

MANCHESTER PLANNING BOARD
LIMITED PUBLIC HEARING / BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
January 21, 2016 – 6:00 p.m.
City Hall, Third Floor – Aldermanic Chambers

Board Members Present: Chairman Mike Harrington, Vice Chairman Ray Clement, Eric Kizak, Guy Guerra, Matthew O'Brien, Kevin McCue, Jim Roy, Pierre Boissonneault, Alderman Joe Kelly Levasseur

Alternates Present: Michael O'Donoghue (voting), Catherine Flinchbaugh (not voting)

Excused: Dan LeClerc (Alternate)

Staff Present: Pamela Goucher, Deputy Director of Planning & Zoning; Jonathan Golden, Senior Planner; Jeff Belanger, Senior Planner; Jodie Levandowski, Planner, and Bill Klubben, Planner

I. The Chairman calls the meeting to order and introduces Planning Board Members and Planning Staff.

II. LIMITED PUBLIC HEARING:

With respect to the applications below, appropriate materials have been submitted to invoke the jurisdiction of the Board. Although additional information may be required prior to final consideration, it is the recommendation of the Staff that the Planning Board accepts the applications and conducts a public hearing. A motion would be in order.

Mr. Roy made a motion to accept the new application, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried)

1. SP-34-2015

Property located at 267 Wilson Street (Tax Map 342, Lot 19) and a portion of the former RR ROW (shown as A-2 of Tax Map 473, Lot 46), a site plan application to change the use of 37,600 SF of the former CA Hoitt Furniture building to Hope for NH Recovery center and other non-profit tenants within the RDV Zone. CLD Consulting Engineers for 267 Wilson Street, LLC

2. CU-24-2015

Property located at 267 Wilson Street (Tax Map 342, Lot 19) and a portion of the former RR ROW (shown as A-2 of Tax Map 473, Lot 46), a request for a Conditional Use permit to allow Offices of health care practitioners and outpatient health care [H-2 (1)] within the RDV Zone. CLD Consulting Engineers for 267 Wilson Street, LLC

3. CU-03-2016

Property located at 267 Wilson Street (Tax Map 342, Lot 19) and a portion of the former RR ROW (shown as A-2 of Tax Map 473, Lot 46), a request for a Conditional Use permit for a reduction of parking and the use of public and controlled parking within 500' for the proposed 37,600 SF building for Hope for NH Recovery center and other non-profit tenants. The applicant

proposes a combination of 50 un-striped spaces onsite and on Map 109, Lot 4 where 111 are required within the RDV Zone. CLD Consulting Engineers for 267 Wilson Street, LLC

Dick Anagnost appeared along with Andy Cruz. He advised that they are the private sector that stepped forth to purchase the building. Also present was Ken Rhodes of CLD, the engineer who along with Steve Burnell of Burnell & Johnson have been providing pro bono professional services on this project, as well as Alexander Anagnost, the project manager. A handout was distributed to the Board to provide an understanding of what the operations within the building will look like.

Mr. Anagnost advised that the building is located at 267 Wilson Street, the old Hoitt's Furniture Store, which has been in the Longo family for the last half century. The majority of the structure is an old mill building that was built at the turn of the century. The brick and windows are still underneath the cement façade that is over it. Their ultimate goal would be to restore the building to its former glory. That would be more like Phase V of the building because in order of importance, it is the recovery center first, services second and then the exterior of the building last. The only exterior renovation to the building that they are proposing immediately is the entrance, which will be in the rear of the mill portion of the building where Lot A2 is located. He advised that when they purchased the building they also purchased Lot A2, which had been purchased by the Longo family from the City of Manchester. All of the property in question is owned and under the control of the existing ownership. The new entrance is to allow access to a passenger elevator that will be placed into the old freight elevator shaft. They are actually going to take the freight elevator shaft, build a new shaft within it and make it accessible for ADA and elevator purposes to go to the upper floors. There will also be a staircase going to all of the upper floors for egress and access located in that area. In addition, it allows access to all floors from the rear so that if someone were dropping off or picking up they would be taking them off of Wilson Street or Valley Street and they would be able to drive to the rear of the building and gain access to the building through that door. The building is split level with the elevation of Valley Street being lower than the elevation at the rear of the building so the rear access that they are proposing is at grade level. The access, which will remain in place for the first floor that was the old Longo Furniture store, will also remain in place for access to the recovery center.

Mr. Anagnost advised that included in the handout are floorplans of each floor with the proposed tenants that are definite as well as the ones they are in preliminary discussions with and the additional available space in the building.

Alexander Anagnost stated that on the first floor, there is 9,158 SF marked off for Hope for New Hampshire, the 24/7 recovery center. They also have an additional 2,624 SF for an additional tenant. Dick Anagnost advised that the recovery center is where the coaches will be located. There are no services administered from the recovery center. Currently the recovery coaches are at 140 Central Street. They will continue to go out and provide their services to the community as they have currently, which is that they respond to Narcan calls by the Fire Department. They respond to administer recovery services to people with addiction and even though they are co-located here, they will still be in the community as well. There are also additional spaces that have been provided within this space for other agencies to come in and co-work.

The 2,000 SF space that Alex mentioned is what they are earmarking as their medical space. They are currently in discussions with Dartmouth Hospital, Elliot Hospital and CMC to provide medical services for clearing purposes, essentially step down, medical triage and that sort of thing. They hope to have a medical component in the building. They will be meeting with Manchester Mental Health who has an interest in locating some of their professionals within the building to administer services in real time to people coming into the property as well.

Alex Anagnost referred to the plan of the second floor and advised that they have preliminarily earmarked a 5,615 SF space for Serenity Place to occupy. They also have an additional 8,904 SF for either additional services that Serenity may provide or another tenant.

Dick Anagnost advised that this is for Serenity Place's outpatient services which is not yet committed. Hope for Recovery is 100 percent committed and that floorplan has been finalized and is currently in the process of going through the construction vetting.

They have also met with Phoenix House who has expressed an interest in bringing their services here as well. Steve Burnell will be meeting with them next week to draw up additional floorplans in some of the vacant space.

On the third floor Alex Anagnost said Families in Transition will be occupying the entirety of it which is 8,370 SF.

Dick Anagnost said FIT are currently providing these services in the basement of the old Greek Catholic Church on Beech Street where they are woefully undersized. This will right size their operation and provide some room for expansion. Families in Transition is committed and the floorplan is out for fit-up pricing at this point.

Alex Anagnost advised that on the fourth floor they have 4,884 SF preliminarily earmarked for Serenity's outpatient services. Dick Anagnost said essentially Serenity has their choice of locations. They have provided a little bit larger space downstairs because they couldn't get the full program into the fourth floor but if they decide they want the fourth floor they could take it exclusively.

Dick Anagnost advised that Lot 109/4 is also going with the building and that provides the majority of the parking. They will also have parking along the rear of the building in the Lot A2 area that they acquired from the City. The door that he called out that would be on the exterior of the building would be right in the middle of the first jog along to the rear along the A2 portion of the building. The total number of spaces is somewhere around 50 that would be striped City standard spaces. It is their intent to utilize the parking more on a valet situation because the majority of the parking would be used for staff. The reason is because Hope for Recovery and Families in Transition have a van service and most of the people in these programs do not have cars or do not have licenses. One of the key components of this property is that it is on the public transportation line. Also, another key component is that it is centrally located. The Police

Department is a block to the east. The Fire Department (Engine 7) is to the south. All of the services including hospital, medical services, pharmacy and shopping are all within walking distance of the building.

Ken Rhodes of CLD Consulting Engineers advised that the approach for this application has essentially been the renovations of the interior, but the Board does have the obligation to at least have an overview of what they were able to find for utilities and they have had the support and feedback from the reviewing departments. For water utility this building has been hooked up with a six inch main for some time and it is currently sprinklered. The systems will have to be refreshed to code. There is also a meter for domestic service. Although there is only going to be wash rooms and rest rooms on each floor, the sizing of that meter will have to be reviewed with Water Works and the applicant is aware of that. There is both domestic and fire service to this building. The Fire Department advised that they would want a PIV valve. He believed on the interior fit up they also indicated that they are going to need an alarm panel.

Mr. Rhodes said they asked the Public Works Department and the Environmental Protection Division (waste water treatment plant) for confirmation. Everybody knows that this building has had a sewer bill sent to it for a very long time, but there is no record that the sewer was ever connected. He said Fred McNeil at the plant said there is a service there and Mr. Rhodes said they will be working with the applicant to do a dye test. There is sewer both in Wilson Street and Valley Street.

With respect to drainage, Mr. Rhodes said everything goes down Wilson Street. There is a lot of surface drainage which works fine. They are not changing any paving or directions of drainage and that ought to continue to work fine. There are only two existing curb cuts that are going to be used for this property and none of that is going to change. This is a signalized intersection with a left turn northbound on Wilson Street. They have done no specific numbers but he has traveled this street often and has not seen this section under much distress whatsoever.

They have seen no particular utility issue to cause concern that there is going to be stress on the public infrastructure be reoccupying this building as described. Mr. Anagnost said the building itself is an adaptive use of a currently vacant property that will become a living, breathing weapon to fight the epidemic of addiction that this State is facing. It is an integrated program. All of the services within the building complement one another. Families in Transition's Intensive Outpatient Program is geared towards women. Serenity Place's is geared towards men. The recovery coaches are there for all included. The medical services that could be provided by the hospitals would integrate nicely with doing assessment and triage on people with addiction to get them into the programs that are within the building. By collocating them all together they will have essentially a one stop shop. With that one stop shop comes economy of scale and significant savings to the service providers. He explained that currently with 24 hour facilities, they are all monitored and at this location there would be one security system that would cover 4, 5 or 6 operations instead of those different operations having their own monitoring systems. It is the same thing with the phone system. As such, there is a significant economy of scale, which

will drive down the cost of the overhead and provide more dollars on the street to provide the services necessary to address the problem going on in the City.

Mr. Anagnost advised that it is called out that they need 111 spaces and they have provided 50. The other thing that this zone allows them to do is to take into consideration public parking within 500 feet of the facility. He handed out a diagram showing the 500 foot radius that produces another 75 spaces. It is unlikely that they would utilize them, but they are there for their use.

In addition to the adaptive reuse of the building, Mr. Anagnost said they have also been able to identify additional buildings that are being utilized within the neighborhood. Alex Anagnost asked that the Board be aware of a spinoff benefit from this recovery center and has already begun with an adaptive reuse of a neighborhood property by Rise Above for 18 beds of sober living geared towards the female community. Rise Above is in the process of opening a second facility geared towards men in the near future. They also have successful houses in Nashua and Massachusetts with solid sobriety.

Dick Anagnost advised that Families in Transition is also moving towards a program where they will identify certain blighted properties that they could potentially bring on as sober living as well so that would complete the continuum of care. The continuum of care essentially begins with recovery then you go into treatment and then you go into the outpatient program and then living and then ultimately the recovery coach takes you through all of those and brings you out on the other side.

Chairman Harrington thanked the applicant for bringing this project forward and stated it is worthwhile considering the times in which we live in right now. He said he greatly appreciated their efforts.

Mr. Roy said that this is sorely needed in this City and he didn't think there was a member of this Board that doesn't think that way.

