

**MANCHESTER PLANNING BOARD  
PUBLIC HEARING / LIMITED BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES  
March 03, 2016 – 6:00 p.m.  
City Hall, Third Floor – Aldermanic Chambers**

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

**Alternates Present:** Catherine Flinchbaugh, Dan LeClerc, Michael O'Donoghue

**Staff Present:** Pamela Goucher, Deputy Director Planning & Zoning, Jeff Belanger, Senior Planner, Jonathan Golden, Senior Planner, Jodie Levandowski, Planner II

---

**I. The Chairman called the meeting to order and introduced the Planning Board Members and Planning Staff.**

**II. PUBLIC HEARING:**

*(Continued From June 18, July 16, August 6, August 21, 2015 and February 4, 2016)*

**1. S-06-2015**

**Property located at 855 Candia Road (Tax Map 478, Lot 8), an application to subdivide one lot of approximately 10.9 acres into two lots of approximately 1 and 9.9 acres, with a Dunkin' Donuts to remain on the smaller lot and a 105-unit, multifamily development to be constructed on the larger lot. *TFMoran, Inc. for Candia Realty, LLC***

**SP-12-2015/PD-04-2015**

**Property located at Candia Road (Tax Map 478, Lot 8-1), a site plan and planned development application for a 105-unit, multifamily development comprised of three residential buildings and a clubhouse, with associated site improvements on the newly created lot of 9.9 acres. *TFMoran, Inc. for Candia Realty, LLC***

**SP-13-2015**

**Property located at 855 Candia Road (Tax Map 478, Lot 8, an amendment to a previously approved site plan to modify the parking lot of a Dunkin' Donuts. *TFMoran, Inc. for Candia Realty, LLC***

Chris Rice of TFMoran appeared on behalf of the Scrivanos Group. Also present was Gus Scrivanos, Bob Duval from TFMoran as well as Attorney John Cronin.

Mr. Rice said following last month's Planning Board hearing, they coordinated with staff to put together a list of outstanding items that they had to address. The first was to provide updated site plans to staff and both full size and reduced sets of plans were provided to them on February 19<sup>th</sup>. The second item dealt with intersection plans and they were asked to make some revisions. Based on Steve Pernaw's last memo, they removed the term "Progress Print" from the plans. They added the Wendy's sidewalk link. The mast arm locations have been shown. They are not being relocated; they

are staying in the same location that they currently are. The merge signage has been added. They provided a color rendering as requested. He said they took a look at the “Do Not Block Intersection” comment. That is the only one they didn’t address on the plan; mainly because the queue length is so short they felt that it wasn’t really necessary if they put the “Do Not Block Intersection” at the entrance to the Dunkin Donuts which would push the queue back so that it was blocking the Drive-Thru exit. There is a lot more traffic coming out of the exit than the main entrance so they felt it made sense to leave that alone. The third item dealt with the traffic report and accompanying data. They provided all of the additional information to Steve Pernaw as well as NHDOT. It is their understanding that Mr. Pernaw has reviewed that information and doesn’t have an issue with that. He reminded the Board that NHDOT has already stated that they leave the signal design to the City; they just want to see the final plans. Mr. Rice said they have been sending NHDOT plans and traffic data as it has been progressing and they will continue to do so. Item #4 had to do with easement documents. It is his understanding that John Cronin has submitted draft documents to staff for their review. Item #5 deals with a question of ledge blasting. He said they have estimated that at about 4,800 CY; however, this is a net fill-site so they expect no trucks to be leaving the site. They expect to crush the ledge on site and use it for their gravel underneath the parking areas. Item #6 had to deal with school age children and school buses and John Cronin has provided some information. Basically they are looking at a number of approximately 18 children and that will be over at least three different schools, if not four, and they come at different times of the day. As such, when they looked at it, they expect no more than 4-5 kids at a bus stop at any given time and they have provided an 8x10 bus stop area 50 feet east of the driveway entrance and they coordinated that with the Manchester Transit Authority.

Mr. Rice advised that they received their NHDOT Alteration of Terrain permit, a copy of which has been provided to DPW as well as the Planning Staff.

*Chairman Harrington advised that Matt O’Brien had joined the Board and Jeffrey Belanger had arrived as well.*

In looking at one of the plans, Chairman Harrington said there were a couple of different variations of a path for the children to get from the apartment complex down to the street. Mr. Rice said they have a sidewalk on both sides of the main drive aisle now and there is a crosswalk before the exit of the Dunkin Donuts’ drive-thru exit so you can either walk down the easterly side of the drive aisle or the westerly side then use the crosswalk to cross. Mr. Rice said it is shown more clearly on the color site plan. Mr. Guerra said on the color plan there is one that red and one that’s blue. He asked if the blue one is the one they are keeping or if they will be operating both of them. Mr. Rice said they will be using the blue one. Mr. Guerra asked who was going to maintain it. Mr. Rice said it is 50/50 and it will be addressed in the easement documents. Mr. Guerra asked if it will be shoveled for the kids to get down to the bus stop. Chairman Harrington clarified that they will be going with the blue option that comes down the easterly side that is on the plan.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if this is going to be phased. Mr. Rice said it might be that one building finishes before another but it is not the intention to just build one building and then finish that and start the next one.

Mr. Kizak asked if the bus stop pad on the abutting property or at least on the abutting frontage has been coordinated with that owner. Ms. Goucher said originally staff thought they might put in a concrete pad right before the public sidewalk for the children to gather, but the bus coordinator for

the School District preferred that the kids wait down at the sidewalk, just past the entrance. Mr. Kizak if there will be a sign or something in the street easement. Ms. Goucher said she expected there will be a sign that says "School Bus Stop".

Ms. Goucher asked if the mast arm at East Industrial was going to remain where it was. Mr. Rice said it will remain. She asked if that has been finalized with Highway because she thought DPW had said they needed to have it relocated. Mr. Duval said they worked out a revised alignment where they could keep the mast arm in place and that was OK with DPW.

Mr. Roy thanked the applicant for all the work they did and said they have addressed all of the Boards questions.

