

**MANCHESTER PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING / BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, July 21, 2016 – 6:00 p.m.
Carol M. Rines Center, 1528 Elm Street, Room 164**

Board Members Present: Chairman Mike Harrington, Vice Chairman Ray Clement, Guy Guerra, Kevin McCue, Pierre Boissonneault, Alderman Pat Long

Alternate Present: Dan LeClerc, Michael O'Donoghue

Excused: Member: Joe Kelly Levasseur
Alternates: Catherine Flinchbaugh

Absent: Jim Roy

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

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

II. PUBLIC HEARING:

(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. Clement made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Guerra, that the applications were complete and to conduct a public hearing. (Motion Carried)

1. S-09-2016

Property located at 401 South Mammoth Road (Tax Map 856 Lot 3), an application to subdivide one parcel of approximately 2.9 acres into 8 single family lots on a new public street within the R-1B zone. Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, Inc. for John Giovagnoli Revocable Trust

Joe Wichert appeared on behalf of the John Giovagnoli Revocable Trust. He advised that this property at one time went all the way across the highway to the south where the farm is. Currently that is also owned by the Giovagnolis. In the 1960's, when they created Interstate 293, the DOT did a "taking" and separated the property so there is now Lot 3 and then on the south side of the highway, there is Lot 4. Currently Lot 3 is a vacant piece of land where the Giovagnoli homestead used to be. It burned down about seven years ago. That house in the southeast corner of the lot next to the garage and the driveway.

The application before the Board this evening is to subdivide the property into eight building lots.

It has frontage on the north by Mooresville Road, frontage on the east by South Mammoth Road, and is bordered on the south by Interstate 293. On the west is the Chartrand's property. The property is zoned R-1B and the application consists of three new lots that are going to front on South Mammoth Road and five lots that will front on a new private road to be created.

Mr. Wichert referred to Sheets S2 and S3, which show the lot areas and buildable areas. The smallest buildable area they have is 8,229 SF and in the R-1B district, 7,500 SF is the minimum required. The largest lot they have is almost 12,800 SF, so the lots comply with the regulations in regard to area.

There are a series of easements on the lots; specifically on Lot 3F in the southwest corner, there is a proposed drainage easement. They have some sewer easements that run on the north and south sides of Lot 3E that head out toward Mammoth Road.

They are asking for two waivers. First, they are looking to reduce the width of the travel surface to 30 feet. The second waiver is in regard to the highway setback. When the Board instituted the new rules in January of this year, they formalized the 100 foot building setback from the highway property. In looking at this proposal, they have two lots that would need that relief: Lots 3, 3E as well as a portion of 3A, however, he thought Lot 3A could be configured to comply.

They have received DPW comments and he believed they could work with DPW to resolve the comments before the next hearing. The issue they have is, without knowing what the Board's preference is regarding the highway waiver, they are at a standstill. They would like to get a decision or at least a polling of the Board to see if they support the waiver request or not. If the Board doesn't support the waiver request, he said they will have to go back and relook at their proposal. If the Board does support it, then they will go back and try to resolve the DPW and Water Works concerns. As to why they think the waiver should be approved, Mr. Wichert said the Interstate is set back almost 72-77 feet off the edge of right-of-way. There is a 20 foot easement on that south side, so from the actual travel surface they aren't really close. The problem they have is that it is a wide right-of-way. There is a lot of green area between the actual pavement on I-293 and the lot. If you measured from the edge of the right-of-way, which is the way the regulation is written; then basically Lot 3E would be eliminated as well as the majority of Lot 3.

Mr. Wichert said that another reason they believe the property is deserving of the waiver request is because this area is in the Navigational district so the houses are being soundproofed. They are going to have central air, extra insulation, heavier windows, etc. That work will be done no matter if they build 100 feet or 30 feet off of the highway. That is another unique feature of this property that warrants consideration of the request.

Lastly, Mr. Wichert said the Giovagnolis as a family have gone through two or three iterations of takings from DOT. In the 1960's, this used to be one contiguous piece of land. The State came in to build I-293 and separated the land and basically turned the western part of Lot 4, which is the southerly lot, into a swamp. Therefore, the loss of the two lots on this property, which is really the last piece of property that the trust owns which is developable.

Chairman Harrington asked the Board if they had any questions regarding the issue of the waiver for the proximity of the interstate.

The Chairman asked if the State has approached the applicant regarding anything else to do with the shifting of the property line or perhaps a taking along that edge or if there is a long-term plan for I-293 that might actually move that boundary even further into their land. The applicant advised that the State has not approached them about expanding this lot line or anything like that. He is unaware of what the long-term plan is for I-293.

Mr. McCue asked if there would be a request to the State to build a sound barrier or if there is enough of a natural buffer there to act as a sound barrier for the development. The applicant, Mr. Giovignoli, said at this point in time he would not be requesting the State to build a sound wall. He said about 30 years ago, the State asked his mother if she wanted a sound wall and she said no because it would block her view.

The applicant advised that he had a discussion about four years ago with the DOT when they were taking the land at 725 Mammoth Road and he asked about a sound wall on this piece and they said that was not part of the project because that was all part of the expansion from I-93 from Boston up to I-95 in Massachusetts. Mr. McCue reiterated the Chairman's concern about the State stepping in again and wanted more of that easement if that would be a problem if they built that close to it. The applicant said after this development, he didn't know what the State would do.

Mr. Guerra said there were two things he was nervous about. First, he said he wasn't crazy about the houses being that close to the highway. In addition, he said he takes that corner and sits at that intersection every day and he was curious about what effects the existing traffic will have on people trying to get out of that small cul-de-sac, taking a left. He said it is not a fun intersection to sit at.

In terms of re-engineering the site, the Chairman asked Mr. Wichert if the Board did not grant the waiver, if they would not be able to achieve as many housing lots. Mr. Wichert said they would lose two lots.

Regarding Mr. Guerra's comment, Mr. Wichert said in DPW's letter received today they were concerned about the queuing and they were looking for a 12 foot wide easement along Lots 3G, 3C and 3B along the northerly lots. He said this is an eight lot subdivision so they don't necessarily have to do a traffic study per the regulations but because of what Mr. Winslow wrote in his letter they will probably at least take a look at it so they can address it when they come back. From talking to Mr. Winslow, he believed the problem is "today there is an issue". He thought if they took "today" out of the equation, he didn't think adding 80 extra cars total would be a really huge impact on Mammoth Road or even to a lesser degree on Mooresville Road because Mammoth Road is a heavily traveled road. He thought the concern from DPW was that it does back up. Mr. Guerra thought the frustration would be from the people living on the cul-de-sac trying to get out more so than on the people already on Mooresville. Mr. Wichert thought that would be one of

the reasons, if it was warranted, that they would be looking to do the queue lane to pull the line further to the east away from the entrance of the cul-de-sac so there isn't a blocking of the road.

Mr. Guerra asked if that would eat Lots 3C and 3G. Mr. Wichert said it would; however Lot 3B fronts on Mammoth Road so they won't have any frontage issue there. There is 97 feet of frontage so if they lost 12 feet they would be at 85 feet. Lot 3C fronts on the new road and Mooresville so he thought they were good there. Lot 3G has frontage on both so they could take the 12 feet off and because of the size of the lots. He thought they had the area to put it there for the dedication and then they could always take that 20 foot setback along Mooresville Road and increase that to 32 feet or something to allow for the future widening.

Mr. McCue asked if any consideration was given to putting the three street lots on Mooresville Road and accessing the rest of the lots off South Mammoth Road. Mr. Wichert said they looked at four or five different options. He explained if you put the road off of Mammoth Road then they will have lots that will probably have double frontages and he didn't think that was generally a configuration that is encouraged. They looked at actually putting the road along the highway to try and use the right-of-way and where they were coming out at that point on Mammoth Road was more of a concern.

Mr. McCue asked if the creek would be impacted. Mr. Wichert said there is a wetland on the very southwest corner of their property but no matter how they did it they were not going to have any wetland impacts.

Mr. Wichert reiterated that they tried looking at it in different ways and they thought this had the least amount of road to make it work but the downside with this configuration was the buffering. When they started the project, this rule wasn't in writing and in January it became formal.

With regard to the waiver, the Chairman believed the reason it was memorialized in their documents was because of complaints coming in to the City from people who live up against a heavy roadway like this with noise concerns. He asked Mr. Wichert if he could give them anymore "comfort" that the potential buyers, even though they know an interstate runs close to the back of their property, that the City won't be bombarded by complaints regarding traffic noise. In looking at total compliance of the rules, Mr. Wichert said they would just reconfigure and lose Lots 3A and 3. He didn't know if the City would have the same calls for the remainder of the lots because he believes it is a subjective issue. He said there is a lot of airport noise in that area, there will be road noise from Mammoth Road, which is a heavily traveled roadway and there will also be noise from I-293. Being new construction and being built to new standards, he thinks inside of the house probably isn't their concern. He believes the concern is going to be if you are outside in your yard and if that noise level is comfortable or not comfortable. When they looked at it and talked about where they were and they stood 50 feet off the right-of-way versus on Mooresville Road, they didn't take a measurement of it but there is not a noticeable difference in the noise level. He didn't think it is something that precludes enjoyment of your property but he does think that it would obviously need to be something that a buyer would want to consider before they make that purchase. He said they understand the intent of why the Board included it and there was discussion about trying to not have as many unwritten rules and try to write down

the things that have become common practice. He doesn't believe the 100 feet was based on any science and that it would be substantially quieter 20 feet away versus 105 feet. That is what they were looking at and in this instance they have a larger distance from the actual edge of pavement on the highway to the boundary line than is normal, which he thinks works in their favor. There is a 20 foot easement all along that southerly line that basically precludes any development or building so they are somewhere up around 95 feet. If it would make the Board happier to get another 5-10 feet along that line, he thought that was something they could consider and it is not something that would stop development of those two lots.

Chairman Harrington inquired how the Board felt about the waiver.

Mr. McCue said he didn't have a problem with it. Mr. O'Donoghue also didn't have a problem with it.

The Chairman advised Mr. Wichert it appeared that the Board was going in the direction of supporting the waiver request on the distance to the highway. Given that, Mr. Wichert asked if they should address how they thought they would address the concerns of DPW or if he would like them to just resolve them and come back. The Chairman thought it would be good to resolve the issues and come back to the Board.