With regard to them saying that they are required to have 111 parking spaces and they are going to have 50, Mr. Roy asked how the Board would validate how many spaces that this actually needs. He thought they could work with the number of staff that is going to be within the building. He asked if they know how much staff Serenity is going to have. Mr. Anagnost said they don't at this time because they don't know what services she has committed. Mr. Roy asked if there is any way they can get a number. He assumed it wasn't going to be that many. Mr. Anagnost said staff is transient in this situation. They are by appointments so they come, meet then leave. The recovery coaches come in to check in but they are in the field. For instance, Families in Transition would send their van to pick up the client; they would bring them in then bring them back again. In that case Mr. Roy said if you figured it out there might be one or two people there during the day. He said it would be the same thing for Hope for NH, which is 24/7 but obviously there isn't going to be a lot of staff there, especially at night time unless they respond to the emergency room and they show up. Mr. Anagnost said the other part that needs

to be considered as well as the 50 is the radius that provides another 75 spaces, so there is really 125.

With regard to the seven or so spaces in the back of the building, Mr. Roy confirmed with Mr. Anagnost that there has never been any parking in the back before. Mr. Roy asked if that is allowed or if they will need to get a variance.

Mr. Roy asked where the handicap spots will be. Mr. Roy advised that the Fire Department comments said they need it striped as a fire lane and he recalled Mr. Anagnost stating that it will not be striped. He said the reason they need it striped is so that it is very clear to people that they can't park in the fire lane. He assumed Fire's comment related to the back of the building. He said that is what he wants to see to make sure that that's okay. Mr. Rhodes said he saw Mr. Lennon's information recently and he brought it to the applicant's attention that if fire lanes are going to be required back there they would have to identify them.

Mr. Clement said they definitely need this type of service in the area.

Mr. Clement asked if there will be security on site 24 hours per day. Mr. Anagnost said it is locked down and monitored. Staff is trained but there is not a full time security guard. There hasn't been one necessary in the previous operations that have gone on that are moving here and with the Police Department one block to the east, they feel that they are pretty secure as long as they have the correct protocols in place to address any situation. Mr. Anagnost said there will be panic alarms, 24/7 camera monitoring and alarms within the spaces themselves.

(NOTE: The Fire & Police Departments are located to the west, not the east of the facility.)

Mr. Clement asked if they would be updating the lighting around the parking area and building. Mr. Anagnost said the existing lighting will be in place. They have not yet been able to assess whether they need to add some additional wall packs.

Mr. McCue thanked the applicant for bringing this project to the City as it is well needed.

Mr. McCue asked about ambulance access in the anticipation that a patient needs to go to the hospital. Mr. Anagnost said it would be the rear entrance and it would be pick up only in the event of an emergency.

Mr. McCue asked what would be the next step after a patient enters the program. Mr. Anagnost explained that part of the problem with the system in New Hampshire that is broken in there is no central coordination of information. The Recovery Center itself is that coordination of information. A patient would come in and meet with the recovery coach and they would talk to them about the issues they are having then they would come up with a comprehensive plan for them for instance if they needed to go into a detox bed. They would know all the criteria and know where a detox bed is open so the patient could be sent there. If they needed medical assistance they would know exactly where to send them in order to do that. If they needed

counseling they would know where to send the patient within the building to do that and they would know all of the criteria to meet each one of those programs. The services they are providing are all symbiotic. As far as how long of a stay, he said it is not really a stay because there are no beds. This is strictly an outpatient facility at this time. As such, the recovery coach takes a patient from essentially the time that they have been treated with Narcan or are treated in the emergency. He said they have also spoken with Chief Willard and if someone is arrested and the police determine that the underlying reason for the arrest was addiction they could bring in a recovery coach to the scene or the Police Department could come to the facility and drop off so the recovery coach could take over from there. As far as length of stay, once they are in recovery for life so they will be coming in and out of here and they might become a recovery coach themselves.

Mr. McCue asked if Narcan would be kept onsite. Mr. Anagnost said currently it is administered by emergency personnel but in the event they are successful in bringing the hospitals in on that small section of first floor space, definitely because it would be administered by professionals that would be located on site as well.

Mr. McCue inquired about where funding would come from. With respect to the building's retrofit, Mr. Anagnost advised that they have \$300,000 in CDBG funds that have been committed by the City of Manchester. They currently have a local business, which will remain unnamed right now, that will be making a \$100,000 donation. They have applied to CDFA and they are looking into whether or not they can have an emergency round for credits that have been turned back in. He and Mr. Cruz have sold all of those credits. They have businesses that have committed to them in order to provide capital with which to fit up the building. In the next round of the CDFA credits, all three of the non-profits that were discussed earlier have been invited to put in an application for an allocation. He and Mr. Cruz have committed to sell those credits as well to local businesses in order to provide the capital to take it to the next step. Lastly, he and Mr. Cruz are prepared to get bank funding and potentially roll it into a loan to the non-profit in order to meet the needs of their fit up.

When they need bus service to come to the facility, Mr. McCue asked where they would be dropped off. Mr. Anagnost said wherever the current bus stops are. There are stops right across the street at the shopping center. Mr. McCue said he was thinking more of a specialized bus. Mr. Anagnost said they would just drive in the rear.

With regard to the striping in the back of the building, Mr. Boissonneault said the logic for not striping escapes him. He asked what the situation would be if the ambulance were to show up and there were vehicles that were not properly parked back there. Mr. Rhodes said one of the things in operating this building the tenants and the owner are going to have to realize that there are fire lanes and their access for services are going to have to remain open. A challenge in striping and actually laying out a conforming parking field is because around the perimeter of a lot you can't put a parking space any closer than 10 feet to the lot line so they would lose a lot of space. There is only about 20 feet around the corner of the building for access and you have to stay so many feet away from the building. In the lot across the way the buffers are somewhere in

the range of 6-8 feet and there are no stripes in that lot at all. They did lay it out and they got 35-37 spaces in there but he has been in parking fields where there is no striping. The report he made back to the owner was that if they manage it on an owner-tenant relationship and tell people where they can and cannot park, they are going to have a better ability to keep cars off the streets than in trying to make a conforming parking lot. Mr. Boissonneault said he could envision a situation where the staff in that facility are just busy with other things and an ambulance needs to get in there and they can't. He thinks that is where Mr. Lennon's concern is. He thinks this area is critical for access to the back of the building and needs striping.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if they have verified if the underground fuel tank is still there. He swore he saw it come out a few years ago. Mr. Rhodes believes it was removed.

Mr. Kizak thanked Mr. Anagnost for bringing this project to the Board.

With regard to the space for tenant 2 that they indicated they were seeking to get some medical tenant in, Mr. Kizak asked what other type of uses would they have in that space. He asked if it would be treatment rooms or beds. He wondered if that will trip any of the things for water usage or the meters into the buildings. Mr. Anagnost said it wouldn't be anything more than like walking into an urgent care right now. Perhaps a couple exam rooms, a receptionist, some administration. It is not a very big space. It is more utilized so the hospitals or the medical providers could have a presence on site where if somebody needed to be seen or assessed they could literally walk across the hall and be assessed directly within the building itself. He said they are still "flushing that out".

In looking at the floor plans for the upper floors, Mr. Kizak was a little confused on how those are fully accessible as he did not see the circulation that makes those accessible. Mr. Anagnost said the only issue they would have is if they put a second floor tenant in the vacant space. At that point, because it is grade level on the exterior, they could put a one level lift on the exterior that also makes that space accessible. The architect has assured them that it will all be handicap accessible when it is completed.

Mr. Kizak said there was a large roll out dumpster on the concrete pad between the 3rd and 4th notch in the rear of the building. He asked if they were going to utilize that same spot for the dumpster for this facility. He asked if it would be screened. Mr. Anagnost said the dumpster would probably be located there, but they would go from a 30 yard roll off to a 10 yard that gets picked up a couple times a week.

Mr. Kizak said that is typically shown on a site plan and they typically require screening around that, which he does not see on the plan. Mr. Anagnost said where it is located is pretty screened because it is located in the interior corner of the building and it is not seen from any direction. He said they would look into possibly putting a fence around it to screen it further once they get the size of it and it is in its final location. Mr. Kizak told them to bear in mind that the fire lane is going to have to be back there as well because that will affect the placement.

Mr. Kizak said he was concerned about snow removal and storage with everything that is going on in the back of the building. Mr. Anagnost said snow to the rear of the building would either be pushed to its most easterly point. That would all be snow storage there all the way up and including the land to the right. Ultimately in the parking lot across the street, the snow would be taken away.

Alderman Levasseur asked what the square footage is of the grassy area. Mr. Anagnost advised that it is the old railroad right-of-way. He asked if the City is working on allowing them to use that or give them that. Mr. Anagnost said “no, but it’s a great suggestion”. The Alderman wondered why that hadn’t been brought up. Mr. Anagnost said it sure would provide a great deal of assistance to the building to be able to meet a bunch of the issues. The Alderman noted that there may be a rail trail down the road somewhere, but wondered if they could temporarily use that area. He confirmed with Mr. Anagnost that that area is not included in their plan. He asked if they had that area what would that provide them with. At a minimum he thought they could store snow in that area.

Mr. Rhodes pulled up the GIS map and pointed out the Old Portsmouth branch that comes out of the millyard and goes east out to the Massabesic Traffic Circle. If these are 50 feet right-of-ways, he said this right-of-way the Alderman is talking about would have to be in the area of 60-70 feet. A double loaded parking corridor is about 60 feet wide. It is a 20 foot space on either side and 20 foot aisles. He said this is long term targeted for rail trail and potentially infrastructure improvements for CSO down the line, but right now it is a tangled web of brambles. It is his understanding that it is a City controlled right-of-way. The Alderman thought that was something they could probably go to the Board of Aldermen with.

Mr. Anagnost advised that the building with the A2 parcel originally had a long term license with the City for its temporary use. He thought if they could work out something like that and approach the Aldermen to get the license to utilize that for temporary parking, that would eliminate some issues that were just discussed. He advised that the Mayor offered to spearhead an effort to acquire the right-of-way (along Valley Street) that is still owned by the railroad but when they looked at it, it would add another 30 spaces to the site but unfortunately you would have to back up over a sidewalk onto a public street so that idea was abandoned a while back.

The Alderman confirmed with Mr. Anagnost that there are no zoning issues with this property. Mr. Anagnost said only the conditional uses that are before the Board tonight for the change of use.

Alderman Levasseur asked if all of the stucco on the exterior can be taken down after they open up and operate in the inside without any problems and Mr. Anagnost said they could. Mr. Anagnost pointed out where the original mill building was with the brick as well as the addition that was built in the 1970’s, which has no historical significance beneath it. As such, their proposal would be to paint the addition and restore the exterior of the original building. With regard to the rail trail, Mr. Roy said the City has already gone into leases with a couple entities along that trail and, of course, there are caveats in there that when they want to change it over

the City takes it back. That would be an option for them to pursue because they did it recently with the Asian store right across Valley Street and down the other way they did it with “My Brother’s Pub” on Maple Street.

Mr. Roy asked about signage. He thought the only thing that has been on there traditionally is the letters “C.A. Hoitt”. Mr. Anagnost said they don’t plan to change the signage. They plan to reutilize what is there. The majority of the signs would be interior directory signs. The only thing they would announce is that this is the recovery center, which would go on the existing panels there. They may not be as large, but would be in the same location. A directory sign would be provided at both entrances inside in order to direct people inside the building as to where they are going. Mr. Roy confirmed with Mr. Anagnost that there are not any scrolling message boards proposed.

In taking the façade off, Mr. Boissonneault asked if they anticipate that there may be an asbestos abatement issue. Mr. Anagnost said they are not aware of there being any asbestos. In doing their due diligence, they ripped off a portion of the exterior and found board insulation underneath. As far as what they did with the windows inside, he said the Longo family was very good in the way that they made their improvements and they are basically encapsulated and intact.

