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

II. PUBLIC HEARING:

(New Items)

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.

**Vice Chairman O’Donoghue made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc, that the following applications are complete and available for a public hearing:** S2018-119, PDSP2018-087, CU2018-121, SP2018-122, IMP2018-120 and SP2018-123. (Motion Carried)

1. **S2018-119**

   Property located at 554 Huse Road (Tax Map 853, Lot 22), a subdivision application to subdivide one existing lot of 42,457 SF into two (2) single-family parcels of 10,043 SF and 15,230 SF, in the R-1B Zone. *Promised Land Survey, LLC for Sirron Development, LLC.*

   Tim Peloquin of Promised Land Survey appeared along with Norris Viviers representing Sirron Development.

   Ms. Trisciani asked for clarification on the number of lots. Ms. Goucher advised that it was three lots. Mr. Peloquin said there was a little confusion within that because it was two new lots with an existing lot.
Mr. Peloquin advised that it is a lot of approximately one acre that is an old homestead on Valentine Drive, which was carved up a number of years ago. This was the original homestead within that whole subdivision. It stayed in a homestead for a number of years and because of a passing, it has been in an estate and it was sold recently to Sirron Development. Their desire is to subdivide it into two residential single family lots. As best they can ascertain, it meets all of the regulations. They have met with DPW regarding sewer hookups and such and he feels they can accomplish everything.

Ms. Goucher asked that Mr. Peloquin elaborate on the sewer connection that will be required. Mr. Peloquin said the existing house fronts on Huse Road and has a side yard on Valentine Drive; the house is serviced by the sewer on Valentine Drive. The new lot on Valentine Drive will be serviced by the sewer on Valentine but they had to create an easement down one of the new lot lines to service the lot that fronts on Huse Road. That was the most practical way to serve that lot based on not having to cut into the street of Huse Road so they are proposing to create a private sewer easement across the back of the existing dwelling. There will be one trench on Valentine Drive and patchwork and proper trench work will happen as a result of that and a repave and a shim of Valentine Drive so it will be minimum excavation and they will be completely staying out of Huse Road other than the driveway cut on Huse Road for one lot.

In response to Mr. Hebert’s question (inaudible), Mr. Peloquin said it was just sewer. Water and electric will be serviced via the utilities within the roadway. Water Works has agreed to their connections and they have not queried the electric companies yet as to how it would access the lot, but it would be overhead service most likely.

Mr. Hebert asked if water would be coming from Huse Road. Mr. Peloquin said “yes” for the lot on Huse Road. If there is an opportunity to come off Valentine Drive for one trench in one road that may be the best other than getting into Huse Road which, if there is an opportunity to create an easement, there needs to be 10 foot separation between a water and sewer line but he thought they could accomplish that potentially. The lots are oversized such that the 7,500 SF minimum that this easement will still stay within the regulation of the buildable areas. If there is a way to come off Valentine Drive once construction begins that would probably be their preference.

In looking at the easement, Mr. Hebert saw the word “electrical outlet” and he asked what that was for. Mr. Peloquin said this lot has existed for many years. There are many sheds that need to be removed and he wasn’t sure about the outlet. In looking at historical Google images, Ms. Levandowski said it looked like there was a camper there at one point so she thought maybe it was an outlet to plug in their camper. Mr. Peloquin said that made sense based on the driveway that is right there.

Ms. Charlebois asked what existing buildings will be razed. Mr. Peloquin said all except the one to the rear of new Lot 22B where it shows “garage”; it’s an oversized shed. He referred to note #8, which says “Existing garage to be razed or a variance secured prior to plat being
recorded at the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds.” He said it is an entirely good building and it would be a shame to raze it unnecessarily. The reason it needs to be razed is because it is currently the primary structure on the lot after the subdivision. Once a new house is constructed, then it would not be the primary structure and it would meet the current regulations. As such, it is the desire to keep that shed but they didn’t want to get held up in the process. He asked if an escrow could be put up to raze that shed. Ms. Goucher advised that Mr. Viviers only had the two options she outlined. Mr. Peloquin said they would probably secure the variance.

With regard to the sewer extension shown for the new lot proposed to face on Huse Road, Ms. Goucher asked if they would be able to sewer the house by gravity. Mr. Peloquin said they would. Ms. Goucher confirmed with Mr. Peloquin that a sewer pump would not be necessary. He said he confirmed that with Keith Coviello of DPW.