Mr. Guerra advised that backing up against a highway that tight is a tough sell. It is great for the first person who moves in, but it is not great for somebody who has kids. They are not going to move in there.

When they were doing their "what if's", Mr. Boissonneault asked if they looked at a nine unit planned development. Mr. Wichert said they did. He explained if they did a PD, the street would be nominally shorter but then the homeowners would have to pay to maintain it and he believed that is more a draw on the value of the house than the location. From the family's point of view, they thought this was a better option.

When they looked at the planned unit development, Mr. Boissonneault asked if they were clustering the houses closer to Mooresville. Mr. Wichert said that was the problem because their experience has been if they do a PD with no lot area they are almost impossible to sell.

Chairman Harrington advised that this hearing would be held open until the public hearing in August. The Chair asked if they would be ready for the hearing on August 4th or if they would need more time. The Board had a meeting scheduled for August 18th. The applicant said that date was better.

Ms. Goucher advised that there would be no further notice to abutters and the hearing on the 18th would be held at the Rines Center.

2. **S-10-2016**
Property located at 51 Platts Avenue and 162 Holt Avenue (Tax Map 248, Lots 41 and 48), a

subdivision application to adjust the lot line between Lots 41 and 48 with approximately 3,595 SF transferring from Lot 41 to Lot 48 within the R-1B Zone. *Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, Inc. for Constance Harvey and Joseph & Debra Malynn*

Joe Wichert appeared on behalf of Constance Harvey and Joseph & Debra Malynn. He advised that a previous lot line adjustment was done back in 2002. Mrs. Malynn is Mrs. Harvey's daughter. Mrs. Harvey is getting ready to downsize and move out of the family homestead, which has been in her family for 50-60 years. Over the years, Mr. & Mrs. Malynn have maintained the yard so they store a lot of lawn equipment in that shed. He said the existing lots are much larger than what the R-1B zoning district requirements are. Currently the Harvey residence has almost 24,000 SF and the Malynn residence has 14,800 SF. They are going to take just shy of 3,600 SF from the Harvey residence and annex it onto the Malynn residence. There is no creation of any new building lots. They are going to start with two and finish with two. He didn't believe they needed any waivers or any relief on any other items. It is a straight lot line adjustment and it is really just being done to finalize or help clear up some family estate issues.

Ms. Goucher advised that some of the deck/shed structures were built without benefit of permit so permits would have to be secured for those accessory structures.

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

The Chairman closed this public hearing to be deliberated at the next meeting.

3. S-11-2016

Property located on River Road and Union Street (Tax Map 216, Lot 2 & 3), an application to adjust the lot line between Tax Map 216, Lot 2 and Tax Map 216, Lot 3, with a total area of approximately 25.3 acres, and a subsequent subdivision of Lot 2 into 25 single family lots on a new street in the R-1A Zone. *CLD Consulting Engineers for Manning Hill, LLC*

Charles Sullivan advised that he and his two sisters; Patricia Myers and Deborah Dussault, own this property between Union Street and River Road. He advised that Brian Pratt would present the material that is before the Board but first he wanted to give the Board an overview of the history of the property.

Mr. Sullivan said this was originally a 24 acre property on North Union Street that their parents acquired in 1932. It has since been subdivided twice. He showed an aerial view of the property and advised that his sister, Patricia, owns and lives at 1330 Union Street. The north-south streets of Ray Street, Chestnut Street, Bay Street and Elm Street all dead-end at their south property line. River Road is the western boundary and the northern boundary is the back of the lots off of Heather Street. The other house on the original property is 1300 Union Street, which was built in the 1960's and was sold off by his family. There is a garage and greenhouse that is essentially on the property line between those two properties. He pointed out the parcel in question, which is the roughly 20 acre parcel, which was originally a pasture and it is now fairly heavily wooded.

Mr. Sullivan said the property slopes about 125 feet up from River Road to Union Street. He

pointed out an area where there is quite a steep slope that eventually levels off and slopes up again. There are two major wetlands on the property; one that nearly bisects the property halfway up and a small one at the corner of River Road. This pretty much dictates the development approach to this area because obviously they are not touching those wetlands. They have been looking at this for a couple of years. They consulted with some architects and developers two years ago and then they hired Brian Pratt's firm. He did some studies showing the zoning potential of the area. By right they could do 30 lots for 30 single family houses. In this iteration, there is a street that comes off River Road, curves around avoiding the wetlands, and goes out toward Chestnut Street and a cul-de-sac up toward 1330 Union Street.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he and his sisters are not getting any younger and only Pat resides in Manchester. They all have children but none of their children are interested in maintaining a home here. They wanted to do the responsible thing by this property and they did not think that in this case that a 30 lot subdivision was appropriate for the land or for the north end of Manchester. They looked at another concept of 30 single family condominiums and by that time, his sister decided she wanted to cut off part of the lot and own it personally so that was no longer part of the development proposal.

Mr. Sullivan advised that the plan Mr. Pratt came up with, which has been modified since having a neighborhood meeting in May, comes off the northwest corner of the lot and swings around quite steeply towards the south where there is a pedestrian outlet to Elm Street. The road goes up and creates a cul-de-sac, which is now a dead-end road. They have spoken to the Planning Department and Fire Department and they are okay with it being a dead-end as long as the houses are sprinklered. There is no longer a vehicle access off to Chestnut Street. They feel that the neighborhood and the development would be a benefit by having pedestrian and bicycle access to Chestnut Street and Elm Street. There would also need to be utility access here. Elm Street is paved right to the property line. Chestnut Street is a paper street from the corner of Madeline. There is also a right-of-way that they have left so his sister could eventually develop a couple of lots on this property.

Mr. Sullivan advised that the relief they are looking for is to subdivide this overall lot to create two lots and then subdivide the larger lot for 25 single family houses.

Mr. Sullivan showed a depiction of the right-of-way at the end of Chestnut Street, which has been kept open and maintained by the abutters. From the cul-de-sac he said there is a path for bicycles and pedestrians out to Madeline. They have met on the site and there is a serious drainage issue. The slope not only runs down to River Road but it runs off towards Madeline Street. They have looked at creating a berm, drainage swale, catch basin and a diversion on the south side of the right-of-way to take care of the runoff that has historically been a serious problem for these abutters.

Brian Pratt of CLD Consulting Engineers advised that he was hired to help them figure out some development options and hopefully proceed with the full design on this property. He said Mr. Sullivan did a good job talking about the general layout of the road, the property, sidewalks, etc.

Mr. Pratt referred to the second page of the plan set (SD-1), which is the subdivision plan. It shows the general layout of the road. It comes in off of River Road and snakes up the hill. The grades are steep so the reason the road comes in, takes a quick right and loops around and comes up is to get up the hill without massive excavation. The lots are all at least 12,500 SF with many of them being quite a bit larger. Mr. Pratt pointed out that the hatched areas on the plan are the drainage easements.

Mr. Pratt stated that stormwater is a concern of the neighbors and an AoT permit from DES is required. They have had some challenges in designing the stormwater to make everything work, but he thinks they have a plan that works nicely now.

They received comments back from DPW just a few hours ago as well as from AoT a couple of days ago. He doesn't see any comments that would require them to either move the road or change a lot line significantly so he thinks in general this is the layout.

Mr. Pratt said there are two breaks where the stormwater is. The wetland in the middle of the large wetland is kind of a natural divide in the property so everything above that flows from Union Street and comes down and hits this wetland and flows down off site. They have a large detention pond that is actually called a "micro pool extended detention pond", which provides peak flow mitigation and treatment for the stormwater for the homes and the road. Once you come down around the corner they have a small detention pond to help with the peak flow and then they have a large infiltration pond. Once you come around the corner you come down and all the stormwater is collected and there are two gravel wetlands down by the road. There are two discharge points; one is a culvert in River Road. Everything in the pre-development came down and hit the swale and came out and flowed under the road. They are working with DPW and YDC to try and get an easement to lower the pipe. If they can everything will work great but if they can't then they will just have a little bit of reduced cover. There is a reduction in peak flows for all the storms at both discharge points.

Mr. Pratt said most of the lots will be serviced by gravity sewer. There is no gravity sewer along their frontage in River Road. It is to the north, but they are not capable of connecting to it with gravity so their gravity sewer connection will come down through the Elm Street right-of-way. The City actually just reconstructed this portion and they left them a sewer manhole right on the edge of pavement so they are going to tie in with their gravity sewer there.

There are four proposed homes too far down the slope to tie into the gravity sewer so they will each have their own small pump station and there will be a force main that comes up and ties into a sewer manhole; then it will go via gravity. With respect to the homes in the high area of the site, they will tie into the gravity sewer down through the Chestnut Street right-of-way and tie into the sewer manhole that is on Madeline Street.

As far as water service, there is a water line in River Road. After talking to Water Works, they will be doing a closed loop connection with a new 8 inch water main that comes up the road and then it will come back and loop into the water main in Madeline. They received comments from Water Works and they have no issue with them and are working on addressing those comments now.

Natural gas exists just off the property in River Road. They will run gas up the outside beyond the sidewalk and run it up into their property and it will dead-end; it will not loop back into Madeline.

With regard to traffic, they did a trip generation letter and their conclusion of that was that it would really have no impact on the traffic on River Road. There is plenty of site distance looking both ways on River Road, especially if they do some tree trimming along their own frontage.

Mr. Pratt advised that they submitted four waiver requests. The first one is for center line radius. The Ordinance requires a 200 foot center line radius and because of the steep grade and because they tried to snake the road up the hill, having a 200 foot radius just wouldn't fit. Because of the slopes they couldn't really put the homes as close together as a typical pocket neighborhood but by tightening up the radii of the center line, it should create more of that neighborhood feel. DPW reviewed everything and it meets Ashto's minimum requirements and DPW supports the center line radius waiver.

Because they come down away from River Road at a 2% grade to create a flat platform and then they come up at a steeper slope, right in that stop condition they can't the "K" value, but they are providing the 100 foot platform that DPW asked for so they also supported that waiver.