In the plan for Hope for NH Recovery, the Chairman said there are several large meeting rooms shown. He asked if they had capacities for any of those rooms and if he knew how many people are going to be in those rooms at certain times. Mr. Anagnost said he doesn’t. They were put in there by Hope, who understands their program better than he does. He explained that those rooms are for group services so there will be times in this building where there will be staff members conducting group meetings.

Holly Cekala, Director of Recovery Support Services for Hope for New Hampshire advised that groups that run in the center are varied and they don’t all happen at one time. There are two larger rooms but they will not be used at the same time. The groups vary in size from “6 to 15 to 25, on average”. They might have a few extra people, but they have worked pretty closely with the Fire Department on capacity at their temporary site so she is sure they will come over and go through all of those things and they will be mindful of that.

The Chairman asked how regular the groups get together. Ms. Cekala said they have 6-10 groups per day depending on what the community wants to see and they could be varied. She reiterated that some groups are very small and closed to the public and some groups are open for the community to use, but on average it is about 25, possibly 32 per group at max that they are averaging right now. She said most of the people use public transportation. She said community centers are pretty good at scheduling things around public transportation so people can utilize those services and not be left out of the possibility of using those services. That is part of how they create the services. The Chairman said that is why they all agree that the location of this is one of its positives. He explained that the Board also has to take into consideration the public

safety and making sure that there is enough proper parking and egress, etc. associated with this use. Ms. Cekela said she appreciated that and they are just very anxious to save lives.

To that end, the Chairman assumed that they are not seeing a reduction in services. Ms. Cekela said a lot of their services are done “tele-health”, “telephone” and text support so not all of the services that Hope for NH does are within the building. They also do outreach so some of their staff may be onsite, but some of their staff may be offsite so with those stacking parking issues, it is pretty transient. They are really trying to integrate services as much as they can and get peers in other service provider teams so they may not always be at the center all the time.

Mr. Roy asked for an idea as to what she thinks the number of staff would be there. He knows it will fluctuate. Ms. Cekela said right now she has five staff members and three per diem people that might work on other teams. That doesn’t mean that they come to the center. As they elongate hours, it will be three and two. In the evenings there probably won’t be more than two staff people and three during the day.

Chairman Harrington asked that Mr. Anagnost expand a little more regarding the sprinkler systems. Mr. Anagnost said Chief Burkush has been through the building and the sprinkler system is in pretty good shape. The biggest deficiency is the fire alarm panel, which they will be upgrading. The Chairman confirmed with Mr. Anagnost that the panel will service the entire building including the various tenancies. Mr. Anagnost said they will meet all the life safety codes. Chairman Harrington asked if there would be places of assembly in the event that there is a fire alarm that goes off and they exit the building. Mr. Anagnost said the best places of assembly will be in the parking lot.

Chairman Harrington said the plans submitted were not stamped by an engineer. He asked if they were planning to present stamped plans to the Board at some point. Mr. Rhodes said a number of times they submit their information for review and if they have any modifications to make they will do that. These have been presented as a compilation of record information and he would be happy to stamp the plans basically making those representations. He said he is not trying to avoid it; it was simply while it was under review.

Chairman Harrington said it didn’t appear that there was a need for a full blown traffic study, but there is a change of use that is occurring and Highway staff has reviewed and provided trip generations using their own calculations. It looks as if this use will have higher trip generation than what was previously there. Mr. Rhodes confirmed that it will. In entering this project their support role to get this application for discussion this evening was very limited. They got the information from Public Works that Kristen Clark did provide some traffic generation numbers for a medical office use in comparison to the previous furniture use. It indicated, as expected, AM and PM peaks on the streets were higher than what a furniture store would generate. He also asked his colleague, Paul Koneska, in comparison to a medical office use what a regular office use would be because some of the uses could be categorized as just regular office use. It is somewhat less instead of the 80 to 100 increase in the AM and the PM; it is more in the 50 range for that. They don’t have any level of service analysis for the intersection. Only from empirical

information, just the same as Alderman Levasseur and everyone in traveling Valley and Wilson Streets, this area does not present itself as being under distress. There is a 4-way signalized intersection right at Valley and Wilson Streets. The capability of the street network out there seems well able to handle the reuse of this particular building. With the configuration, the curb lines and the sidewalks out there and the intersection being fully signalized at this point, the timing of the intersection may be the only thing they may be able to do once traffic pulls itself in with the Public Works garage being right down the street and everything like that, but there are no offsite improvements here that are really credible to make to this intersection or to the streets.

Mr. O'Brien asked what the project schedule line looked like. Once they receive approval from the Planning Board, Mr. Anagnost said they will be in the financing stage of it. They are out to bid already on the Hope for Recovery and FIT portions of the site. They would start as soon as enough funds are in place to put in one or the other. They have agreed with Chief Burkush to rehab the building in stages. As the money becomes available they will put in each one of the tenants. Hopefully, if everything goes as planned, they will have the Recovery Center first floor opening in June.

Chairman Harrington asked if there are others in the audience who run an organization that is committed to your space. Mr. Anagnost advised that Maureen Beauregard of Families in Transition, the other committed agency, was present.

Ms. Beauregard advised that they are very excited by this project. They are the only program in town that works with pregnant and parenting women, which is their specialty. They also have an Intensive Outpatient Program (IOP), which is an innovative, four-month-long that helps participants recognize, examine and understand the effects of substance use and trauma on their lives and the lives of their families. They are operating at 161 South Beech Street in the basement of the church that they rehabbed. In the course of a week they have about 45 people that come in for treatment. Everybody is not there at the same time. Right now they have four staff and they have an approximately two week wait for people just to come in to get an evaluation. As such, they are looking to move to the new location so they can increase the services that they are providing. They will also be able to extend their time into the evening, which they are not able to do right now.

In terms of parking, Ms. Beauregard said historically when they have come in to talk to the Board about any of their programs, they have been able to demonstrate that less than 50% of the people that they work with have vehicles.

Ms. Beauregard was excited about this project as it an opportunity for non-profits to come together to really work in unison to make sure that they are each doing their mission and they are able to add some cost savings. She added that they have a large van and they go out and pick up not only the moms but their kids and they are able to come in for a few hours and the kids are provided with some supervision and snacks then they bring them home after. Chairman

Harrington asked if she ever envisioned a time where her portion of this would be a 24 hour seven day per week operation and Ms. Beauregard responded “never”.

With regard to the bus, Mr. McCue asked if it would be left on the property. Ms. Beauregard said they have the option of either leaving it there or at any of their other locations. It isn't just used for the IOP; they have other programs and it goes everywhere so they can leave it where ever they want.

Mr. Roy asked where the fire panel is going to be located. Mr. Anagnost advised that the fire alarm panel is located in the foyer. Mr. Roy asked if it still will be in the future or if it will be off the back where there is a separate door so the Fire Department can get in there at night time. Mr. Anagnost believed there is a Knox-Box there now that allows the Fire Department access to get to the current panel. That's where they plan to relocate the existing panel.

Mr. Roy asked where the sprinkler is located now. Mr. Anagnost said there is a sprinkler room in the building now and it will probably remain where it is, he just doesn't know where it is on the plan. Mr. Roy guessed it is probably off the back. Mr. Boissonneault said it is in the far corner of the Wilson Street side. Mr. Anagnost said that's where the water entrance comes in as well. Mr. Roy asked how they access it. Mr. Boissonneault believed it was right downstairs from there off the back parking lot. Mr. Anagnost said where that bell is located directly below it; if you were to take the stucco off there is an entrance to the building right there as well. Mr. Roy said that was interesting. Mr. Anagnost said the staircase inside still goes down to the exterior wall.

With respect to the numbers for the traffic and the trips generated and the fact that Mr. Konieska came up with a different number, Mr. Roy asked what the criteria was that he used to come up with that number. He said obviously it wasn't a medical office building. Mr. Rhodes said that was correct. He explained that a number of the tenants don't qualify as a medical use but as more of an office use. He said office use generates less traffic under the ITE. Mr. Rhodes said he asked Mr. Konieska if it is more than an office use rather than a medical use what the number would be. It was more like mid-fifties. The challenge was what the owner/operator presented to him was that most of this was going to be the allowed office use and the CU was going to be a lot less than that.

Mr. Anagnost advised that when Director Lafreniere met with them originally they were trying to get enough uses to be approved within the building that would cover the entire building, encompassing everything so they wouldn't have to come back for every single tenant. Director Lafreniere recommended that they put it in as medical use for the 2,000 SF on that first floor where they are trying to get the hospitals in. If the hospitals are not involved, there will not be any need for the conditional use permit for medical.

Chairman Harrington asked if they foresee that they would ever put beds in this property; maybe in the vacancy. Mr. Anagnost said that is not part of the application before the Board but they have been approached by a certain Alderman and the potential to do that. He said they would have to come back before the Board should they decide to change it to the residential as well.

Ms. Goucher said if that was a potential in the future it would be helpful if they could tell the Board what part of the building it might be in and what the range of beds would potentially be. Mr. Anagnost said they actually did a layout of that 8,000 SF on the second floor so if it was residential it could encompass 20 beds, which would be the maximum that would fit. They just did this floorplan as an exercise when they were requested on Tuesday to consider whether or not beds could be located in the facility. Chairman Harrington confirmed with Mr. Anagnost that the request is not associated with any particular user at this point. Mr. Anagnost said it would most likely be associated with Serenity Place, which is why they provided them with an option of both floors and the potential flexibility that they would come back before the Board for a residential use, but there is no residential use before the Board tonight. He said they did enough thinking at the request of a certain Alderman to be able to encompass it if they could.

With respect to handicap access, Chairman Harrington asked if there was a plan for any ramps outside or if they need to ramp any of the entrance points. Mr. Anagnost said they wouldn't need to ramp either one of the two existing entrances because you are able to enter the building through that rear entrance and go directly into an elevator. The only place there would be a potential ramp is if the vacant space on the second floor became an independent tenant at the opposite end of the building they would then construct another entrance that would have a one floor lift to it that would allow handicap access from that end of the building as well. The Chairman confirmed with Mr. Anagnost that it is a future use that is not being contemplated tonight.

Ms. Goucher said she wanted to get some clarity on a couple issues regarding the parking. On the parcel that the City sold to them, which is the area that they are currently showing parking on, Ms. Goucher said Mr. Rhodes was correct in that those spaces don't meet the zoning code. Currently there is no history of parking existing there. Regarding the parking lot across the street, even if there isn't the required 10 foot buffer, it shouldn't be an issue because historically, that has been a parking lot for the building, even though the spaces are not currently striped.

Going back to the building parcel again, and to Alderman Levasseur's question about possibly purchasing that area, Ms. Goucher advised that the City did actually sell the small sliver to Longo's that then transferred to the applicant. Because the State had to get involved in the transfer, they specifically said the 30 foot wide transportation corridor could not be impacted. As such, she doesn't know if that would allow them to put in parking spaces where they showed them on the diagram. Additionally, because of the State's involvement, she doesn't know whether they could get a revocable license similar to what the City has given to other people, which would allow them to expand parking. If they were limited to parking on their site to perhaps just a couple of handicap spaces, along with the parking lot across the street, Ms. Goucher asked if they thought they would have adequate parking for the facilities. Mr. Anagnost said the answer was yes. He explained that they were trying to show the maximum spaces that they could put in on their site. He said that site used to be used for parking for the staff. Only staff was allowed because it was in the loading/unloading areas. Mr. Anagnost said they could reverse them and put the spaces against the building and keep the lane open on the exterior for drop off, deliveries, fire, etc. Ms. Goucher thought that is what gets them closer to what the Fire

Department is looking for. She explained that there is a requirement for a loading zone even though they state they don't need one. While this Board can't waive the loading zone in its entirety, they could waive the size down dimensionally and, at the same time, that loading zone could potentially act as a place for the vans for the organizations. Mr. Anagnost thought that was a great suggestion.

