



**Town of Hollis**

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

**HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**August 18, 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:** B. Ming, V. Orlando.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 PM.**<sup>[SEP]</sup> B. Moseley called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

V. Mills stated that she will be recusing on File PB2022-015 and File PB2025-011.

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

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

July 21, 2026: **Motion to approve** – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by M. Leavitt. Motion passed, with D. Petry abstaining.

**3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING:**

- a. Agenda Additions and Deletions: none.
- b. Committee Reports: none.
- c. Staff Reports: none.
- d. Regional Impact: none.

- 4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS:** K. Anderson stated that PB2026-009, the Burton subdivision, has met the conditions and requirements and is ready for signature.

**Motion to approve signature of PB2026-009** – motioned by V. Mills, seconded by J. Mook; motion passed unanimously.

**5. CASES:**

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

50  
51 B. Moseley stated that when the Board gets close to voting this case there will be another public  
52 comment session.

53  
54 K. Anderson stated that no new information was submitted in regard to this application; the  
55 Applicant's consultant is here to give us an update to the status of some on-going studies which the  
56 Board has requested.

57  
58 Applicant: Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer and Principal Owner with Fieldstone Land Consultants, for  
59 Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC with their project, Toddy Brook Estates. Per a question from B.  
60 Moseley, C. Brannon confirmed that he is a licensed professional engineer in good standing in the  
61 State of New Hampshire. Stated that he had just a brief update from the last meeting; the second 72-  
62 hour pump test has been completed. It was completed at the end of last week, and they are collecting  
63 and processing the data. He does not have any of the results to share as yet. They look forward to  
64 reviewing that data with the Board when it is prepared. They will be requesting a continuance to the  
65 Board's next meeting.

66  
67 **Motion to continue File PB2022-015 to the Board's meeting on September 15, 2026** – motioned  
68 by R. Hardy, seconded by D. Cleveland; motion passed unanimously.

- 69  
70  
71 b. **File PB2025-011 – Final Review:** New residential subdivision for 35 new residential homes on a  
72 new road connecting Deacon Lane and Proctor Hill Road (Route 130). Owners: Raisanen Homes  
73 Elite, LLC., Applicant: Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC., Map 17 Lots 5, 8, & 9; Zoned: Rural  
74 Lands (RL). **Public Comment and Continued Discussion.**

75  
76 K. Anderson stated that the Applicant has submitted a landscaping plan to meet the requirements for  
77 rural character along Deacon Lane. That plan has been under R. Hardy's review. R. Hardy will  
78 speak about his concerns in terms of the plan. K. Anderson further stated that some of the  
79 outstanding items are the landscaping, and that he has asked the Applicant to close the loop with the  
80 Fire Chief regarding driveway concerns.

81  
82 K. Anderson stated that we have received one letter from an abutter. The letter was received on  
83 August 10, and it summarized the abutter's concerns. The abutter requested a hydrogeological study  
84 to review withdrawal demands, groundwater contamination concerns from the transfer station,  
85 provide extensive mapping of existing well data, create a baseline of quality and quantity for  
86 surrounding homeowners, impose mitigation protections for affected homeowners, and traffic impact  
87 concerns. The letter was distributed to all of the Board members.

88  
89 Applicant: Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer and Principal Owner with Fieldstone Land Consultants, for  
90 Raisanen Homes Elite with their project, Abbott Hill Estates. Stated that they don't have a lot of  
91 additional information to share; he will provide an update. They did finally hear back from the NH  
92 DOT, today, and they submitted the DOT response to Staff today. Essentially, the summary of the  
93 email states that the blinking yellow light would not be permitted at this location. They only permit  
94 those at schools, and intersections of that sort. In terms of the chevron signs that were being  
95 requested along one of the corners, they claim that it would not meet warrant articles for that, but the  
96 Town could request the chevron signs themselves to DOT and DOT would take a look at the road  
97 geometry in that corner separately. As far as the speed monitoring signs, they responded that that  
98 would typically be requested specifically by the Town, and they shared a contact as to who the Town

99 should reach out to, at DOT, for that request. It sounds like that would be something that they would  
100 permit. As it relates to “Intersection Ahead” signs, they said that as soon as the Town accepts the  
101 road then certainly that signage would be allowed. All of the items would be required to be  
102 maintained over time by the Town.

103  
104 C. Brannon stated that, outside of that, it is their understanding that the only outstanding items are  
105 pertaining to the Fire Department’s review of the modified information which they submitted for the  
106 last meeting. He has agreed with K. Anderson that he would reach out to the Fire Chief and try to get  
107 him to formalize a response to those comments, and will hopefully have something on that for the  
108 next meeting.