With regard to the cul-de-sac length, Mr. Pratt said they are requesting a length of almost 2,000 feet. They met with the Fire Department, staff and DPW and they could connect the road through to Madeline through the right-of-way of Chestnut but none of the abutters wanted that and to give this more of a neighborhood feel, they thought the waiver for the length in cul-de-sac would be much better for the neighbors instead of having the ability for through traffic to cut through. The Fire Department supported it because they are going to put the requirement that each home is sprinkled. DPW supported it and he didn't believe the Planning staff had an issue with it.

The last waiver is for the roadway cross section. They discussed that at the beginning and the ideal section was a 30 foot wide paved with a four foot grass panel and then a six foot sidewalk on behind the grass panel on one side. DPW supported that waiver as well.

Mr. Pratt said they had a meeting with many of the abutters and they took into consideration their concerns. They added some fences to try to prevent headlights and noise from vehicles traveling up the road. They are also adding two diversion swales to divert some stormwater that flows down the hill.

Mr. Pratt said some of the abutters were concerned about the sidewalk connection and will probably speak up this evening. He explained that they do not want the connection and they don't want the utility connections through there. He thought a lot of people were interested in having a full sidewalk connection from the end of Elm Street up through the development and then back down. He thought it makes a nice connection but they will let the Board weigh in on how they feel, especially after the abutters get up and express their concerns. They have offered to put some fences or landscaping, but they haven't gotten any specific thoughts back from them on what they would like or if they would like anything at all.

Mr. Guerra advised the Board that the Conservation Commission met on July 13th and there was no quorum so they plan to have a special meeting on August 3rd to discuss this particular issue, so they should be able to have information to this Board by August 4th.

Mr. Boissonneault asked about the maintenance of the onsite drainage. Mr. Pratt said one of the comments from DPW was that they had to create a homeowners association to maintain it. Mr. Boissonneault asked if the forced sewer main would be included in that and Mr. Pratt thought it made sense to do that. Mr. Boissonneault asked if all members would be responsible to maintain that forced sewer even though some will not be receiving benefit from it. Mr. Pratt said he hadn't thought that far into it. He thought the homeowners themselves should be responsible for their pump because the pump will be on their lot and near their house. Mr. Boissonneault asked about the one running down the street. Mr. Pratt said they each have their own force main so there are going to be four separate force mains. Mr. Pratt asked if Mr. Boissonneault thought they should have the association responsible for everything within the right-of-way. Mr. Boissonneault said he was open to suggestions but thought that seemed reasonable.

With regard to the K value issue, Mr. Boissonneault asked if that is really to keep trucks from bottoming out. Mr. Pratt said it is actually for stopping sight distance. The primary reason for that is when you come to a peak in a road, they don't want there to be a really sharp peak so that you can actually see hundreds of feet down the road. Mr. Boissonneault confirmed with Mr. Pratt that the only reason it would be of a consideration is if it was too steep a truck would bottom out.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if there is any evidence that the Chestnut Street right-of-way was ever discontinued. Mr. Pratt said all of their research says it is active.

Mr. Clement asked about the gravel wetland. Mr. Pratt explained that it is relatively new and came into popularity with the new BMP manual that came out with NHDES' new Alteration of Terrain rules in 2010. He explained that it is almost like a filtration system. From the surface it will be vegetated and will look just like a detention pond but it will have some four inch PVC stand pipes coming up out of it. They are relatively low maintenance. He said these are good for compact areas where there isn't room for a treatment swale or a large detention pond or something like that. Mr. Clement asked who would be responsible for the maintenance and Mr. Pratt said it would be the homeowners association.

Mr. Guerra asked if this is a private street or a city street and Mr. Pratt said it was a city street.

Chairman Harrington inquired what type of soils they have. Mr. Pratt said he did about twelve test pits on the site. He pointed out an area where they went down 6-7 feet and hit a little bit of ledge. He pointed out another area where they went down 13-14 feet and they didn't hit any ledge. That is the area where they are going to have about 10 feet of cut because the land kind of slopes up there. He explained they have to do a flat platform for safety reasons before they get the road to come up at 8-1/2 percent so there will be some excavation in this area. He expected that there would be blasting when they first designed it but after doing the test pits he was very encouraged that he got so deep with the test pits. He knows there are probably some ledge

outcrops and they spoke to some of the abutters who said they definitely have ledge on their property, but he said his test pits were very encouraging that they will have a lot less ledge.

If the property is to be developed, Chairman Harrington asked if they will have to bring material in. Mr. Pratt said this will probably be a little bit of an export site.

Mr. Clement confirmed with Mr. Pratt that there will be a sidewalk on one side of the street and that they will have granite curbing.

Alderman Long confirmed with Mr. Pratt that the street is a public street and that the sidewalk will be publicly maintained. The Alderman asked if DPW had any concerns regarding snow removal. Mr. Pratt did not believe they had any comments regarding the sidewalk. With it being a cul-de-sac dead end the Alderman was concerned about snow removal. Mr. Pratt said he assumed they wanted the sidewalk plow to just plow the snow off to the side like they do everywhere else. The front setback is 30 feet so the homes are not going to be right up on the sidewalk so there will be plenty of space. Alderman Long asked if there is a buffer for the snow on the side without the sidewalk and Mr. Pratt said there was 10 feet on that side to the right-of-way. He referred to the detail on sheet D-1.

Mr. Clement asked if the cul-de-sac is going to be a straight asphalt area or if they would be doing anything in the center of it. Mr. Pratt advised that it is straight asphalt and it was designed per the City standard size, shape, configuration and radii. Mr. Clement asked if the Fire Department would have an objection to something like that. Mr. Pratt said they didn't ask and just went with the City's detail. Mr. Clement thought it might look a little bit better in that type of development. Mr. Pratt didn't know how staff and DPW would feel about it, but he agreed to ask them about that.

Mr. Guerra asked if there was any thought as to the cost of the homes. Mr. Pratt said they chatted with a few developers and they haven't committed to go with anyone specific yet. They are just trying to get the project through the approvals first and then they will start to figure out who to work with but he thought the homes would be in the \$400,000 range.

Chairman Harrington asked if they anticipated selling this to one developer or if they would be selling off individual lots. Mr. Sullivan said they talked to some developers and they were told that the further they took this in the permitting process the more control they would have and the better they would do. He thought the most recent and most plausible proposal to them was that the family would finance the construction of the road and utilities based on a developer's agreement to buy 10-12 lots per year until the property is sold out. Mr. Pratt advised that market conditions would obviously dictate the amount of houses.

If this isn't sold to one developer, Mr. Clement asked if they would be able to keep control as to what type of housing goes into that project. Mr. Sullivan said they don't want to get involved in design review on a lot by lot basis and they don't want to be selling individual lots themselves; although they haven't ruled that out. However, in general he thinks they would try to choose a developer who presents the type of house that they see as being most appropriate and the exact

details of that relationship and how they enforce the quality control he can't really testify to. They would have to get into that with the developer. He reiterated that they are not trying to cram in the maximum of lots here. They want a project that is compatible architecturally with the neighborhood.

Mr. Guerra asked if their focus is on regional and local developers or if they are going nationwide. Mr. Sullivan advised that they have stayed local (southeastern New Hampshire).

Chairman Harrington inquired about the impact on lighting. Mr. Pratt advised that they will be installing streetlights per City code.

Chairman Harrington opened the hearing for public comment.

Attorney John Cronin appeared on behalf of **Mr. & Mrs. Litvin** who live out on Heather Street (1226 Chestnut Street) to the left of Lot 19 as shown on the plan. He has two options for his presentation, the first of which would be the easy one. He suspected that a plan of this magnitude would probably be continued to another meeting to take a look at drainage and some certain issues. If that were the case, then he probably wouldn't go into his technical concerns. If he is being told that this could be a "one and done", he said he better make his record tonight. Considering this subdivision and the detail that is still required by DPW and others, Chairman Harrington thought they would probably hold this open. Given that he would have another opportunity to speak, he advised that he would keep his comments brief.

Attorney Cronin advised that they have concerns regarding the configuration of Lot 19. They complimented Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Pratt for their intention to go forward and do a reasonable and neighborhood sensitive development. The Attorney advised that Mr. & Mrs. Litvin, unlike a lot of abutters, would like to do something about Lot 19. They have extended an offer to Mr. Sullivan to try and work out some resolution where they could acquire that lot, which would resolve their concerns. They understand that Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Pratt have been busy preparing for this meeting and they haven't heard anything back from them. They would hope to have an opportunity to talk to them regarding that particular lot about their technical concerns and some of the issues they might see to be able to resolve that and come back before the Board at the next meeting and support this proposal.

David Shirley of 8 Madeline Road pointed out the big wetland that drains onto his property. He has spoken to Mr. Sullivan and Pat Myers about the possibility of acquiring what is identified as Lot 13, which would allow him to have some control over any issues that might arise with that. He is generally in favor of this development. He has lived there for 12 years and in that period of time they have had an incident with a homeless person setting up a camp in this undeveloped area and chasing one of his neighbor's daughters around on the north end of Elm Street. He thought it is important for the safety of the surrounding houses that this area be responsibly be developed. He also appreciated the fact that the design of the neighborhood has lots that are larger to the ones on the south, which is where he lives, yet smaller than the ones to the north and they seem to be priced in an intermediate range between the two neighborhoods. He also liked the fact that they are not connecting the road at Chestnut Street. He said the curve as you

come down Madeline is also steeply sloped and could be a problem with cars passing through there if there is an intersection so he really appreciates their thoughtfulness in not extending a road through there. He knows that his neighbors uphill have some issues with the utilities and the walking going through there and he appreciates the position and he will leave them to address that. From the sense that he gets is that it would increase the walkability of the neighborhood to the south having two walking paths connecting that road to the south. He also heard one of the members of the Board talk about doing some type of island on the cul-de-sac and his personal experience with cul-de-sacs is if you want kids to play there and for ease of maintenance it is better not to do something in the middle of it. He, like Attorney Cronin, reserved his right to get more technical into the drainage aspects. Right now on Madeline the water flows across that street and in the winter it actually comes up under the curb and freeze on the street in the corner, which has caused people to strike the stone wall on the corner repeatedly over the years. The issue he has that he would like to have more control over is if they redirect all that water into the wetland behind his house that is going to come into his house instead of the street.