With regard to Mr. Peloquin’s comment regarding sharing the trench for water and sewer once construction is underway, Ms. Goucher said they will have to get that finalized beforehand. The plan has to state if it is an easement for water and/or sewer and they will have to make sure that Water Works is on board to share the trench. Staff will want to make sure that is clear before any action gets taken for a recorded plan. Mr. Peloquin said that was “fully understood”.

Mr. Peloquin advised that Mr. Viviers had a question relative to the option 3 he tried to put on the table because he doesn’t really want to go through the variance process. Mr. Viviers said it was kind of unnecessary but he doesn’t want to raze the shed so he was caught in a pickle. Mr. Viviers said it was his understanding that once they put a house on that lot; that will become a secondary structure. He asked if there was a house built on that the secondary structure if it would have the benefit of a lesser setback. Ms. Goucher said it is essentially the principal structure issue that is at play here. They have had this issue before with other properties where there has been an existing garage and the same scenario has occurred. The requirement has always been to either remove the garage before a plan can be signed and recorded or see if the ZBA will grant a variance to allow the garage to be left as a principal structure. Otherwise, they would be asked to sign a plan that is in violation of the Zoning Ordinance. That is why they have the either/or option. She understood what he was saying and he was correct that if they were to build a house and use that as a garage, it is a secondary accessory structure and the setbacks are different but staff cannot sign a plan and put a plan on record if it violates the Zoning Ordinance. That is the reason they only have those two options. Mr. Viviers asked even if there was a condition it would be razed within a period of time. Ms. Goucher said the condition would be that it be razed before the plan is signed. Mr. Viviers asked if he posted a bond to have that razed with the condition that if a permit is not pulled and a primary structure isn’t built so this become conforming that it would still be completely unacceptable. Ms. Goucher said what she was trying to explain was that staff cannot sign a plan for recording with a violation and they cannot pull a permit to build a house if the plan hasn’t been recorded to create the lot; that is why they have the two options she stated for this issue.
Chairman Harrington asked if there was something the Board could do so they would not have to come back before them a second time. Mr. Viviers said he would take the building down.

With regard to the razed part, Mr. Peloquin said perhaps it could be moved 5 feet or so until such time and then moved back. He said that was a possibility and he may add that as a note and he would certify it if need be.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

Doris O’Neill of 43 Valentine Drive asked where the homes would be situated on the lots and what kind of homes they would be. She was concerned about water draining off onto her property.

Mr. Peloquin said generally, if she could picture where the garden has been for a whole number of years, somewhere within the confines of the garden area is where the house will be placed within the setback. The other lot would certainly be in front of the shed they talked about being razed or moved towards Huse Road and further away from her lot. The type of home would be dependent upon what fits conveniently within the lots and what would be market driven. Both will have full basements. Chairman Harrington asked about grading for the foundation and sloping of the terrain. Mr. Peloquin said they would make sure everything drained properly.

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

2. **PDSP2018-087**

Property located at 1124 South Mammoth Road (Tax Map 797, Lots 3A, 4 & 9), a site-plan / planned development application for a 162-unit, townhouse style, planned residential development. The development includes approximately 3,850 LF of new private roadway servicing 30 residential buildings, as well as a proposed clubhouse in the R-SM Zoning District. *Northpoint Engineering for the Timbers, LLC.*

Jeff Lewis of Northpoint Engineering appeared along with Will Socha, the owner/applicant and developer for the project. Also present was Steve Pernaw, the traffic consultant who prepared the traffic study for the project.

Mr. Lewis gave an overview about Mr. Socha and what he does in the City of Manchester and the developments they have worked on in the past.

Mr. Lewis advised that the project they are here tonight for is in South Manchester off of South Mammoth Road. There are three existing parcels and Mr. Socha is the present owner...
of those. Map 797, Lot 3A is about a 2.7 acre parcel, which is undeveloped right now. Lot 4 is an 8.2 acre parcel that is largely undeveloped but does have an existing single family house down at the corner with a driveway onto South Mammoth Road. Lot 9 is in the back and is a 15.5 acre lot that is a landlocked piece of land that crosses into the Town of Londonderry. Together those three pieces comprise 25.2 acres. They are proposed to be merged as part of this development and that would create the subject parcel for the development.

Mr. Lewis advised that the abutting property in Londonderry is a largely undeveloped portion of Londonderry at the north end. There is a large wetland complex that flows towards the airport. There is a pretty good mix of commercial uses with a few single family residences as well as the Eversource powerline and easement that provides a little bit of a bi-section from this part of the neighborhood to the residential part.