With regard to the parcel on the north side of building, that wasn't practical for parking because they would have to back out into Valley Street; Mr. Boissonneault asked if they had considered some parallel spots up against the building rather than perpendicular. Mr. Rhodes said they hadn't specifically. Mr. Boissonneault asked if there was sufficient width. Mr. Rhodes said there is about 27 feet from the wall out. He explained that they were trying to improve parking numbers and they would only get 5-10 parallel spaces. He said between the curb line and the building there is a 20 foot corridor that is currently lawn and he thinks the conversation he heard this evening is that the applicant and their tenants will have to adapt to what they have out there right now. Mr. Anagnost said the problem he has with that area is they would have to cross over the sidewalk and they are very close to the lighted intersection.

The Chairman turned the hearing over to the public and invited those opposed to this application to come forward. No one came forward and the Chairman invited those in favor of this application to come forward.

Tim Soucy, the Public Health Director for the City of Manchester, said in his 26 year history with the Health Department he has never used the word "epidemic" outside of what is currently going on with the opioid and heroin crisis. It is a magnitude that they have never seen before. This project presents an opportunity that he has never seen before either to get service providers along the continuum of care in one building to deal with prevention, intervention, treatment, recovery and behavioral health services. He truly appreciates the job and the due diligence that this Board has to do as a Planning Board and he asked that they take those factors into consideration as they look at the conditional use requests before them for the project.

Senator David Boutin advised that the drug epidemic is unparalleled in our state and across the country. The medical examiner for the State has said that the number of drug related deaths in 2015 was 400 and maybe higher so over just a few years we have nearly doubled the number of people that have died in this state. On the State level he said they are doing their job. They passed three bills in the legislature this year. They have a bill coming forward that he is sure will pass that has to do with funding in addiction so they will have more resources to send to the City of Manchester to partner up with the Police Department to help get the people who are distributing and selling these drugs off the street. With regard to the parking issue, the Senator said he has toured Tirrell House, New Horizons and Serenity Place and none of them have parking. Based on the testimony that he heard in Concord as well as his own experience in going to these facilities the majority of these people are not going to be driving cars to this site. He believes it's a manageable situation. He thanked Mr. Anagnost and Mr. Cruz for stepping up and doing what they are doing because there is no government money involved in this; this is private investment. The Senator advised that the Board has a great staff that does very good work. He

said he worked with Ms. Goucher for nine years and she's great. He asked that the Board pass this plan tonight and give staff the authority to finish up the last details.

Crystal Bissonnette, a Manchester resident, advised that she and her husband have had custody of their grandson since he was four months old. She appeared on behalf of Hope for Recovery NH because this service is really needed in this State and most of all in this City. Manchester has been hit with such a bad epidemic and numerous people are affected. She never thought she would be, but she is. Her son is an addict and now she is raising his son and there are many grandparents out there right now raising their grandchildren because of this epidemic. Her son is currently at the Farnum Center. He has been there since December 22nd and his graduation day is this coming Tuesday. She and her husband are petrified that he will not have a place to go once he is done at the Farnum Center. They do not feel that 28 days is enough time for a lot of these addicts and they need the after care, most especially living in sober homes where they can readjust and re-acclimate into real life. It is her hope that the Board will approve this tonight because it is desperately needed in the City of Manchester.

Manchester Police Chief Nick Willard echoed what the Senator said and tonight is hope for Manchester that the Board will vote for this tonight, move it along and let the staff do the due diligence. He said this is the most significant law enforcement crisis, health crisis and social crisis. He said we are in the throws of human tragedies every single day. His officers are in the front lines of it. He has 25 undercover offices out tonight locking up bad guys. They need to shrink the pool of the people who are suffering the disease of addiction. There will be fewer needles on the street. There will be less demand, which means there will be less supply, which means the police officers can patrol neighborhoods instead of doing drug and addiction. It starts with helping people get past their addiction so people who are addicted and would not otherwise commit a crime are not committing a crime. This is the most significant action that he has seen in the State of New Hampshire when it comes to dealing with the addiction crisis. He said it is a 24 hour center so the Manchester Police Department is going to have a great deal of discretion and latitude to help people instead of incarcerating people and that is very important to him. It doesn't mean he is going to dismiss victims who are victimized by people who are addicted for instance a robbery suspect who is fueling his addition by committing robberies is going to go to prison. However, a person like he saw the other day who was panhandling with a sign that said he needed money for food and he asked the man what he really needed the money for and he said he needed it for heroin. The Chief said it would have been nice to call Missy and have one of these recovery coaches come curbside and bring him to the facility. He said he is going to institute some policies that will allow police officers to show a degree of compassion and get these people off the street and get them the services that they need. He said this is going to mean so much to the Manchester Police Department. If somebody tells them that they are addicted to drugs and they are getting ready to bail them out, their policy is going to bring them to the recovery center if they are willing to go. Now they just provide them with recovery locator cards and wish them luck because there is only so much they can do.

The Chief said in 2014 there were 14 drug overdose deaths that the Manchester Police Department confirmed. The Fire Department numbers are different because the Police

Department actually confirms there through the medical examiner in investigation. In 2015 there were 69 fatal overdoses. In 2013 they went to 113 overdose calls. In 2015 they went to 616 overdose calls and these numbers are not as large as the Fire Department who obviously deals with the medical side of the equation where the Police Department deals with the enforcement side.

In conclusion, Chief Willard said the Recovery Center is vitally important to the Manchester Police Department and he is going to incorporate it into the way they enforce laws in the City of Manchester with a greater degree of compassion and less of a degree of enforcement and the only way he can do that is if he has a place that he can bring them.

Katie Cote, a Manchester resident, advised that she is in support for this permanent home for Hope for NH Recovery on Wilson Street. As a lifelong City resident and a mother of three young boys, the addition crisis that the City is facing is both terrifying and shocking. She is grateful for people like Dick Anagnost and Mr. & Mrs. Cruz for their vision and commitment to tackling this problem. She is excited to see that the Hoitt building is going to get a new life with this important purpose. She was happy to see this project get financial backing from the City and she hopes that this Board will give it the additional seal of approval that it needs to get it into the community as soon as possible.

Rick Cornell, Vice President of Community Relations for the Mental Health Center here in Manchester where he has worked for the past 42 years. He said he has never in 42 years of working in this community seen anything that has pulled this community together and it is so sad that it has to be because of the reason why. However, at the same time he is very excited to see so many agencies willing to collaborate together. He said the Mental Health Center is very committed to this project. They fully support it and they want to be a part of it. They have a couple RFP's they are working on right now to gain some more services for their agency to help with this particular issue and to help with mobile crisis in the community. He hopes the Board will support it as the community needs it. He said parking is such an interesting issue to him because where ever you talk about things in Manchester everybody always complains about the parking but right now there are people dying and he believes that is more important than parking.

Rick Bodnick advised that he is the owner of E&R Dry Cleaners as well as the father of four. He said this issue is so important. He is intimately involved with Missy and they have just over 200 employees. The number of instances just within their family business and their employees has been excruciating. He said New Hampshire is 49th in the country and now there are private businesses stepping up. He asked the Board to do whatever they can do to save a life and push this through.

Kriss Blevens, owner of Kriss Cosmetics and political makeup artist. She is the girl that has been whispering in the ears of the presidential candidates that we have a really big problem here in New Hampshire. She knows firsthand about this big problem because she is one of those parents that suffered the pain of losing a child to overdose. Her body was found on New Hampshire Lane,

which is just off of Elm Street on April 23, 2014 and courageously two weeks after that she started to talk about what they were going through as a family. Before she knew it she said she had what felt like a football field of people that related to what they were going through. Since then she has been advocating and Amber's story was shared ten days ago before Congress in Washington DC. She said the nation is watching New Hampshire right now. This is a Federal problem. It is definitely a State problem and New Hampshire is in the lead for that so all eyes are on the decision that this Board will make tonight because this center is going to be the beginning of the miracle. She if her step-daughter when she got out of Valley Street Jail didn't walk down to the nearest crack house but could have walked just a couple blocks up to the Recovery Center and be greeted by some of these beautiful people here she might be here today. She explained that she advocates for this so her step-daughter's death will not be in vain. She hoped that the Board will push this through as quickly as possible.

Clinton Anderson said he is a very emotional and compassionate person and he wished to read a letter that he wrote a few weeks ago when he got saved by the Center. He said he is a person in long term recovery only because this place saved him a little while ago.

"If you are here in this place of miracles you are in a good space. Don't just walk in and walk out. You are all welcome here to receive the unconditional love, understanding and friendship, which most of us don't understand. It costs nothing. You've paid the price out there. Some have paid with their lives; others have paid with their pride and self-worth. After 26 years I still thought I was worthless and a loser. I have been on this road to self-destruction and all it took was reaching out to me on the way to the liquor store with the unconditional love and understanding and put me back on the road to recovery. You saved my life. I have to say thank you. I'm just one, think of all the people who you have all reached out to and saved. Keep up the good work and God bless you all. Thanks. There is more hope in here than you can imagine. The smiles, the hellos, the good mornings, it's all priceless but it may just get someone coming back for more. The world outside that door is evil, hateful and no hope. We are about helping and giving hope back to all. Don't give up on anyone."

Tammy advised that she is a very grateful recovering addict. **James** advised that he is a recovering addict as well. Being a recovering addict he felt compelled to come up here and explain a few things from their point of view. He thinks it has become very clear that people are dying out there. He personally buried his cousin on December 4, 2015. He has also buried friends and a lot of his friends have buried friends and it stinks. If the Recovery Center can bring recovery to suffering addicts it is a great thing. He doesn't know what goes into it or about parking and permits but what he does know is that once an addict gets recovery they find purpose, at least that was the case for him, so by getting more people to recovery that is going to enable them to help even more addicts. That is what they do. They want to see other addicts get better. By giving addicts recovery it is not just going to be the people that make it to the center because then they are going to go out and bring even more addicts to recovery. He didn't know if people were aware that is what they do. They help each other. That becomes their purpose.

Electra Delano advised that she has been a Manchester resident for four months. She is a licensed eligible substance abuse counselor. She is from UMass Boston where she teaches ethics per diem. She was on the Board of the PTA at her daughter's school and the Board of the Historical Society District in her town in Grafton, New Hampshire. She is a 3.9 GPA graduate of Franklin Pierce College. She is also a person in recovery. She is one of the people that wound up with an injury and she became addicted to opiates from her doctors prescribing them to her and it became a big problem. Alcohol then in turn became a bit more of a problem that she has been battling for years. In 2010 her family was a victim of a very serious crime, which changed their lives permanently. It was the weekend of Hurricane Irene and definitely at that time her life spiraled out of control. It was a sexual assault. Being up in the North Country and trying to do therapy on her own, trying to hold her business together, her education and with her reputation within the community of being who she was, it was hard. She said she did a pretty good job of that until she didn't and couldn't anymore and she had a clinical nervous breakdown. She ended up going into treatment for alcohol addiction and she lost her house for \$8,000 in back taxes. That is what brought her to Manchester where she ended up at Angie's Place, a shelter for women, which was mind boggling to her. Due to the love she received from Hope for NH she has one of her friends now that is an investor that is getting her home back.