109  
110 Additionally, C. Brannon stated that they are looking for feedback on the landscape design. It is his  
111 understanding that R. Hardy has had a chance to look at that. They look forward to hearing his  
112 feedback, and making any corrections as necessary. He also understands that there is going to be a  
113 public hearing at this meeting; they will take notes and try to address any comments or questions that  
114 the Board may have on that feedback.

115  
116 Regarding the landscape plan, K. Anderson stated that some of R. Hardy’s concerns involved the fact  
117 that the plant species specified are very low-lying shrub-type plants. We are trying to work through  
118 the rural character ordinance, which speaks to trying to emulate what is out there – which is more of a  
119 mature forest. He believes that, as a result, R. Hardy will ask for some larger trees to be planted to fill  
120 in some of the areas that are being disturbed.

121  
122 K. Anderson stated that the tree line will be fairly well cut back along Deacon Lane. There is a  
123 limited access from Deacon Lane onto the property, but there is a detention basin on the left-hand  
124 side so there will be no trees in that vicinity. Due to grading concerns and the first property on the  
125 right, there will be substantial clearing and grading along the right hand side.

126  
127 R. Hardy pointed out an area on the plan in which the tree line was not clear in the vicinity of the  
128 detention basin; C. Brannon stated that they can add more clarification there.

129  
130 R. Hardy stated that in looking at this project, they would call the area coming up Deacon Lane a  
131 mature forest. The trees are pretty large. There are a lot of well-headed deciduous trees, mostly oak  
132 and maple, along with white pine, as well as a mix of some other things. He stated that when you  
133 look at the size of the road, it’s not just the road itself but the road cut that is required for the basin –  
134 so the person who lives at #30, for example, in R. Hardy’s opinion, has lost all of his screening.  
135 There is no protection at all for him from the road. Additionally, the plants currently depicted for use  
136 in the detention basin area are relatively low: there is low-bush blueberry, and cardinal flower, which  
137 only likes cool roots, so it’s not going to do well there anyway. Also depicted are just three choke  
138 cherries – those are the only trees that the Applicant has. Choke cherries tend to be short and stocky.  
139 They are not a broad tree with a canopy. The plan has no deciduous trees at all.

140  
141 R. Hardy stated that the other plants the Applicants has on the plan are switchgrass, which grows 3-12  
142 feet high, but the plan doesn’t spell out which hybrid they intend to use so we have no idea of the  
143 height. Also, that is a perennial which dies back. They have gray twig dogwood, which is native, and  
144 fits into this application. That grows 6-12 feet high – but where this really isn’t a wet area, it’s only a  
145 retention area, he thinks that the growth will be on the lower side rather than the higher side. R.  
146 Hardy listed some other plants which are depicted for use, and stated that they are sheep laurel:  
147 which, again, grows very low at 2-3 feet high. He hasn’t seen any of it on site, although he does see it  
148 in the Rocky Pond area – but it provides no screening at all.

149  
150 R. Hardy stated that there are alternatives that the Applicant could be using in this area. They could  
151 be using white spruce, tupelo, swamp or red maple, tamarack. There are a number of tree species  
152 which they could use in that confined area which would soften the impact of the road cut and also

provide some screening for the neighborhood; as it is now, there is none. R. Hardy further stated that in terms of the west side of the road, they have five or six choke cherries – however, they are in the foreground, and the lower plants are west of that in the background, so it doesn't replicate the existing forest at all as they have no larger trees. No oaks, no maples, or even some of the birch species, or beech: so they have no under-story at all, in those areas. What is listed is ornament; it's grasses which are going to die back. The only thing that is going to be substantial is the choke cherry and the gray dogwood. They have low-bush blueberry on the back side, which won't even be seen. To R. Hardy, the plan doesn't replicate at all what is going on in the rest of the area as far as the rural character landscape. He referenced the plan's suggestion of seeding the whole slope with wildflower mix, and asked why it wouldn't be replanted with trees.

In terms of the specs, R. Hardy mentioned a few items such as number 2, which states "Remaining trees to be preserved and protected during construction", but they're not noted on the plan. Number 5 states that "Any proposed plant material changes may be approved by the owner", but it should be approved by the Planning Board as that's the way it usually works. "All plant materials shall be guaranteed by the installer, one year" – that is typically three years, with bonding.

R. Hardy stated that the noted wildflower mix is not specified; we don't even know if they're wildflowers that work on the prairie in Iowa or in New England. He summarized that he thinks the whole landscape plan has to be improved. He knows that Raisanen has used landscape architects on developments in the past, such as at Bella Meadows and Cobbett Lane. It might be wise to use someone with a landscape architectural stamp in this instance, as opposed to an engineering stamp.