With regard to zoning, Mr. Lewis said these three parcels were recently rezoned from Residential Suburban (RS) to Residential Suburban Multifamily (RSM) this past fall in large part because RSM is a higher density and allows the attached units whereas RS does not. There is water and sewer in South Mammoth Road, which really allows the higher density. It is contiguous to a RSM district that includes the existing multifamily so they have this kind of corridor of RSM with predominantly the RS district being the single family neighborhood and then an industrial district that includes the commercial businesses and industrial businesses on South Willow Street. This RSM district really provides transition between the commercial area of South Mammoth Road and South Willow Street to the single family residences.

Mr. Lewis advised they have 162 proposed units. There is a total of 31 buildings; a mixture of four, six and eight unit buildings. All the buildings are two-story units with full basements, the same as what they just built on Hidden Oak Way. They have one driveway entrance proposed off of South Mammoth Road. Similar to what they did up at Hackett Hill Road they are proposing a boulevard style entrance. They would have an 18 foot wide ingress lane then a 10 foot wide landscaped median with a sign for the project located within that and then a separate 18 foot wide egress lane. That will be the major entrance to the project. As soon as you come into the project on the right hand side there will be a clubhouse, which was designed to be consistent with what they built at Hidden Oak Way. There will also be a mail station outside the building, but covered so people will be able to either walk down to that or access it when they come in and out of the project. There will also be a small office in there for onsite staff and a maintenance garage in the back.

Mr. Lewis said they have a system of private roads that are designed to be 26 foot wide paved travel ways. All of them are two way drives. There will be sloped granite curb on either side of the drives. Parking is in front of the units. Parking spaces are all 8-1/2 feet wide by 20 feet deep and they have 6 foot wide sidewalks throughout; in front of the parking spaces, in front of the units and a system of sidewalks that carry throughout the whole development so there is good pedestrian access throughout.

Mr. Lewis advised that the road is designed with a couple of loop systems. That defines the
two halves of the site; the front half being the first phase and the second half being the second phase. They tried to make sure they have good circulation throughout knowing this is a long development with only one point of access from South Mammoth Road.

Relative to the parking spaces, Mr. Lewis said on 14 of the buildings, they are providing a single car garage on the end units similar to what they did at Hidden Oak. There will be a total of 28 garages that are included in their parking count for the project. They are right around a three to one ratio for parking here, which is what the ratio really needs to be. They are required to have two to one ratio for these units but that really doesn’t give a lot of room for visitor parking. They have a three to one ratio at Hidden Oak and that parking lot is full a lot of the time, especially on the weekends so they really need to have that parking here and they think they are in good shape with that.

Mr. Lewis advised that drainage on this site is relatively straightforward. In looking at the topography, the site rises uphill from South Mammoth Road about 40-50 feet and then it slopes back down in the back another 40-50 feet to the wetland on the Londonderry town line so it is pretty much a natural divide between the two halves of the site. They have the whole front half of the site designed to drain down to the front of the site. There will be storm drains and catch basins enclosed drainage system within the road network and the entire front of the site will drain down to the stormwater management basin. They have a bit of a high water table in an area so they have a gravel wetland designed as a treatment device. There is an existing drainage culvert that goes under South Mammoth Road that that stormwater would then overflow or be discharged. On the back half of the site all the infrastructure slopes down to a stormwater management basin. They have better soils out there, well drained, higher depth to groundwater so there will be an infiltration back there for the treatment component of the stormwater and that will discharge or overflow. They have applied for an Alteration of Terrain permit looking at all aspects of the drainage design, erosion control and that sort of stuff.

Mr. Lewis advised that water and sewer are available in South Mammoth Road and they will be extending water mains and sewer mains into the development. Water Works has reviewed andcommented on those plans and they are working with them right now to finalize some of the minor technical comments they had. The front half of the site will have a gravity sewer main system that drains back down to South Mammoth Road. The back half of the site will all gravity drain down to the low end of the site and then they have a private pump station and force main that will pump back up to the gravity mains in the front of the site and then drain back down to South Mammoth Road.

Mr. Lewis stated that gas is another feature. Currently there is no natural gas in South Mammoth Road but Mr. Socha is working with the gas company and they are proposing to extend gas from the town line all the way up South Mammoth Road to the development. That is in the works.
Mr. Lewis said the private utilities will all be underground. They will be working with Eversource to lay that out once they have conditional approval from the Planning Board to locate all the features of the electrical services, transformers and other boxes.

