

PLANNING BOARD
27 School Street
HILLSBOROUGH, NH
December 01, 2021

DATE APPROVED:12/15/21

TIME: 6:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.

MEMBERS: Gary Sparks- Chairman, Susanne White-Vice Chair, Adam Charrette, Ed Sauer, Melinda Gehris, Nancy Egner

EX-OFFICIO: James Bailey III

PLANNING DIRECTOR: Robyn Payson

ALTERNATES: Bob Hansen

Excused: Ed Sauer, Bob Hansen

Public: Ken Fowle, Peter Mellen LLS, Brett Cherrington, Riche' Colcombe, Tammy Davison, Jen and Shaun Lane, John Noonan, Tom Carr, Dan Higginson, Carl Borowiec, Matt Cooper, Alan Ager, Michelle Dumont, Audrey Lawson, John Cooper, T. Coleman, Bruce Egner, Richard Head, James McDonough, Scott Bourcier

Chairman Gary Sparks called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Gary asked for a motion from the Board to move the "Town Meeting Public Hearing Schedule" to after the minutes. Susanne White made a motion to move the work meeting on the Town Meeting Public Hearing Schedule to after the minutes. Nancy Egner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion about engineer review fees with guest Scott Bourcier of Gale Associates

Robyn Payson introduced Scott Bourcier from Gale Associates has been working as the Town's Engineer. He came to the Planning Board to answer any questions that they may have.

Robyn Payson asked if he could explain how fees for projects were developed.

Scott said that the fee is based on the type of project and the size of the project. They then determine the level of review that is required and that the town wants. He provides a comprehensive review letter to the applicant outlining the scope. He said they do their best to keep their fees in line with the applicant.

Susanne White asked if he has to do site visits.

Mr. Bourcier said he does. He goes to the site and looks at the plans to get a full picture of the project. He said his goal is to give the Board the technical resource with the information in hand so the Board can make a decision.

Jim Bailey asked what he charged for an hourly fee.

Mr. Bourcier said his hourly rate is \$210.00-\$220.00/hour. They try to use staff engineers and lower-level engineers to work on reviews as much as possible. The same is true with construction oversight. They use the lower-level staff as much as possible. They try to keep the costs to the applicant in mind, but their job is to look out for the best interest of the town.

Melinda Gehris asked how much of their work is peer reviews as opposed to doing work for the developers.

Mr. Bourcier said they do 100% peer review. The only development they do has to do with site improvements. There is also an "Athletic" development group that does athletic facilities for high schools and colleges. They are not doing developments like Cumberland Farms or Domino's. He said he feels that is a conflict of interest although there are some consultants out there that work both sides. He said he is a municipal civil engineer that works with towns. Besides Hillsborough he works with Bow, Chester, and Milton. He is there to work for the Planning Board and Conservation Commission and the Road Agent and Public Works Department. He said he is there to support the town.

Melinda said one of the concerns that has been raised with the Board is that in at least one instance we had an applicant that believed the cost of having the review was more than the cost of the initial engineering. So what would you say to an applicant if in fact that is the case.

Mr. Bourcier said he has heard that multiple times and it is no different than the argument about a surety bond. The applicant will say they can get a cheaper engineer. He said the purpose of the surety was in the event the Town has to do this work, the Town is going to have to put this out to bid and there is a cost to that. Going back to her question, he agreed there were many different engineering firms that are professional engineers and are licensed by the state but some of them work out of their homes making their overhead much lower. It also depends on the type of work they are going for. The ones that work on the side of the developer understand the developer is looking for a low-cost engineer. When you get into mid-sized firms which is what Gale is or large size firms, those firms work for multibillion-dollar projects. The smaller firms have less overhead compared to Gale. Gale has other resources to go to. They have surveyors, traffic engineers, highway engineers in house that they can refer to where small firms do not have that.

Melinda said that sounded like it's not an "apples to apples" comparison.