Bill Croteau of 28 Madeline Road appeared along with his wife **Deb Croteau**, and neighbor **Lee Moore** of 52 Madeline Road and advised that they are the abutters to the paper street (Chestnut Street). Ms. Croteau said they also have some issues with the development, but they will reserve those for the next meeting. Their main concern tonight is the paper street. She said the “subdivider” proposes to use the unbuilt section of Chestnut Street, which is private property. She explained that Chestnut Street was dedicated in 1946, never built, and the dedication expired in 1966. This land has only been used by the abutting homeowners for a decade and no one has approached them seeking to use that land. As the subdivider doesn’t have the right to use this land, they feel the subdivision plan should probably not be approved this evening. Ms. Moore advised that her comments are in concert with Deb and Bill. Also, running along the back of the property line are intact stonewalls that are property markers as well as a lot of the larger trees that are there, which they have concerns with for the drainage, which they will go into more detail at a later time. For the record, she said it is her wall that gets hit frequently when the water comes up and freezes.

Ms. Goucher advised that staff has done some research regarding the unbuilt section of Chestnut Street. Mr. Golden has been in contact with both the City surveyor and the City solicitor who said that the roads had status right up to the southern edge of the property. Staff will obtain additional clarification to make sure that is accurate. She believed Mr. Pratt had also done some research and they came to the same conclusion that they had the ability to extend. She knows that Chestnut Street on the other side was recently released and discharged through an action of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen back in April, but on the south side, she doesn’t believe any such action has occurred. As such, staff believes there is status but they will certainly try to get more clarification from the City surveyor.

Chairman Harrington advised the abutters that this hearing would most likely be held open for another public hearing so he encouraged them to come up with additional documentation that they could present at that time.

Steve Brophy of 2600 Elm Street thanked the Sullivan family who has been very open about

letting the neighbors know what is going on. He said the sewers on Elm Street were just redone. He was away for a few weeks and when he returned there were grass and tree bits in his toilets so obviously it is not big enough to handle what is already there. He was told they could only put in a 12 inch pipe. If they were to add anything more to that, he said it is definitely going to come into his house through the toilets. Just prior to doing that, he said the storm sewer plate on Bennington Avenue would actually percolate up. The storm sewer across the street from him percolates up with water and lifted the sewer cover. Even now with the new sewers it is not enough to handle it so he has a great fear that would just end up coming down the driveway and causing a problem. Another thing to be aware of is, at the end of Elm Street, they have had so many problems with drunks flying down the road and ending up in the woods. As such, if there is going to be an opening there, that could be a problem. With regard to the value of the house, the last he hears was the values would be in the \$350,000 area. At least for him that would hurt his property value. He wondered if instead of having 25 houses at \$350,000 if they could have 20 at \$437,000 or something like that, which would turn out to be the same revenue line. If the values could be higher, it would be helpful for the houses that are selling. Mr. Brophy said his house is unusual inasmuch as it is all concrete. If there is going to be any blasting he has a fear that there is no give and take as it is just a cement box. He reiterated his gratitude to the family for being candid throughout all along about what they are going to be doing.

Chairman Harrington asked if the stormwater has been separated from the sewer systems in the areas that Mr. Brophy talked about. Mr. Pratt said in that recent project, they just redid all the stormwater and sewer. He believed they were trying to separate as much as they could and there were some catch basins in that area that they couldn't separate. What they are offering is a drainage easement to the City so they can come in and separate those last remaining things in that area.

Peter Kalil advised that his uncle's property is 117 Heather Street. This property has been in the family for more than 60 years. The house is historic in that it was designed and built by Frank Lloyd Wright. It is an original Frank Lloyd Wright house like the Zimmerman house on the same street that belongs to the Currier Art Gallery. Frank Lloyd Wright designed and built the house including the siting on the lot so his uncle, the owner, is concerned that a large development behind the house could adversely affect the historic quality of the property depending on how it is done. His uncle has concerns about Lots 18 and 19, which would abut his property if approved, so he would like to see if there is a way to talk to the parties involved between now and the next meeting to see if his concerns could be addressed. Concerns about privacy and maintaining the historic quality of his property.

Janece Brophy of 2600 Elm Street said she was at the last meeting and the dialogue and information was very helpful and she appreciated them taking into consideration the feel of the neighborhood. With respect to the style of homes to be built, she was concerned because each home in this neighborhood is different. Her concern would be to have it look like a tract housing area. With regard to the pedestrian and bicycle walkway going to the end of Elm Street, she thought if they had it exit at the other end on Chestnut Street that would bring people who don't live in that neighborhood to just zip through whereas if they only had the one entrance and exit she thought less people would ride their bikes all the way through there and it would bring people

in that aren't from that neighborhood. If it were her and she had kids, she said she would be concerned about so many people just whizzing through if her kids were out playing. With just one entrance there wouldn't be as many people going through.

Ms. Brophy stated that the two houses at the end of Elm Street (hers and the neighbor across the street) are the only houses that can't get natural gas on that street because the gas company won't come down to the end because they said there is ledge at the end of Elm Street. With them bringing natural gas into the development, she asked if there was any way as they are tying in the sewer in that area to possibly bring it to just those two homes, just because it is so close.

John Kalil of 117 Heather Street stated that he does not want to be impacted by anything anybody else builds.

Oscar Coronaro of 490 River Road asked if the houses being built will be "cookie cutter".

Mr. Sullivan said they would like to mitigate the impact on their neighbors as much as they can. With regard to the abutters who asked about selling lots, he said they would like to keep it intact until they get in discussions with a developer. It is possible that they could decide to sell lots but they have not reached that point yet. He said he wasn't aware that they had a formal offer, but there are three of them in the family so that "may have ended at some other branch". He said the end of Elm Street strikes him as a problem that they share with the City and is a very strange condition where Elm Street 100 feet wide comes for miles and dead ends at a stone wall and they are perfectly aware that cars come up Elm Street going as fast as they can and catapult themselves into the woods and that's not great. On the other hand, he is sure the neighbors wouldn't want brightly painted jersey barriers either. He would like an opportunity to work with the staff to come up with some way of mitigating the end of Elm Street and perhaps turning it into a more obvious kind of cul-de-sac rather than a dead-end with a barrier. If they can run natural gas out to there he doesn't see why not and they would certainly work with the utility to see if there is a possibility of that. He said they will take the other comments under advisement and discuss at the next meeting.

With regard to the people who commented about the style of home, the Chairman advised that the applicant had indicated that they don't know what is going to be built there at this point because they have not begun working with a developer yet.

Mr. Guerra said he wanted to say thank you to Mr. Sullivan because it is rare when abutters come before the Board speaking highly about somebody who is looking to do something, especially with a piece of property like this. The people who came in this evening seemed to have a lot of respect for the time that the Sullivans have taken for them. He clarified that he was not speaking on behalf of the Board but for himself when thanking Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Boissonneault said at the beginning, Mr. Pratt spoke about the Chestnut Street right-of-way. He asked if it has been the abutters who have been maintaining that and keeping it open and Mr. Pratt said it has been the abutters. Mr. Boissonneault asked if the City has ever done any type of maintenance through there to maintain it as a fire lane or anything. Mr. Pratt did not believe so.

Chairman Harrington advised that this hearing would be kept open until August 18th. No further notice to abutters.

Mr. Pratt confirmed with the Chairman that his tasks are to get DPW and staff to sign off on all the comments and address the concerns of the abutters and the Board.

4. **SP-04-2016**

Properties located at 401-419 South Willow Street (Tax Map 300, Lots 6, 7 & 8), a site plan application to redevelop existing commercial property with a new 5,000 SF retail building and associated site improvements within the B-2 Zone. *Shawn Smith for One Wall Street LLC & Brickwater LLC*

Jon Rokeh of Rokeh Consulting appeared with Chris Lewis, the architect from Brady Sullivan Properties. The subject property is an old D'Angelo's Restaurant, which has not been in use for some time. The plan for the site is essentially to demo the building, the parking and almost the entire site as it exists today and redevelop it into a new 5,000 commercial building. About a year ago they went before the ZBA and received some variances for setbacks and being able to put the building closer to the property line; basically right on the property line to the north. This has gone through a couple different iterations. They were close to coming before this Board before with a different layout and there were some issues with DPW and staff so they went back before the drawing board and redesigned the site to fit with what everybody was looking for. One of the main components is there is an existing curb cut on South Willow Street that is really big right now.

They have come to a final agreement with DPW and staff is that they will have a one way in and a one way out instead of having basically open access onto South Willow Street and it gives them an opportunity to put some landscaping in there and limit the movements that can happen onto South Willow Street rather than closing that access completely.

The second main entrance is actually going back to the east into the parking lot and being able to go both ways onto South Willow Street at stop lights. There is currently a big open access area onto Upton Street that is being all closed off by the building but they do want to have just a little one way parking area with a right turn only because they have six parking spaces along the edge of the building that they don't really have enough room to do a full 90 and completely close that off. The idea is that those spaces will be for employees so there won't really be a lot of traffic going in and out of that entrance during the day. He pointed out the dumpster location. They are actually reducing the impervious surface with this proposal without doing anything so with just a straight redesign of the site they are reducing the flows but they have actually added a bio treatment swale along the bottom edge where everything comes down and goes through that also before it connects into the storm drain system in South Willow Street.

Mr. Rokeh said they had Eric Buck do a full landscape plan for it. They have a lighting plan. The size of the building requires 20 parking spaces, which is what they have, including a single handicap space at this location. The new design of the building basically matches in with the

newer structures in that development so it will really tie everything together in the Manchester Commons site. All of the utilities are municipal. The sidewalks all tie together.

Chairman Harrington inquired about the waiver requests. Ms. Levandowski advised that there was waiver request for preparing a traffic impact assessment. From the letter staff received from the applicant, they feel the use does not warrant preparing a full traffic report. In the letter dated February 1, 2016 from Sean Smith, the prior civil engineer, the three items they noted were as follows:

1. The new 5,000 SF general retail building replaces an existing high turnover sit down restaurant with similar traffic generation.
2. The additional square footage created by replacing the existing 2,000 SF building with the new 5,000 SF building is a minor component of the existing Manchester Commons commercial facility.
3. No new curb cuts to existing public ways are being proposed as part of this project. The new parking area will utilize an existing curb cut along South Willow and close an existing curb cut on Upton.

The Chairman asked if they know what type of use will go in there and Mr. Lewis said they did not; other than it being general retail. The Chairman confirmed that it wouldn't be another restaurant.