Mr. Lewis said they have a wetlands application permit for DES as they have two wetlands crossings; one at the main driveway entrance where they have a 5,700 SF wetland impact. He pointed to a roadside low value/low functioning wetland that they will be impacting as part of the driveway access. He pointed out another small wetland that they will be “clipping” to get the secondary access for the loop road through, which is about a 1,300 SF impact. As such, they have approximately 7,000 SF of wetland impact, which is a minor wetland permit. They have an application in to DES and have also met with the Conservation Commission about this application and they seem to be okay with what they are proposing.

Mr. Lewis advised they have had correspondence with the Natural Heritage Bureau and NH Fish & Game on this project regarding endangered and threatened species and have gotten a sign off from both of those entities. They have also coordinated with the Division of Historical Resources for any concerns over historic or archeological resources on the site and there are none so they think they are in good shape for their State permits and expect to have those in hand by mid-to late February. They also have a driveway application in to DOT. He explained that South Mammoth Road is a DOT right-of-way so that will require a driveway permit. They met with them over a year ago at the site. It is a pretty straight road with plenty of visibility so they do not expect any issues with that. All of the mentioned permits are in process right now.

Because this is a planned development, Mr. Lewis said they know they have criteria from the Zoning Ordinance to meet. They prepared a narrative and outlined in that how they think they meet the criteria. He reiterated that this is a mixed use neighborhood with a lot of commercial uses and there are already town house units out there. This has recently been rezoned to RSM so they feel this is absolutely compatible with the neighborhood. Obviously these units together are very cohesive. Based on the size of the project and the buildable area, they could be allowed to have over 300 units and they have proposed 162.

Mr. Lewis advised that they submitted a waiver request letter primarily because of the requirement of Section 5.2(e) of the Subdivision and Site Plan Regulations pertaining to cul-de-sacs, which technically this is classified as because they only have one point of access from South Mammoth Road. He said if you were to measure the longest length of their drive from the point of South Mammoth Road all the way around it is 2,224 feet so that exceeds the 1,000 foot length; however, they have the median entrance. He said DPW requested that they extend the divided median up to where the first loop begins and they have agreed to do that and will be doing that as part of their plan revisions. As such, they basically have a divided road up to a point and then there will be a loop access so they have two ways to get to that first loop and then there is a short connector to get to the second loop so that 2,200 feet becomes 1,200 feet.
The other two requests he did not think were technically waivers; he thought they were just modifications to the driveway design standards of the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Board has the ability to modify the standards. Because they have the two driveways, strict conformance with the Zoning Ordinance would require those to be 30 feet apart, which would be a 30 foot wide median and they have a 10 foot wide median, which is consistent with what has been done on other projects. Also, the driveway width exceeds the maximum 36 feet due to the way it is designed.

Mr. Lewis believed they have received copies of all the comments from DPW, Planning & Community Development, and Water Works. They also have State comments from Alteration of Terrain and Wetlands. They are actively working on those right now. They feel all the comments they received to date are minor in nature and they believe they can address everything at the staff level or with the State agencies.

Stephen Pernaw advised his office prepared the traffic impact assessment report that was submitted for this project dated October 2018. As it turns out, his firm was fortunate enough to help out with the Hidden Oak project on Hackett Hill Road where they did the traffic study for Mr. Lewis and Mr. Socha a few years ago.

Mr. Pernaw said the scope of the study was established at a meeting back in October 2017 where they met with the Planning staff and they came up with a study area size of four intersections. He referred to an aerial photograph showing three out of the four intersections. Starting at the top was Lucas, the middle blue dot of where they did counts was in the vicinity of the Best Western intersection which gave them data for what is going by the proposed “front door” and then they went down into Londonderry and did the intersection of Route 28 and South Mammoth Road. They City asked them to study the typical morning and evening peak period counts. One thing they did a little different on this project was doing their counts on two weekdays rather than the typical one weekday. What they elected to do in terms of future projections was to use the higher of the two. Things were pretty typical. Their peak hour in the morning was 7:15-8:15 and in the evening it was 4:30-5:30. They were also asked to do ten year projections into the future as well as an opening year. Their traffic report estimates how much traffic is going to be generated by this development during that morning peak hour and during the evening peak hour. There will be 75 trips in the morning of which most will be exiting the site, but there will be some arrivals. During the evening, the highest hourly volume, it was 91 trips and again, during the evening, most will be arriving at the site.