With respect to the pedestrian crossing, Mr. Roy recalled that the last time they talked, it was expected that there would be one pedestrian but now the numbers have been changed, which made sense to him. He believed what he read in the report is that there will be 11 walkers in the morning and 14 in the afternoon. Mr. Duval said that was correct. Mr. Roy said he had a question about the queueing and he didn't know at that time how long the lights were going to have to stop and it says that it will be about 37 seconds when someone crosses the street. In the morning that will be maybe 11 occurrences or maybe not because two people could actually walk together. He asked if this new information changes the queueing back towards the highway in any way. He recalled last time they talked about it he thought it was about 500-550 feet and Elton Avenue is about 800 feet away so it wasn't a problem. He asked with more use of the pedestrian crossing, if it would back that up any further towards the highway. Mr. Duval said it does have a small effect on queueing. Basically the way queues are calculated, it is based on a percentile basis so in looking at a 50 percent queue, which means it happens half the time, and you look at a 95<sup>th</sup> percent queue, which happens 5 percent of the time. He explained that when you have 11 pedestrian actuations, depending on the cycle length, it is only a small percentage of the number of cycles. If the cycle is 60 seconds, it would be 60 cycles per hour. Therefore, if you only push that button 11 times, you are not at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile; you may be at the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile but the queue has a chance to recover.

Mr. Roy asked if it will ever reach Elton Avenue. Mr. Duval said the queue does not reach back to Elton Avenue with the proposed mitigation. Mr. Roy asked - going back to East Industrial Drive – if it will create a situation there. Mr. Duval said it will not create a situation there.

With respect to Item #3 on the back page of the handout from Mr. Pernaw, Alderman Levasseur said it states "It is suggested that any approval of the site plan by the Planning Board include a condition that requires NHDOT approval of the traffic study." He didn't think this Board should be approving it before the State approves it. He doesn't like putting the cart before the horse on this one. He thought originally the NHDOT said they didn't want a light and then this last letter says they are ambivalent and now Mr. Pernaw is basically saying "It is suggested that any approval of any site plan by the Planning Board include a condition that requires NHDOT approval of the traffic study." He asked if this Board is going to approve this based on what they say or are they going to approve it and then they are going to come say whether they like it or not and then this Board will have to "unapprove" it. Ms. Goucher said it is not unusual for the Planning Board to impose a condition that all the State approvals be in place prior to final approval and signing the plans. Sometimes an applicant needs an AoT permit, sometimes

it is a wetlands permit and in this particular case it would probably be NHDOT approval. Obviously, if after NHDOT looks at the modifications or revisions that have subsequently been sent to the State because of the pedestrian activation time changes, if the State had some issues then the burden will be back on the applicant to address that and the plans wouldn't be signed. Alderman Levasseur said he would rather see them approve everything that they are planning before this Board gives them any kind of a seal of approval on a project this big. Ms. Goucher explained that the State has already reviewed the traffic study that was prepared prior to the last meeting and they have already given approval for a new light to be installed at this intersection. The only thing that they didn't see in the last traffic report is the modifications that have subsequently gone up to the State that address the differences in any potential queuing with pedestrian activation. Since that time, the applicant has provided a reasonable number to expect during the AM peak hour and the PM peak hour and that is what they were just talking about. She said it is not unusual to proceed in this fashion and clearly if the applicant and his engineers cannot obtain that final OK from the State, then they essentially don't have a fully approved plan from this Board.

Chairman Harrington invited Mr. Pernaw to come forward and take the Board through his recent memo.

Steven Pernaw of Pernaw & Company advised that they have been assisting the City with the review of the original traffic study plus the follow-up documentation. Since he was before the Board last, he advised that they had received an addendum to the traffic study, which is what their March 2<sup>nd</sup> memorandum addresses. They have reviewed the traffic study addendum and basically their memo summarizes for the Board four bullet points in terms of what is actually being proposed by the applicant at this point. There is no new information. It is consistent with what they talked about the last time. There will be an exclusive pedestrian phase, which was one of his recommendations and the analysis has been revised to show that.

Mr. Pernaw advised that they have developed three suggestions concerning the signal plan and the site plan. This has to do with the timing plan and when that timing ought to run from, which is really a minor change. They also made a suggestion on signal head placement. The last suggestion was what was just brought up and that was to have the State review, approve and accept all of the final modifications, which is kind of a standard boiler plate item when they know NHDOT approval is needed.

Alderman Levasseur asked if it was Mr. Pernaw's understanding that NHDOT knows that everything that was given to them as far as documents is the same as the documents that have been given to this Board, with the changes that have been made. Mr. Pernaw said it was his understanding that this addendum has been sent to the NHDOT. Alderman Levasseur asked if anything has been received from NHDOT prior to today. Mr. Pernaw advised that the Alderman would have to ask TFMoran that question.

In regard to the question about NHDOT, Mr. Belanger said staff has not received any confirmation from them one way or the other as to their opinion on this since the introduction of the new pedestrian phases.

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

**Joseph Collins** of 99 Waverly Street, which is off of Elton Avenue, advised that this is the second Planning Board meeting that he has attended where this project has been considered. He thought there were a few things that were being overlooked especially with the traffic and the impact to the Elton Avenue and Waverly Street neighborhood. He said there are only two ways in and out of that neighborhood and one is Candia Road. In the morning and evening during peak times you can't get out from Elton Avenue onto Candia Road. Traffic coming off of the highway is extremely dangerous because it is a short distance between Elton Avenue and the exit. Cars coming off of that exit continually are looking to the left to see if they have to merge and if danger is there they aren't looking to the right for any cars that are coming out of that road. If you want to take a left either in the morning or at night you can't do it. He said they are constantly talking about stacking and queueing but the constant traffic on that road doesn't allow anybody to get in and out, especially if you are going to the left. He knows some people think the answer to that is to go to Holt and East Industrial, which is the "back way" into that neighborhood. However, that intersection hasn't been looked at at all and in the morning and in the evening when Comcast and the Union Leader are letting out, you can't take a left from Holt to East Industrial because it is too wide and you don't know if the cars are turning or going straight because nobody uses their signals.

The other issue that doesn't seem to get addressed, especially in the evening, is the stacking and the queueing from the highway back to East Industrial Park Drive. There is no light at Dunkin Donuts now and that is already stacked back into East Industrial Park Drive and beyond. He has sat on the other side of that light for 2 or 3 cycles just trying to get up past East Industrial Park Drive. If an additional light is added in there that stacking is going to be worse. As such, he doesn't see that adding a light is going to make that situation any better even if a slip lane is added going into East Industrial Park Drive.

Mr. Belanger advised the Chairman that today the Planning Department received two different emails from two separate sources; people who he believes live near the area. One was from **Ben & Sharon Adams** of 21 Waverly Street and the other was from **Joseph Collins**. The Board took a moment to review the emails.

