandum summarizing the results, all the documented analysis of adjacent wells that were  
140 monitored, within a week. They look forward to submitting that to the Town and hopefully reviewing  
141 it at the next meeting. Aside from that, they are working on the other State permits, Alteration of  
142 Terrain permitting, and addressing the remaining Staff comments now that they have essentially  
143 verified that the water is there. The tests were run on both wells, and preliminary results have  
144 indicated that there is certainly adequate water for the development.

145  
146 C. Brannon stated that they would like to be continued to the Board's next scheduled meeting.

147  
148 R. Hardy stated that at the Board's last meeting he requested to know whether there is a docket  
149 number associated with this, at the State level. C. Brannon replied that there is a permit number. He  
150 does not have it with him, but it will be on the memo that they submit. R. Hardy asked whether the  
151 Board could get that number before the next meeting. C. Brannon stated that he thinks it has been  
152 submitted to the Town; he is not the consultant doing the community water system evaluation – but

153 he thinks that when the well siting was approved, and they approved the drilling, the Town did get  
154 copies of that letter.

155  
156 K. Anderson added that the documents to which the Applicant is referring are required to be  
157 submitted to K. Anderson by June 3<sup>rd</sup>, so there will be two weeks to review those documents prior to  
158 the Board's next meeting.

159  
160 **Motion to continue File PB2022-015 to the Board's meeting on June 16, 2026** – motioned by M.  
161 Leavitt, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.

- 162  
163  
164 c. **File PB2025-011 – Final Review:** New residential subdivision for 35 new residential homes on a  
165 new road connecting Deacon Lane and Proctor Hill Road (Route 130). Owners: Raisanen Homes  
166 Elite, LLC., Applicant: Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC., Map 17 Lots 5, 8, & 9; Zoned: Rural  
167 Lands (RL). **Continued Discussion, Public Comment Closed.**

168  
169 B. Moseley stated that again, this file will have another Public Hearing at the appropriate time.

170  
171 K. Anderson stated that in the Board's packets for this meeting there is a letter that was submitted by  
172 a Town resident. The resident is requesting that the Board dedicate more time to addressing various  
173 issues and concerns previously raised by the Deacon Lane residents.

174  
175 K. Anderson stated that at the Board's last meeting the third-party traffic engineer, GPI, presented  
176 their information. A request was given by the Board for K. Anderson to compile a list of traffic-  
177 calming measures that could be presented. He went back through all the documents that were  
178 prepared by both VHB and GPI. Recommendations are limited to additional signage, additional  
179 signage along Proctor Hill Road. Two items that the Board can consider, which he doesn't personally  
180 recommend because he doesn't know that they are warranted, are a blinking light – where it would go  
181 he doesn't know – and a speed radar system, which would indicate what your speed is. Again, he  
182 doesn't see the need for these: they are additional maintenance items which he doesn't know are  
183 going to affect the overall design of this.

184  
185 Applicant: Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer and Principal Owner with Fieldstone Land Consultants, for  
186 Raisanen Homes Elite. Stated that at the last meeting they received feedback from the Town's traffic  
187 consultant, GPI. They had the opportunity to review GPI's final letter, which was dated April 15,  
188 2026. The Applicant stated on the record that they had no problem incorporating their  
189 recommendations relative to additional signage on the subdivision road, and also stated for the record  
190 that they have no issue addressing traffic calming if the Board so chooses, regarding adding  
191 additional signage, a blinking yellow light, or the speed radar system – as have been brought forward  
192 by GPI as options. The traffic-calming measures that the Board may consider on the State highway  
193 would require the Applicant to go back to DOT for approval. They are looking for feedback from the  
194 Board relative to that at this meeting, as they would like to finalize the details of the plan relative to  
195 traffic and would like to submit for that permit. Since the last meeting they did have the opportunity  
196 to go through and address the remainder of the Staff comments, in detail. They did not submit that in  
197 time for that review to happen at this evening's meeting, but the material has been submitted. At this  
198 time in their opinion they have essentially addressed all the items on the Staff memo, with the  
199 exception of the visual impact study. They were hoping to get some guidance from the Board relative  
200 to that. The Staff memo states that the Board should comment on whether the existing forest provides  
201 sufficient screening to the public way, or whether they need to do the study. The Applicant is looking  
202 for some feedback from the Board on that.

203  
204 C. Brannon stated that it is their opinion that they have addressed the traffic position. They have the  
205 permit from DOT, they have gone through the review by the Town's consultant, they have addressed  
206 all of their comments. They feel that they should be in a position at the next meeting to hopefully

207 work through the remaining comments – so if the Board does want to schedule a public hearing, it  
208 may be suitable to do that at the next meeting as well.