R. Hardy stated that, in addition, in the area of the next driveway over – that space is 160, 180 feet, with no planting, no screening, no re-vegetation shown. He stated that when the case was initially presented, the open space was proposed to continue from Beaver Brook, etc. He doesn't think the plan works at all in this particular case.

C. Brannon stated that, clearly, from R. Hardy's comments, there is a different approach to the plan, where the rural character is evaluated from the public road and not necessarily from an abutting property. When they looked at the public road, looking up and in, if the slopes are vegetated and the backdrop is the forested area, which is the open space area – . He indicated that there wasn't a lot of focus put on re-vegetating because of the forested area in the backdrop. He stated that R. Hardy certainly has a different opinion on how this should be done, so they can revisit the plan and come up with a modified landscaping plan.

#### **Public Hearing.**

Abutter: Mark Johnson, 34 Deacon Lane. Stated that his home is right at the intersection of the proposed new road, across from #30, referenced above. He is a direct abutter, and for some reason he did not get a notification for this meeting via letter. He stated that that may explain why some of his neighbors aren't here, if they didn't get letters this time; usually they do get letters.

K. Anderson stated that this meeting has been continued to date-specific. We are not required to notify abutters for date-specific continuances.

M. Johnson stated that he appreciates that the owner has a right to develop their land, and make a reasonable profit on their investment and time. However, the Planning Board has a responsibility to make sure that the proposed development is appropriate and meets the Town's requirements. This does not meet the Town's requirements, and it is not appropriate. Building 35 houses that have access off of an existing, 30-year-old, 24-home cul-de-sac is just not appropriate development. And it doesn't meet the Town's requirements – as he understands, you have to have two entrances/exits: two access points to this development for something this large. We don't have that; we have one and a half. The main entrance and exit is going to be off of the cul-de-sac, Deacon Lane. The other

intersection is dysfunctional, and not a full intersection. He stated that the bottom line is that he has two requests of the Board. One, reject the plan as-is. This is more appropriate for perhaps six houses, rather than 35, so the plan should be rejected. Also, the Deacon Lane neighborhood will have to deal with construction traffic – so construction trucks should be excluded from Deacon Lane. He doesn't know how long it's going to take to develop this; it could be 10 years, 5 years, 15 years – but we should not have to endure 10 years of heavy-duty trucks going up and down Deacon Lane when there is an access point on Rt. 130.

Abutter: Thierry Laverdure, 30 Deacon Lane. Stated that he is the next-door neighbor to M. Johnson. Stated that his property is on the other side of the proposed entrance from Deacon Lane. He is greatly concerned. He has two young daughters, both under the age of 10. He has great concerns about construction traffic going in and out for the next several years. He is also concerned about the water table. His well is somewhere between 600-800 feet deep, and they have a really poor recovery rate as it is. If 35 houses are installed and start drilling into the water table he is afraid for what that could do to his property value, and their quality of life. In terms of the entrance and exit from Rt. 130, he thinks that people are going to take a left no matter what, and there will be accidents.

Abutter: Ed Carballo, 26 Deacon Lane. Stated that he has concerns about the landscaping as well, since there won't be any trees and he will be able to see three houses from where his property is. He is set back from #30; he is the furthest back, and he is the only resident in Town who is directly impacted on three sides based on the current proposal. He is adamantly opposed to the development, for the reasons that were previously stated. He is also opposed for other reasons as well; he is going to provide two letters to the Board. He is not going to go into great detail on that, but he is asking for some relief – and if the lot numbers haven't changed since the last iteration, if the Board votes to move forward with the development he is asking them to please omit Lots 4, 6, and 35. He is asking that not just for selfish reasons because those are the three lots immediately around his property on all three sides, but also because maybe, as an alternative to using Deacon Lane – one of those lots is down the hill from him; if the Board saw fit to remove that from the plan of 35, you could actually build the access road down there and only impact him, and not three of his neighbors. As the road is cut now, there are four of them who are going to see and hear everything going in and out of there until the end of time. His other concern is 35 multi-million-dollar houses – everybody's got their straws in the ground, drinking from the same source of water. What he would ask, because he is directly impacted on three sides, is that if the Board accepts the plan as-is, he would like some type of bond put in place to make him whole because he shouldn't have to come out of his pocket \$30,000 to drill a well that he wouldn't need if there weren't 35 new houses drinking from the same bucket of water.