Mr. Pernaw said they did a trip distribution analysis to get a handle on what percent they think will head north versus south on South Mammoth Road and their analysis showed a slight majority are going to head in a southerly direction to get to Route 28. They did build projections, with the development fully occupied, and because traffic will split at the front door, some north most to the south, the biggest impact turns out to be about 50 cars during that PM peak hour, which is pretty close to a car a minute so it is not a huge traffic generator when you look at it in terms of net impacts.
Mr. Pernaw advised that they focused their analysis on the proposed site driveway so they could tell the team what that intersection needs. First of all, they determined that the intersection will operate at level of service B or higher during all hours of the day with the development fully occupied; it is Phase 1 and 2 combined. They looked at the need for widening Route 28A to see if turn lanes were needed to handle the projected traffic and the answer was no, they were not even close to being warranted. That told them that the northbound lane on South Mammoth Road will function adequately as a shared lane for traffic and right turning traffic into the site. It was the same finding southbound; the existing through lane will function adequately as a shared lane.

With regard to sight distance, Mr. Pernaw said the road is straight and relatively flat, which is all good. They noticed when they were out there that there was vegetation that will have to be cleared out as part of the construction of the main site driveway. He said their recommendations were rather limited and basic. The new intersection should operate under stop sign control. They recommended that a double yellow center line be added but the applicant is proposing a 10 foot wide raised median which, from a traffic engineering standpoint, is optional but they have their reasons and that works fine. They recommended a stop line as well.

Mr. Leclerc asked why they thought most of the traffic was going to go south as opposed to north. Mr. Pernaw explained what they looked at was the commuting pattern information that is available from the latest US Census. They also looked at the travel patterns that are happening out on South Mammoth Road today. In addition, they are familiar with the study area so there is a mathematical derivation their finding is that most are going to head to Route 28 to head north toward the mall or south toward Exit 5.

Mr. Leclerc said sometimes to him it seemed like people head back to Corning or Sheffield and snake across that way. Mr. Pernaw said they do expect that will happen with 45 percent of the traffic. Mr. Leclerc asked how far it is from the highway to the point at South Willow. Mr. Lewis said it was approximately 1,500-1,600 feet.

Mr. Leclerc asked if this was considered private and if there will be street plows and school buses allowed up in there. Ms. Goucher advised that the City will not be plowing the roads - that will be the responsibility of the Socha Companies. She explained that typically school buses do not go on private roads, but that is really up to the bus company. Mr. Socha advised school buses will not go into the development and at Hidden Oak the bus company will not allow them to go onto private property. Mr. Leclerc asked if there was a safe spot for kids to meet in the morning. Mr. Socha advised the sidewalk goes all the way out to Mammoth Road and what they found at Hidden Oak Way is the same situation and there are a few kids out there in the morning and they have been safe. Generally they do not have a
lot of kids in these developments. He was at Hidden Oak this morning and there were three kids on one bus for one school and there may have been three or four for the next bus. They stand on the sidewalk and their parents are with them. Mr. Leclerc said he was more concerned about safety than the numbers. Mr. Socha said he was open to suggestions and ideas. Mr. Leclerc said some places have a pad for the kids to hang out. Mr. Socha said he did a pad at Evergreen Way, which is next to Hidden Oak and that was 32 townhouses. That was a request by Alderman Hirschmann and he does not think he has seen anyone use it so it just kind of looks funny. He thought any kind of structure would impede visibility and Mr. Leclerc agreed.

Mr. Golden asked Mr. Pernaw to address the addendum. Mr. Pernaw said at Mr. Socha’s request, they expanded the study area to include the intersection to the north where Sheffield Road and Corning Road comes in. They went out and did the two days of counts in October 2018 and did the same projections and the impact at this new intersection to the north will be less than what he talked about earlier and that is because only part of the total amount of site traffic heads in the northerly direction; about 34 trips in the morning and 41 in the evening. They did the same impact analysis that they did before and again that is much less than a car a minute; about a four percent increase. They then looked at intersection capacity and level of service and things like that and came up with several findings, which are outlined on page 11 of the report.

With regard to the traffic study, Mr. Hebert asked if they were saying they do not need a turn lane on South Mammoth Road. Mr. Pernaw said that was correct and explained they did not need a southbound left turn pocket nor a northbound exclusive turn lane because shared lanes will work fine. Mr. Hebert confirmed with Mr. Pernaw that there will be 162 units.