209  
210 B. Moseley stated that, in line with the abutters' comments, the way he sees this progressing, we need  
211 to receive and review any traffic-calming measures that are being recommended, and put traffic to  
212 bed. The 26 open items from Staff will be looked at. After those two steps are taken care of, the  
213 Board will have a public hearing. The Board will act on anything that comes up during the public  
214 hearing, and then move to a vote on this case.

215  
216 The Board was in consensus with B. Moseley's summary.

217  
218 B. Moseley asked whether, from Staff's standpoint, we have received a formal traffic-calming  
219 proposal from the Applicant. K. Anderson replied that the additional recommendations were made at  
220 several of the Board's previous meetings, and the recommendations were for additional signage. The  
221 Board will need to make the decision as to whether they want to see additional signage implemented  
222 on the plan set. The Applicant will need to take that plan set back to DOT to get their approval on  
223 locations, etc. The Board will need to direct the Applicant to add the signs, if the Board deems them  
224 necessary. Additional lights, the blinking lights, a speed system – that direction has to come from this  
225 Board.

226  
227 B. Moseley asked how the Board felt about going through that process, have the Applicant add the  
228 signage, the lighting, and the other radar indicators on their plan so that the Board can formally  
229 review it at the next meeting.

230  
231 K. Anderson stated that he thinks we should be clear on three separate items – the additional signage  
232 as recommended by GPI; whether or not this Board believes additional caution is necessary, with the  
233 recommendations for a blinking light – which came from this Board; and the speed indicator as a  
234 third option.

235  
236 C. Brannon clarified for the record that they did commit to the signage as a traffic measure, and those  
237 were included in their March 10<sup>th</sup> submission. The plans are on record, and they have formally  
238 offered the signage. He thinks that GPI's letter in response to a review of that signage just  
239 recommended one additional "intersection ahead" sign, and they are happy to agree to adding that  
240 signage, but the Applicant has already made a formal commitment in offering signage for traffic  
241 calming.

242  
243 B. Moseley stated that, then, the two open items are a blinking light proposal and a speed indicator.  
244 C. Brannon agreed, if the Board chooses one of those.

245  
246 J. Mook asked where the blinking light would be – just outside that driveway? C. Brannon answered  
247 that the blinking light would essentially be squared on the intersection of 130 and the proposed road,  
248 and would be at the intersection location. It would be an overhead light, and would likely hang on a  
249 cable over the highway. B. Moseley stated that he saw Board members nodding their heads on that  
250 point.

251  
252 J. Mook asked the same question in regard to the speed indicator – would that be in both directions,  
253 and where would they be located? She stated that if we are going to have it at all, she would think it  
254 should be in both directions.

255  
256 Per a question from V. Orlando, it was clarified that the speed indicator would be on Proctor Hill  
257 Road. He asked whether, if it is a right-in, right-out intersection, they would need it in both  
258 directions. B. Moseley replied that he doesn't think it would hurt, because you know that there are  
259 people who are going to push the issue. His thought is that it would be in both directions. V. Orlando  
260 agreed.

261  
262 J. Mook stated that she thinks it would call attention to people speeding, and we might have some  
263 luck in convincing people to slow down.  
264

265 M. Leavitt stated that he thinks the blinking light is probably a good idea – it will attract attention.  
266 He’s not so sure about the speed indicator – that is something that you’re going to have to read, and it  
267 will take attention away from coming down the road. The light itself is going to attract attention, and  
268 let people know that there is something going on, here.  
269

270 D. Cleveland agreed with J. Mook and with M. Leavitt. He is leaning more towards concurring with  
271 J. Mook’s thoughts.  
272

273 K. Anderson reminded the Board that the installation of these additional items would be on the  
274 Applicant/owner, but the long-term maintenance is on the Town.  
275

276 J. Mook asked whether the Board can change its mind after having the additional items put on the  
277 plan. B. Moseley indicated that they could, up until the time that they vote – in theory. J. Mook  
278 asked whether we should discuss this with the Police Department. B. Moseley replied that the Police  
279 Department has weighed in; at this stage, he thinks that the Board needs to say whether they want the  
280 additional items or not. This has been going on far too long, and it’s not fair to the Applicant. He  
281 would like to get the traffic resolved so that they can proceed, we can get a set of plans before us, and  
282 move forward. We have the letters from Police, Fire, and the DPW.  
283

284 K. Anderson stated that one concern he has about the light is that the light is going to be hung over  
285 the road, and he doesn’t know at what point, traveling along Proctor Hill Road, you’re actually going  
286 to be able to see it. This whole area is heavily treed, and he doesn’t know that you’re going to be able  
287 to see the light until you’re on it.  
288

289 B. Moseley stated that at least you’ll see something, versus nothing at all.  
290

291 K. Anderson added that he does not know the process for permitting an overhead light like that, and  
292 would like to hear from the Applicant whether he has any experience in that. He doesn’t know if  
293 there are sight lines that have to be met, or if there are other design criteria.  
294