Mr. Bourcier said you could say that, and he didn't want to go down the road of discrediting or saying Gale is better than them because they are all professional engineers, we are just looking at the applicant in a different manner. The applicant's engineer is looking out for the best interest of the applicant whereas they are coming in and looking out for the best interest of the community. Whether it relates to the rates or the hourly costs it's a matter of do you want the Cadillac, something in the middle or do you want the Pinto. Its whatever is more important to that person paying that fee.

Mr. Bourcier thanked the Board for their time and said he would be happy to come back any time.

Gary Sparks thanked Mr. Bourcier for coming to the Board.

Minutes 11/17/21

Melinda Gehris made a motion to approve the minutes. Susanne White seconded the motion. The motion carried. The minutes were approved.

Town Meeting Public Hearing Schedule

Robyn said the Planning Board needed to vote to forward the two warrant articles to be heard at a Public Hearing. The hearing will have to be at the January 5th meeting.

Melinda Gehris made a motion to accept Warrant Article 1 and Warrant article 2 as written and to schedule them for Public Hearing on January 5th 2022. Susanne White seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Applications

Nancy Egner recused herself from this application

Subdivision -Public Hearing

216 Bible Hill Rd (Map 11I Lot 50)

Brett M. Davison

Tom Carr of Meridian Land Services Representing the Applicant

Tom Carr said the plan had not been changed since the last meeting.

To recap, they started with 8 lots. One of them could not comply with the Shoreland Protection Act so the lot was dropped. There were questions and concerns from the Road Agent regarding the lots on Moore Road. We did some drainage work on that and was acceptable to the Road Agent. He said they recognize that the Conservation Commission has some concerns about the drainage and erosion control, so they have proposed stormwater and erosion control plans. He said he believes in every capacity these lots meet the Town's Subdivision Regulations; they meet the Zoning Ordinance; they meet the standards for driveway grades. All the lots comply with what is required and there have been additional protections on all the lots.

Melinda Gehris said she had a question about what they learned about Mike Borden; which she understands is that he is not qualified to do what we are asking him to do. That raises some concerns. She asked Mr. Carr if he has seen that comment.

Mr. Carr said he had and how he can respond is that these are stormwater management plans that are the same things we do in Deering, and Amherst they are the same for the Shoreland Protection Act and these aren't things that have to be done by a professional engineer. He said there aren't any regulations in town on this so he doesn't have any way to say they are complying with this or that rule. They are offering what works for Deering and the State. We are showing a good faith proposal to mitigate runoff. He said he gets that Mike is not a "PE" but he is not a "PE" either, but he is allowed to do this. They are proposing to make this part of the septic plan application that becomes part of the regulatory review. Mike's on site and he said he

is qualified to tell if the site is working or not.

Adam Charrette asked if in the future development of these lots, if these measures were proven to be insufficient at the time of development, what would be the repercussions.

Mr. Carr said that the Town does not have any regulations that are going to say that “this” isn’t sufficient. What we are providing is something that is better than nothing. He said he didn’t have a regulatory level so he can’t really answer that question.

Adam Charrette asked if in the future the plans could be changed, and would that create any conflict with the purchase and development of these lots?

Mr. Carr said the driveway plans going back to what was worked on with the Road Agent had to do with what was going on with the right of way. The design is conceptual at this point but once we get to the final design when the person comes to them for the septic design and the stormwater management plan and erosion control, this plan isn’t going to change much but it will change.

Adam Charrette asked if those problems would be addressed on a separate occasion?

Mr. Carr said Yes, each design is different and when a house comes in it has its own stormwater management and erosion control design.

Gary Sparks asked if this application were approved what kind of infrastructure improvements will you have to make to this proposed development.

Mr. Carr said there aren’t any. The infrastructure they are going to be doing is literally the driveways. The infrastructure improvements we proposed to off site which is the road right of ways are specific to Moore Road with what they worked on with the Road Agent to show him how we are going to put these culverts under the driveways. The plans provided with the engineering stamp, the surveyor’s stamp, and Mr. Carr’s stamp on it are going to be part of the plan sets that stay with the Town. Only sheets one and two will be recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

Susanne White said she saw the plan with the driveways indicated.