Chairman Harrington advised that one of the emails that came in was from the gentleman that just spoke and the other one had a very similar theme. He asked if either Mr. Rice or Mr. Duval would like to give any light to some of the comments that were given tonight. He said the Board also heard those concerns in the past meetings, especially in reference to taking a left out of Elton Avenue.

Mr. Duval said that was incorporated into their traffic study from the beginning. They have examined conditions at Elton Avenue and Candia Road. He said it was clearly true that there is a serious traffic problem at Elton Avenue. There are lengthy delays trying to make a left out of that site in the morning. Luckily Elton Avenue connects through Waverly actually to Holt Avenue to East Industrial. It is about a 1.2 mile circuit if you are at the first house on Elton Avenue to make it around to that signal so luckily those people do have another way out so there is that opportunity to make a safe left at reasonable level of service. Perhaps more importantly, the problem on Candia Road is really a queueing problem that is caused by the conditions at East Industrial basically backing up across the site and this queue

backs up across the Dunkin Donuts driveway and backs up all the way to Elton Avenue and around the corner and back up the ramp onto the highway in worst conditions. By making the improvement at East Industrial Drive that queue is resolved and drops down to just a few hundred feet and doesn't even get back as far as the Dunkin Donuts driveway by making that improvement on East Industrial that allows that free right to turn the corner and by resolving that queue that solves a lot of the problem that the property owners on Elton Avenue talked about. It at least gives them an opportunity to make a right turn. The left turns are just as difficult. They are no more difficult and, in fact, they are a little bit easier to the extent that they are not blocked.

As a further improvement that they could make, Mr. Duval said there was a discussion of putting "Do Not Block" markings in front of Elton Avenue on Candia Road, which has proven to be effective on Brown Avenue. He said they could certainly do that and at least if it does back up that far it will help encourage people to leave an opening for the Elton Avenue people to get out. The good news is that will be a much rarer occurrence, if ever, backing up that far once the East Industrial improvement is made. As such, it will really make a substantial improvement in the operation of that corridor from the highway all the way to East Industrial Drive and that will improve conditions at Elton Avenue and he thinks this is a significant benefit for that neighborhood and it will make life easier to get in and out of Elton Avenue.

Going back over the notes from the August meeting, Mr. Guerra said there was also something about the left turn access into Elton Avenue westbound being able to turn in and they were going to be extending the left turn lane. He asked if any thought had been given to that; coming the other way (westbound coming from East Industrial). Mr. Duval did not recall that they ever anticipated doing any improvements into Elton Avenue. First of all the volume is very small and by memory there are only two vehicles making left turns into Elton Avenue in the morning. As such, there would really be no reason to extend the lane beyond what exists. Also, that movement is not terrible. He said that movement operates at an "A" so it is essentially not delayed except by blocking, which they are going to fix. As such, making that left in is not a problem so he wasn't sure if that was a misquote.

Mr. Guerra said they talked about the "Do Not Block" painting on the street, which will probably help to lighten the load also just by allowing that to be open from both sides. Mr. Duval said it certainly can't hurt and they are willing to make that "Do Not Block" part of it.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if the State would have an issue with putting that "Do Not Block" on the pavement because if there were a queue that made it to the off-ramp, that would exacerbate that. Mr. Duval said it is almost an exact analogy to the Brown Avenue ramps, which are also under State control. He expects if they allowed it on Brown Avenue that they would also allow it here.

Mr. LeClerc agreed that the "Do Not Block" will help, but he still sees an issue unless both lanes are actually backed up to allow cars in and out of there.

Alderman Levasseur thought the "Do Not Block" was a good idea and that it should definitely be part of the conditions

The Alderman asked if there was a curb cut when coming into the project off of Candia Road or if it is like an open parking lot. Mr. Duval said there are actually two entrances to the Dunkin Donuts.

When taking the right to go to the drive-thru, the Alderman asked if there is a little space then a barrier and then an open space to get out. Mr. Duval said there was a curb and a grass island before the drive-thru and then another curb and grass island before the parking lot. Chairman Harrington asked if it was detailed in the site plan that they are making those modifications to Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Rice said it might show up clearer on the colored plan.

Mr. Belanger referred to the blue sidewalk drawing from the MTA and the School District and asked for clarification that Mr. Rice and Mr. Duval are comfortable with the sidewalk area depicted in blue. He advised that the School District is proposing that basically after the parking lot near the clubhouse that the sidewalk be entirely filled out on the eastern side of that driveway. In other words, the crosswalk would not occur right after the egress from the drive-thru. He said if they did it on both sides that would be fine. Mr. Duval said the plan that they will be constructing has the sidewalk the entire length of the east side. They are going to preserve the crosswalk at the Dunkin Donuts in case somebody wants to walk there, but the sidewalk will go continuously from Candia Road on the east side of the access drive all the way up to the first parking lot on the east side.

For the record, Chairman Harrington advised that the email from Ben & Sharon Adams of 21 Waverly Street would be made part of the record even though it wasn't fully read into the record.

There were no further comments from the public or the Board members.

Chairman Harrington closed this public hearing and said it will be deliberated at the next business meeting.

Ms. Goucher confirmed with the Chairman that all of the applications (S-6-2015, SP-12-2015/PD-04-2015 and SP-13-2015) were closed.

*With respect to the following applications, 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 determine the applications complete and conduct a public hearing. A motion would be in order.)*

***Mr. Roy made a motion to accept the new applications and conduct a public hearing, which was seconded by Mr. McCue. (Motion Carried)***

**2. SP-33-2015**

**Property located at 795 Grove Street (Tax Map 129, Lot 1), a site plan application for a proposed communications head-end building of approximately 496 SF, associated parking, utilities, and landscaping within the RDV Zone on a leased portion of Tax Map 129, Lot 1. *McLane Middleton, Professional Association for Verizon Wireless***

Chris Swiniarski, an attorney for Verizon Wireless, advised that they are seeking site plan approval for what they think is a very minor project that they are proposing on Grove Street but has the ramifications of being a very major benefit for the City. This building is what they call head-end and it is part of a new technology emerging where they will be augmenting their existing network by placing antennas on existing utility poles and other places where they can put something that is very, very small. They are able to address the incredible increase in demand for wireless service without having to build new towers and new macro facilities such as large rooftop facilities in certain areas where the demand is very dense.