295 B. Moseley stated that first he’d like to close out the radar speed detector.  
296

297 B. Ming stated that he was in favor of the light, but also agreed with K. Anderson that the utility is  
298 questionable. Regarding the speed detector, B. Ming stated that yes, he thinks we should have it.  
299

300 R. Hardy asked whether radar speed detectors can be programmed to have weather warnings, such as  
301 when the weather is very bad or very slippery. It seems like a lot of the accidents that occur in this  
302 area have been not only because of excessive speed, but in very stormy conditions. That is when  
303 school is cancelled, most often.  
304

305 B. Moseley stated that he has seen those weather warning signs, but does not know whether they are  
306 part of the machine or programmed into it by someone manipulating it.  
307

308 C. Brannon stated that he doesn’t believe the sign we’re talking about has the ability to have a  
309 message board.  
310

311 R. Hardy asked why not.  
312

313 C. Brannon stated that he thinks it just addresses speed; it blinks and it gives you the number.  
314

315 R. Hardy stated that his question is why it can't have a message.  
316  
317 C. Brannon stated that it's not part of the practice that is recommended by the Board's traffic  
318 consultant, or that is commonly installed – and that probably has to do with the fact that message  
319 boards create distractions for drivers.  
320  
321 R. Hardy stated that they are all up and down Route 3, in bad weather. He asked why not consider it.  
322  
323 B. Moseley stated that it would involve a management issue, as to who programs it. He's not sure  
324 who would take that on. J. Mook suggested the DPW. D. Cleveland stated that the Police  
325 Department has one that they move around Town. It's a portable sign that could be placed down  
326 there as well.  
327  
328 It was pointed out that R. Hardy was talking about a permanent sign. R. Hardy stated that with  
329 today's technology it's not too hard to change signage. On Route 3 when the weather is really bad,  
330 with a lot of snow, the warnings are at almost every bridge or every other bridge. Why couldn't we  
331 do that here? We know that that is when most of the accidents happen.  
332  
333 V. Orlando stated that he leans toward J. Mook's point. He is kind-of stuck in the middle, but leans  
334 toward the point that having the extra precautions there is better than not having them.  
335  
336 B. Moseley stated that we are getting a consensus from the Board that we do want the speed indicator  
337 in both directions, and that if it is possible to have a message indicator there, too, they want to add  
338 that.  
339  
340 M. Leavitt stated that he thinks the message indicator would be a distraction, and that the light is  
341 enough.  
342  
343 C. Brannon put in that he didn't want to waste everyone's time on this, because the Applicant is not  
344 willing to do both options.  
345  
346 B. Moseley stated that C. Brannon can say that once the Board firms up their discussion on the  
347 options.  
348  
349 D. Cleveland stated that he is inclined to agree with M. Leavitt. He is in favor of the blinking light,  
350 whether it is an overhead light or not. He doesn't necessarily think it has to be overhead.  
351  
352 B. Ming stated that he thinks we should have the message indicator.  
353  
354 B. Moseley stated that J. Mook was a yes on the message indicator, and that R. Hardy was a yes on  
355 the message indicator.  
356  
357 V. Orlando stated that he agrees with M. Leavitt; he thinks that a message indicator is a little too  
358 much.  
359  
360 B. Moseley stated that he tends to agree, too, that a message indicator would be too much in that short  
361 of a distance – so the consensus is to at least have the radar speed indicator, and a blinking light.  
362  
363 In terms of having the blinking light overhead or on a post on the shoulder of the road, D. Cleveland  
364 stated that he doesn't care either way – he has seen both. With an overhead light you might not see it  
365 until the last minute anyway, so it may or may not be that effective. It could be lower to the ground  
366 on a post, as opposed to up in the air on a cable. He doesn't know whether one might be better than  
367 another.  
368

369 M. Leavitt stated that he doesn't think overhead vs. on a post on the shoulder makes too much  
370 difference. He asked whether an overhead light could be adjusted to one side of the road or another.  
371 You'd have more chance to see it if it's closer to the entrance.  
372

373 B. Ming stated that he'd prefer an overhead light. J. Mook also said overhead.  
374

375 R. Hardy stated that he'd choose overhead or shoulder placement based on the line of sight. It might  
376 be better on the side, or it might be better in the middle.  
377

378 V. Orlando stated that a radar speed sign is a flashing light on the side of the road anyway, so he'd  
379 rather see the blinking light on the overhead.  
380

381 B. Moseley stated that it sounds like the consensus of the Board is a speed radar indicator, and an  
382 overhead light – but asked C. Brannon whether, his experience, for visibility it's better for a flashing  
383 light to be overhead or on the shoulder of the road.  
384