Mr. Carr said that was the plan in working with Richard Head. They sent that to DES to explicitly show Ridge Mock to determine impacts to the Shoreland Protection so everyone could see the questions. The questions were answered, and they do not need an Alteration of Terrain permit because it is not going to qualify.

Susanne White asked if because of where the driveways are shown on the plan, is that where they are going to have to be?

Mr. Carr said it doesn’t have to be. These are conceptual.

Susanne White said that we have no way of knowing where they will be.

Mr. Carr said no, they didn't. He said he expects that is how they will be done but this isn't a Site Plan.

Melinda Gehris said she continues to have significant concerns about lot 50-6. She said she spent a lot of time over the past couple of weeks looking at it. The slopes are not over 25% but they are still steep. She said she doesn't see a way that we can have conditions that do the same kind of protection on that lot and the potential runoff from that lot as we can from 50-5. It still raises significant concerns to her and she said she is not sure that she could vote yes on this.

Mr. Carr said he could only answer that by saying the lots are compliant with the Town's regulations at the Subdivision level, the Zoning level, and the driveway level. Lot 50-6 is a legitimate lot and he thought denying a lot and denying a whole subdivision for fear that a contractor is going to screw up and do a crappy job is not a reasonable or legitimate reason to take a lot away that's fully compliant with the Town's regulations and ordinances.

Melinda Gehris said she understood that position and she wanted to let him know how she is feeling. There are a lot of other things to balance including the fact we have a swimming hole and recreational area right there; we have Beard Brook right there we have significant slope there and that is not the only thing that we consider as a Planning Board. She said she knew he as seen the letter from the Conservation Commission which cites to the case of Patenaude which clearly says that's not the only thing the Board looks at.

Mr. Carr said he understood that. He said there is a Housing Appeals Board in the state now because developers, property owners and taxpayers are going through these motions and getting to where we are now with something that is fully compliant and are getting denied. Regulations have to be predictable. The State is recognizing that the taxpayers cannot be slam dunked for fears or I don't like the lot and I don't think its fair. If this is denied that's where we will go.

Gary Sparks said the Planning Board is very well aware of what he just said. He said it is the Board's job to go into this quite thoroughly and he said he would like to believe this Board does that. If the Board asks questions that make him uncomfortable or make you worry about court, the Planning Board is very cognizant of the procedures. We try to avoid it too because it costs us attorney fees also. We want to be fair to everybody. Our client is the Town, so we are doing our job for the Town. Your job is for the Davison's. That's why we do this and why we are asking the questions.

Mr. Carr said he understood the concerns and that is why they are proposing the stormwater management and erosion control plans. These are not required in this state. This is something additional and not just on that lot; on all of the lots.

Gary Sparks said he has seen lots of plans and subdivisions over the years and this is in a spot that is near and dear to many people in this town so that's why we are being careful.

Gary Sparks asked Robyn Payson what she thought on timing. She said that they were at 65

days but she had contacted Mr. Carr and he said the applicant was willing to waive that constraint. Gary asked if she thought the Board should wait two weeks and consider approval at the next meeting. She said the Board needs to have all of their questions answered and it is possible there could be approval in two weeks, but the Board would have to feel their concerns have been addressed sufficiently.

Gary asked the Board if they were prepared to make a decision or would they like to wait two weeks to think of conditions in the meantime.

Gary Sparks recognized Richard Head, Chairman of the Conservation Commission.

Richard Head said regarding lot 50-6, the Conservation Commission has recommended that lot not be developed. It is not just on account of steepness; it is a number of factors. One is we are not anticipating that development will be done in a shoddy manner. We are expecting the development will be done properly and the way you would want to have property developed.

Even with that in mind we are asking that lot not be approved as part of this subdivision because you have to take the project as a whole. The project as a whole has slopes that come down towards Beard Brook, you're within the Shoreland Protection area, you have what are compliant but small lots and you are developing each of these lots, each of which have wetlands, each of which (on Beard Road) are within the Shoreland Protection zone.