E. Carballo stated that the other issue he wanted to raise quickly is that every time this Board has asked for a report on an environmental study or the like, the builder has been very savvy; they've gone out of their way to provide that information, but not provide it when it would show the true data. The best example he has is the environmental study: the Board asked for the environmental study, and instead of doing it in the spring or summer when the wildlife is the most abundant they did it in the late fall and in the winter. Miraculously, none of the Blanding's turtles issues were there, none of the salamander issues were there, and none of the northern New England hares were there. Those are all endangered species. None of those showed up on their report.

Abutter: Jennifer Parker Cash, 137 Proctor Hill Road. Stated that sometimes a piece of land is meant to remain just an undisturbed piece of land. However, this story has a sad ending due to the actions of a pompous, litigious, and very greedy person: a person incapable of seeing the irreplaceable treasures of nature in the form of both flora and fauna, one of which is the Blanding's turtle. A person who views both the human and wildlife residents of Hollis as mere collateral damage. A person who lacks any empathy in the pursuit of their monetarily-driven project. This story has only a temporary sad ending, as it is destined for many more sad chapters in the future. These chapters will include Hollis residents being forced to navigate on dangerous, re-configured roads, and view the desecration of

wildlife as they are flushed out of their habitats. In closing, she would like to remind this person, who truly believes that they are all-powerful, that no person is exempt from the power of karma. It is available to everyone.

Abutter: Jim Usseglio, 44 Deacon Lane. Stated that he is opposed to this application. First, most of the discussions by this Board over the last couple of years have focused on Proctor Hill Road and its issues, which are completely legitimate, but from a Deacon Lane perspective it seems like it's been totally disproportionate. He hasn't heard any in-depth discussion by this Board about any of the Deacon Lane issues that the residents have raised. They have kind-of been glossed over, in his opinion, compared to the time that has been spent on Proctor Hill Road. He would ask that the Board spend more time on the Deacon Lane issues, which are memorialized in the meeting minutes, before they vote on this matter. Secondly, he doesn't know whether they can do this or not, but he wonders whether the Board can have conversations with the Planning Department and the Applicant about a different layout. He thinks the only person who likes this layout is the Applicant. He thinks all of us see how pitiful it is. He stated that at the Board's March 24, 2026 meeting, R. Hardy stated that it wasn't known whether this project would be approved all the way through Deacon Lane, or developed that way. That is the point that J. Usseglio is trying to make – there has got to be a better development plan, that the Board or the Department could propose, than what is currently being put forward.

Abutter: Theodore Hart, 91 Deacon Lane. Asked whether there is going to be any additional funding given to the Fire Department or Police Department for this increase in traffic and likelihood of accidents, and overall population increase for a cul-de-sac that was designed for 24 houses. The population is going to be increased over 100%. He stated that he is also firefighter in Massachusetts; he deals with a lot of these traffic incidents on a daily basis – and this current design layout, going from an extremely high-density road to a quiet, secluded cul-de-sac, and which is going over a bridge, as well, just doesn't seem adequate, or well-equipped for the amount of traffic that it might bring. Therefore, he wanted to see if that is being addressed, for the local resources. If those resources get strained, it's going to strain the rest of the community.

Abutter: Winnie Crouse, 131 Proctor Hill Road. Stated that she wanted to second everything that J. Parker Cash said. They are both on Proctor Hill Road. She, W. Crouse, is living probably as close as anybody to that exit, and it's already terribly unsafe. She can't understand how the proposal is at all safe. Her other concern is about the wildlife environment, back there. In her back yard she sees moose, bear, deer, bobcats, and many smaller wildlife animals. The area is very populated by wildlife, and their whole environment is being destroyed, and she hates to see that.

Abutter: Chris Bergeron, 15 Deacon Lane. Stated that, being a property owner at the bottom of Deacon Lane, all of the traffic will cycling past their house. It is a challenge, sometimes, leaving their house. They live just downside of the curve over Beaver Brook; traffic coming down the hill is sometimes difficult to see, and now we would be more than doubling the amount of traffic coming through there. Since they won't be able to take a left turn onto Rt. 130, the vast majority of that traffic will be going up and down from Deacon Lane. That is his main objection to the plan as proposed.