Mr. LeClerc said even though he agrees that the D'Angelo's property right now really needs some work because it is not attractive at all, he asked if they need another empty retail building in that area.

Mr. Rokeh advised that the existing D'Angelo's has no chance of ever renovating or doing anything and this proposal will bring a brand new attractive building that matches in with the rest of the site and gives it potential to make the area look better, which could potentially attract people for other sites within the development.

Mr. Lewis showed a rendering of what they are proposing to building. The idea is that it can really be penetrated from any of the sides. As such, the front could be Upton or South Willow depending on the tenant that moves into the site. They would prefer a single tenant but if there are two tenants there are opportunities on three sides of the building to enter. The Chairman said that was exactly what he wanted to see.

Chairman Harrington asked if there will be any outdoor seating here. Mr. Lewis didn't think it would be likely with the type of tenants that would move into this space. There is some green space along the front on South Willow Street but its right on the street so it probably wouldn't be suitable for outdoor seating.

Mr. Boissonneault confirmed with Mr. Lewis that the D'Anagelo's sign on the corner of Upton

would go away. He noted that there will be signage on the building and asked if they would occupy a panel on the large sign to the south. Because that sign is specific to the plaza Mr. Lewis said they wouldn't be able to do that.

Chairman Harrington asked about lighting. At this point, Mr. Lewis said it will just be standard parking lot lighting. The Chairman said he liked what they have come up with a design and thought it was so much better than what is there currently and thought they may want to do something with the lighting to really highlight it to architecturally bring your eye to the building, especially along that corridor. He said as people make new investments and new designs into that corridor, it would be nice to have an upgraded look to it.

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.

It was the consensus of the Board that they were comfortable with the application and what was presented and the Chairman closed this public hearing.

5. **PD-04-2016**

Property located at 8 Goffstown Road (Tax Map 775, Lot 8), an application to construct a planned development with a private street and 7 single-family homes on one parcel of 8.24 acres, with 9,820 square feet of permanent wetland impacts and associated site improvements. *Keach-Nordstorm Associates, Inc. for Michael D. Tancreti, Trustee & DE Desharnais, Trustee MTEA Realty Trust*

Patrick Colburn, project manager with Keach Nordstrom Associates appeared along with De Desharnais, a trustee from MTEA Realty Trust, and attending via computer was Brent Cole from Keach Nordstrom.

Mr. Colburn handed out the existing conditions plan and said they are talking about a property that is referenced on Map 775, Lot 8 and it is situated at 8 Goffstown Road. It is 8.25 acres in area and completely undeveloped today. It is entirely in the residential one family medium density zoning district. The site is encumbered by a jurisdictional wetland that creeps up from the adjacent Lot 4 in Goffstown all the way up to Lot 7A in Manchester and bifurcates the property and cuts off access from Goffstown Road. The site is also encumbered by two easement areas; one is a roadway widening easement out along Goffstown Road that is for the benefit of the City of Manchester that was Deeded several years ago and the other is a 135 foot wide Eversource easement located further to the south on the property that can be seen cutting through the property from northeast to southwest.

Mr. Colburn said they began this journey with a conventional subdivision. He referred to Sheet Y-1 of the plan set, which is the yield plan that shows a seven lot conventional subdivision. This particular property is served by Manchester Water Works but is not afforded access to the City's municipal sewer system so the seven lots shown exceed the minimum lot size in the City because they are required to abide by soil based lot size and calculations at the State of New Hampshire. All seven of these lots, if built, would require individual private septic systems.

Mr. Colburn advised that they are bounded to the north, east and the south by a residential property in Manchester. To the west they are bordered by the municipal boundary between Goffstown and Manchester and the property just on the other side of the town line is undeveloped industrial land in Goffstown.

He advised that Mr. Cole has laid out and will present this plan but basically it abides by City zoning, shows the 100'x100' box on each lot. It also shows the 4,000 SF septic reserve area on each lot and what a conventional subdivision could look like. The purpose of that is so that they can determine the yield for the property and that yield, obviously by this plan, is seven units.

Given the encumbrances mentioned; the jurisdictional wetland out front and the easement area out back, they went back to the drawing board and looked for a way to cluster this development into a tighter footprint and they landed on the plan shown on Sheet 2 of the plan set. Sheet 2 in the plan set is their residential site layout plan showing seven detached single family condominiums. The target market is people that yearn for the pride of ownership but lack the motivation or desire to deal with yard maintenance, plowing, shoveling, etc. of their yards. Although these are condominiums, the intent here is to create a development that feels very much like a single family residential subdivision would. As seen on Sheet 2, there are both common areas and limited common areas defined. The proposed Bentley Way is a 400 foot long road that dead-ends into a cul-de-sac and that is to remain private. The limited common area is defined around each of the seven new homes. Generally speaking, that common area starts 15 feet off the proposed Bentley Way and provides what some would call a "lot" around each of the seven units where the individual homeowners will have some flexibility as to what they can do in that area. For instance a garden, a shed and things of that nature could be done in the limited common area while the balance of the site would remain as common area and each of the seven homeowners would enjoy one seventh common ownership of that area.

Mr. Colburn said the development is maintained entirely on the north side of the Eversource easement. The only portion of the development that crosses under and to the other side of the easement is the community leach field that will provide septic discharge opportunity for four of the units. The second leach field will be situated behind Units 3 and 4 adjacent to the Eversource easement. There is a little narrow gravel path for access between Units 4 and 5 and then under the power lines out to that community leach field area.

The development will cross the jurisdictional wetland. They are crossing at the narrowest opportunity, which is 20 feet off of the property line from their easterly abutter. Bentley Way is designed to be 26 feet in width, which was dictated by the Manchester Fire Department and they are proposing a cul-de-sac with a landscaped center, which is a feature that the applicant is endeavoring to have in order to break up the massive amount of pavement at the end of this little cul-de-sac.

Mr. Colburn stated that Manchester Water Works is on board to extend municipal water from Goffstown Road in a straight line down Bentley Way terminating at a hydrant at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Storm water on site is really straightforward. The design allows for the entire development from back to front to be pitched at a continuous one percent. As such, from the front yards of the units all the way out to Goffstown Road the development pitches continuously. There are two double grate catch basins located at the intersection of Goffstown Road and Bentley Way. Those catch basins pick up all of the surface water and convey to a small wet pond, known at the DES as a “pocket pond”. This aboveground stormwater feature will collect, treat and mitigate all of the stormwater and surface water coming from the proposed development and mitigate it to predevelopment discharge rates at the property line. Obviously discharge from that is into the existing wetland complex which heads down toward the river.

Mr. Colburn referred to the Common Landscape Plan (Sheet 6) which proposes a series of street trees both along Goffstown Road and then around the cul-de-sac. It is anticipated that each of the units will have their own private landscape around the individual units.

In addition to landscaping, they are providing common lighting (Sheet 7). There are a half dozen short residential style LED light fixtures dispersed throughout the development for street lighting. Given the short length of road coupled with the short quantity of units, just seven, they are not proposing a common sidewalk along Bentley Way. They didn’t feel that it was required in this case given the roadway will be 26 feet in width and traffic is very minimal, not to mention the fact that along Goffstown Road there are no sidewalks at this end of Manchester so the sidewalk wouldn’t be able to connect to anything.

Mr. Colburn advised that they submitted a waiver request relative to the requirement to construct a sidewalk along their frontage with Goffstown Road because Goffstown Road is listed as a key street. In addition, the surface runoff water from Goffstown Road, which was recently rebuilt by DPW, relies on the open drainage and they would hate to see that change by closing the drainage section of the roadway.

Mr. Colburn said this project is large enough to require an Alteration of Terrain permit, which has been submitted and remains pending. In addition, because it is a condominium it qualifies for and requires State subdivision approval, which was submitted and remains pending. Lastly, the wetland permit from the State was submitted and remains pending.

Mr. Colburn advised that they have worked closely with Mr. Belanger and City staff as well as Water Works, DPW, the Health Department and the Fire Department to put together the plan before the Board this evening. As of today (6/21/16), he believed the only outstanding comment that isn’t addressed in the plans before the Board came from Manchester School District. It was a comment he received the day prior and had his first opportunity to speak to Mr. Belanger today about. The Manchester School District was concerned because apparently for the last number of years there have been no students at this end of Manchester that required a school bus to approach the municipal boundary so the question came up when this development comes in presumably there would be the 1.6 kids per house and how would they turn around. He said their first question was where they turn around today and the response was that they turn around today at Duncan Farm Road, which is about 900 feet to their east because there are no students

apparently between Duncan Farm and the municipal boundary. There was some concern about utilizing the proposed Bentley Way, because it is private, for a turnaround but there would be no guarantee for the School District that Bentley Way would be maintained in a suitable passable condition. He said he and Mr. Belanger went back and forth today about possible alternatives; one was to seek some sort of guarantee from the DPW in Goffstown that the next public way in Goffstown would be maintained in perpetuity for the use of Manchester School District. Both he and Mr. Belanger felt that was a tough thing to ask for so they came back to utilizing Bentley Way for use by the school buses. The concern from the School District was not necessarily the size of the cul-de-sac as it was drawn but what happens if there are cars parked around the cul-de-sac and if a school bus could still make its way around that landscape island. A plan was handed out that was put together this afternoon showing a 65 foot passenger school bus working its way around that cul-de-sac island with nine vehicles parked around the outside of the cul-de-sac. The purpose of that is to show that the cul-de-sac standard in Manchester is quite large and a car looks very small in the middle of a 50 foot radius circle and there is ample space accommodated for school buses to utilize Bentley Way as their turnaround just in advance of that municipal boundary. Given this information, he said probably the best and safest way to handle the turnaround is at Bentley Way. He said they talked at length if they were to turn around in Goffstown where they would pick up students. It was their opinion based on information they reviewed this afternoon that the place the School District would vote to pick students up would be at the end of the Bentley Way at the intersection with Goffstown Road and then continue east into Manchester.