Attorney Swiniarski said this is a small 496 SF building that is very innocuous. They chose this spot because it is a good location to the existing fiber optic infrastructure in the City, which is obviously part of this and how this connects to the installations that will be on utility poles and in other places. This particular lot allowed them the opportunity to use just a corner of it and still leave the remaining lot for development. Otherwise, they would have been buying a full large lot and they would put this building on it and the rest of it could end up blighted.

The Attorney advised that a few variances were needed to do this, which they obtained from the ZBA about three weeks ago.

Mr. Kizak referred to sheet Z-3 and said note #3 indicated that the surveyed work was based upon a prior plan. He asked if their engineer had gone out to the site to look at the property. The applicant said they actually had an instrument survey done subsequent to that. Mr. Kizak said based upon the note it wasn't clear that they were even at the site to develop this plan. The applicant advised that they were absolutely at the site many times. He explained that a full survey was not initially done for this plan, but they have been there many times and subsequently a full survey has been completed.

Chairman Harrington asked if there was a plan to subdivide this at some time as they had mentioned potential future development of the area that is not currently being improved. Attorney Swiniarski said there is certainly a plan for development on the remaining part of the property and it was their preference to do that by easement. He explained that the owner of the property would prefer subdivision and they are still trying to negotiate that; but right now the plan is to do this via easement. The owner of the property is very adamant about developing that portion of the property and there were several requirements for them that are there simply to preserve the owner's ability to develop it. It is really what all the screening is about.

Mr. Roy said it looked like there are only two parking spaces so there won't be many people in this building. Attorney Swiniarski said they are really not parking spaces. There won't be anybody at this building. The Attorney explained that there is one of these going into every city in New Hampshire so what he has explained to people is that there will be a vehicle parked there occasionally, but that vehicle will be parked less than the mailman is parked in front of your mailbox. It's very rare.

Mr. Roy asked if there would be any signage. Attorney Swiniarski said there would be no signage other than just a small placard on the door.

Mr. Roy asked about the landscape plan that depicts trees. He said there aren't any trees now so there is no doubt that it will be an improvement. Attorney Swiniarski said this is the sum of the landscaping they are proposing. He explained that they are trying to do this as minimal as possible and to use the minimum amount of land that they need to do this. Mr. Roy asked what type of trees they are proposing. Attorney Swiniarski said they have it listed as arborvitaes because that is typically preferred for screening. If there is a different species of tree that is preferred he said they can do that within reason as long as it is not something exotic.

Ms. Goucher advised that there are four waivers that the applicant has submitted. One of them is the waiver for the landscape plan. Generally if and when the Board is of the opinion to grant such a waiver from actually preparing a landscape plan that is signed by a landscape architect, and waive the irrigation, it still generally falls to the staff to make sure there is at least some adequate screening on the development. As such, as the Attorney has represented they are willing to put in some reasonable landscaping but they are asking the Board to grant them a waiver from the complete landscaping plan.

Mr. Clement asked if anyone would be going by to cut the lawn or trim the bushes to make sure it is kept up and doesn't get "weedy" and things of that nature. Attorney Swiniarski advised that they have maintenance for all of their facilities all over America. There won't be a lawn to cut, but the trees will be pruned as needed. Mr. Clement asked if garbage will be cleaned up. The Attorney said their sites don't have any garbage on them and they keep them in incredibly good condition and he thinks what they are proposing will be quite a bit better than is there now and what has been there historically.

With respect to the waiver for a drainage plan, Mr. Boissonneault asked how much total impervious they are creating. Attorney Swiniarski advised that they don't have that information listed here but he will provide that. Mr. Boissonneault asked if they would be raising that paved area up because currently the grades fall off toward the back of the parking area so the street will drain into their site at the existing grade. Attorney Swiniarski advised that there wasn't any indication on the plan that it was going to be raised up; it should be at the existing grade as the site is completely flat. When he drove by it recently he didn't recall perceiving that it was lower. Mr. Boissonneault said in looking at the topographical map their property is 284 perhaps less and the street is at 285. He said if they curbed the back of that paved area they will end up with a big puddle. The Attorney asked if there was a suggestion as to what they should do. He didn't think it warranted a full drainage plan. Mr. Boissonneault said if they have curbing in the back there would at least have to be a break in it to let the water out. Attorney Swiniarski said they were not proposing curbing. Mr. Boissonneault thought it would make more sense to have the curbing but bring the grade up at the back. If there is a suggestion on things of that nature, the Attorney said they are happy to go whichever way the Board would like them to go because their plan and purpose for this is not impeded either way by any requirement like that. In that case, Mr. Boissonneault suggested that they bring up the back of that paved area to 285 instead of 284 and then it will flow out to the street.

Ms. Goucher advised that staff submitted the plan to the Highway Department as well as a follow up, however, they have not yet received a comment from them so they may have a comment just about the grades. Further to that, on this type of a project, staff would probably want some kind of a condition that when they are ready to apply for a building permit they would probably want to see the proposed grades and how it will all work out on a plot plan. She said they have gotten away from that

typically, but there are some small sites where those kinds of issues become a bit problematic and they would rather catch it before they start the installation rather than see the problem at the end.

Mr. McCue asked if the chain link fence around the building will have barbed wire along the top. Attorney Swiniarski said they typically do that but they may not have proposed that here. Mr. McCue said it is on the plan. Because there are a lot of kids in that neighborhood so he thought barbed wire was a little intense. He asked if they had considered putting colored slats in the chain link fence to make it a little more aesthetically pleasing. Attorney Swiniarski said they could put slats in the fence and that they do that when Boards require it.

Mr. O'Brien asked what the exterior of the building is. Attorney Swiniarski said it is going to look like brick although it actually isn't masonry. He said they haven't determined exactly which material they will use but it will probably be a fiber board of sorts.

Mr. O'Brien thought a wooden fence would be a little more appropriate for residential. He asked if the Board requested a wooden fence if that would be too extreme for them. Attorney Swiniarski said his biggest problem with a wooden fence is the size of this. In thinking about what this will look like with a wooden fence he said "it's a big wall" and it won't look good, but that is something they can do if the Board wants.

Mr. O'Brien asked why they have bollards out front in the vehicle area. In addition, he said it looked like the profile of the building shows a curb in front but it doesn't look like it in plan view. He said the plan looks like it has double lines along the edge of the pavement, which is typically the symbol for a curb of some sort. If they are doing curbing, he asked if they could extend it across the front of the building and they wouldn't have to do bollards. Attorney Swiniarski said they do have to do bollards because they cannot have a vehicle hit this. Mr. O'Brien was concerned about the abutters having to look at the bollards out their front windows. Attorney Swiniarski said they will see these bollards but this is not on the front face of the building, it is on the side of the building from the vantage point of the street.