Karen Bridgeo, 65 Buttonwood Drive. Stated that although she serves on the Town's Conservation Commission, she is speaking as a private citizen, referencing public domain information. She stated that the Planning Board received the wildlife report for this project on February 7, 2024. On that same day, Fieldstone presented this report to the Conservation Commission at its regular meeting. After public deliberation, on February 29<sup>th</sup>, the Conservation Commission sent a letter to the Planning Board outlining its questions and concerns. A couple of months later, on May 17, Fieldstone submitted to the Town a letter written by the author of the wildlife report, answering those questions that were posed both by the Conservation Commission and quite a few questions that were put forth by the Planning Board. In the fall of 2024, the Conservation Commission revised its list of

recommended certified wildlife biologists that is utilized by the Planning Board. This list omits the author of the report that was submitted for this particular project. In May of 2025, the NH Natural Heritage Bureau data check for this property was received by the Town Hall. That was May 19, 2025. 23 reports of the State endangered Blanding's turtle are contained within this report. Of note is the fact that this data check was dated February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024. Her point is that the author of the wildlife report had access to the Natural Heritage Bureau data check prior to submitting responses to the Planning Board and to the Conservation Commission, yet this information about sensitive wildlife data was omitted in those responses. She brings this to the Board's attention so that they can gauge the quality of the information that the Planning Board has received regarding its questions about wildlife.

K. Bridgeo stated that her request to the Planning Board, as a private citizen, for the action that she would like them to take, is that they consider requesting an ecological wildlife review from the NH DES, now. Please do not wait until the wetland disturbance permit is filed. She thinks that the Planning Board would greatly benefit from having a neutral third party examine the wildlife implications of this proposed project.

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive. Stated that for the record, this Board has not allowed public comment on this proposal in over a year, yet the Board has routinely allowed presentations – .

B. Moseley reminded J. Garruba to speak to the application under discussion, and not to the Board's actions.

J. Garruba stated that this is relevant, if the case gets deliberated by a court. He stated that he is speaking specifically about the process, here. By allowing input from the Applicant, the Board is effectively conducting viewpoint discrimination. It's unfair to allow the developer's assertions – .

B. Moseley again reminded J. Garruba to speak to the application.

J. Garruba stated that he requests that the Planning Board deny this application unless the Applicant can revise it in a manner that is compliant with the Hollis subdivision regulations as well as the Hollis zoning ordinance. If no changes are made, the Board should require written responses by the Applicant to each concern that he will raise. There are several problems with the development. He will begin with the hammerhead. Per subdivision regulations Section IV.7 B, each leg of the hammerhead must have 55 feet of driving surface. The hammerhead included in the plan set has legs measuring only 40 feet. He asked K. Anderson to pull up the diagram from the plans, for the Board to view.

D. Petry stated that J. Garruba should have sent his points to the Board in a detailed letter. J. Garruba replied that he didn't have time. He pointed out the dimensions of the proposed hammerhead on the plan.

J. Garruba stated that his next point is that cuts and fills may not exceed four feet in depth within 1,000 feet of each other. This comes up regularly on large developments. Proposed Road A has a fill exceeding four feet at station 2750, and it has cut exceeding four feet at station 3400. Those are within 650 feet of each other, and clearly they do not meet the regulation. That is on sheet PP3 of the plan set.

J. Garruba stated that the next thing we've got is that the subdivision regulations require open drainage, but in several instances this plan includes closed drainage. He referenced Subdivision Regulations Section IV.7 E(1), item 14, the Table of Geometric and Other Standards. He stated that there are at least three instances, and noted sheet PP2, station 1985, station 2609, and station 2720.

B. Moseley asked J. Garruba to conclude his comments, as the two-minute-per-speaker limit was up.

J. Garruba replied that he has several other zoning and regulation violations, and the only method that he has is to come here and explain them – so he will come back after everyone else has had their two minutes.

B. Moseley stated that everyone has two minutes period, and invited J. Garruba to send a letter with his points.

J. Garruba then began to argue with B. Moseley, loudly stating “You guys are charged with voting –”. B. Moseley firmly told J. Garruba to sit down, which he did.

Applicant Rebuttal: Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer and Principal Owner with Fieldstone Land Consultants, for Raisanen Homes Elite with their project, Abbott Hill Estates. Stated that he would start by speaking to some of J. Garruba’s comments. The hammerhead measurements to which J. Garruba was referring are right-of-way measurements along the proposed right-of-way, and not along the edge of the pavement. As the Board may agree, they have gone through a substantial review of this project with the Fire Department, as well as with Town Staff, including K. Anderson, who is a professional engineer, verifying that they in fact meet the standards. Those hammerheads are dimensioned appropriately on the right plans. J. Garruba was referring to a survey sheet, and not an engineering design sheet. As it pertains to cuts and fills, the regulations actually state that you are allowed one four-foot cut and fill for every 1,000 feet of road. Because of that, you take the total linear footage of road proposed for the development, and the Applicant meets those standards. They are not required to ask for any waivers. They have been reviewing this design before the Board for a few years, now, and this was something that was reviewed during the Conceptual Design Review and certainly during the Final Review phases. They are compliant with those regulations. As it pertains to closed drainage, they are actually tying into closed drainage along Deacon. In order to tie into existing closed drainage, you have to basically transition into the closed drainage – so that’s just complying with an existing measure. Also, it’s important to point out that a lot of people have raised concerns relative to environmental standards. This project is going to require a number of State permits, and the State now requires that you treat all stormwater runoff, even through wetland crossing areas. Because of that, you will have small sections of curbing in order to divert that runoff to a treatment area, thereby meeting those standards. They believe that the plans they have designed, which have gone through substantial reviews over a long course of time, do comply with the Town regulations.