Based on Mr. Socha’s experience with his other projects and especially where this one is so similar to the one off of Hackett Hill Road, Chairman Harrington asked if he had a profile of his tenants. Mr. Socha asked his sister Sheila to address the Chairman’s question as this is her expertise. Sheila McDonough, Business Manager at Socha Companies, advised basically Mr. Socha builds the buildings and the filling, managing and maintaining the residences is up to her and her team. In all interest to fair housing, she said they really have a diverse mix of residents. At Hackett Hill, they have minimal children in the units. About a third of the units are two bedroom units and the rest are three bedroom units. They get some families as well as roommate situations. They have retirees, people looking to downsize from single family homes, people with great credit ratings. She did an analysis and about a third of the residents at Hidden Oak work in the City of Manchester and the rest commute out of the City of Manchester. They get a lot of residents for Oracle, BAE Systems and a lot of the newer businesses in town and technology businesses. She has had air traffic controllers, doctors, attorneys, teachers and blue collar workers. All kinds of great people. They care about their units. They want a really nice place to live but they don’t want to have to maintain their lawns and fix their roofs. They want to have somebody else to do it. They really have a great group of residents. At Hidden Oak right now rents range $1,800-$1,900
per month so you need to have a job and make decent money to be able to afford them. She said she takes a lot of pride in their units and they are lending them their asset to live in and they want them to take care of it just as much as they really want to take care of it. That is why a lot of people ask them why they don’t subcontract out their landscaping, snowplowing, etc. She explained you don’t maintain control over your properties when you do that. They want to have their crew taking care of their properties and knowing Mr. & Mrs. Smith that live in so and so unit. She said they may live out of town themselves, but she and Mr. Socha are at these properties every single day making sure they are being maintained and looking after them.

The Chairman said he was really questioning the parking a little bit, which is why he was trying to get a better understanding as to the profile of their tenants because to have this high number of parking spaces for these types of units relates to the impact on the environment with the impervious surface. Where really they would only need two per unit, they are at three per unit, which is why he was trying to get a better understanding. Ms. McDonough said it is more of a roommate situation with no kids. She said there may be some older teenagers or even young adults that stay with their parents or are going to school and they will have three cars. They also need visitor parking. They really try to discourage residents from having three cars. They tell their residents when they are marketing the units that they have two cars per unit. They want as much green space as possible so the way she has looked at it, and they have learned a lot from Hidden Oak, is having a certain extra amount of spots for those units that need three spots and then having whatever is above and beyond that for their visitor parking. They charge extra for any resident that wants a third spot to discourage people wanting three spots. They do not want people to think everybody that moves into a unit can have three parking spots because tenants have visitors and they do not want an overflow. When they plow in the winter they don’t want 50 cars that aren’t moving and things like that. It is a balance between having enough parking, keeping the residents happy, having a good group of people and having green space as much as possible. If you don’t have the green space you won’t rent the units.

Mr. Socha said at Hidden Oak Way they found areas where they didn’t have enough parking and the extra parking was so far away so they went through building by building on this and made sure they had visitor parking by each building. With the high rents and high quality, people are demanding and when they have no place for their mother-in-law to park when she comes over they get upset. As such, they provide as much as they can for the people. If they didn’t need it, he said he wouldn’t want to pay to build it. Ms. McDonough said having the consistency of the sidewalks through the property add walkable space for residents so even though it might look like there is a lot of parking, they have that consistent sidewalk.

Ms. Charlebois noticed there were three handicap spaces. She asked if they had any accessible units they are looking to put in. Because the way the units are set up where you walk right into them, they do not have to have any specific handicap units per code. However, they do have other units in town so if somebody comes to them with a handicap need or needs other special accommodations they do everything they possibly can to assist
them and get them in a unit.

Chairman Harrington confirmed with Mr. Lewis they do not have their driveway permit yet. Mr. Lewis said they received comments from all the State agencies. Over the past year or two they have been a little bit delayed in their response. They met with Bill O’Donnell of DOT District 5 last year and there were no red flags from his perspective for any concerns out there. They have received a copy of the plans, the traffic study and drainage hope and hopefully in the next couple weeks they will be getting comments from them, if they have any. He hoped in the same timeframe in February they would have a driveway permit. They expect their DOT permits at some point in February and he thought the DOT permit would be along that same timeframe.

With the phasing of this project, Chairman Harrington asked how long they expect construction to occur. Mr. Socha said they did Hidden Oak in three years and one month. This one will probably be about three to three and a half years. They build it on market demand. They do not want to flood the market and have too many at one time. They do all the construction in house so they can only get so much done at once. They will be doing the road complete; 2,000 feet in phase 1 and 2,000 feet in phase 2.

Chairman Harrington asked if that is a similar process to what they did at Hidden Oak. Mr. Socha said it was similar and explained at Hidden Oak they had more phases and then they found that they needed to have the road ahead of them to be able to have people living behind them. At Hidden Oak they had a lot of blasting so they had to get as much done as possible. It goes fast especially when you start putting in six or seven foundations a month in the summer getting ready so they can build year round. In terms of dust, with OSHA and all their requirements now, they have to address that daily.