Ms. Delano said she went to the intensive outpatient at Family Willows. Their trauma based IOP is like none other. She has worked in the counseling field in Boston and this model separates this facility from any other place that she has ever seen. They go and pick up the mothers and the children so there is a supervision type of aspect to make sure these families are okay, that they are safe, that the parents are getting cared and the children are getting cared for. That in turn with that whole support network, especially with Hope being in that building is going to change a lot of lives. It is going to change the lives of these children that could potentially wind up in the system because there is intervention and people that care. She said the day that she walked into Hope for NH Recovery she was following someone else there because she didn't quite know where to go. She went from being all of her former life down to this low bottom and the team at Hope for NH Recovery saved her life and this place has turned her life around and she has hope like no other for the first time in years. It took a lot for her to overcome the losses that she had but she feels that this was God's way of bringing her here so she could be a part of making the change for the future. She and her family survived something tragic and she has never been happier in her life and it is as a direct result of the team from Hope for NH Recovery. They are recovery specialists. She said when you walk in the door you are embraced with a family that you didn't even know that you had with hugs, love, respect and understanding and for her that was really important because her self-esteem was so destroyed. She believes this is going to be the beginning of a major change and shift for the State of New Hampshire.

Bryan Patriquin advised that he is a survivor of active addiction. He is the survivor of a heart attack. He is a full-time college student working on his addictions counseling degree and he is also a peer recovery coach at Hope for NH Recovery Center. He has been a volunteer since the end of May and he has personally witnessed thousands of lives change. The count is 3,000+ cumulative since they opened the doors, which has been six months. With regard to parking, he said they had one parking spot when they first opened the doors with a 900 SF three-bedroom

apartment and there were no safety issues. They had hundreds of people in and out. The numbers skyrocketed from there when they moved to Central Street where they saw almost 1,000 people in the month of December when they have less than 20-30 parking spaces. He urged the Board to give Mr. Anagnost and Mr. Cruz what they're asking for so they can save lives and open this place up as soon as they can.

Dave Cote, a resident of Manchester who owns a small family photography business on Wilson Street about eight blocks away from where the center will be. He said the plans for this building are amazing and will bring some life back to that neighborhood and to bring some recovery into the City is an amazing gift. He was there to give his approval and to say "please allow this to happen". He said the parking issues will take care of themselves.

Jasmine Lamontagne advised that she is an addict. She said she was deemed hopeless from society and she had lost all hope in herself and she wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for places like this. Today her life is very dedicated to recovery. She spends countless hours every week on the phone with sick and suffering addicts who want help and ask her to help them get help. She said this is a beautiful gift that she can guide people that actually want help and want to change to the Recovery Center. She said the Board has an opportunity to help save lives and help change what is going on around here.

Dennis Dutra, a peer recovery specialist and a person in long term recovery said it was a center just like this that saved his life in Rhode Island. He had a place to go where he learned to have fun in recovery and he made new friends. He said just as addiction affects everyone, recovery does as well. He said the Board seems to be the catalyst right now to save countless lives. He is fully in support of this and urged the Board to please approve this. He said New Hampshire seems to have the second biggest problem in the nation and they are the second worst in part of the solution so he asked that to change today.

Kelly Riley advised that she is a person in long term recovery and is a recovery coach. Her son died of a drug overdose. It will be great for families to go to a place like this after to have someone to talk to. She said this is needed more than another pharmacy or Walmart and this needs to get done as soon as possible.

Chairman Harrington thanked everyone for coming to speak and providing support to everybody.

The Chairman turned the hearing back over to the Board.

With respect to the comments about Angie's Place, Mr. Anagnost said it is about 50 percent occupied on a regular basis. It is an underutilized resource. This recovery center will put people in the position to be able to meet the criteria to maximize the use of Angie's Place.

Mr. Anagnost said the Farnum Center was their first effort and Anagnost teamed up with Easter Seals and purchased and redeveloped the property. The Farnum Center is their tenant and unfortunately it is fabulously successful and it is not big enough to service the need. Mr.

Anagnost said truly this is a living breathing partnership. It is the non-profits, the private sector and the government all coming together with a common cause. The cause may not be what they want it to be to come together in that fashion but what you have here is a banding together of everyone to fight this epidemic.

Mr. Roy didn't think there was anyone on this Board who wants to see this go through more than him. A few weeks ago when this came to the Board they were asked to hear it tonight and this group looked at the application and essentially determined that this application was incomplete, which means they wouldn't have heard it until next month at the earliest. However, knowing how important this was, the Board decided to hear it tonight and Mr. Anagnost brought some additional information, which was great. Unfortunately, he thought there are some loose ends here. For example, he referred to Ms. Goucher suggesting a waiver for dimensional requirements and that is not before the Board. They don't know where the handicap parking is going to be. If this hearing is closed tonight they won't get that information in and they won't be able to consider it. If they close this hearing tonight and vote on this project, they are voting on something they don't even have in front of them. He thought that could be accomplished very easily in the next two weeks and they could not only finish this if they leave it open and get the added information in and close it, but they could also have a limited business meeting in two weeks and vote on it then.

Alderman Levasseur said his first vote on the Planning Board will be an enthusiastic yes to get this project going.

Mr. Clement is in favor of leaving it up to staff. These are important issues and even two weeks might be too long for someone.

Mr. McCue said Mr. Roy pointed out some valid issues, however, he feels that the Planning staff is very capable of working out those issues with the applicant so he doesn't have a problem closing this hearing tonight.

Mr. Boissonneault understands where everyone is going and they want to get this done. He asked if they were to put this on the agenda in two weeks, if they would be able to get everything that staff needs by that meeting to address the concerns that Mr. Roy just brought up. He said this Board has an obligation to make sure that the safety and handicap access, is addressed. Personally, he doesn't think it is fair to put staff in a position where the Board really can't weigh in. From everything he heard this evening, the issues are not insurmountable and one of the reasons that they didn't get very specific about it is they knew there were going to be a lot of options that could be underway. Mr. Boissonneault said he supported Mr. Roy's observations and this could be voted on in two weeks if that information is returned to staff in time. Mr. Rhodes said it is just a matter of what the final plan looks like. He is sure the pieces can be put down, it is just who needs to see it when.

Mr. Anagnost asked to outline the open issues. There is the location of the handicap spaces. There is the fire lane. There is the dimensional waiver for the loading zone. There is the location

of the dumpster and the screening that would go need to surround it. Those are the ones that the Board made that he made notes of to address. He would need to address with the Aldermen the use of the land behind the building so that wouldn't come before this Board.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if he was comfortable that those could be addressed in two weeks. Mr. Anagnost said he felt comfortable that both of them could be addressed. He took a moment to speak with Mr. Cruz. One of the things that makes it important that they attempt to address it tonight is because on Monday, there is an application due for the CDFA credits. Part of the application needs to show they have control of the property, which he and Mr. Cruz have already closed on. They also need to show that the property is shovel ready by showing that they have approvals to progress forward. If the vote weren't to be taken tonight, subject to those items being resolved, then there is the potential that they would lose that round of funding. This round is being put forth out of normal schedule for the reuse of the credits that have been turned in in order to devote them to this project.

Ms. Goucher asked Mr. Anagnost if the Board were to take an action on the conditional use permits for the use and the reduction in the parking, but held off on a decision on the details of the site plan, would that help them with their application. Mr. Anagnost said they have made conditional approvals in the past so he asked if there was a way to craft an approval that kept open those five issues but granted the rest; That way they could at least say they have Planning Board approval subject to going back before them for those five issues. Ms. Goucher thought that the Board was more concerned that they should have the opportunity to see what the final layout is and if the hearing is closed, they won't be able to see that information.

Mr. Anagnost said he was thoroughly convinced that they are going to - with staff's assistance - meet the criteria necessary to address the five open issues that he outlined.

Mr. Anagnost said they would be willing to roll the dice and submit the CDFA application with the conditional use permits approved and keep the site plan open and come back with the five additional things for the Board's review. There is still some risk to that but if that is the Board's pleasure then they will run with it the best that they can.

Mr. Roy said he wouldn't have a problem with that at all. The problem he has is what he believes is State law and he believes this Board is the one who is supposed to review the technical stuff that is involved with these site plans. He doesn't believe there is a lot of room for staff to do that. He said if they could craft something that those five issues are left open that would be fine with him.

Mr. Anagnost said he has had applications in the past where he received a conditional approval subject to the submittal of the additional information where staff has presented the additional material at the business meeting for final action.

Chairman Harrington said one additional condition to the five would be Mr. Rhodes providing stamped plans. Mr. Rhodes said the plan that he will stamp will have all of the requested information on it.

Senator Boutin said they could approve this tonight with a notation that prior to the ability to secure a building permit the staff would have to supply a final report to the Board that the issues have been addressed.

Ms. Goucher said what it comes down to is whether or not the Board feels that the changes are substantial or not substantial. If they decide that they're not substantial and they want to take action tonight, it could be handled with conditions. She thought the question for the Board was whether or not the things they discussed that would be changed on the plan are substantial or not substantial in their mind. If they're not substantial or material, then the hearing can be closed and staff can work with the applicant but if they feel that the items are substantial, then they need to keep it open.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if the Board doesn't see the handicap issues resolved, are they putting this project in potential legal jeopardy by not assuring that they are meeting ADA. He asked if they moved this too fast if there is a chance that it could end up in court and actually slow down. Ms. Goucher said any action they take on any project can end up in court. What it comes down to is if she believes the applicant can show conforming ADA parking spaces in the back of the building. She said she believes they can. Does she think that they can show a loading zone with a request in writing from the applicant to reduce the standard size? Yes. Can the applicant show a dumpster with an enclosure to meet the zoning requirements? Yes. He can do all of those things so that the plan the staff would ultimately sign would be in compliance with those issues. However, if the Board thinks those are substantial issues because they haven't seen them on a plan, then that is an issue only the Board can decide.

Chairman Harrington asked that the Board also consider what has just come to light regarding the credits and if they miss their deadline because of the Board's action not to take action tonight. They heard some very compelling testimony here tonight so he thought that had to be taken into consideration as well and weigh whether or not these changes outweigh that.

Mr. O'Donoghue said he would like to see, with a vote, whether the Board would like to address this tonight with conditions. He thought it would be important for them to take some action on it tonight.

Ms. Flinchbaugh heard the testimony and she is definitely moved and she definitely thinks this is something that our City needs. However, she is concerned that the status of the plan is a little unusual and she feels a little rushed. She doesn't feel that the Board would normally take action with plans in the condition that they are currently in and that makes her nervous. She wished they weren't in this position frankly because she thinks each and every one of the Board members wants to approve this tonight and she thinks the problem is that the site plan isn't in quite the shape it really should be.

Mr. Kizak asked if Mr. Anagnost could put a number on the amount of credits they are talking about. Mr. Anagnost said it is \$350,000. He explained that those credits were turned back in and what normally would happen is they would go into the next round for competitive funding. They were asked for an application out of round, which has never occurred before in the CDFA, specifically so they could earmark these credits towards this project. As such, if there is a delay and they miss the round what will happen is they will go into the next round and be allocated with applications that come in in May. He said if you couple the \$350,000 that would come in this round plus the \$300,000 CBDG and the \$100,000 donation, it at least gets them enough money to fit up the Recovery Center portion of the building.

Mr. Kizak asked how much money and what kind of schedule they were looking at for getting to the final product of the façade and some of the site improvements they alluded to. Mr. Anagnost said in the May round all of them would be resubmitting again. Depending on what they got that would get Families in Transition in the building. With respect to Phoenix, they would be bringing private capital and he and Mr. Cruz would be posting some capital that would go into some sort of lease for them so they can get that capital back out of it. Serenity Place has yet to be discussed or determined at this time as they haven't committed.