Mr. Kizak asked about snow removal. Attorney Swiniarski said they don't have to clear the entire paved area of snow but there does need to be access for a vehicle. He pointed out the area where snow would be stored.

With respect to the three plantings along Grove Street, Mr. Kizak asked if they would entertain making one of those a canopy tree such as a maple tree. He pointed out that there is a list of acceptable street trees in the Planning regulations. Ms. Goucher advised that the staff could work with him on the type and specie of tree. There are lots of deciduous trees that have a column like growth appearance that will still provide a street tree without necessarily encumbering overhead wires. Mr. Kizak said he would be happy with staff doing that.

Alderman Levasseur asked if this is a mini version of a cell tower and if they will be able to replace cell towers with buildings like this. Attorney Swiniarski said this is one component of a network that replaces the need for cell towers. This is not a mini cell tower and this does not obviate the need for

existing cell towers. This allows them to expand and enhance the network without having to put up new towers.

Alderman Levasseur inquired about health issues or neighborhood issues. Attorney Swiniarski said this is just equipment inside what is essentially a concrete vault. This doesn't affect the neighborhood at all. The Alderman asked if this had to be approved by the FCC or the Federal Government. The Attorney said there are no radio emissions from this, there are no antennas and it is not a cell site.

Alderman Levasseur asked if it is strictly telephone. Attorney Swiniarski said it is data processing and is strictly wireless. The Alderman confirmed with Attorney Swiniarski that it is not for cable.

Ms. Goucher advised that their site plan shows that there is an existing utility pole in the middle of their proposed driveway. She asked if they are proposing to relocate the utility pole or if they are going to shift the driveway. Attorney Swiniarski said it is right at the corner of the driveway. Ms. Goucher referred to Z-4; it is clearly in the driveway. She said it may be possible to reduce the entrance to 22 or 20 feet if that is adequate and they can avoid moving it. Otherwise, the plan should reflect a relocated utility pole. Attorney Swiniarski said they are not going to relocate a utility pole. Ms. Goucher advised that they would then have to relocate the driveway. The attorney said that was not a problem.

Ms. Goucher advised that they stated at the beginning of their presentation that the owner of the property has plans for development on the site. She said staff hasn't seen anything yet so they are not aware of what is being proposed. However, if Verizon maintains an easement on their property as opposed to have it being a subdivided lot and recognizing this as a principle structure, then any additional development that occurs on the remainder lot is going to have some relationship to this as multiple principle buildings on one lot. As such, she said they may be better off looking at subdividing a piece and letting the owner develop the rest regardless of what is going on at this corner. Attorney Swiniarski said they would look into that.

Mr. Guerra explained that when you have two structures on a piece of property they have to work with each other. In other words, if the owner decides to develop that piece of property with the applicant's being a leased piece, because it is considered a principle structure, the City looks at it as whatever they develop on that other piece of property must be cohesive with this piece. If they were to subdivide they would have their own piece of land and they could do what they want and the owner can develop and do what he wants. Attorney Swiniarski stated that the owner wants this subdivided. He went on to say, "That's fine, we can do that."

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public. No one came forward either in favor of or in opposition to this application and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.

Mr. O'Brien asked if there will be a revised plan before they vote on this at the business meeting in two weeks because they are looking at a new configuration of the parking lot, there may or may not be curbing and when you look at the layout of the trees they are all over the place. He doesn't think that they can actually fit them where they are proposing them right now. Ms. Goucher advised that landscaping is something that the Board typically delegates to staff.

Ms. Goucher said it was unusual that they haven't gotten comments back from Highway. She knows they have been very busy. She doesn't know if they would have some comment affecting the drainage of this site. If the Board wants to see some additional modifications they could keep it open for two weeks and staff could bring forth a recommendation then and potentially some modifications to the plan. It doesn't negate the possibility of staff bringing forward a recommendation in two weeks, but it would at least keep it open for the Board to consider some modifications that they are suggesting. Staff is not a proponent of closing public hearings when the Board has asked for new information to see.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the Board would be opposed to leaving the hearing open and having them do a quick presentation in two weeks and possibly vote on it at that meeting.

Attorney Swiniarski said he had no problem revising a plan for the Board but asked for clarification on what revisions he needs to make.

Mr. Roy said this lot has been vacant and growing tumble weeds for many years. He said it is going to look a whole lot better than what it is now. He doesn't think there is a need to keep the hearing open but he doesn't have a problem with it but he doesn't want to hold them up because to him this is a no brainer. There is nothing in there and the issue about the subdivision is the owner's problem. He said if the Board wants to give them some specific things to look at, he thinks they are all very minor, but he would like to see this get done.

Mr. Boissonneault said he didn't want to hold them up either but they are asking for a waiver on a drainage plan. He realized that it is the size of a postage stamp, but because they are asking for a waiver he would like to hear from the Highway Department before voting on that. He has no problem voting on it in two weeks, but he would like to hear from Highway first.

Chairman Harrington polled the Board about holding this application open for two weeks to let the applicant revise the plan. Ms. Goucher said it would be an opportunity for the staff to let the Board know what the Highway Department has to say.

The items the Board requested the applicant address were as follows:

- Adding slats in the chain link fence. (Color to be determined by staff.)
- No barbed wire on the fence.
- Modify the driveway entrance.
- Make one of the three trees shown along Grove Street a canopy tree.
- Submit a waiver request for curbing.
- Remove the double line on the edge of pavement on the plan if no curbing.
- Identify what the building material will be on the exterior of the building.

Chairman Harrington advised that this application will remain open until the next meeting on March 17, 2016. Staff will be prepared to have a recommendation and, assuming the public hearing is closed, the Board could then render a decision that night. There will be no further notice to abutters.

**3. SP-03-2016**

**Property located at 235 Myrtle Street (Tax Map 24, Lot 22), a site plan application for a proposed entrance canopy for the Mt. Carmel Nursing Home, of approximately 935 SF, with a newly proposed horseshoe drive, landscaping, and associated site improvements. The proposal will add one additional curb cut and relocate one existing curb cut on Myrtle Street within the C-1 Zone. *Nobis Engineering, Inc. for Mount Carmel Rehabilitation and Nursing Center***

Chris Netto of Nobis Engineering appeared along with Shawn Bolduc of Lavallee Brensinger Architects and Joe Bohunicky from Catholic Charities of New Hampshire.