Given that they are a planned development, Mr. Colburn said they were asked to provide a series of unit selections that would be offered so the Board would have an opportunity to see what the developer is thinking and how the unit selections would marry with the requirement for a planned development. Four renderings were shown of what the developer is thinking of. The intent of this is to not look like a townhome development where everything is the same. The intent is to create a development that looks and feels more like a conventional subdivision. All seven units will be built by the applicant, Ashwood Homes, a subsidiary of the applicant, and these selections come from them. The garage doors are all six light, white panel garage doors. All of the window glass is 12 over 12 double hung. The roofs are all architectural style asphalt shingles. They will have clapboard style vinyl siding. Any accent siding will be a cedar shake style vinyl siding. All of the trim work around the vinyl is a white vinyl or aluminum. They believe the architecture here is in keeping with each other and will create a very private but exclusive community.

Mr. Colburn had an opportunity to meet with the ward alderman before this meeting. They also met with their nearest abutters who are the Pions, just to the north and east of the project and they expressed their concerns. They are new homeowners just as the applicants are new property owners and they expressed concern about their privacy and what will happen to their backyard when this development comes along. He referred to the plan and said there is a gap where today there is an existing and probably in the past there was a road that continued through. This site sees a tremendous amount of four-wheeler traffic and it is certainly a "road" that is gated right at the Pion's property line so that gap remains. They weren't thinning that gap, it is just there. To help close that gap, the applicant agreed to change their landscaping plan to include a thick stand of evergreens.

Mr. Colburn said they believe they have utilized this difficult property encumbered by several things to its maximum extent and will create a nice little private neighborhood and create a new market.

Mr. Guerra noticed there is a trail going through this to the rear and noted Mr. Colburn's comments regarding the four wheelers. He asked if that is going to remain an existing situation. Mr. Colburn said that is not an authorized activity at the moment. That is mostly as a result of the Eversource easement area. He thought the trails Mr. Guerra saw were the result of constant four wheeler traffic. He doesn't think they are Eversource's roads. He believed they were just constant traffic beating down a path. With this development they are going to close the roads that are on the north and west side of that easement area because they are going to develop that area with this new neighborhood. What happens under the power line easement shy of parking somebody out there and stopping people, he doesn't know how they would enforce it.

Mr. Clement asked what type of curbing they would be using. Mr. Colburn advised that bituminous curbing is what is proposed. Mr. Clement advised that the standard is granite curbing. Mr. Colburn advised that granite curbing is a requirement for public streets but this is a private way. Ms. Goucher advised the Board that they haven't approved any planned developments with bituminous curbing to her knowledge – they have treated it much like a site plan. If it was a public street, they would be required to have vertical granite curbing but under the regulations for a site plan, typically they would be looking at sloped granite curbing.

Mr. LeClerc said the center of the cul-de-sac with the trees is also depicted on the plan as snow storage. Mr. Colburn said he likes the landscape architect to show snow storage on the landscape plan and it is not so there is an error there. Mr. LeClerc confirmed with Mr. Colburn that the center of the cul-de-sac is proposed to be landscaped and plowing will be typical "kind of where ever it ends up in front of people's homes". Mr. Colburn said that is part of the reason when they were working with staff that Mr. Belanger suggested that width of common area.

Mr. LeClerc said if it is not approved to have the buses to go up the street, he would like to see sidewalks for the kids if they have to meet at the end of the street on Goffstown Road. Mr. Colburn said it was their opinion that with just 400 feet of roadway and only seven homes the traffic is so limited that sidewalks are not required, but he understood Mr. LeClerc's opinion.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if Eversource has signed off on the sewer crossing to the leach field on the far side. Mr. Colburn said just as this afternoon they signed off on that crossing. He referred to the Septic System Plan (sheet 8) and pointed out the two leach fields and noted their proximity to the Eversource easement lines. He said they pretty well tucked those leach beds as close to the easement line as they could and Eversource has asked for their gracious setback. They have asked them to pull those leach beds off the easement line four feet from where they sit now and he agreed to do so. As such, during their plan revision that will make that revision. In an email Eversource approved the line and grade of the access right under the lots. Mr. Boissonneault said he was not surprised they asked for that.

With regard to the four wheelers back there running up those leach beds, Mr. Boissonneault asked if there was any way to protect them. Mr. Colburn said they had not considered much protection there. The important piece of them is buried a foot below grade. They will be grassed. He doesn't know what to do there. He said you can't plant that close to them so it's not like they could plant a buffer around them. He would hate to see a fence around them for obvious reasons.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if there would be any benefit to shrinking the island just a little bit to get a little more swing room to get a bus in there. Mr. Colburn said they discussed that and he thought that was a valid point and they looked at shrinking that 3-4 feet. Mr. Boissonneault thought that little extra would be helpful and Mr. Colburn thought it was reasonable.

Alderman Long said he understood Bentley Way not having a sidewalk with there being only seven homes. With regard to the waiver for the sidewalk on Goffstown Road, he thought there should at least be some type of "stand" or some kind of waiting spot. Mr. Colburn said he and Mr. Belanger spoke about that in anticipation of that comment tonight and either a raised paved sort of path or something somewhere between the identification sign shown on the plan and the edge of pavement so kids have a place to stand off the edge of pavement that would be cleared year around. Obviously only assuming the School District doesn't decide to use Bentley Way, when he left Mr. Belanger he got the understanding that they would probably lead down the road of using Bentley Way because of the complications with crossing the municipal boundary but they didn't have enough time to iron that out completely with the School District.

In speaking with the School District's transportation coordinator, Mr. Belanger advised that she expressed the School District's reluctance to go across municipal boundaries. They generally never do it and he thinks the reason is that they make their decisions as to whether or not school is going to be in session in Manchester based the condition of Manchester roads and they don't always know what Goffstown or some other town will be doing with their roads. Therefore, going across the municipal boundary for a bus to turn around is something they don't really want to risk. Therefore, absent some sort of formal agreement with Goffstown where Goffstown would say they agree to maintain that road for Manchester to turn around, they really don't want to turn around there. Where they turn around currently is Duncan Farms Road or Legacy Drive so this is really the only turnaround before the Goffstown border. Keeping Bentley Way clear and the ability for a bus to turn around with sufficient turning radius is of pretty high importance here.

Chairman Harrington asked what the importance is with the guardrail that goes from Goffstown Road along Bentley Road on both sides. Mr. Colburn said as part of their design as to minimize the wetland impact and given that they have 24 inch diameter culverts under the road to provide hydraulic connectivity from one side of the wetland to the other, the road is elevated above the wetland. In order to minimize the wetland impact they tightened the fill slopes up to two to one. As such, off the end of pavement there is the curb and then there is a four foot flat platform and then two to one slopes and aashto standard is that if you have three to one or worse within eight feet of the travel lane you are required to have a guardrail. To keep it as a residential feel the applicant asked DPW if they could use wood beam guardrail and DPW said they could.

When they put up the examples of what the elevations of the homes will be the Chairman said it was kind of like Sesame Street to him a little bit in that one of these things doesn't look like the other. He asked if in keeping with the context of a planned unit development if there was any reason why the single story home couldn't be more similar to the two-story homes. Mr. Colburn said it was just tailored to folks looking for a one-story ranch style home. That particular unit is a three bedroom where all the others are three or four bedroom units so that was a smaller scale structure that was part of the selection. The Chairman said the Board would have to weigh in on whether or not they believe that is the case.

With regard to the limited common areas in front of the homes being so large, the Chairman asked if the intent as to have the homeowners take care of that land in front of their homes as their own. Ms. Desharnais said the homeowners would maintain that area.

Mr. McCue asked if the monument sign will be lit and Mr. Colburn said it would not.

Mr. McCue inquired about trash pickup. Mr. Colburn advised that he was told by the applicant today that trash pickup will be private and part of the association. Mr. McCue confirmed with Mr. Colburn that each unit would have a toter and a private hauler would pick it up. He also confirmed that snow plowing would be done by a private entity.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

Carol and Bob Backus of 1318 Goffstown Road, which is a unit in the Greatstone Condominiums that abuts the proposed property, advised that she had a letter from the current president of their association authorizing them to speak on behalf of the Board. Ms. Backus read the letter from Oliver Lucia, President of Greatstone Condominium Association, into the record as follows:

Dear Mr. LaFreniere:

This letter is to state that Carol and Robert Backus, owners of a unit at Greatstone Condominiums, is authorized to represent the Greatstone Board of Directors as myself and other board members are unable to attend the hearing for the proposed development at 8 Goffstown Road. Carol and Robert Backus are longtime owners here at Greatstone. Carol Backus is a former president of Greatstone Condominiums and is, therefore, familiar with the operations of the board and has a thorough understanding of the geographical concerns of the property.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

*Oliver A. Lucia, President
Great Stone Condominium Assn.*

Ms. Backus said she didn't want to let the north end people be the only nice people in the room

this evening. She said they also have things they like about this development. They looked at the first plan and felt that it would have had some negative impacts on their property that are mitigated by this second plan. However, there are still some real concerns and they are primarily to do with the geology and hydrology in that part of town. She said many people may think of that as a high part of town where there shouldn't be any problems with water but when they had the Mother's Day flood in 2006 they had real problems at Greatstone. Her basement was flooded with 18 inches of water. Other basements were full up to the first story level. Water came down the street from the area where this development is proposed through the front lawns of the two houses along Goffstown Road and the third one which is off the map took and a huge right turn and ran into Greatstone. She said the whole area is basically granite ridges starting from Rock Rimmon then a low area where you have Black Acres and there are some wetlands there and then there is the ridge where the big white house is and a ridge that goes up along Duncan Farm Road then there is the low spot where Greatstone was built and finally a ridge that trends northeast to southwest along that power line easement. Because of the water flow there is a lot of sand that is in the low places between these granite ridges and it is just so porous that water flows right through it except where it is blocked by the granite and, of course, the road cuts through all that. She said this is not an insignificant problem for them and their fear is that this development, although there are some efforts at mitigation, will create increased runoff and they may experience the same problem again in another storm of that type. They continue to have some flooding on a regular basis on the back of their property. A lot of people put in sump pumps after that experience but it is still a major concern to them. She said they need a storm drain as the closest one is at the corner of Duncan Farm Road and Goffstown Road and it is really a big problem for them.

Ms. Backus said they would hope they could have some discussion about ways they can improve this plan so that they don't have that runoff. They would also hope that they could have some assurance that the existing vegetation would be maintained on the side of the property that abuts them so they don't have an increase in the natural runoff from that ridge.