You have a valuable natural resource in Beard Brook, you have a Town resource in the swimming hole, and you have a stream that comes through lot 50-6 that creates a transport mechanism for sediment and for erosion material or pollutants into Beard Brook. The two areas of wetland that the driveway would have to snake in between, and you don't have a lot of control over that. These are conceptual driveways. You also have the removal of trees. The trees themselves provide an essential component of the hydrology of these properties. As you remove more trees you create a greater risk of increased water throughout these properties.

You also are adding impervious surfaces through the driveways and the homes. Mr. Head said he agrees with Mr. Carr, those can be addressed through various mechanisms. You again do not have a great deal of control over that once the subdivision is approved. You have lawns that are going to be developed and you have materials that are going to be put on those lawns. You are developing a large percentage of land that is all sensitive because of the wetlands and the hydrology, because of the slopes.

When you combine all of these factors and the one that creates the greatest risk is lot 50-6. Taking into consideration the restrictions Mr. Carr has agreed to which is no further lot development beyond the wetlands so you wouldn't be creating more crossings there. The other two lots above are not as steep and present fewer problems with development. At least if development occurs on the lower end of these other two lots you are in a better situation relative to slope and the risks to wetlands.

When we are talking about wetland impacts, we are talking about what are the functions and values of wetlands. Some of the essential ones on these properties are water retention and flood

control because you do have the slopes and you do have Beard Brook down below and the roadway down below. You also have habitat and the other functions and values but the key essential one is flood control. As you add impervious surfaces, as you remove trees and as you develop lawns those are the functions and values that become essential for what the future impacts are on the property down below. He said he was not suggesting that these lots would be developed in a poor manner, he is not suggesting they would be doing anything improper. But you do lose a little bit of control because they are all going to be developed as individual house lots.

You also don't have control over the amount of fill they are going to be bringing in to put in those lawns. All of these lots as seen on the site walk (especially on 50-6) are a lot of boulders and things that are likely going to have to be removed and replaced with topsoil. You are creating a new environment up there in these lots that are compliant but very small. That is why he thinks the Patenaude case gives the Board discretion to look at the over all picture and look at what are the purposes of town planning. Specifically mentioned are wetlands and environment. These are essential components of what we are talking about with a subdivision like this. We appreciate and understand the effort that has been made by Mr. Carr and the owner, but that lot does present the greatest risk relative to this project. The Conservation Commission recommends that the project be re-designed in a way that does not result in the development of lot 50-6.

Susanne White asked if 50-6 was subsumed in to 50-5 and 50-7 would that resolve the problem, or would you prefer to see development prevented on that lot?

Richard Head said they didn't have a specific position on that. Either way would be within our recommendation.

Adam Charrette said, you said 50-6 is the lot with the greatest risk. Is it a great enough risk that it cannot be mitigated with stormwater management design? If there was still something there, but the lot was bigger how would it change any kind of impact on stormwater runoff because the house adjacent to it would not be there.

Mr. Head said you would be preserving the property in this area creating a larger area for ground water to be absorbed, less impervious surfaces and a greater area of a more natural environment. Could it be developed in a way that does not have impacts; I think the answer is no because you are going to be bringing in to a very tight area with wetlands on either side and a moving water body impervious surfaces, new soil, open area and fewer trees. And you are going to be inevitably affecting the hydrology with the greatest impact being on that lot.

What that exactly means when it is developed he said he couldn't predict with a level of certainty I am just saying is in the Conservation Commissions' view the greatest level of risk. It doesn't mean at the end of the day nothing would happen or something would happen we are talking risk and that is the one we perceived based on the site walk, based on the plan and the wetlands that are there the greatest risk to the things consistent with the town code which is protection of the environment protection of wetlands and protection of the town's natural resources.

Gary thanked Mr. Head for his comments and asked for any other comments. He recognized Brett Cherrington.