Mr. Netto advised that Mount Carmel Nursing Home is a 20-bed nursing facility that is owned and operated by Catholic Charities of New Hampshire. The building has been there since the late 1960's. The purpose of their application is to add a safe and visible entrance to the front of the building on Myrtle Street, something that currently is not there. They are proposing to add a covered canopy and a horseshoe driveway around the front with four parking spaces. That will allow residents and visitors and ambulances to safely drop people off at the front door. Some of the visitors have trouble finding exactly where the front door to the facility is now so this will enhance that. The horseshoe driveway is 22 feet wide. There will be four parking spaces out front. In addition, they are re-striping the two parking lots on either side of the building to provide for a total of 60 parking spaces. They are closing one driveway up on Myrtle Street, which is on the westerly side of the building. That parking lot is currently one way, but since they are closing a driveway off they are going to make it two-way and that will be limited to employee parking so that people coming in and out of that parking lot know exactly where they are going. They are adding a small sign in front of the building.

Mr. Netto advised that they were at the Zoning Board in December and they were granted some relief on setback for the canopy as well as lot coverage, which they have increased to 81% as well as some relief on parking and stall size and aisle widths of the existing parking lots that are there.

Shawn Bolduc said the materials they plan to use are metal panels. The intent of the main canopy is to have acrylic between the two metal panels, which will be softly backlit to create a lantern effect. Cantilevered off the building side of that car canopy will be a pedestrian coverage. It won't be attached to the building and is a standalone structure. It is just to provide a little additional coverage from weather and there will be some soft seating under there. There is a lot of stone on the chapel side of this building and they are going to incorporate that into the columns. They also submitted a landscape plan. They are proposing a rain garden out front to accommodate the additional runoff from the additional impervious area. They are protecting a very large beech tree on the east side of the front and supplementing with shrubs and perennial grasses as well.

Mr. Kizak said it was a nice looking plan. Regarding the parking lot on the west side that is going to be for employees only, he noted that all of the handicap accessible spaces on the plan are within that parking lot. He wasn't sure if they really needed three handicap employee parking spaces and none for visitors. He thought the location of some of the handicap spots should be revisited.

Mr. Kizak advised that the notes indicate that the sidewalk going in where the curb cut was removed off the same lot was bituminous. He did not recall what the existing sidewalk is made of on that side but whatever goes back should match what's there.

With respect to the handicap spaces, Mr. Bolduc explained that the challenge with this site is in order to meet the ADA and the slope of the parking spaces; that is the only place within both parking lots that meets the ADA slope requirements. Mr. Kizak said he was looking at this from the perspective of if that is a lot that is marked as "employee parking" and you come in there needing a handicap space to visit your Aunt Mildred where do you go. He said you can't go to the visitor lot because there isn't a place and you can't go to the employee lot because you're not an employee.

With respect to the horseshoe turnaround, Mr. O'Brien asked if there was any thought to just coming in the existing curb cuts and coming across the front yard and going out the other one. Mr. Netto said that was a good question and that they looked at a bunch of alternatives. The reason they didn't run straight across the front of the building was because of the beech tree on the east side. It is a very significant tree and they did not want to lose that tree. They then looked at if they could just come in one side and then out to Myrtle Street and Catholic Charities was really concerned about the traffic flow and people understanding that this is the primary entrance for the facility and a drop off for everyone. As such, they really thought the horseshoe was the best way and the safest way to get people into the front door to be dropped off and then back out so if they wanted to park either on the street or in either parking lot they could do so.

Mr. O'Brien felt like the overhang is going to be a really strong indicator that this is the front door. They could almost fix their ADA compliance issue by sharing that entrance so they could combine those curb cuts, provide visitors to come in and pull a quick right there and then cut across and go out the other side of the horseshoe. Mr. Netto said they have looked at almost every alternative that they could think of and Catholic Charities' preference really was the horseshoe shape. Mr. Bohunicky said on the west side of the property between their horseshoe and what is proposed to be employee parking is a PIV valve and a storm drain that goes out to the road that they didn't want to be impeded upon. With regard to the employee parking Mr. Netto advised that Mr. Dangora, who is one of the facility's project managers, said that because all of the handicap spaces are located on that westerly parking lot they won't restrict it to just employees but they will also encourage visitors and residents to park in the other parking lot so they will be able to use those spaces. The Chairman asked if that is something they would do with signage. He suggested a sign saying "Employee and Handicap Parking". Mr. Netto said they find that signage works to a certain degree but really education of the people visiting is the best way.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public. No one came forward either in favor of or in opposition to this application.

There were no further comments from the Board and Chairman Harrington closed this public hearing.

**5. CU-04-2016**

**Property located at 587 Maple Street (Tax Map 24, Lot 24), an application for a Conditional Use permit to allow other business and professional offices within the C-1 Zone. *New Hampshire Catholic Charities***

**6. CU-05-2016**

**Property located at 587 Maple Street (Tax Map 24, Lot 24), an application for a Conditional Use permit to reduce the required parking within the C-1 Zone. *New Hampshire Catholic Charities***

Chairman Harrington recused himself from these applications and Vice Chairman Clement acted as Chairman.

Jocelyn Weise, and attorney at Sheehan & Phinney, appeared on behalf of Catholic Charities along with Harry Dangora, a project manager at Catholic Charities.

Attorney Wiese advised that they have applied for two conditional use permits; one for a change of use from a single family home to professional office space and the second for a parking reduction from five off-street spaces to one off-street space. As shown on floor plans that were submitted, Catholic Charities intends to purchase a property in order to move its IT Department from 593 Maple Street to this property. She explained that the department has outgrown its space and is looking to move three of its IT employees to this property. Catholic Charities will be working within the existing layout. There is room for four offices on the first floor of the property and the second floor will be used for storage. There are currently only three IT employees but they may hire an additional one in the future. The commercial office use is authorized within this zone and they think it will be compatible with the neighborhood. Catholic Charities owns the Bishop Peterson residence next door and also has offices on Myrtle Street as well as the Mount Carmel Nursing Home. By allowing the change of use from the single family home to the office space will allow Catholic Charities to remain all in one area.