Mr. Backus said there was discussion regarding the lack of a sidewalk on Bentley Way because of the low density proposed housing and also mentioned in connection with that is that there is no sidewalk on Goffstown Road. He thinks they need a sidewalk on Goffstown Road and hoped at some point they will have a sidewalk on Goffstown Road as part of their plan to make Manchester more pedestrian friendly. Goffstown Road has very heavy traffic and there are a lot of people that might enjoy an opportunity to walk from where they live along Goffstown Road into the City. As such, he did not think that was a good reason not to include a sidewalk here. He said there is a big problem with four wheeler traffic and the applicant is exactly correct in that the roads are there just from those four wheelers going in and out. One of the things he hopes this development would do is find some way to assist Eversource in minimizing the use of that power line for unauthorized and very annoying activity as it is really quite distressing.

Regarding the school bus turnaround, Ms. Backus said they actually set something of a precedent at Greatstone as the School District wanted to turn a bus around their circular driveway. Some of the unit owners were opposed to that and didn't want a school bus in there but their Board decided, and she is very glad that they did, to allow the school bus to come in and turn around

there for the safety of the children. She doesn't think they have anyone going to school right now so they may not have a bus there this year, but they have in the pass and it was a good service to the community.

With regard to Ms. Backus' comment regarding buses coming in and picking up children, Ms. Goucher asked if there was ever a time when their private streets were not kept plowed or maintained for those buses and if they were kept up to the standards of the public street. Ms. Backus thought in general they were. She couldn't recall a bus ever being unable to come in there. They have a plow service that seems to be good and satisfactory to them.

Ward 12 Alderman Keith Hirschmann came tonight to provide institutional knowledge of the area, some insight and some advocacy for the Pion family who own 1338, which is the abutter just to the east. It is a single family home in the R-1A zoning district.

Starting with the application, the Alderman said 8 Goffstown Road does not exist. This is Lot 8. The address that is the abutting address in Manchester is the Pions at 1338. As such, when this application was presented to the abutters in the public ten days ago everyone thought it was the insurance company near the rotary so when he got it he put it aside. He hadn't had any conversations with Mr. Colburn and he hadn't heard about Keach-Nordstrom coming in on Goffstown Road.

The Alderman said he wanted to be brief but had some important things to tell the Board. He said that the City just got sued by the abutter to the west in Goffstown. The immediate abutter is an industrial park and that abutter went to Superior Court and sued the City of Manchester because he had signs on Goffstown Road in the R-1A district with all beautiful homes and they didn't want the traffic trailers and traffic after 9:00 PM. They sued and won in Superior Court. That property to the west in Goffstown really isn't shown in much detail but it is going to be an industrial park. The Goffstown state representative is advocating heavily at the DOT to bring from Interstate 293 a ramp close to Goffstown Road to serve this industrial park.

Alderman Hirschmann was advised by the City Solicitor that all of those signs have to come down, that tractor trailer traffic is allowed now on Goffstown Road to serve that industrial park.

The Alderman said he was advised by Mr. Colburn that DES makes him enter Bentley Way at the narrowest point on the wetland so that is why it is close to the Pion property. They were hoping that it could come westerly a little bit, but he understands that is impossible.

Right now there are stanchions on this lot that have arrows because it is a dangerous curve so Alderman Hirschmann is hoping that the eastbound traffic from Goffstown can still have some safety markers somewhere near those trees that are proposed for safety. He is also hoping that when Mr. Pion comes to the end of his driveway for sight lines that there would just be a pole with a sign saying "Bentley Way", not a marquee on the ground that is going to affect his sight lines.

As an Alderman, he said he is not a big fan of these private ways and he was concerned about

snow plowing of the private street. With the size of the cul-de-sac, he was concerned about fire apparatus getting in there as well. If the school buses did have to go into the proposed cul-de-sac he thought there should be no parking on the private way.

In looking at the site, Alderman Hirschmann said it is advertised as 8.24 acres. The buildable space is really only about 2.5 acres. He is a little leery of the success of the septic systems due to the activities that occur under the power lines. If this has to go in, he said five homes would probably be an acceptable density. He didn't want the access road into the power lines because he knows of the havoc back there, but he just learned that is where the septic is going. He thought there should be a gate there.

Alderman Hirschmann said it was really good when the Board proposed a 50 foot green buffer on Hackett Hill Road when all those townhomes were built. He thought it would be great if they could do that in this case and provide a fence. He also thought there could be an agreement such as the one on Coolidge Avenue where the Board had the developer agree to some stipulations.

Noah Pion of 1338 Goffstown Road appeared along with his wife Jenna. Mr. Pion said he would really like a buffer on the side because his biggest concern is privacy and the sound. He is also concerned about kids from the development running into his yard. He would like the green buffer because he doesn't want to see the guardrail and he doesn't don't want to hear the traffic of vehicles entering and exiting the development. He is also concerned about the property value of his house with this development. He does not care for the sign at the end of the road. He explained that people fly around that curve and perhaps they can just do a small sign on the telephone pole would be better.

With regard to the hydrology issue and drainage at Greatstone, it was Mr. Colburn's opinion as a professional engineer that this proposed project has no impact whatsoever on the drainage at Greatstone. As mentioned in his testimony, the development as a whole pitches from back to front toward Goffstown Road. That doesn't mean that it pitches into Goffstown Road and then around the corner toward east and Greatstone. What it means is that he is collecting all of that stormwater, treating and mitigating it on site then discharging it actually towards Goffstown into the wetland that is a tributary eventually to the river further to the south. The limited work that they are doing both under and on the south and east side of the Eversource easement there is little not no tree clearing required and the surface cover out there today is overgrown grass. Over the leach field they are going to replicate that grass because that is how you keep a leach field alive. Given the fact that he is not changing the surface cover he is cutting very little trees; just to construct that little access road. The Grading Plan and the overall scheme for the development propose no adverse impact to Greatstone.

Regarding the wrong address, Mr. Colburn advised that is how the Assessing records and Deed list the property as 8 Goffstown Road.

As far as apparatus access through the development, Mr. Colburn said Manchester is very unique in its requirement for 36 feet of pavement. The Board will allow a reduction down to 30 feet of pavement. That is still wider than any other community he works in and the norm statewide is 24

feet. This pavement width was dictated by the Manchester Fire Department and it was based on International Fire Code of 2009, which the City has adopted, and that lists 26 feet of pavement width, which is how they resulted at 26 feet.

Regarding no parking in the private way, Mr. Colburn advised he would bring that up to the applicant and ask if they could potentially put a covenant in the Declaration. His concern is that during events such as graduation parties, etc. where people would park. He and Mr. Belanger spoke about a possible visitor parking area on site. It is his opinion that visitor parking is not warranted or required. If he was to do it, the one spot he would be able to do it would be facing the Pion's property, right in to that gap that they are here tonight expressing concern about. As such, he is not sure that is favorable but that is for the Board's consideration.

With regard to a gate at the septic access road, Mr. Colburn thought that was a great idea and they would put it at the interface of the property with the Eversource easement and make sure that none of the four wheeler and other traffic that is under the power line easement comes in to Bentley Way.

With regard to Alderman Hirschmann and Mr. Pion's suggestion that the improvements proposed at the intersection of Goffstown Road and Bentley Way may have an impact on sight lines, Mr. Colburn said given that they are on the outside of that curve with Bentley Way their improvements have absolutely no bearing. He explained that the outside of the curve puts all of their improvements way outside of their sight. There is absolutely no opportunity for them to impact their sight.

As far as a fence instead of evergreens, Mr. Colburn said the elevation of the street is above existing ground and similarly to that the low corner of the Pion's yard is considerably lower than their home. His concern with a six foot fence is that from their home that six foot fence is going to offer little to no buffer. What was discussed prior to the meeting was densely planted evergreens that would be 6-7 feet at planting. The applicant is certainly willing to close that gap with evergreen buffering, which in his opinion is the chosen alternative. Tonight Ms. Desharnais is not authorized to commit to a fence so they will not be able commit to that this evening.

Mr. Boissonneault asked if they put a WB-50 template on that cul-de-sac. Mr. Colburn said they did not. Mr. Boissonneault believed that is what the Fire Department requires. Mr. Colburn stated that the Fire Department did not have any comments. He told Mr. Boissonneault that his idea of reducing the diameter of the inside will help. This cul-de-sac, although it has a middle, the outside radius is the Manchester standard 50 feet.

Mr. McCue asked if the homes are going to be sprinkled and Mr. Colburn advised that they will not.

Mr. Colburn advised that they are cleared with DPW, the Fire Department and Water Works. They need State permits, which is always a condition of approval. What they are looking for is final resolve with the Manchester School District. That is the only outstanding comment they had from staff.

Mr. Colburn asked what they could do to help the cause in terms of the units because that was out of his and Ms. Desharnais' hands. It was the Chairman's recommendation to work with staff to come up with designs that are more in keeping with a planned unit development. Mr. Colburn advised that they started with selections other than these and landed with these as a result of their meeting with staff.

Mr. LeClerc said ranch style homes are becoming much more popular in a lot of different developments around the City. Not everybody wants stairs and he agreed with what the applicant was staying. As far as the design, he said the windows are the same, the garage doors are the same and the roofing is the same. He didn't think a little bit of difference was a bad thing. Mr. Colburn said that was truly the applicant's goal.

For something that is a planned unit development where they are looking for consistency both in design and also in finishes, the Chairman said it just doesn't come off that way. Ms. Desharnais said they have a community in Concord where two of these designs; the ranch and one of the colonials and the City actually likes the fact that they have the differential in height of the rooflines. Ms. Goucher asked Ms. Desharnais if she could provide photographs of that development to the staff. She asked how many units were in that development and Ms. Desharnais said there were 64.

Mr. Guerra advised that he lives in a planned unit development with a private street. He said one thing they noticed is that the streets are not built to City standards. They had school buses turning around on their street because it was a nice U-turn until started realizing that it was beating the heck out of their street. They asked the School Department to have them stop turning around because they were causing damage and additional cracks because the roads are not built for the weight of those machines going back and forth every day. He asked that they take that into consideration while they are thinking about allowing school buses to go up a private road. He said it gets expensive to the homeowner association later when the road that they are expecting for 25 years only lasts for 15-18 years. Mr. Colburn said he would confirm that but he believed their cross section is the City standard cross section so he believes the structure of the road is there.