385 C. Brannon replied that that is a good question; his experience is that he has always seen flashing  
386 lights in the center of roads. He stated that we have to keep in mind that this is a traffic calming  
387 measure, so it is just intended to bring people's attention to an intersection ahead, and potential  
388 turning movements. You want the highway traffic to see it. The sight distance is just over 400 feet  
389 looking to the west so there would be good line of sight for that light, he believes, but they would  
390 have to take a look into that a little bit more. Certainly DOT would have some say in that as well.  
391 That would be part of a modification of the permit.  
392

393 B. Moseley asked whether C. Brannon would be able to look into that before the Board's next  
394 meeting. C. Brannon replied that they would be happy to look into that, but stated that the Applicant  
395 was willing to do one or the other – there was never a contemplation of both, and he thinks that is  
396 kind-of how it was presented from the engineers, as well.  
397

398 B. Moseley stated that the Applicant is hearing from the Board that they would like both.  
399

400 C. Brannon asked to poll the Board on a preference, if one was selected, so that he has that  
401 information when he reviews it with DOT. DOT may not allow both, either.  
402

403 B. Moseley suggested that C. Brannon tell the Board what DOT says, and the Board will cross the  
404 bridge of choosing one measure or the other when we get there. It is the Board's thought that we are  
405 looking for both.  
406

407 Regarding the visual impact study, C. Brannon stated that the Staff memo seems to pose questions to  
408 the Board, so the Applicant would like the Board's feedback accordingly.  
409

410 K. Anderson stated that early on in this review, Staff had the position that when we apply rural  
411 character to a project it is from the public right-of-way. In this case, it would be from Proctor Hill or  
412 Deacon Lane. The first houses are well over 500 feet off of Rt. 130. He does not know off the top of  
413 his head how far they are off of Deacon Lane. He wants the Board to be aware that if they are  
414 looking for a visual impact study, there is a question of scope – what are they looking for, given that  
415 the houses are set back off of the road a fair distance?  
416

417 C. Brannon stated that you won't see the homes from Proctor Hill at all. On the Deacon Lane side  
418 there is one lot on the right-hand side that has the potential to be visible. That is about 400 feet in  
419 from the roadway. The distance may preclude the study being necessary, but that needs to be  
420 determined by the Board.  
421

422 R. Hardy stated that the distance from the road is great, but we have no idea what the amount of clear  
423 cut is. When that is defined, you can determine what is seen and what is not.  
424

425 C. Brannon stated that that has been defined for well over a year in the plans. We can go to the  
426 grading plan and take a look at the grading and cutting associated with it; it's pretty minimal.  
427 Because of the regulations, the grading follows the terrain fairly well.  
428

429 B. Moseley asked whether it was correct that on the Proctor Hill side they wouldn't be cutting  
430 anything between the last house and the road. C. Brannon replied that there is a significant woodland  
431 area between the home and Proctor Hill, for sure. You're cutting where the road goes; that's it.  
432

433 K. Anderson stated that one of his larger concerns is tree clearing associated with the storm water  
434 ponds adjacent to Proctor Hill Road, and whether that will open up the view. Trees will be thinned;  
435 he does not know whether they will be clear-cut but they are not indicated to be.  
436

437 C. Brannon put the grading plan up on an easel for the Board to view. He stated that the alignment of  
438 the road is not linear, so the alignment will provide buffering as you come in. The drainage cutting is  
439 isolated. He showed areas that will be vegetated, all the way up to the home, and stated that the  
440 elevation, along with mature vegetation, will create a great deal of buffer. Along another side there is  
441 undisturbed land with a drainage basin internally. There will be cutting on the lots, but that is  
442 internal. There is substantial buffering. The impact, with the exception of the drainage, is essentially  
443 within the proposed right-of-way.  
444

445 R. Hardy asked whether there will be any replanting associated with the drainage basins. C. Brannon  
446 replied that the drainage basins will meet the State standards for vegetation. It's primarily loam and  
447 seeded. He thinks there is a biomat in one of the basins, which is essentially a filter. They're not rain  
448 gardens where there would be plants inside the basins, but they are somewhat broken up and isolated  
449 to fit in with the topography – so it's not like we have these massive basins at the entrance to the site,  
450 which he thinks is really what this Board's concern has been in the past.  
451

452 B. Moseley asked whether R. Hardy was happy with the Proctor Hill side, to which R. Hardy replied  
453 yes.  
454

455 Switching to the Deacon Lane side, B. Moseley stated that right now it is kind-of clear cut going up  
456 the access road. C. Brannon stated that the Deacon Lane side is narrow, so there is a narrower  
457 footprint to work with. There is a small treatment swale down at the base, near the intersection, but  
458 they don't have any large drainage basins. The drainage is primarily up the hill and around the  
459 corner. He showed where the driveway will be, and stated that it's all going to be mature woods on  
460 the right-hand side. The perspective is not going to be wide open into the site. There is about 40 feet  
461 in elevation to the home; that one home would likely be visible from Deacon Lane, but that would be  
462 it. Other homes on Deacon Lane, coming up to this property, are visible from the roadway, so it's not  
463 like they're creating something that is unfamiliar to the surroundings. He thinks that a good  
464 landscaping plan would be better than a visual assessment, in this particular application.  
465