C. Brannon stated that as it relates to a number of comments relative to traffic, they have gone through a very thorough and detailed traffic review, including with a third-party consultant hired by the Town. That traffic review has contemplated both Proctor Hill Road and Deacon Lane. That has been completed, meeting all local and State requirements. In terms of the concerns pertaining to wildlife, C. Brannon stated that they submitted and satisfied all of the criteria for the reports throughout this project. The gentleman who authored the wildlife study, Peter Spear, is a well-seasoned, extremely experienced wildlife biologist. He is a professional wildlife biologist. They had him here at meetings, presenting to the Board and answering questions. They certainly believe that they have met all the requirements locally, pertaining to that. There will be a review process as part of the Alteration of Terrain Permit, where certainly they will look at any threatened and endangered species, and such, so that State permitting process will also look at those elements as the local process did.

In summary, C. Brannon stated that they have prepared these plans, they have gone through significant reviews, locally and also by third-party consultants, and these plans, the plans that they have before the Board, the layout, the road design, everything meets the local standards – and ultimately does meet the State standards. They still have to secure the State permits, other than the DOT permit, which they have already secured. They meet those standards, they meet the local regulations, they meet the local zoning. They believe that this is a good plan.

B. Moseley asked whether C. Brannon has any thoughts about the water issue that was brought up. C. Brannon responded that with residential wells, that's why you have the radiuses. In Town it's a 100 foot radius. The State actually requires a 75 foot radius. That's normally the cone of influence, around a residential well. All the lots have been sized appropriately, the development is sized appropriately for site-loading, there will be the appropriate amount of re-charge on site – so from a water balance standpoint, he thinks the project definitely meets any engineering design standards. There is no local standard for addressing wells, but they don't see any concerns or issues with this project. When you think about the development, it's a large-acre property. They have pretty significant buffering to neighboring properties, so that is not a concern that he has.

#### **Public Hearing Closed.**

K. Anderson stated that C. Brannon mentioned that the Alteration of Terrain Permit would trigger the NHB review and wetland species review. He asked whether the Wetland Permit would also require that. C. Brannon answered that that is correct. Two separate State permits that would both trigger the T&E review. He stated that the New Hampshire Heritage Bureau data checks are good for one year. They are on year 3 with this project. When someone starts questioning dates, and timeframes, and data, it changes over time. There have been three or four different data checks that they have done for this project, but ultimately the review will be done by the State, through the Wetlands Bureau, and also through the Alteration of Terrain Bureau. The State of New Hampshire as of this year adopted an Ecological Review Board, and they are part of the State permitting process as well. They basically dovetail with Fish and Game. The project is going to be reviewed at the State level for those concerns.

K. Anderson asked whether the State recommends, or asks for comment from Conservation for each of those permits. C. Brannon answered that they do for the Wetlands Permits, yes.

K. Anderson stated that he wanted to close out the comment regarding funding for the Fire Department / Police Department. That would be referred to as an impact fee; the Town of Hollis does not have impact fees for Fire and Police services associated with development.

B. Moseley stated that an impact fee is not a trivial matter, either. K. Anderson concurred, and stated that there is a lot involved in asking for and implementing an impact fee.

K. Anderson asked C. Brannon whether he needs more data from Planning Staff or R. Hardy for direction on the landscaping. The last thing he would want is for an insufficient plan to be submitted. Does C. Brannon have a pretty good idea of what is being requested?

C. Brannon replied that he took a lot of notes; he thinks that R. Hardy's review was quite thorough. Through his comments, he thinks that they have a better understanding of what the Board is looking for.

K. Anderson asked whether the Board would allow him to work with the Applicant and R. Hardy to iron that out, and B. Moseley answered yes. B. Moseley added that, as we are so close to bringing this case to a close, he would like that done as expeditiously and efficiently as possible. R. Hardy agreed to continue to provide input.