Brett Cherrington said Susanne's question made him think that if the questionable lot is split and divided by the two neighbors, wouldn't that open up their ability to cut trees and expand their lawn at least as far as the wetlands? What about up hill from the wetlands? Although it's not going to be developed is there anything restricting the owners from cutting trees up hill of the wetlands? If not, then there is a high risk to the wetlands.

Tom Carr said they did at the Conservation Commission's request, restrict the area above the wetlands on 6 and 5 to be a no development zone.

Brett Cherrington said his question was about trees being cut.

Mr. Carr said logging happens and it is happening on the property right now. If somebody wants to cut firewood on their property you can't stop them from doing that. There's no wetland crossings proposed. If someone wanted a wetlands permit they would have to go through the Conservation Commission and they would deny that.

Terrence Coleman said this is going to affect three parts of his property. He is concerned about the two houses on Moore Street. Mainly the second one where they moved the houses down. He said "When I come out of my garage, my headlights are going to be on the house right in front. Are we going to be dealing with this for the next three years for each and every house? How are we going to know what people are going to do like put lawn fertilizer down? Is someone from the town going to go down and check? We hope they will be respectful to the land." He said he was opposed to the house on Moore Street. He said the land just doesn't look big enough. He said he has been in contact with four surveyors, he believes the property line is in the wrong spot. He asked if the board would review every lot to see where the driveway and septic would be. He said he had concerns about the erosion of his driveway because the land is so wet.

Gary Sparks said when a subdivision is approved the location of the septic and the water is up to the state. The driveway cuts are regulated by the town unless they are superseded by state regulation. The people who purchase those lots will not have to come before the Planning Board. They have to meet state and other town requirements. The Planning Board approves the layout.

Mr. Coleman asked if the stream running through one of the lots divided it in to two lots.

Adam Charette said that was in reference to the buildable area being contiguous. So if the wetlands ran through that lot only the larger portion would be buildable square footage.

Leigh Bosse said the process was bothering him. This is the third time he had been here for a hearing on this subdivision and it's the third time the Conservation Commission has come in and said that it meets every requirement of the Town. He said he had a great deal of respect for the Conservation Commission, and he agrees 100% with everything Mr. Head said today and if the applicant was here asking for a variance they would have a great application. It has no

application as to whether the applicant gets granted an application that is universally accepted as meeting every requirement of the Town. They need to be approved tonight.

Adam Charrette said that their job as a Planning Board was not to meet the bare minimum. The Planning Board is to keep an eye out for the town.

Mr. Carr said Brett Davison is not present, he asked that the hearing be tabled for two more weeks so they can discuss this among themselves. He said he didn't want to see this plan be denied tonight. He said he thinks it is legitimate to approve this plan, I feel our client the tax payer would be harmed if this was denied tonight. He knows the applicant does not want to wait.

Gary said that the big sticking point is that lot 50-6 and maybe if you could discuss that and maybe a compromise.

Tom Carr said he had an idea that might appease both sides but he didn't want to divulge that right now.

Susanne White made a motion to continue the hearing to December 15th. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Nancy Egner re-joined the Board

Subdivision Accept Application No Public Comment

232 Bear Hill Rd. (Map 12 Lot 152)

Dan Higginson Representing Pierre Chabot

This is a two lot subdivision on Bear Hill Road. The applicant has asked for a waiver that would allow building outside the "Buildable Area" of the lot.

Dan Higginson is representing the applicant.

The applicant is proposing to carve a 2 acre lot out of a 25.3 acre parcel.

There is sufficient space at the front of the lot to locate the house and the infrastructure, but the 40,000 square feet is not contiguous. The goal is to build on the road side of the lot to avoid impacting the wetland.

Melinda Gehris said she was confused because the well radius shown on the plan is not at the front of the lot. Mr. Higginson directed Ms. Gehris to the second sheet of the plan. It was determined the second sheet of the plan had not been submitted. Mr. Higginson circulated his copy of the second page of the plan to the Board.

Susy White asked to be shown the buildable areas of the lot.