Attorney Wiese advised that they have also submitted an application for a parking reduction to one space. There is about 1,600 SF of floor area on the first and second floors of the home as well as some additional space in the basement. The one parking space will be located in the garage shown on the plan. They had originally shown two additional parking spaces in the driveway; however, after the zoning review it was determined that the driveway is not wide enough to have the two legal spaces. They believe there is sufficient on street parking in the area in order to accommodate the building. There is on street parking on Maple Street, Pearl Street and Orange Street that they believe will be sufficient. As mentioned above, they will be moving existing employees to this property. It is not going to be additional employees that will need parking, they have already had to use parking in this area.

Chairman Clement turned the hearing over to the public. No one came forward either in favor of or in opposition to these applications and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.

Mr. Roy asked if these two properties are going to be merged. Attorney Wiese said at this point in time they are not going to be merged. Mr. Roy asked if they merged them, if it would relieve them from the burden of having the cars park too close to the property line. Attorney Wiese said that would allow for parking in that driveway area possibly but that's not their current plan. Mr. Roy asked where the one car is going to park. Attorney Wiese said in the garage.

Chairman Clement closed this public hearing to be deliberated at the business meeting.

Chairman Harrington returned and closed the March 3, 2016 public hearing of the Manchester Planning Board.

**III. LIMITED BUSINESS MEETING:**

*(Tabled Items)*

***Mr. Roy made a motion to take SP-08-2015/PD-05-2015, CU-04-2015 and CU-05-2015 off the table for discussion, which was seconded by Mr. Boissonneault. (Motion Carried)***

**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. Belanger reminded the Board that this application first came before them in May 2015 and it was an application for two CU's as well as a planned development. The basic overall idea is that there is a church existing at 53 Mammoth Road and they are interested in adding an additional principle structure to the site that will be a congregation center where they can hold various events for the church. The representation at the hearing was that everyone who attended the service would go over to this building afterwards. There wouldn't be a significantly higher number of people; it would just be used in conjunction with the people who are already attending the church. The Board closed the public hearing and then it went to the business meeting afterwards. One of the outstanding issues was under the planned development criteria where the buildings must be architecturally tied in together. That was an issue that was left to staff to discuss with the applicant and try to bring the two buildings closer together than they initially proposed. That is still an ongoing issue and it has been on the docket ever since. At the meeting in December, the Board requested that the applicant provide something in writing to let the Board know what is going on with the project and if they are making progress. In January they provided a letter requesting a 45 day extension to work out the architectural issues. That 45 days expired and Mr. Belanger has been in discussion with the new chairman of the Board and

talked to him about what is required. As of today, the drawing in front of the Board was submitted to the Planning Department for staff to review.

Mr. Belanger advised that the paper he handed out has two sides to it. There is one that is upright if you look at it in portrait view and there is one that is in landscape view. The landscape view is the new one. The portrait one shows what they submitted for an architectural elevation back in May 2015, which is a barn style building with barn doors on the side and the church is more of a 1970's architecture and they were not viewed as necessarily compatible. The drawing dated February 27, 2016 shows that they have made some modifications. The barn doors are gone and there are some differences on the windows on the side.

Mr. Belanger stated that the posture at this point is that the hearing has been closed and the Board delegated this to staff to look at. Having just received this today, he said staff would be happy to continue to discuss this with the applicant but they just wanted to show it to the Board.

Mr. Kizak did not see it as very much of a change other than a couple of lights and a different surround around the door and he said it still doesn't relate. He said he was the one who made the motion to have them submit something or get this off of the docket and he doesn't feel like they came very far at all. He hates having something just sit on the table because other applicants then look at that and get the impression that the Board is holding up development in the City, which is clearly not the case. It has been on the docket for a year and he thinks it is time for them to start over.

Chairman Harrington agreed that there wasn't a significant change. He was in line with Mr. Kizak in that he doesn't want to have things hanging on the docket.

Mr. Belanger advised if the Board wanted to have them start over the process that they would likely want to take is to make a decision on this and say that it does not meet the criteria of a planned development and it would be disapproved likely without prejudice allowing them to file a new application. The downside to this - which was expressed to staff by their representative Joe Wichert - is that they are a small church without a lot of funds, which was the Board's thought on this 45 days ago. He said they have a new chairman on their church board who seems pretty interested in moving this along and complying with what the Board wants. Staff would be happy to communicate the Board's "less than thrilled" response with this drawing and then report back to the Board at the business meeting in two weeks.

In response to the Board suggesting that they go back to their architect, Ms. Goucher said in looking at the drawings, the plans are done by Geo Barns so they are working with a company that typically provides barnlike structures so there are probably some limitations within their palate of the type of buildings that they would typically design and build. If they had gone with an architect, potentially they would have had a different project that would have come forward.

Mr. McCue said it is time to basically "cut bait on this one". He appreciated that it is small church without a lot of money, but the plans are too much for a church that doesn't have a lot of money. He doesn't think they will be able to come up with a design that the Board would be satisfied with. As

such, he thinks they really have to go back to the drawing board and rethink it and see if they can come up with something better.

Mr. Guerra said where this building is located it cannot be seen from the street. He doesn't know why the Board is giving them such a hard time with this particular building. He said making it match is a relative thing in that what matches in one person's eyes doesn't necessarily match in another's eyes. It is a clean building in a space that they are going to utilize and it is not an ugly building. He doesn't know that he would give them this much of a hard time on this.

Mr. Roy agreed with both Mr. McCue and Mr. Guerra. He asked how long the new leader of the church has been in that position. Mr. Belanger said the new chairman only told him that he was "relatively new". Mr. Roy asked if he was the one who has been working on this thing for the 45 days that the Board gave them because if he was then there is no hope that anything else is going to come forward. He kind of felt how Mr. Guerra did about the fact that it is in the back, etc. but then again he agreed with Mr. McCue in that they have rules that they have to abide by. He doesn't think it is that difficult to make something relate. He said it has been so long since the Board has looked at this.

Mr. Roy asked if there were other outstanding issues. Mr. Belanger said there were a few but the question is really how much of those issues fall under this Board's purview versus how much of them are things that can be sorted out between the applicant and the Fire Department and the building process of this. Ms. Goucher explained that it wasn't exterior fire access issues; it was internal issues. Mr. Belanger said he made that clear to applicant.