D. Petry asked C. Brannon to explain the errors in the wildlife study which were pointed out in public comment.

C. Brannon replied that he does not believe there are errors in the wildlife study, at all. The Town had a wildlife study requirement; the Applicant hired a gentleman who, frankly, far exceeded the requirements at the time. He prepared a study, he did the necessary site evaluation, they did a

wetlands and vernal pool assessment, he spent time on the site, and he reported what he observed for habitats. C. Brannon doesn't believe that there were errors. He stated that he thinks they modified the report to address concerns that the Commission had. They actually modified the layout of the subdivision, at the time, to address comments that the Commission had – and then they had to, associatedly, update the report. He doesn't believe there are errors in the report.

C. Brannon stated that they would request a continuance to the Board's next meeting.

J. Mook asked K. Anderson about the Town water – is that resource near the bottom of Deacon Hill? Is that where our center-of-town water comes from?

K. Anderson answered that it comes off of Rocky Pond Road; there is a water conservation area associated with it. He does not know that this development is in that; there is quite an increase in topography as you go up into this property.

J. Mook stated that she is wondering whether this is another impact of water use, and how it would affect the center of Town if there is some drain of that reservoir.

K. Anderson stated that the topic of water comes up with just about every application we have; the State is really the driver, through permitting of water wells. The Town really has no control over that. Our development regulations are actually pretty substantial, and restrict a lot of development throughout Town. This would not have a community well, so it would not go through that elaborate process that the previous application, Toddy Brook, goes through. These are individual wells, servicing individual, single-family homes.

J. Mook stated that the landscape plan says that the areas will be maintained, and have a sufficient amount of water to maintain viability – either by irrigation, or by other means. She asked for elaboration on that. K. Anderson stated that we should look to have some of the species changed on that landscaping plan; he doesn't want to be irrigating a potential Town right-of-way. He would like to completely revisit the landscaping plan, after hearing from R. Hardy.

C. Brannon stated that the notes generally speak to the critical period for making sure that there is viability in maintaining the landscaping. With a three-year guarantee, typically you do water during the first season, anyway. Sometimes it's water bags on the trees, sometimes it's through some manual watering – but they will revisit that with Staff.

B. Moseley stated that ideally they would want to put landscaping in that is low-maintenance. C. Brannon concurred.

**Motion to continue File PB2025-011 to the Board's meeting on September 15, 2026** – motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by J. Mook; motion passed unanimously.

**RECESS: 8:07pm to 8:14pm.**

- c. **File PB2026-011 – Plan Amendment Second Driveway:** 15 Nutting Lane, Owner: Cory R. Hussey Rev. Trust, Applicant: Wolf Rock Construction, Map 20 Lot 29-2, Zoned: Residential & Agricultural (RA). **Application acceptance and Public Comment.**

K. Anderson stated that as a requirement for second driveways, the Planning Board needs to approve them. The application came before him with a septic design and building permit. The Applicant is building a detached garage structure; it does have a convenience bathroom in it. The septic design submitted to him depicted a driveway coming off of Nutting Lane, and he informed the Applicant that

that would need Planning Board approval. They revised the septic plan to get the building permit, and it was depicted coming off of the existing driveway. This is a very long, linear property. The approved septic plan depicts the driveway coming off and turning back up, approaching the proposed structure. The building is under construction, and does have a valid building permit. This case is to close out the second driveway application, and do what the homeowner is intending to do.

K. Anderson stated that we will go over a couple areas of concern on the property – buffers, and tree cutting. The application is complete, as far as a second driveway goes, and he would recommend application acceptance.

**Motion to accept the application** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by V. Mills; motion passed unanimously.

Applicant: William Edwards, with Meridian Land Services. Stated that he completed the septic design and facilitated with his engineering department to complete the engineering drawings. Per a question from B. Moseley about his qualifications, W. Edwards stated that he is not a professional engineer; he is an interning septic designer and project technician – and was the project manager for this project. He stated that he has been working for Meridian Land Services for about two and a half years, and is appearing on behalf of Cory Hussey for construction regarding this additional driveway cut. Meridian was contacted in approximately early April, via Wolf Rock Construction, to design this dedicated septic system for the detached garage with a convenience bathroom. As was explained, they initially designed the project like this but were informed, due to local restrictions, that they had to come off of the existing driveway.

W. Edwards brought forth an easel with the septic design. B. Moseley asked whether the septic design was submitted as part of this application, and K. Anderson stated that it was not; it was part of the building permit that was approved.