Adam Charrette asked if he moved the lot line would there be a contiguous 40,000 square feet.

Mr. Higginson said there would be. But it would be at the back of the property and would require crossing the wetland.

Following discussion which indicated that the Board was not comfortable with the Buildable Area not being contiguous Mr. Higginson agreed to revise the plan and bring it back with a contiguous 40,000sq ft of contiguous buildable area.

Mr. Higginson wanted to be sure that with the 40,000 square feet on the back of the property, that he would still be able to build on the road side of the property.

Melinda Gehris said she was not sure without seeing the property.

Susanne White made a motion to accept the application as complete. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Site Plan Accept Application-No Public Comment

West Main Street (Map 11F Lot 20)

Jeremiah Boucher

John Noonan from Fieldstone Land Consultants presented on behalf of Patriot Holdings and Jeremiah Boucher.

The project is to construct a self-storage development with two contractor buildings, one climate control building and five self-storage buildings totaling 57,900 sq ft of total building area.

Mr. Noonan presented the application that included the construction of a mixed use storage facility. It is all self-storage even though it is being presented as a mixed use. The mixed use is the Contractor Buildings which are storage buildings targeted for small contractors to rent the spaces.

The building along the frontage is store front with 17 parking spaces in the front. This is geared toward a small contractor that would store something like electrical supplies and have an "Admin" or a secretary up front and has a small customer retail facing on the front of the building. This building is constructed differently than the standard storage buildings at the rear.

The other 50' wide contractor building does not have any store front or water and sewer. The only water and sewer service is in the front building. This is geared toward the small contractor who is storing tools or building supplies. Or it could be a private individual who would want to store an RV or classic cars. Some of the other buildings are standard self-storage with no heat or air conditioning. The building in the rear is climate controlled with humidity control, air conditioned and heated keeping the climate consistent throughout the year.

Access is off of West Main Street with the parking in front. The aisles are 25' so trucks can pass also allowing for fire truck and vehicle access. The drive isle in front of the 50' building is 35 ft.

Susanne White asked if all access to the contractor building was from the front. Mr. Noonan said

that was correct.

They are increasing impervious surfaces the over all development size and impacted area will go into the DES Alteration of Terrain Permit. All of the site work will fall under the DES regulations for Alteration of Terrain. That permit will need to be a condition of approval.

Mr. Noonan described the drainage plan in detail.

There is a large man-made pond which will not be impacted. They are not directing any water to it. They are also leaving the vegetation around the pond.

All of the drainage is built to handle a 2-year storm, 10-year storm, and a 50-year storm.

Mr. Noonan reviewed the utility plan. All of the power will be underground.

Mr. Noonan reviewed the lighting plan which included full cutoff down facing lights. The lights are on motion sensor and during the daylight hours they will be off.

Mr. Noonan reviewed the landscaping plan. The landscaping is concentrated toward the front.

Mr. Noonan presented examples from their other buildings of what the building design might look like.

Melinda Gehris noticed the ATV trail and asked if it would be relocated.

Mr. Noonan said the owner wants to work with people to re-locate it.

Nancy Egner made a motion to accept the application. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White made a motion to schedule a Site Walk on Saturday December 11, at 9:00 am. Nancy Egner seconded the motion. The motion carried with Melinda Gehris Abstaining

Nancy Egner made a motion to continue the application and hold a Public Hearing on December 15. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Site Plan Accept Application-No Public Comment

95 Antrim Road (Map 11L Lot 319)

Peter Mellen Representing 95 Antrim Road LLC.

Peter Mellen introduced the application.

Mr. Mellen is requesting a waiver. (see attached)

Following discussion Susanne White made a motion to grant the waiver. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White made a motion to accept the application as complete. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Peter Mellen presented the application for the construction of a 60x60 maintenance shed, a 30x40 office and south of the wetland a 40x40 salt storage shed.

There is also going to be a gravel drive constructed up the hill for a construction equipment storage area. The plan also shows a proposed well that will service the office building.