Chairman Harrington kept this public hearing open until August 18th. There will not be any additional notice to the abutters.

The Chairman then concluded the public hearing of the Manchester Planning of July 21, 2016 and convened the business meeting.

III. BUSINESS MEETING:

Chairman Harrington convened the July 21, 2016 business meeting of the Manchester Planning Board.

(Tabled Item)

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to take S-02-2016 and S-10-2016 off the table, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried)

1. **S-02-2016**

Property located at 336 & 312 Mystic Street (Tax Map 696, Lots 7 and 8), an application to subdivide two parcels of 26,069 and 21,887 SF into four lots (two new building lots with frontage on Slade Avenue and Rose Avenue) within the R-1B Zone. *Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, Inc. for Lacombe Trust*

Ms. Goucher advised that there was a recommendation and the staff report highlighted the decision that the Zoning Board took when it went back before the ZBA last Thursday. They agreed to make some modifications to the snow storage easement and put some conditions on the approval. The Notice of Decision from the cases as well as their conditions of approval were attached to the staff report.

With regard to the waiver request for utilities, the Chairman recalled that there was one house that seemed to make sense that they waive the underground utilities. On the new lot that would come off of Slade, Mr. Klubben advised that the location of the end utility pole allows them to reach almost any place on the lot but on the lot coming off the road the utility pole is far enough up the street that it is likely they would end up putting another pole up someplace in order to reach the gable end of the house or wherever they want to attach it.

The Chairman said if the Board wanted to they could split the waiver and grant it for Lot 7A and not Lot 8A.

Mr. Guerra and Mr. O'Donoghue were against approving the waiver for either lot.

Ms. Goucher advised that everybody in attendance could vote tonight.

Mr. Boissonneault said it seemed strange to accept one and deny the other. In that case, Mr. Clement said they might as well deny them both.

The Chairman said even though these are infill lots, it is in a sense a new subdivision.

Mr. O'Donoghue made a motion to deny the waiver request for underground utilities, which was seconded by Mr. Guerra. (Motion Carried) (Opposed: McCue)

Mr. McCue confirmed with Ms. Goucher that the access with the trees was the one that was of concern. He asked if the staff recommendation is for both streets to have access with driveways into that lot. Ms. Goucher said the plan that went to the Zoning Board is the one that condition #3 addresses. The easement is pulled away from the Kluckey's property. They are not putting a full turnaround in at the City standards. Mr. McCue asked if they are putting an easement to allow snow to be piled there. Ms. Goucher said they were and it is also pulled away from the Kluckey property. Mr. Klubben pointed out that Public Works has pulled back from the

requirement that if you built to full City standards, which before meant 21 inches of excavation that has a lot more penetration into the root zone.

Mr. McCue said basically the applicant got what they expected to get, which was two driveway accesses into the property. Mr. Klubben added that the Zoning Board and the applicant did what the Planning Board letter requested.

Ms. Goucher said it was her understanding in speaking with Mr. Landry after the hearing that the abutter on Slade was somewhat satisfied because they put in a condition that the driveway be 10 feet away from his property and the Kluckeys were happy that it was no longer a City turnaround.

Mr. McCue made a motion to approve S-02-2016 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and plans shall be submitted for final approval;
2. The applicant shall obtain final approval from all reviewing agencies, including the Planning staff, prior to submitting plans for signing and recording the subdivision plan;
3. All Zoning Board of Adjustment conditions of approval for cases ZO-167-2015 and ZO-168-2015 approved December 10, 2015 and for cases ZO-57-2016 and ZO-58-2016 approved July 14, 2016 shall be addressed, and identified on the plan for recording;
4. Easement documents for the snow storage areas, subject to review and approval by Department of Public Works and City Solicitor, shall be recorded concurrently with the Subdivision Plan;
5. All new property corner monuments shall be set prior to submitting plans for signing and recording;
6. New street addresses shall be secured from the Highway Department and shown on the plan along the parcel frontage prior to final approval;
7. If the Planning Board grants a waiver from the Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the recorded plan shall contain a note regarding such waiver;
8. The school impact fee of \$2,733 per single family unit shall be paid prior to the CO for the new single family dwelling units;
9. A rectangular box of at least 4.5 inches wide by 2 inches tall shall be located above the title block that shall be reserved for an approval stamp and signature;

10. The surveyor shall provide to the Highway Department a digital file in AutoCAD.DWG format with boundary lines and horizontal and vertical features based on N.H. State Plane Coordinate System (NAD83/92-NGVD 88) prior to signing the plans;
11. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit one set of mylars for recording, one set of mylars to remain on file with the Planning Department, and four complete paper sets;
12. The surveyor shall provide the HCRD recorded plan number to the Planning Department within 30 days of final approval;
13. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided in Subsection 4.13 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the Planning Board shall hold a hearing to revoke this approval, pursuant to RSA 676:4-a; and,
14. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for each house, the Planning Staff shall review the proposed layout, including the location of the driveway.

(Current Items)

2. S-10-2016

Property located at 51 Platts Avenue and 162 Holt Avenue (Tax Map 248, Lots 41 and 48), a subdivision application to adjust the lot line between Lots 41 and 48 with approximately 3,595 SF transferring from Lot 41 to Lot 48 within the R-1B Zone. *Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, Inc. for Constance Harvey and Joseph & Debra Malynn*

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to approve S-10-2016 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and plans shall be submitted for final approval;
2. The applicant shall obtain final approval from all reviewing agencies, including the Planning staff, prior to submitting plans for signing and recording the subdivision plan;
3. A rectangular box of at least 4.5 inches wide by 2 inches tall shall be located above the title block that shall be reserved for an approval stamp and signature;
4. Building permits and certificates of occupancy shall be obtained for the existing deck, pool, tree house, shed, and paved basketball court, which were constructed without

benefit of permits, prior to submitting plans for signing and recording;

5. All new boundary monuments are to be set prior to submitting plans for signing and recording;
6. All material changes to the approved plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board at a public hearing;
7. The surveyor shall provide to the Highway Department a digital file in AutoCAD.DWG format with boundary lines and horizontal and vertical features based on N.H. State Plane Coordinate System (NAD83/92-NGVD 88) prior to signing the plans;
8. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit one set of mylars for recording, one set of mylars to remain on file with the Planning Department, and four complete paper sets;
9. The surveyor shall provide the HRCD recorded plan number to the Planning Department within 30 days of final approval; and,
10. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided in Subsection 4.13 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the Planning Board shall hold a hearing to revoke this approval, pursuant to RSA 676:4-a.

3. Review of new applications for regional impact and comment by the Manchester Conservation Commission.

The staff has received and reviewed the applications listed below and the Planning Board should 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 or warrant comment by the Manchester Conservation Commission.

1. S-12-2016
Property located at 407 Prescott Street (Tax Map 312, Lot 4), an application to subdivide one parcel of 11,600 SF into two parcels of approximately 5,800 SF and 5,800 SF within the R-3 Zone. The proposal is to keep the two-family residence on the parent lot and to create a new buildable lot for a two-family residence. *Tom Huot, S&H Land Services for Granite Properties of New England, LLC*
2. CU-13-2016
Property located at 677 Hooksett Road (Tax Map 217 Lot 1), an application for a Conditional Use Permit to provide an alternative parking arrangement and allow a reduction in the required onsite parking for a seating expansion of 43 seats into existing unused space for Villaggio's within the R-1B/B-2 Zone. *Villaggio Ristorante*

Ms. Goucher did not believe this application would be going forward to a public hearing.

3. CU-14-2016

Property located at 1065 Hanover Street (Tax Map 634, Lot 5) an application for a Conditional Use permit, for a general retail children’s boutique store with accompanying office space. The applicant proposes to utilize 600 SF in a multi-tenant building located within the IND Zone. *Johanna Rolfe for John & Kristy Sylvia, CSX4, LLC*

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Clement, that the followings do not have regional impact and do not require review by the Manchester Conservation Commission: S-12-2016, CU-13-2016 and CU-14-2016. (Motion Carried)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

1. Review and approval of the Planning Board Minutes of June 16, 2016.

Mr. McCue indicated areas where he thought the minutes needed corrections.

Mr. Boissonneault made a motion to approve the Planning Board Minutes of June 16, 2016 with amendments, which was seconded by Mr. Clement. (Motion Carried)

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

Department of Transportation

Mr. Klubben advised that the first public information meeting on the I-293 Exit 6 and 7 project is scheduled for Wednesday, August 10th at the Manchester Community College.

300 Bedford Street Hotel

Ms. Goucher advised that she and Ms. Levandowski had a traffic scoping meeting this morning with the applicant, and with Kristen Clark and Dave Winslow from DPW. They discussed the areas of the study that they thought the Board would be interested in and that planning staff and DPW were interested in looking at. She didn’t think the Board would see the site plan before October. Ms. Goucher said the BMA has been working on this project which is on City land. There are a lot of different people who are working on contracts and easements for air rights for the parking deck and they will have to go before the Heritage Commission. The project seems to be moving along.

337 Hooksett Road - Bonneville (SP-26-2015)

Ms. Goucher advised that this project was moving along. Mr. McCue said they have the new fence going up. Mr. Boissonneault said he still wasn’t sure about that wall. Ms. Goucher said she had a discussion with the project engineer and they both thought the wall was perhaps a little too big proportionately, and that the blocks are a little too big. Mr. McCue didn’t think you would be able to see the cars.

Ms. Goucher said the site landscaping is looking very nice.

Southern New Hampshire University

Mr. McCue told the Board that the new athletic complex for SNHU would be accessed off Alice Avenue. Ms. Goucher read some of the Hooksett Planning Board minutes and they didn't think it had regional impact and they didn't need to notify Manchester.

Mr. Boissonneault asked Ms. Goucher if she knew that they were cutting the grade in River Road on the Hooksett side. Ms. Goucher said she did not know that and assumed they were working with Manchester DPW on that. Mr. Boissonneault stated "I wouldn't bet on it" and Mr. McCue said he wouldn't either.

Ms. Goucher asked if the Board would like to see if she could get Jeff Kevan from TFMoran to speak to the Planning Board about what is going on. Mr. Boissonneault thought that would be good and Mr. McCue thought it would be very interesting.

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

ATTEST: _____
Michael Harrington, Chairman
Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD: August 4, 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