B. Moseley stated that, therefore, the septic design was not reviewed by members of the Board. He asked W. Edwards whether he is aware that there are submission requirements for an application to this Board. Any plan that is presented to the Board has to be provided to the Board, to the Planning Department, in a timely fashion per our rules of procedure; otherwise, the Board cannot review it. The public needs an opportunity to see it because there is going to be a public comment session. It is unfair to the public to make comment if they haven't had access to all of the information.

W. Edwards said to then ignore the septic design. He stated that it is public record anyway, and is on the State website.

B. Moseley asked the rest of the Board for their thoughts about whether or not to proceed with the case at this meeting, as information about the initial plan for the driveway cannot be presented to us. He stated that it seems to him that the Board has an issue; they are being asked for an alternative driveway when the original driveway hasn't been formally presented to them. He personally has a concern with that.

V. Mills and J. Mook agreed that they also have concerns about that fact.

D. Cleveland stated that he would like to hear K. Anderson's view on this. He did concur that he is concerned that the initial driveway was not formally provided to the Board.

D. Petry also agreed with the concern.

M. Leavitt stated that he thinks there is enough information here for the Board to understand what the Applicant wants now; he is not too concerned about the original design.

K. Anderson stated that the Board's application acceptance was whether the application as submitted was sufficient. The request is for a second driveway to access a detached structure. The Applicant, for lack of a better term, circumvented the Planning Board procedure with the second driveway to obtain the building permit to start construction via using the existing driveway. That met the criteria of our ordinance. This is a kind-of a stand-alone application; the Board can say no to it. It is a compliant building permit, and they can move forward with their driveway off of the existing driveway. He does believe that there is sufficient information here to weigh in on this. If nothing more, to evaluate the project as a whole. If we are concerned about how the existing driveway is going to be utilized, that would be a good reason for a request for continuance to the Board's next meeting.

B. Moseley stated that his primary concern is that this application was scheduled to have a public comment, and the public has not had access, as they normally would, to the original driveway.

K. Anderson stated that he is only stating that there is sufficient information here to talk about a second driveway. The project as a whole and how it is accessed off of the existing driveway is a valid request, and valid information that, if this Board sees fit that they need, then that would be the next step.

B. Moseley asked whether the Board was willing to continue this application to their next meeting, so that the information regarding the originally proposed driveway can be adequately provided to the public and to the Board for the purposes of evaluating a second driveway.

**Motion to continue File PB2026-011 to the Board's meeting on September 15, 2026** – motioned by J. Mook, seconded by V. Mills.

Further discussion: D. Petry asked K. Anderson whether there is any planned living space in the detached building under construction. K. Anderson replied that, to his knowledge, there is not. D. Petry asked why, then, they are putting septic in. K. Anderson answered that there will be a convenience bathroom. The primary dwelling on this property is a long distance away. D. Petry asked what the square footage of the proposed building is. K. Anderson stated that he does not know that off the top of his head, and he does not know what is to be on the top story. He stated that it does get heavily vetted through our Building Department as to the uses of the building.

D. Petry suggested that K. Anderson look into that in detail, because his hunch is that this is more than just a garage/barn.

**Vote on the motion above:** motion passed unanimously.

B. Moseley asked whether we need to re-notice for a public hearing; K. Anderson stated that he will take care of that. The Board did continue the case to date-specific, but with a few abutters to the project, he has no problem taking care of that matter.

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

### **a. Zoning Ordinance Change Season**

B. Moseley stated that K. Anderson provided a really good calendar for the zoning ordinance process. On October 6<sup>th</sup> there will be a joint meeting of the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment to discuss potential changes.

K. Anderson stated that the Planning Board's next meeting is September 15; he intends to hand out some draft language on proposed zoning amendments to initiate where we are going. He has about a

half dozen items; four of them are very minor in nature, and two are larger topics. He intends for there to be some preliminary discussion by the Board at the meeting on September 15<sup>th</sup> so that the joint meeting on October 6<sup>th</sup> will be productive. The ZBA will be submitting their own suggestions to him in writing, before hand.

K. Anderson further stated that the calendar he submitted to the Board includes some placeholders to continue our zoning discussions; it has the deadlines regarding petition submissions, beginning and end, and the key dates that we need, to move forward. We are a couple of months ahead of schedule compared to where we usually are in this process, so he is hopeful that we can utilize this time to our advantage. He added that if Board members have additional ideas for potential zoning ordinance changes, they should please reach out to him.

## 7. ADJOURNMENT:

**Motion to adjourn at 8:28pm**– motioned by D. Cleveland, seconded by J. Mook; motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,  
Aurelia Perry,  
Recording Secretary

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