466 In response to a question from B. Moseley, C. Brannon stated that they could have a landscaping plan  
467 ready to go by the Board's next meeting.  
468

469 R. Hardy pointed out the area to the north of the home that would be visible, and the area that C.  
470 Brannon stated would remain as mature forest. In order for that to continue to remain that way, he  
471 asked whether there would be a no-cut zone on the plan. The Board has seen plenty of applications  
472 where screening was supposed to have been left, but was gone five years later.  
473

474 C. Brannon replied that he thinks that's a great question, and stated that what he would point out is  
475 that the open space area actually flanks that lot, so there is a pretty sizeable open space portion of

476 mature forest through there. That would be undisturbed, and restored, and would thereby address that  
477 concern.

478  
479 R. Hardy stated as long as it's shown on the plan. B. Moseley concurred.

480  
481 B. Moseley stated that what he is hearing is that instead of a visual impact study we'll do a landscape  
482 plan for the Deacon Lane end. On Proctor Hill we're pretty much satisfied. J. Mook added that there  
483 should be no cut areas shown on the plans.

484  
485 B. Moseley asked Staff whether it would be doable, at the Board's next meeting, to address the 26  
486 open Staff comments and then go into a public hearing. K. Anderson responded that he thinks the  
487 next meeting will be to address those 26 comments. He would expect that we would need to do a  
488 follow-up meeting after that.

489  
490 B. Moseley stated that at the next meeting we will go through the open items, we will hopefully get a  
491 report from C. Brannon on what the traffic-calming situation is, get a landscape plan, and that will  
492 bring us to the Board's July meeting, on July 21<sup>st</sup>. We will shoot for the next public hearing at that  
493 July meeting, deal with anything from the public hearing, and possibly have a vote at that meeting.

494  
495 **Motion to continue File PB2025-011 to the Board's meeting on June 16, 2026** – motioned by J.  
496 Mook, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

497  
498  
499 **Recess from 8:04pm – 8:09pm.**

500  
501  
502 d. **File PB2025-005 – Design Review:** Development of a portion of 93.6 acres located on Lone Pine  
503 Lane into a Major Subdivision with 10 single family lots. Owner: Lone Pine Hunters Club, Inc.,  
504 Applicant: Matt Ciardelli, Map 15 Lot 71, Zoned: Residential Agricultural (RA). **Project Review**  
505 **and Public Comment.**

506  
507 K. Anderson stated that this project was before the Board in Conceptual Review for a 13-lot  
508 subdivision back in December 2022. We had a site walk in January of 2023, and another conceptual  
509 meeting on January 17, 2023. More recently there was an 11-lot subdivision Conceptual Review on  
510 February 18, 2025. This is a partial subdivision of the Lone Pine lot. A section of the land is going  
511 to be subdivided into what is being proposed as 11 new lots – 12 total, because there will be a  
512 remaining lot for the Lone Pine facility itself. They have submitted a complete application including  
513 plans, HOSPD designs, test pit logs, some additional letters, and an archaeological report. Some of  
514 the outstanding items from the previous meeting include a request for a waiverless plan depicting a  
515 connection to Hillside Drive; a lead remediation plan for the former skeet shooting range; there was  
516 an absence of a HOSPD design at previous meetings. Studies requested: environmental, wildlife,  
517 wetlands, archaeological, and stormwater. There is potential for the need for an additional site walk.  
518 Preservation of the James Rideout homestead is also a concern.

519  
520 K. Anderson stated that Staff's comments are limited at this point; he needs to see some additional  
521 information on the plan, including steep slopes, etc. – at least notes could be added. Regarding the  
522 waiverless plan connecting to Hillside Drive, there are some deficiencies though he believes it could  
523 be met without an issue: there are some slope and grading concerns. The Board will ultimately need  
524 to provide direction to the Applicant regarding a choice between a conventional layout or HOSPD  
525 design. The archaeological study was done back in 2017 and encompassed almost the entire parcel.  
526 A part of the project area is just outside of that, so we'll need to expand the archaeological review. In  
527 regard to lead remediation, that is done through the State. He will have some off-line discussions  
528 with the Applicant to try to understand the scope of that.