Chairman Harrington asked if there is a lot of cut and fill with this project. Mr. Socha said there is a minimal cut on the high side about ten feet and it is all sand. He dug down about 15 feet up there so he does not anticipate any ledge at all so there will be no blasting. It will be nice not having to worry about ledge. That is one of the first things he does when he looks at a site.

Chairman Harrington inquired about the plan for bringing material in and out. Mr. Socha said they have to bring in about 15,000 yards. It will be where the eight-unit building is on the south end of the property. They will get that in sooner rather than later because once he builds the road in the beginning he does not want to ruin it. When they bring it in they will place it right away. They do not like stockpiles because then you move it twice.

Ms. Goucher said at Hidden Oak, they moved faster than they originally thought they were going to build from start to finish. She asked Mr. Socha if he had any idea of the timing start to finish on the two phases. She asked where the fill would be coming in from. Mr. Socha said they will make sure all trucks come in from Londonderry, not to disturb the City traffic.
He spoke with his road contractors and the pits and they will all be coming down I-93. He could tell them how he wants them to come because he is paying them to truck it and move it. The anticipation is that the extra material will be coming from Pike or the Bow area and they will be coming right down I-93 to Exit 5 and coming from Londonderry. They don’t want to go anywhere near the inner city for upper North Mammoth Road or South Willow Street for that matter. It is very easy coming from the south.

With regard to the timing of the phases, Mr. Socha said when he gets up to the top on Bobcat Way around 12 and 13, he plans to be paving the rest of it to finish out the development to stay ahead of themselves. If they get going this spring, in a year they will be building that road. Ms. Goucher asked if in one year they will be finished with phase 1. Mr. Socha said a year to a year and a half. He said it is nice to give the road guy plenty of time to build the road.

Mr. O’Donoghue asked if they could separate infrastructure phasing from the unit building. Mr. Socha said the infrastructure will be done in 3-4 months and in 3-4 months he plans to have people live there. The sewer works out perfect. The first 13 buildings are all gravity sewer and the other buildings are on that pump station so once he gets to building 14 he has to have that road completely done and power going to that pump station to be able to pump the sewer back up the hill.

Mr. O’Donoghue said when he uses the term “infrastructure” he is talking about roads, utilities and sidewalks if they are going to build them as part of their infracture. He asked if phase 1 infrastructure would be completed in a year. Mr. Socha said the whole entrance will be built immediately including curbing and sidewalks. Then they will base coat the entire road but then the curbing will be held off and sidewalks until they do each building. As soon as they get the frame done they start doing the sidewalks because then the equipment has moved on. Mr. Socha said phase 2 infrastructure will be similar. The sidewalks and everything will be continuous. They are going to start with building 1. The buildings are numbered pretty consecutively to the way they are going to build it out so 1, 2, 3 and then all those sidewalks will be done and they will have that area. That includes landscaping and everything.

Mr. O’Donoghue asked if the roads and grading and things of that nature will be based on market demand for phase 2 or not. Mr. Socha said they are going to go in there and blow out the first phase of road completely. Mr. Socha said phase 2 will be built out completely just because of the sewer. After the initial 3-4 months when that road is being built they start buildings and then once they start completing the buildings they do about a building a month so every month they have a building coming on line. They get slowed down in the winter so they might lose a month per winter. The only thing that is phased is the road so they have phase 1, phase 2 and then each building goes back to back. They don’t build multiple buildings at once.

Mr. O’Donoghue asked if the road construction will be completed through phase 2
regardless of market demand for the units. He asked if there could be a potential where they may not do the phase 2 infrastructure for more than three years. Mr. Socha said if the economy crashes like it did in 2008 and something happens, but even with that they never even slowed down through 2008. Mr. O’Donoghue asked if phase 2 could be a continuation immediately after phase 1. Mr. Socha said yes and added that at Hidden Oak Way that was wild. That was 3,500 feet of road and they were building buildings as fast as they possibly could, and the road for that matter. He said it goes fast.

Mr. O’Donoghue said when you are building infrastructure there is a lot of traffic and a lot of activity on the roads up front so he was trying to get an idea of how long the people in the first units would be dealing with that. Mr. Socha said the road construction is most of the traffic and it goes fast. With a lot of the traffic on Hidden Oak Way they had the back access that worked out awesome, unfortunately they don’t have that here but the way they designed it with Glacier Way they only have the three buildings so those will be the buildings that will be impacted and the tenants are their customers. If they don’t have their customers they have problems so they bend over backwards to keep them happy. They work from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM and minimize their weekends in the summertime to keep people happy.