Mr. O'Brien thought Mr. Roy was absolutely correct that this plan is not something that the Board would normally approve and he thought giving it to the staff is something that the Board normally doesn't do. He thought it was very brave for Mr. Roy to stand up when everyone in this room was cheering to say "hey, let's slow this down, let's think about this". He thought it was important that Mr. Roy stood up against all the momentum to put out his voice. If this was any other project he thought he would be standing right behind Mr. Roy saying "absolutely". One of the things that they must do on this Board is think about safety and when people ask for waivers he always thinks in his head "what is the hardship, what are we dealing with here". He thought this situation is very unique and he could not say no to this if the Board did take a vote today. It is only because of the timeliness of it and the critical timing for the financing and people are truly coming up and telling them that this vote tonight could save lives and he thinks that is something that no other applicant has brought to them before. That is why he thinks that making these choices to expedite this would be warranted.

Mr. Roy thanked Mr. O'Brien for those words. He wanted everyone to know that he is 100 percent for this project and when they have their consensus, he is still going to say that they shouldn't close this tonight, but if they take an action tonight he would vote for it.

Mr. Kizak made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Clement, to close this public hearing and take it up in the limited business meeting later tonight. (Motion Carried) (Opposed: Roy) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

Mr. Anagnost thanked the Board for their time. He also advised that Mr. Roy had reached out to him to offer all the assistance that he could in order to push this project forward.

Chairman Harrington closed the January 21, 2016 Limited Public Hearing of the Manchester Planning Board.

The Board took a short recess.

Chairman Harrington convened the Business Meeting of the Manchester Planning Board of January 21, 2016.

III. BUSINESS MEETING:

(Tabled Items – Staff would recommend removing Items 1, 2 and 3 from the table for discussion)

1. SP-08-2015/PD-05-2015

Property located at 53 Mammoth Road (Tax Map 716, Lot 1B), an application to construct a two-story community building with approximately 4,100 SF adjacent to an existing church, with associated site improvements. Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, and Rokeh Consulting, LLC for Faith Baptist Church (owner)

2. CU-04-2015

Property located at 53 Mammoth Road (Tax Map 716, Lot 1B), an application for a Conditional Use Permit for a church use in the R-1B Zoning District. Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, and Rokeh Consulting, LLC for Faith Baptist Church (owner)

3. CU-05-2015

Property located at 53 Mammoth Road (Tax Map 716, Lot 1B), an application for a Conditional Use Permit for a reduction in parking from 87 parking spaces required to 80 spaces proposed. Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, and Rokeh Consulting, LLC for Faith Baptist Church (owner)

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to remove items 1, 2 and 3 from the agenda, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried)

With respect to 53 Mammoth Road, Ms. Goucher reminded the Board that they asked them to provide a letter as to whether they were going to be coming forward soon with the revised plans. Staff received a letter last week requesting a 45 day time period, which would bring them to the end of February.

Mr. McCue made a motion to extend SP-08-2015/PD-05-2015, CU-04-2015 and CU-05-2015 for 45 days, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried)

Mr. McCue made a motion to put SP-08-2015/PD-05-2015, CU-04-2015 and CU-05-2015 back on the table, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried)

4. **S-28-2015**

Property located at 388 Elgin Avenue (Tax Map 556, Lot 105) and at Tax Map 283, Lot 49, Tax Map 556, Lot 37 and Tax Map 556, Lot 106, an application for consolidation and subdivision to create 31 buildable single family residential lots with public improvements and proposed easements. Northpoint Engineering, LLC for Marshall-Davis Investments, LLC

Mr. Roy made a motion to take S-28-2015 off the table, which was seconded by Mr. Boissonneault. (Motion Carried)

Ms. Flinchbaugh recused herself from this item for previous reasons stated.

Mr. Goucher reminded the Board that the reason why Elgin Avenue has been a tabled item on the agenda for a while is there was a pavement study that was being done. Staff thought they would have received it before now. They just found out from the engineer today that the report should be submitted to staff within the next couple of days. She expects that the DPW staff will need to take a look at the results of that. Once staff has seen that information, they may be able to get the project back to the Board sometime next month.

Mr. Roy made a motion to put S-28-2015 back on the table, which was seconded by Mr. Boissonneault. (Motion Carried)

(Current Items)

5. **SP-30-2015**

Property located at 522 Harvey Road (Tax Map 722, Lot 21), a site plan application to construct a 2,400 SF one-story building for a contractor's yard, with fenced-in outdoor storage for heavy equipment, parking and drainage and associated site improvements within the IND Zone. James M. Lavelle Associates for Roadway Excavators, Inc.

Mr. Roy advised that this was approved before, they let it lapse and there have been no changes to it since then.

Alderman Levasseur recused himself from this vote as he was not on the Board when this it was heard. The Chairman advised that Ms. Flinchbaugh would vote in his place.

Mr. Roy made a motion to approve SP-30-2015 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final sign-off from all City reviewing agencies;
2. Details of a proposed electronic message board shall be submitted for review by the Planning Board at a business meeting, prior to securing a sign permit;

3. Final sign-off of the revised site plan exhibits by the PCD Department;
4. A note shall be added to the site plan cover sheet which shall read as follows: *“It is hereby agreed that, as the owner/developer of the project, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the improvements for the duration of the approved use”*;
5. Approval of this plan shall be valid for one year from the date of approval, during which time a building permit shall be secured; and
6. A Certificate of Occupancy shall not be authorized until all site improvements have been completed, unless addressed by meeting the requirements of Section 6.4(J) of site plan regulations.

6. SP-32-2015

Property located at 40 Willow Street (Tax Map 734, Lot 3), a site plan application for a change of use to add the use of motorcycle service to the existing storage use within the RDV Zone. The applicant proposes parking improvements in conformance with zoning regulations. CLD Consulting Engineers for Motorcycles of Manchester

Alderman Levasseur recused himself from this vote as he was not on the Board when this application was heard. The Chairman advised that Ms. Flinchbaugh would vote in his place.

Chairman Harrington advised that there was a staff recommendation and the Board took a few moments to review that information.

Ms. Goucher advised that Mr. Golden was handing out a slightly modified plan that was prepared to address some of the issues that were discussed at the public hearing in January. She pointed out the recommendation includes some modifications to the curb cuts. She also pointed out that the applicant didn't want to make any modifications until they own the property; however, she said more than half of the applications that the Board typically gets before them are from tenants who don't actually own the property and the Board requires certain site improvements from them. The degree to which improvements they may want to look at for this property is up to the Board. Staff has suggested a couple of those, which can be seen on the plan. With respect to condition #6, Ms. Goucher advised that staff is working with them as to whether or not a cross access easement will be submitted versus a license agreement. It has more to do with the ownership issue. In any event, staff would want to see something recorded. As such, staff would recommend that condition #6 read that instead of saying a cross access easement document that it be reworded as a “suitable cross access document to be recorded prior to signing the plan set”.

Chairman Harrington requested that staff walk the Board through the changes.

As was brought up in the last public hearing, Mr. Golden advised that access into 40 Willow Street and potentially across the easement on the north end of the property there were two parallel parking spaces that got relocated to the back of the building. The proposed dumpster location is now shown on the plan. Additionally, the space between the parking and the storage units was increased to allow for access and snow clearing as well as the note identifying the actual cross access that wasn't shown on the last plan. He advised that this plan is not reflective of some of the potential conditions of approval that are in the staff report with the expanded center island that was discussed between the curb cuts and potentially the removal of pavement where the two parallel parking spaces were located. In an email, the applicant noted that they are planning on screening the fence along Willow Street, which will be reflected in the conditions.

Regarding the width of the curb cuts, Chairman Harrington asked if that is something, because he is a tenant, that he can apply for on his own or does he need approval from the owner to do so. Not having seen the lease agreement between them, Ms. Goucher couldn't say who might be responsible. She said typically when they sign a lease, the owner will give his/her permission and sign the application forms coming before the Planning Board and they understand that there are things that the Planning Board may be looking for on a plan that need to be accomplished, but she could not speak specifically as to who might be responsible. From an application point of view, the Chairman asked when he applies for a permit to do construction, wouldn't he need the owner's approval on the application. Ms. Goucher explained that on the application there is a place for an applicant to sign that says he has the owner's permission to apply for permits.

Mr. Clement made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Boissonneault, to approve SP-32-2015 per staff recommendation as amended by Ms. Goucher.

Mr. Kizak asked if they wanted to do anything with the curb cut and have the island be bigger. He thought they should also consider that this is not just a lease agreement that the applicant has; they have a lease with a purchase rider on it so it's not just a tenant but a tenant/likely owner. Ms. Goucher asked if he was referring to condition #1. Chairman Harrington said the staff recommendation does state that it shall be increased. Mr. Kizak said he was good.

Ms. Goucher said there were some waivers that need to be addressed too.

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to grant the waiver for preparation of a landscaping plan, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried)

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to grant the waiver from irrigation, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried)

The Chairman advised that there was a motion on the table to approve SP-32-2015.

The motion to approve SP-32-2015 per staff recommendation as amended by Ms. Goucher was carried.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Modification of the site plan to include an increase in the width of the center island along Willow Street and inclusion of additional landscaping, as well as an increase to 10 feet of the landscaping panel adjacent to the sales lot at 98 Willow Street;
 2. Additional landscaping shall be reviewed by the Planning staff;
 3. Final sign-off of site plan exhibits by the Planning Department staff and all reviewing agencies prior to signing of the plan set;
 4. Any changes to signage shall conform to zoning and shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board at a Business Meeting;
 5. A building permit for the storage containers shall be secured prior to signing of the plan set;
 6. A cross access easement document (between 98 and 40 Willow Street) shall be signed and recorded prior to signing of the plan set;
 7. Modification of the site plan to indicate that the access drive between 98 and 40 Willow Street shall be paved, with appropriate spot grades;
 8. Modification of the site plan to indicate the addition of screening to the chain link fence. Additionally, any proposed dumpsters shall be shown on the site plan and shall be fully screened in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, prior to a C.O. for the proposed new tenant;
 9. An owner/developer statement shall be added to the Site Plan cover sheet of the drawings and signed by the owner/developer, which shall read as follows: *“It is hereby agreed that, as the owner/developer of the property, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the site improvements for the duration of the use”*;
 10. Approval of this plan shall be valid for one year from date of approval, during which time a building permit shall be secured; and
 11. A Certificate of Occupancy shall not be authorized until all site improvements have been completed, unless addressed by meeting the requirements of Section 6.4(J) of the site plan regulations.
7. **SP-35-2015**
Property located at 253 Abby Road (Tax Map 510, Lot 6), an application to add 100 parking spaces to an existing parking lot of 219 spaces at a manufacturing facility within the IND Zone.

All 100 parking spaces are to be constructed in the Town of Londonderry, although the existing parking spaces, frontage, and building are in the City of Manchester. T.F. Moran, Inc. for JJJ Properties, LLC

Alderman Levasseur recused himself from this vote as he was not on the Board when this application was heard. The Chairman advised that Ms. Flinchbaugh would vote in his place.

Chairman Harrington said this was a fairly straightforward recommendation and application.