529

530 Applicant: Brad Casperson, professional engineer with Meridian Land Services. Per a question from  
531 B. Moseley, B. Casperson confirmed that he is a licensed professional engineer in the State of New  
532 Hampshire, in good standing.  
533

534 Regarding the waiverless design that was requested for the Hillside Drive connection, B. Casperson  
535 stated that they do recognize that there is a requirement that was overlooked, which is a maximum  
536 grade of 3% for the first 100 feet within the intersection. They have no issue revising that design and  
537 providing the associated plan. What they had submitted was only the profile, depicting a compliant  
538 profile, for what would be needed. What was requested was a plan to go with that, to support the  
539 waiver request that will be submitted for the cut-fill waiver. They have no issues providing that, and  
540 can provide it for the Board's next meeting.  
541

542 Regarding contamination, they have no issue coordinating with K. Anderson and going through the  
543 process for addressing what the contamination is on site and how it has to be dealt with for the  
544 subdivision.  
545

546 Regarding the HOSPD design, B. Casperson stated that previously they had submitted a waiver of the  
547 HOSPD requirement and applicability; recognizing that it was requested by the Board, they prepared  
548 a HOSPD plan which includes the necessary open space and same degree of lots. The Applicant's  
549 preference is for a conventional layout.  
550

551 Regarding studies, there are several that were requested: wildlife, wetlands, archaeological, and  
552 stormwater. They have provided a stormwater report. They recognize that that may need to change,  
553 primarily due to the alteration of terrain permit that is required. They have provided preliminary  
554 environmental studies and reporting which outlined two aspects – one is the vernal pools, of which  
555 there are two on site that exist. They are outside of the project limits, and therefore are being  
556 protected. The other aspect is regarding wildlife. They provided a data check results letter, which is  
557 now expired, and they are in the process of getting a new Natural Heritage Bureau data check results  
558 letter. That talks about the potential presence of endangered or threatened species. What was  
559 included in the expired data letter were two plant species; there were no wildlife species identified.  
560 Comments from the State involved doing a follow-up survey by a qualified botanist to ensure that  
561 these species are not on site. That was conducted, and since then the Applicant has been talking with  
562 the State. They recognize that these plant species are not likely to occur in the project area, but the  
563 Applicant understands that they will need to get a current endangered species review. Their intent is  
564 to get the new NHB results letter, and formalize the consultation with NHB.  
565

566 Archaeologically, B. Casperson stated that they submitted an archaeological report. It was the  
567 archaeological report that was prepared for the original Lone Pine Lane subdivision, which involved  
568 reviewing the entire site to some degree. There are really two main aspects, one being the James  
569 Rideout homestead and barn – you can see the foundation walls, and there are stone walls that lead up  
570 to it; that is what was observed by DHR and the archaeologist. The Applicant's design is avoiding  
571 that and protecting it. The other area was the potential for Native American contact sites. It was  
572 identified in the original report that they are directly adjacent to the Nashua River and, again, outside  
573 of the proposed subdivision.  
574

575 B. Moseley asked, for the record, whether it is correct that the homestead is not a subterranean  
576 basement – it is just a ground-level rock foundation. B. Casperson replied yes, for the homestead  
577 there is no formal cellar – but the barn foundation did have a cellar, so it's more of an excavated  
578 terrain that exists there, abutting the foundations.  
579

580 Regarding additional Staff comments about the steep slopes, B. Casperson stated that he recognizes  
581 that they did not include them on the plan and that they have no issue adding them to the plans. He  
582 checked that they do not impact the acceptable acres, or the building areas shown on the subdivision  
583 plan, and they do not. It does not impact the subdivision itself.

584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636

B. Moseley asked what a jellyfish filter manhole is. B. Casperson answered that it is a proprietary treatment manhole; when you open it up it has tentacles that are treatment filters. It's really a big pool filter – that's exactly what it looks like. It satisfies the State's treatment requirements – primarily suspended solids, nitrogen, phosphorus. He will bring a brochure regarding the filter to the next meeting, for the Board.

B. Moseley asked whether they are going to have to do some easements, associated with the causeway. B. Casperson answered yes; they are showing easements on the abutting properties. They have had preliminary conversations with the abutters, and believe that they have the abutters' support. They do recognize that if not, they would need to incorporate a guardrail and retaining wall into the design, which can work within the right-of-way limits – but yes, there are easements necessary for the disturbance outside of the right-of-way.

B. Moseley asked whether the Applicant is making provisions to service items such as the jellyfish filter manhole. How are they accessed? B. Casperson replied that they are accessed by a standard catch-basin drainage manhole rim. B. Moseley clarified that he is asking about getting there. The Town might have to take equipment there to service this, and if they can't approach it that could be a problem. K. Anderson added that the question is about access to the culverts, the headwalls, down the slope. The Applicant is in preliminary stages of discussing easements associated with the abutting lots; we want to make sure that we can get there to access them. Has that discussion been approached yet?