They have not included a landscaping plan. When the state re-built Antrim Road, there were some stone walls along the road. The state relocated them out of the state's right of way and they have an easement for those. That forms part of the landscaping. There are also some existing trees (sugar maples) along the wall. There may be some plantings near the office building eventually but right now they are utilizing the existing wall and existing trees.

Mr. Mellen reviewed the drainage, grading and erosion control plan. Included in the application was a drainage report that was sent out to the Board.

Richard Head asked how water was flowing out from the salt shed. Peter said he would have the engineer at the next meeting, and he will be able to answer that question.

Mr. Mellen reviewed the photometric plan.

Nancy Egner made a motion to schedule a site walk at 10:00 am Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried with Melinda Gehris abstaining.

Susanne White made a motion to continue the application and schedule the Public Hearing for December 15. Nancy Egner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

NON-PUBLIC SESSIONS

1. Non-Public Session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II(c)-Reputation

Jim Bailey made a motion to enter into Non-public session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II(c)-Reputation. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Jim Bailey-Y, Nancy Egner-Y, Gary Sparks-Y, Adam Charrette-Y, Melinda Gehris-Y, Susanne White-Y. The Planning Board entered Non-public Session at 8:55 pm.

Planning Board returned from Non-public Session 9:00

Susanne White made a motion to seal the minutes of the Non-public Session. Jim Bailey seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Jim Bailey-Y, Nancy Egner-Y, Gary Sparks-Y, Adam Charrette-Y, Melinda Gehris-Y, Susanne White-Y.

Non-Public Session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II(c)-Reputation

Jim Bailey made a motion to enter into Non-public session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II(c)-Reputation. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Jim Bailey-Y, Nancy Egner-Y, Gary Sparks-Y, Adam Charrette-Y, Melinda Gehris-Y, Susanne White-Y.

The Planning Board entered Non-public Session at 9:03pm

Susanne White made a motion to leave Non-public Session. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Gary Sparks-Y, Susanne White-Y, Adam Charrette-Y, Nancy Egner-Y, Jim Bailey-Y, Melinda Gehris-Y.

The Planning Board returned from Non-public Session at 9:10 pm.

Jim Bailey made a motion to seal the minutes of the Non-public Session. Susanne White seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Gary Sparks-Y, Susanne White-Y, Adam Charrette-Y, Nancy Egner-Y, Jim Bailey-Y, Melinda Gehris-Y.

There being no other business, Susanne White made a motion to adjourn.

Meeting Adjourned 9:30pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Robyn L. Payson, Planning Director



Donald R. Mellen Surveyor, LLC

22 Center Road
P.O. Box 412
Hillsborough, NH 03244-0412

Phone (603) 464-3266
Fax (603) 464-3401
Email: mellensurvey@tds.net
Website: www.mellensurvey.com

October 27, 2021

Gary Sparks, Chairman
Town of Hillsborough Planning Board
PO Box 7
Hillsborough, NH 03244

Re: Application of 95 Autrim Road, LLC, for Site Plan Approval on Map III, Lot 319

Dear Gary,

In regard to the above referenced application, the applicant is requesting a partial waiver of the following highlighted requirements of Section 185-5 of the Town of Hillsborough New Hampshire Site Plan Review Regulations:

185-S.B.(1)(a)(3) The boundary lines and area of the Town tax map lot which includes the site; the boundary lines of the site itself, **including angles or bearings of the lines, dimensions** and lot area.

The bearings and dimensions of the subject parcel are shown in the vicinity of the proposed development, but not on the entirety of the property as shown on the cover sheet. This information is a matter of record, shown on Plan No. 39227 as recorded at the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds. A copy of this plan was supplied to the planning board for informational purposes in accordance with NH RSA 676:18, paragraph IV.

Showing this information on the entirety of the property, the majority of which is not affected by the proposed site work, would appear to add little to the board's evaluation of the project. We therefore request a partial waiver of this requirement.

Sincerely,


Peter D. Mellen, LLS