Mr. O'Brien made a motion to approve SP-35-2015 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Roy. (Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant shall obtain sign-off from all City reviewing agencies, including the Planning staff, prior to signing the site plan;
2. A note shall be added to the plan stating, "Approval by the Manchester Planning Board shall be conditioned upon approval by the Town of Londonderry." Any material modifications to this plan required by the Town of Londonderry shall require approval by the Manchester Planning Board;
3. A note shall be added to the plan stating that any modification to Map 17/Lot 17A that would affect circulation on Map 510/Lot 6 or affect traffic in Manchester shall require approval from the Manchester Planning Board;
4. A note shall be added to the plan stating that Map 17/Lot 17A shall only serve the use on Map 510/Lot 6. Any other use proposed for the lot shall require approval by the Manchester Planning Board;
5. The applicant shall either remove, or secure building permits for, the three storage trailers on Lot 6 prior to signing the plan set;
6. No structure, tree, or other feature on the site shall exceed 486 feet above mean sea level, to guard against aviation hazard, consistent with the Airport Overlay Districts;
7. A statement signed by the owner shall be added to the plan stating: *"It is hereby agreed that, as the owner of the property, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the site improvements for the duration of the use";*
8. The plans submitted for final approval shall bear the stamp of all licensed professionals whose work appears on the plans;

9. Approval of this plan shall be valid for one year from the date of approval, during which time a building permit shall be secured; and
10. A certificate of occupancy shall not be authorized until all site improvements have been completed, unless addressed by meeting the requirements of Section 6.4(J) of the site plan regulations.

8. **SP-36-2015**

Property located at Sundial Avenue (Tax Map 435, Lot 9A), a site-plan application to construct a 48-unit, four-story apartment building with associated site improvements within the RDV Zone. T.F. Moran, Inc. for SMC Sundial, LP

Alderman Levasseur recused himself from this vote as he was not on the Board when this application was heard. The Chairman advised that Ms. Flinchbaugh would vote in his place.

Mr. Belanger pointed out that there is no staff recommendation on this application at this time. There are a few things that the Board may want to discuss before getting to a recommendation. Some of the issues that were outstanding at the close of the public hearing were:

- **Granite curbing.** The Board had requested that the applicant provide granite curbing at the public hearing.

After the hearing, staff was in contact with the applicant and they have had a significant amount of discussion. The applicant has agreed to provide sloped granite curbing throughout the site. To be clear, the applicant mentioned bituminous curbing during the presentation but the applicant later contacted him and confirmed that it is not intended to be bituminous, it was intended to be cast in place concrete, which is known to be more durable than bituminous but not as durable as granite.

- **Rail trail.** There was a request from DPW that the applicant provide a 15 foot easement on their property but on the Velcro side of the lot kind of where their driveway is located now for reservation of a proposed rail trail that connects part of the rail trail network throughout the City. A map of the proposed rail trail was provided to the Board members. DPW has been working on this map, but it hasn't been officially adopted by any particular Board but it something that they had in the works for a while.

The applicant is not willing to provide an easement for the rail trail. They apparently talked with an abutter, Frank Dubisz, who submitted an email to staff speaking in opposition to the project if the rail trail were to be part of it. This correspondence was not distributed to the Board as they closed the public hearing.

- **Balconies.** The applicant proposed Juliet balconies and the Board expressed an interest in seeing those be full walkout balconies at the public hearing.

The applicant is opposed to providing full walkout balconies. They spoke with their architect and as a business decision they decided that it was not appropriate. Mr. Belanger said the full text from their email describing their reasons is in the Board members' packets.

On the issue of the balconies, Chairman Harrington recalled the applicant saying that perhaps they would take a look at providing full balconies on one section. He asked if that is something that they are not considering at all. Mr. Belanger advised that they were aware of that distinction and they declined to provide balconies on just the Sundial façade. They do not want to provide them on any façade of the building.

Mr. Belanger advised that he has been in contact with the Department of Public Works, which is still interested in trying to work out the rail trail issue. One of the engineers from Public Works is attempting to have a meeting with the abutter to hopefully work out whatever concerns Mr. Dubisz may have.

Mr. Roy said that rail trail didn't make any sense because the path was so convoluted and it has not been adopted by any Board. He doesn't understand why DPW is so hot on that whole thing. Mr. Belanger advised that he mentioned Mr. Roy's comments to Dave Winslow of DPW and he said they had looked at the grading of potential different paths for that trail. They said it is really a matter of access and grading and this is the best spot for it.

Mr. McCue confirmed with Mr. Belanger that the applicant will provide Juliet balconies along all facades, which was presented at the public hearing.

Chairman Harrington asked if there were any issues from Water Works. Mr. Boissonneault advised that the applicant was in touch with their office and it is their intention to petition the Board at their February meeting. They are in agreement with what staff is going to be recommending to the Board so he doesn't see it as an issue.

Mr. McCue asked about the crosswalk. Mr. Belanger said they are very willing to put that in. That was initially proposed but DPW had some issue with it. He spoke with Kristen Clark at DPW, who had raised the safety concerns, and the specific concern really wasn't so much getting across the street along that crosswalk. It was what the person who uses that crosswalk would do once they reach the parking lot, particularly if it is someone in a wheelchair and they kind of get dumped into a parking lot. There are some obvious site issues for cars turning around other cars and being able to see people. DPW was still not thrilled with it, but they understood that it could be beneficial given the synergies of these two parcels working together. DPW requested that a pedestrian crossing sign be placed between Queen City and this intersection so it would alert motorists to the pedestrians up ahead and the applicant seemed fine with that and did not have a problem with providing a sign.

Mr. McCue asked what side of the Sundial facility is the restaurant going to be on. Mr. Roy believed it was going to be in the corner of the ell where the cafeteria used to be for the college. Mr. Belanger confirmed that it is where the cafeteria was.

Mr. Belanger said the applicant's engineer said that he would take away a parking space where that crosswalk would land basically at that alternate site and provide some kind of a refuge there, but again the issue is just navigating the whole parking lot. They are not going to be providing a sidewalk from that spot to the door so there is some inherent danger there. Mr. McCue asked if they would be willing to put a striped line on the parking lot just along the inside edge of the landscaped area that runs on Sundial Avenue. Mr. Belanger said that was certainly within the Board's authority to put as a condition of approval.

Chairman Harrington said it sounded like the Board needs additional information to come from the applicant and they still need to hear from Water Works so he did not think the Board was in a position to ask staff to make a recommendation. Mr. Boissonneault advised that Water Works doesn't see a need to hold it up because of that.

Mr. Belanger said there are some outstanding issues still for the Board to consider but it doesn't mean that it can't be decided tonight. One of the issues is whether the Board is going to require balconies or not. He thought the rail trail is the biggest outstanding issue. He reiterated that DPW is trying to work with the abutter to work out some solution that might allow this rail trail to occur. DPW mentioned that they are trying to work with Velcro, the abutting parcel, who has been very cooperative in terms of what DPW has requested for an easement on their end. DPW was wondering if they were to take a lot less of the Sundial parcel and not have to restructure the driveway if that would be something that was acceptable to the applicant. That is something they are still working out.

Mr. Roy said they should wait until they get everything. Mr. McCue concurred.

Ms. Goucher said staff just wanted to make sure there were no other issues that the Board wanted to either defer to the staff or any other issues they want to bring up so they can prepare a recommendation and bring it back in two weeks. At that point staff feels like they would certainly have information on whether or not that trail easement may be on this property or not.

Chairman Harrington asked how the Board felt about the balconies. Mr. Clement is in favor of the Juliet balconies because there is no way they are going to store anything on it and it is just something to make it more decorative looking. He thought it was more appealing to renters.

The Chairman said his only concern here is that the applicant has followed every rule but has densely packed this particular lot to the point where there is really no outdoor space. Mr. Clement said it is up to the buyer and what they want.

Mr. O'Brien advised that he used to live in an apartment complex and he chose the place that he lived because he wanted outdoor access to a balcony but when he looked around at the other buildings he found that they were mostly used as storage. There were chairs stacked and a lot of times you just see people's junk out there. Every once in a while they would use them, but he almost feels that it is up to the applicant to see if it is how they want to market their thing.

Mr. Kizak sees it as a business decision on the part of the developer and what he wants to put on the market and what he thinks is going to have the best return. He thinks it is more the purview of the Board of what the outdoor appearance is of the building and from most vantage points a Juliet balcony looks an awful lot like a full balcony. He doesn't see a whole lot of visual impact one way or the other. He agreed that in many areas full balconies are a storage place so he doesn't have any issue with them keeping the Juliet balconies.

Mr. McCue agreed with Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Kizak with regard to the Juliet balconies.

Chairman Harrington said the hearing would be held open so the applicant can get staff the information they require and work out the easement.

Ms. Goucher thought the applicant had made it clear to Planning staff that they are not interested in giving an easement for the trail. She thought they should just defer to DPW to make whatever attempt they want to make with the applicant and staff will bring back a recommendation to this Board in two weeks.

The Chairman advised that there would be a limited business meeting after the public hearing at the next meeting.

9. **SP-37-2015**

Property located at 875 Elm Street, (Tax Map 201, Lot 36, 36A, 36B & 8), a site plan application for a change of use from Commercial to mixed retail and residential. The proposed use of the building shall include storage on the basement level, 16,865 SF of retail on the first floor (includes 3,359 SF of bank space) and 91 residential apartment units on floors 2 through 10 within the CBD Zone. Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. for 875 Elm Street LLC

Alderman Levasseur recused himself from this vote as he was not on the Board when this application was heard. The Chairman advised that Ms. Flinchbaugh would vote in his place.

Chairman Harrington advised that there was a staff recommendation. Ms. Levandowski advised that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen met on this on Tuesday, January 16th and they approved the encroachment onto the City sidewalk, which is condition #4.

Mr. Roy advised that there were two waivers; one for contours and one for a traffic study.

Mr. McCue made a motion to approve the waiver for contours, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried)

Mr. McCue made a motion to approve the waiver for a traffic study, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried)

The Board took a moment to review the staff recommendation.

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to approve SP-37-2015 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final sign-off of site plan exhibits by the Planning Department staff and all reviewing agencies;
2. Crosswalk at the south crossing of Elm Street at Hanover be added to the plan;
3. Any new signage, which must comply with the zoning regulations, shall be reviewed by the Planning Board at a business meeting prior to receiving a sign permit;
4. As represented in Public Hearing, should the BMA support the encroachment of the proposed front steps onto the sidewalk, the applicant shall submit to staff an easement, license or other instrument customarily granted by the City for such an encroachment to be filed or recorded with the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds. Should the BMA deny the request to encroach onto the sidewalk, the applicant shall provide revised plans for review by the Planning Board at a business meeting;
5. The addition of an owner/developer statement added to the site plan cover sheet of the drawings and signed by the owner, which shall read as follows: *“It is hereby agreed that, as the owner/developer of the property, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the site improvements for the duration of the use”*;
6. A school impact fee of \$1,169 per unit shall be paid prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy;
7. Approval shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of action by the Planning Board, within which time period a building permit must be secured, otherwise this approval shall lapse; and
8. A certificate of occupancy shall not be authorized until all site improvements have been completed, unless addressed by meeting the requirements of Section 6.4 (J) of the site plan regulations.

10. Review of new applications for Determination of Completeness and Regional Impact.

The staff has received and reviewed the applications listed below and has determined that, unless otherwise noted, these are *complete* with respect to the minimum required plan material and supporting information. Unless otherwise indicated, it is the recommendation of the staff that the Planning Board determine the applications *complete* to begin formal consideration and to schedule a public hearing.

The Planning Board should also determine if any of the applications are likely to have impacts beyond the boundaries of Manchester, requiring regional review pursuant to RSA 36:54, 55, 56 & 57.