B. Casperson answered not specifically as yet; he would assume that if they gave an area along the toe that is suitable for access that would suffice. B. Moseley stated that, going forward, the Applicant will need to keep that in mind. We have a few examples in Town where items were installed, the Town has to service them, and it is basically impossible to get to them – the DPW has issues, and it goes downhill from there.

B. Moseley stated that the Applicant will be discussing the lead abatement with K. Anderson. He further stated that the Board will probably want to do another site walk at some point, but it is too preliminary to schedule that at this time.

B. Moseley asked whether the Applicant is looking to update the archaeological review in any way. It is dated 2017. B. Casperson replied that when they went conceptually before the Board at the beginning of last year, they initiated conversations with the archaeologist who prepared the report – Robert Goodby, of Monadnock Environmental Consultants. Based on their conversations with him, the James Rideout homestead was being protected, and he recognized that the potential Native American contact sites were also outside of the subdivision, along the Nashua River. It was his opinion that this reporting remains valid. Essentially, they could re-submit it, probably with more of a narrative. B. Moseley stated that if they could get that documented, the Board would appreciate it.

Per a question from B. Moseley, K. Anderson stated that he thinks we have enough information to start the discussion regarding a HOSPD or conventional layout. We had leaned toward conventional in the previous, conceptual meetings, but should look at both. He doesn't know that the Board needs to make a decision on that at this meeting.

R. Hardy asked whether the connecting road is in a similar location as it was several years ago, when the Board had a site walk. B. Casperson answered yes, it is in the same location.

B. Moseley asked how much of an elevation the causeway goes through. B. Casperson stated that the absolute low point, in the wetlands, is at about a 9.1' drop.

637 B. Moseley stated that if you're at the low end of the causeway, and you're looking toward Hillside  
638 Drive, you're going to see pavement. B. Casperson replied no, unless you're 10 feet tall. B. Moseley  
639 stated that he wanted to give the Board a perspective on how big a causeway this is going to be, to  
640 which K. Anderson replied that it is going to be taller than a person. It will be in the vicinity of 7 or 9  
641 feet. B. Moseley stated that it is a pretty big earthen structure.

642  
643 Regarding the possible HOSPD design, K. Anderson stated that the houses are clustered in two or  
644 three separate areas, with open space surrounding each of the lots. A cursory review shows that it  
645 meets the intent of our ordinance. It does meet the open space requirements, but you are clustering  
646 the homes together. The lot sizes are pretty small, at just over an acre. He stated that the  
647 conventional plan spreads the houses out a little bit more, on 2+ acre lots. The back lots all meet the  
648 4-acre requirement. This layout is similar to what is already in the Lone Pine area. In both scenarios,  
649 the James Rideout homestead is being preserved.

650  
651 B. Ming stated that typically he likes a HOSPD design in general, but it is somewhat awkward in this  
652 case. He likes the conventional layout in this instance.

653  
654 M. Leavitt stated that he is leaning toward the conventional plan. D. Cleveland concurred with B.  
655 Ming and M. Leavitt. J. Mook stated that she preferred the conventional design. V. Mills also  
656 preferred the conventional layout, and stated that the point that it is consistent with what is already in  
657 the neighborhood is relevant.

658  
659 R. Hardy stated that he thinks the conventional layout works as long as vegetation isn't cleared right  
660 to the property lines. K. Anderson stated that this area is pretty clear; there are not very many trees  
661 on the one side of the road. Tree lines have been cleared well past the houses. R. Hardy asked what  
662 the impact would be on the few existing houses, if the proposed lots were all cleared pretty much  
663 entirely. Will screening be required?

664  
665 K. Anderson stated that there is a wetland that you'll have to cross to get to the development, and  
666 there's going to be a pretty solid buffer between the old and the new developments.

667  
668 B. Moseley summarized that what we are hearing at this stage – and it is always subject to change,  
669 because we are in Design Review – is that the Board is leaning toward the conventional layout. That  
670 could change, as we get more information.

671  
672 **Public Hearing.**

673  
674 Abutter: Peter Suchcicki, 51 Hannah Drive. Stated that he just moved in in August of this past year.  
675 He has a concern about the well water supply, because where he is, he is abutting two of the  
676 properties. There are four that are basically right up against Hannah Drive – and he has already had a  
677 well run dry since he moved in. There has been no hydrological study. He asked whether there has  
678 been any aquifer capacity testing, and whether we can support four new houses right up against 3-4  
679 houses that are already right there. His well only does 1-2 gallons per minute, and he knows that  
680 other houses on Hannah Drive have low capacity as well – so that is a big concern. Another issue is  
681 where the septic systems are, for the lots. The proposed development is elevated and his home is  
682 down from there, so all that septic is going to go down and flow into his well water. He is concerned  
683 with the environmental review, because he saw that everything was about tadpoles, and plants that  
684 may or may not exist – but no one is worried about the environmental impacts on the residents who  
685 live next door.