The other outstanding issues were that they mentioned they were storing totes internally to the building and there was a flammability issue with that. Mr. Belanger's recollection with that is that Peter Lennon, the Fire Marshal, thought that was a violation of the fire code. The major issue for them and the cost issue that drove a lot of the delay was the requirement that this structure have sprinklers. The reason the sprinklers were required was because they were showing a mezzanine on the second level that was mostly open but it was almost like a catwalk around the perimeter of the interior. That as well as the first floor configuration he thought brought the assembly numbers up to a level to which the Fire Code requires a sprinkler. Therefore, they were trying to work out if they should sprinkle the building or if they could somehow change the interior design to reduce the total number of assembly. He believes they are still working on that and the new chairman mentioned that they are hoping to increase some of the office space, which would reduce some of the space left over for assembly so it would bring them under that threshold. Mr. Belanger said this might be more of a Building permitting issue than a Planning Board issue. Mr. Roy said it sounded as if their plans have been changed or are going to change and the Board didn't see the plans that they are going to vote on. Mr. Belanger didn't know how much they have changed internally.

To Mr. McCue's point about the rules and what they actually say, Mr. Belanger read a sentence under the planned development standard under the Zoning Ordinance that states, "The principle and any accessory structures and uses of a planned development shall relate to the character and purpose of the planned development." As such, what they are considering here is if they relate to the character and purpose.

Mr. Guerra said the answer is yes in that the character is the church and the purpose is assembly. He said they are not talking about the character of the building materials. There was a conversation between the Board members as to what their interpretations were concerning what must relate.

Ms. Goucher advised that there are three applications associated with this. If the majority of the Board feels that the latest sketch doesn't address the concerns that were brought up before, staff would like to hear that opinion or if the consensus of the Board is that they think it is fine, they would like to hear that because then staff can go back and tell the applicant that either it looks like the Board is on board with what they are trying to do or that the Board is not satisfied. She said staff can bring a recommendation forward in two weeks that addresses all of the issues because the planned development and site plan are one aspect of the application, the use is another and the parking is another. Chances are if they are not going to look favorably upon this other principle structure, then they will have to carefully craft recommendations on all three.

Mr. McCue said they would have to be careful who votes for this because this hearing was closed before some of current Board members were on the Board. Mr. Belanger advised that Mr. O'Brien was recused from this as he is a direct abutter. Ms. Goucher said there are eight Board members who have been here the whole time.

Mr. Boissonneault asked Mr. Belanger to re-read the PD language. Mr. Belanger said there are three criteria to the planned development section of the Ordinance. This is Article 5.1(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.

- A. *The principle and any accessory structures and uses of a planned development shall relate to the character and purpose of the planned development. Buildings shall be considered separate and unattached if not connected by ancillary features such as, but not limited to fences, breezways...*
- B. *A residential planned development shall not exceed the dwelling unit density of a standard subdivision which would be allowed under subdivision control.*
- C. *A planned development, residential or non-residential, shall be appropriate to the surrounding neighborhood in terms of character, scale and density and shall not distract from the surrounding neighborhood.*

Mr. Belanger said they are really discussing the first sentence of the first criteria. The key sentence that seems to be the crux of this issue is "The principle and any accessory structures and uses of a planned development shall relate to the character and purpose of the planned development." Mr. Guerra said what would be in direct opposition to the character would be a cinder block eight bay garage building in the back of this church. That would not be working with the character. He does not think an assembly building that is new, attractive and taken care of impedes the character.

Mr. Roy said he was not happy with the new rendition.

Chairman Harrington said they could put it back on the table and let staff go back to them and advise that it must architecturally relate to the building that is already there.

Ms. Goucher said staff is trying to determine who is happy and not happy with the rendering. Chairman Harrington said he didn't see much change from what they came up with before so he is not really happy with what they came back with. It was the consensus of the Board, other than Mr. Guerra, that they were unhappy.

Mr. Guerra stated that he did not want them building something that looks like the church because the church is a cinder block building.

Mr. Boissonneault said if they were to consider the pitch of the roof and something with fenestration that would match the existing, then he would probably go along with that. Mr. Roy agreed.

***Mr. Roy made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Boissonneault, that SP-08-2015/PD-05-2015, CU-04-2015 and CU-05-2015 go back on the table. (Motion Carried) (Opposed: Guerra, McCue)***

**4. S-28-2014**

**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**

This item will remain on the table.

*(Current Items)*

Chairman Harrington recused himself for any action on the next application.

**5. CU-04-2016**

**Property located at 587 Maple Street (Tax Map 24, Lot 24), an application for a Conditional Use permit to allow other business and professional offices within the C-1 Zone. New Hampshire Catholic Charities**

*Mr. McCue made a motion to approve CU-04-2016, which was seconded by Mr. Guerra. (Motion Carried)*

**6. CU-05-2016**

**Property located at 587 Maple Street (Tax Map 24, Lot 24), an application for a Conditional Use permit to reduce the required parking by two spaces within the C-1 Zone. New Hampshire Catholic Charities**

*Mr. Guerra made a motion to approve CU-05-2016, which was seconded by Mr. McCue. (Motion Carried)*

**IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**

**1. Review and approval of the Planning Board Minutes of December 17, 2015, January 7, 2016, January 21, 2016, February 4, 2016 and February 18, 2016.**

Ms. Goucher advised that the January 7<sup>th</sup>, February 4<sup>th</sup> and the February 18<sup>th</sup> Minutes were posted. It was agreed to hold off on the December 17, 2015 Minutes until staff has an opportunity to complete their review of them.

Mr. McCue pointed out some typographical errors to be corrected in the January 7<sup>th</sup> Minutes.

***Chairman Harrington made a motion to approve the January 7, 2016 Minutes with amendments, which was seconded by Mr. O'Brien. (Motion Carried)***

Mr. McCue advised that the Minutes of February 4<sup>th</sup> were the longest (54 pages) that he has ever reviewed and that staff had done a tremendous job as there were very few corrections required. He did, however, point out some errors.

***Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to approve the Minutes of February 4, 2016 with amendments, which was seconded by Mr. Guerra. (Motion Carried)***

***Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to approve the Minutes of February 18, 2016 with one minor amendment, which was seconded by Mr. O'Brien. (Motion Carried)***

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

Ms. Goucher advised that on Wednesday, April 6<sup>th</sup> the New Hampshire Municipal Association will be coming to the Chambers to provide a work session for the Zoning Board members and Planning Board members are also welcome to attend.

***Mr. Guerra made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)***

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_

Michael Harrington, Chairman  
Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD: April 7, 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 Moore, Planning & Community Development*