1. S-22-2015

Property located at 655 South Willow Street (Tax Map 437, Lot 2), an application to subdivide one parcel of approximately 665,899 SF into two parcels of approximately 648,199 SF and 17,700 SF within the B-2 Zone. *CLD Consulting Engineers for 655 South Willow, LLC.*

2. S-01-2016

Property located at Ohio Avenue (Tax Map 235, Lots 4 and 5), a subdivision application to adjust the lot line between lots 4 and 5, with approximately 12,000 SF transferring to lot 4 within the R-1B Zone. *Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, Inc. for Yvon Rivard.*

Ms. Goucher advised that under the revised Subdivision and Site Plan Regulations that the Board adopted two weeks ago, this is one of those properties that probably would have gone to the Conservation Commission for input because of the significant amount of wetlands on the property. Staff hasn't put these applications under those new guidelines.

Mr. Roy asked if the Conservation Commission is meeting before the next meeting. Ms. Goucher believed they will meet on February 3rd. Mr. Roy asked if it could be sent to them for their input. Mr. Belanger said the Board has the authority now regardless of the new regulations to send these to the Conservation Commission as they have before.

Mr. Roy made a motion to that this application should go before the Conservation Commission, which was seconded by Mr. Boissonneault.

Chairman Harrington thought that was a good idea because there are a lot of wet areas on the plans.

(Motion Carried) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

3. SP-01-2016

Property located at 300 Keller Street (Tax Map 874, Lots 12 & 12A), a site plan application to fully redevelop the site with a 40,507 ± square foot CarMax facility, inclusive of a 3,707 square foot private carwash and associated site improvements within the B-2 Zone. *Wadleigh, Starr, & Peters, PLLC for CarMax Auto Superstores, Inc.*

4. CU-01-2016

Property located at 470 Pine Street (Tax Map 7, Lot 1), an application for a Conditional Use permit to allow other business and professional offices and offices of health care practitioners and outpatient health care within the C-1 Zone. *Tom Deblois for Tokena Corp.*

5. CU-02-2016

Property located at 470 Pine Street (Tax Map 7, Lot 1), an application for a Conditional Use permit to reduce required parking by eight spaces within the C-1 Zone. *Tom Deblois for Tokena Corp*

Mr. Kizak made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. McCue, that the following applications are complete and do not have regional impact: S-22-2015, S-01-2016, SP-01-2016, CU-01-2016 and CU-02-2016. (Motion Carried)

11. Staff update of SP-12-2015/PD-04-2015 and SP-13-2015, 855 Candia Road.

Mr. Belanger advised that the applicant initially proposed putting a traffic signal at the intersection of Candia Road and the driveway to this new apartment complex and the State had a say in that because there is a significant amount of Federal money and State money that the State has put into Candia Road so the State has an interest in what happens on Candia Road as well as any traffic that might back up onto the I-93 off-ramp that goes onto Candia Road. As such, they basically had “veto authority” over what happened with this traffic signal. Back in September they issued a letter denying the applicant’s initial proposal for the traffic signal, which would mitigate the safety and traffic impact concerns that arose as a result of this development.

There is a new proposal now from the applicant for a different traffic mitigation plan. The new proposal is to continue with the traffic signal. He advised that just a little east of this site is the intersection of East Industrial Drive and Candia Road where currently there is a lighted intersection and there is a slip lane to turn right onto East Industrial with a light on it. The concern from the State for the applicant’s previous proposal was that there was such backup from that right turn that it backed up to the site and would cause conflict with the intersection at this site and also would impact stacking going back up the off-ramp and potentially backup onto the highway. The applicant’s new proposal is to change that lighted intersection at East Industrial Drive at the slip lane so that there is no longer a traffic signal that blocks traffic. There would still be a signal there on that slip lane that would only turn red when there is a pedestrian wanting to cross. It would otherwise always be green. That would allow for more traffic to cycle through that right turn slip lane and alleviate the congestion in front of this site and also backing up onto I-93. Mr. Belanger advised that in December the State issued a letter advising that they approved this traffic mitigation as it addressed their concerns.

Mr. Belanger distributed the letter from the State as well as the schematic drawings that the applicant provided to the Board members.

The plan is for this to go to public hearing in February for a continuation of that public hearing if the Board is inclined to do that.

Mr. Roy said the last time they felt it was prudent to get a third party PTOE to look at this traffic plan and when he did, he recommended that any subsequent plans be reviewed by a third party as well. As such, he wants to see this new plan be reviewed by a third party. He thought it was Mr. Pernaw last time.

Ms. Goucher said if the Board is going to look at having Mr. Pernaw review the revised report as well as the conceptual plans for the improvements at East Industrial Drive with Candia Road, it would be best if the Board made that clear to staff tonight because the staff would reach out to Mr. Pernaw tomorrow and get him the information tomorrow. She has already had communication with the Highway Department and they would like to sit down with staff and Mr. Pernaw if the Board chooses to have him do that. She is sure staff could facilitate a meeting next week. She advised the Board that the engineer was sitting in the audience tonight. She spoke with Mr. Scrivanos today and told him that if the third party review came up tonight, she would suggest that it be done as soon as possible.

***Mr. Roy made a motion to re-engage Mr. Pernaw to review the applicant's new traffic mitigation proposal, which was seconded by Mr. O'Brien. (Motion Carried)
(Abstained: Levasseur)***

12. CU-03-2016

Property located at 267 Wilson Street (Tax Map 342, Lot 19) and a portion of the former RR ROW (shown as A-2 of Tax Map 473, Lot 46), a request for a Conditional Use permit for a reduction of parking and the use of public and controlled parking within 500' for the proposed 37,600 SF building for Hope for NH Recovery center and other non-profit tenants. The applicant proposes a combination of 50 un-striped spaces onsite and on Map 109, Lot 4 where 111 are required within the RDV Zone. CLD Consulting Engineers for 267 Wilson Street, LLC

Chairman Harrington advised the Board that staff did not believe that the applicant would be able to accommodate 50 parking spaces legally on the two lots so he asked if the Board would be inclined to approve it as a reduction to 38 parking spaces, instead of 50 parking spaces, that are under the control of the applicant.

Mr. Roy asked if the 38 spaces included the two handicap spaces and Ms. Goucher said it does.

Mr. O'Brien did not think 38 spaces were enough. Once they show how they can park along the building, maybe they could fit in more spaces and he would like to see those additional spots.

Ms. Goucher said if the Board was to grant the reduction it would be the staff's intent as they work with the applicant and his engineer to see if they can get more than two handicap spaces in behind the building. However, when they also put in a loading area, even though there is a waiver for its size, she doesn't know how many parking spaces they can legally fit in there. She knows they are going to want to show more if they can fit them in there, but seeing where staff is being asked to provide a recommendation tonight, her concern is if they have a higher number and they can't get them in there legally and zoning compliant, then they would have to go back to the Zoning Board, which is not going to accomplish what they're trying to do. She is not certain that they can get more than a couple of handicap spaces, a loading area for the van, accessibility for a fire truck and a fire lane, and the dumpster. The lot is such a funny configuration and the building has so many jogs in the back. She thinks to be safe they would be better off having a

smaller number of spaces in the approval and then if they can get more spaces in there, great. The Chairman asked Mr. O'Brien if that helped with his decision and he said that it did.

Mr. McCue made a motion to approve a reduction to the 38 spaces, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

13. CU-24-2015

Property located at 267 Wilson Street (Tax Map 342, Lot 19) and a portion of the former RR ROW (shown as A-2 of Tax Map 473, Lot 46), a request for a Conditional Use permit to allow Offices of health care practitioners and outpatient health care [H-2 (1)] within the RDV Zone. CLD Consulting Engineers for 267 Wilson Street, LLC

Mr. Roy made a motion to approve CU-24-2015, which was seconded by Mr. McCue. (Motion Carried) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

14. SP-34-2015

Property located at 267 Wilson Street (Tax Map 342, Lot 19) and a portion of the former RR ROW (shown as A-2 of Tax Map 473, Lot 46), a site plan application to change the use of 37,600 SF of the former CA Hoitt Furniture building to Hope for NH Recovery center and other non-profit tenants within the RDV Zone. CLD Consulting Engineers for 267 Wilson Street, LLC

Chairman Harrington advised that there were several waiver requests. Ms. Goucher asked that the Board address the waivers separately.

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to grant the waiver for a landscape plan, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to grant the waiver for a signage and lighting plan, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to grant the waiver from showing additional utility design and valuation materials, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to grant the waiver for traffic analysis, which was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to grant a waiver for the reduction in loading zone dimensions.

By mentioning that in the meeting tonight, Mr. Roy asked if that covers the Board as far as the waiver having had a public hearing. Ms. Goucher said that it does.

Mr. Boissonneault's motion was seconded by Mr. Kizak. (Motion Carried) (Not Voting: Flinchbaugh)

In response to a question from the Chair, Ms. Goucher advised that the applicant was provided with a copy of the recommendation with conditions that was just prepared.

Mr. McCue made a motion to approve SP-34-2015 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur.

With respect to condition #3 which states "The fire lane, dumpster with screening and loading zone shall be depicted on site", Mr. O'Brien wanted to make sure it was clear that the fire lane will actually be designated on the pavement with paint. He would also like to add that the parking spots are actually painted. Ms. Goucher said they will have to be striped because they haven't asked for a variance from the Zoning Board. While the representation by the applicant was for them not to stripe the spaces, the Planning Board can't grant the "non-striping" - only the Zoning Board could do that with a variance. Mr. O'Brien wanted to make sure because the plan they saw tonight said "striping not proposed".

(Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant shall obtain sign-off from all City reviewing agencies, including the Planning staff, prior to signing of the site plan;
2. Two handicapped accessible spaces shall be depicted onsite;
3. The fire lane, dumpster with screening, and a loading zone shall be depicted onsite;
4. The applicant shall demonstrate that outside lighting is adequate for reasonably secure night-time access;
5. The plans submitted for final approval shall bear the stamp of all licensed professionals whose work appears on the plans;
6. An easement shall be recorded to dedicate the parking lot on Map 109, Lot 4 for the use of tenants and clients of 267 Wilson Street (Map 342, Lot 19);
7. Parcel A-2 of Map 473, Lot 46, shall be merged with Map 342, Lot 19;
8. The plan shall contain a note to clarify that boundary and topographic information is taken from Reference Plan #1 (see plan note 6). "Tax Map 342 Lot 19, Exhibit Plan 2, Prepared for: Carl D. Longo Exempt Family Trust, Located at: 267 Wilson Street, Manchester, N.H. by: S&H Land Services, Dated: June 13, 2015";

9. A statement signed by the owner shall be added to the plan stating, “It is hereby agreed that, as the owner of the property, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the site improvements for the duration of the use”;
10. Approval of this plan shall be valid for one year from the date of approval, during which time a building permit shall be secured; and
11. A certificate of occupancy shall not be authorized until all site improvements have been completed, unless addressed by meeting the requirements of Section 6.4(J) of the site plan regulations.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

1. Review and approval of the Manchester Planning Board Minutes of December 17, 2015.

Approval of the December 17, 2015 Minutes was tabled.

2. Any other business items from the Planning Staff or Board Members.

There were no other business items.

Mr. Clement made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. O'Brien. (Motion Carried)

ATTEST: _____
Michael Harrington, Chairman
Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD: May 19, 2016

With Amendment
 Without Amendment

The above minutes are a summary of the meeting and are not intended to be verbatim.
Audiotapes are available in the Planning and Community Development office for a limited time.

Transcription by Lori Moone, Planning & Community Development.