686  
687 Applicant rebuttal: Brad Casperson, professional engineer with Meridian Land Services. Stated that  
688 the abutter's statement was a great comment and yes, it was silent in the application. Fortunately it is  
689 something that is inherent in subdivisions that are done that there is the State soil-based lot sizing,  
690 which is tied to the well requirements and sewage requirements. They tie them both into one,

691 recognizing that lots need to be able to support both if that is the circumstance. They also have  
692 provisions whereby if you're served by public water, then that gets a reduction in the lot size,  
693 recognizing that you still need a septic. In terms of the feasibility, or availability, of water supply, it  
694 is his understanding that the aquifer zone does not extend out to Hannah Drive while Lone Pine Lane  
695 is located in the aquifer zone – so it should inherently have better groundwater conditions,  
696 specifically for wells. It is just a geological condition of where both of these subdivisions lie.  
697

698 **Public Hearing Closed.**  
699

700 B. Moseley asked whether K. Anderson had any comments regarding the water. K. Anderson  
701 concurred that it is an issue that does always come up. He stated that, as B. Casperson suggested,  
702 both of those are governed through State statues and State permitting – both the well locations, and  
703 proximity to property lines and septic systems. Septics are also permitted through the State, with  
704 their location proximity to property lines and abutting wells. K. Anderson added that this application  
705 is still in the Design Review stage; we don't know if lots are going to get shifted around. As these  
706 plans evolve, we will see the designated areas noted on the plan: well locations, septic locations.  
707 There are plans that should depict the test pits, and so forth. He believes that as the plans evolve we  
708 will be better able to address those comments.  
709

710 K. Anderson encouraged all abutters and residents, when they have a concern, to reach out to him.  
711 He can guide them through the regulations and requirements.  
712

713 In terms of what Staff and the Board are looking for from the Applicant, K. Anderson stated that he  
714 wants to see the plan and profiles proven, along with the slope of the road, so that we can get those  
715 nailed down and see the grading effects of the road itself. If the Applicant has time and can do so,  
716 placing some houses and/or septic systems and wells, to give us an idea of where proposed development will  
717 be. would be useful.  
718

719 B. Moseley pointed out that, while the Board is leaning toward a conventional layout, that can change  
720 in the course of Design Review.  
721

722 K. Anderson further stated that at the next meeting he would hope to be able to provide the Board  
723 with an update on the lead remediation, and on the wetland permits.  
724

725 **Motion to continue File PB2026-005 to the Board's meeting on June 16, 2026** – motioned by D.  
726 Cleveland, seconded by B. Ming; motion passed unanimously.  
727

728  
729 **6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

730  
731 **a. Master Plan update**  
732

733 K. Anderson stated that this work is still in progress.  
734

735 Per a question from B. Moseley, K. Anderson confirmed that he is putting together a map of the  
736 buildable lots. B. Moseley encouraged members of the Board to get an early start on considering  
737 potential zoning change recommendations. Suggestions should be emailed to K. Anderson.  
738

739 **b. Subdivision Regulations**  
740

741 B. Moseley asked how the subdivision regulations are coming along, to which K. Anderson  
742 responded that he hasn't heard any comments on them, so he will move forward with cleaning them  
743 up. B. Ming pointed out that within the regulations there are some terms that are capitalized, which  
744 he usually takes to mean that they are defined somewhere, but those capitalized terms aren't always

745 defined. K. Anderson replied that if B. Ming could note those, he would be more than happy to  
746 define them or uncapitalize them.

747  
748 It was confirmed that there will be a posted public hearing in regard to the subdivision regulations,  
749 around the August timeframe.

750  
751 **c. Google Drive information downloading**

752  
753 K. Anderson stated that there has been an issue across all of the towns in the state in relation to  
754 ‘hacking’. People are finding applications and entities, putting together false invoices and billing, and  
755 sending them to applicants to write checks. As a result, K. Anderson took down all of the  
756 information from the Town’s Google Drive so that it wasn’t available to the public. He has gone  
757 through half of it to re-post it, making sure that there is no sensitive information related to applicants  
758 within it. That information – applicant addresses and phone numbers – is allowed to be posted, as  
759 these are public documents, but he is trying to limit the exposure. Invoices for several thousands of  
760 dollars have been sent out to applicants to pay, for supposed Planning Board fees, and all sorts of  
761 other things.

762  
763  
764 **7. ADJOURNMENT:**

765  
766 **Motion to adjourn at 8:47pm**– motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by M. Leavitt; motion passed  
767 unanimately.

768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773 Respectfully submitted,  
774 Aurelia Perry,  
775 Recording Secretary

776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785 NOTE: Any person with a disability who wishes to attend this public meeting and who needs to be provided with reasonable  
786 accommodation, please call the Town Hall (465-2209) at least 72 hours in advance so that arrangements can be made.