Alderman Levasseur asked what City services they are planning to use and impact. Mr. Socha said all trash will be handled on site as well as all plowing and landscaping so the City services will be a small school impact and minimal fire/police, if any. Alderman Levasseur asked how the garbage would be picked up. Mr. Socha said the trash will be picked up on site and paid by them. Mr. Socha said they will have seven dumpsters. Mr. Lewis said there are two banks of dumpsters in each phase and he pointed out the locations on the plan.

Ms. Charlebois asked what kind of discussions, if any, have they had with Londonderry. Mr. Lewis said they met with Londonderry when this was conceptual. There is regional impact for this so they sent plans to them. They have not expressed any concerns to them at all. Mr. Socha said the only thing Londonderry said at that time was if they were doing a subdivision they would want to have input because some of the land is in Londonderry but the fact that it is not they are happy with that. That is one of the reasons they got rid of the house out front.

Chairman Harrington advised that Mr. Golden had some communication from the Town of Londonderry and they sent him an email basically saying they do not see any impacts to their town. That is on record with the town.

As a point of clarification, Chairman Harrington said Mr. Golden received an email from Kristen Clarke who reviewed Mr. Pernaw’s traffic impact study and SNHPC comments. He read it into the record as follows: “We have reviewed SNHPC comments in addition to ours. Overall we feel the number of added trips are minor and that any safety/operational improvements that result from their responses will be able to be addressed at the staff level.”
Alderman Levasseur asked how much the project on Hackett Hill Road impacted the schools; Northwest Middle School or the high school. Mr. Socha said the impact on the schools was minimal, especially for the amount of units. A good sign of the school impact is how many kids are standing out and getting picked up by the school buses. He reiterated at Hidden Oaks for one bus there are three kids and on the next bus there are three or four kids. The Alderman asked if he was seeing any major impact on the school district from this project. Mr. Socha said not that he was aware of. He said they have had the least amount of turnover on a development as they have had with Hidden Oak. Normally in the first year of the development, you will get turnover and when they did Hidden Oak, they didn’t have that turnover that first year and people are staying longer. The alderman asked if tenants have to sign a one year lease and then it is month to month. Mr. Socha said they do a one year lease and they encourage as many years as they can get. They don’t go up on rents all the time, they try to hold rents and keep them down.

Alderman Levasseur asked what they will be paying in property taxes. Mr. Socha said the property taxes are $690,000 per year when it is completed. With impact fees and plan review fees over the first few years it is $1,000,000 that the City will be getting.

Mr. Curry inquired if they would consider putting a sidewalk on South Mammoth Road. Mr. Lewis thought if it was to be considered it would need to be considered more holistically along that whole corridor. He said they only thing they really control is their frontage, which is a DOT right-of-way. South Mammoth is a road that does not have a curb, there is a ditch line on the side of the road so to put a sidewalk in there either you are adding curb and changing the whole drainage there or you are setting the sidewalk back 10 or so feet on the other side of the ditch. It is a much bigger issue than just building a sidewalk. If they were to put a sidewalk just on their frontage they would basically have a sidewalk going to nowhere in both directions. It was not anything they discussed through this process with the City at this point. He said sidewalks are a great idea, but they would be directing people out onto South Mammoth Road and then not giving them anyplace to go to so you have to be careful where you are directing people or promoting pedestrian access. Mr. Socha advised there is a bike lane.

Ms. Trisciani asked for a little background regarding tree clearing and concerns over a bat population. Mr. Lewis said really the only environmental concern on this property, which is pretty close to statewide now, is the northern long eared bat and Fish & Game has requirements when you can do clearing and when you can’t and that window is over the winter. At a certain point in the spring, they really don’t want you to do any major clearing until the fall. As such, Mr. Socha did most of the clearing at the end of last winter in anticipation that they would have been starting this project sooner than this so right now the remaining clearing he would like to get done before that window closes again at the end of this winter. There is more clearing that has to be done. Mr. Socha said 90 percent has been done. He was sure to leave buffer areas and he didn’t want to cut. They had the zoning in place and there was an issue and he was confident that they were going to prevail.
on that issue sooner than later. It was a tough decision to make. He said it is always a bad idea to cut trees before plans are in place and he apologized for that. He didn’t like to do it. He had high hopes that they would be building this time but they didn’t want to have any issues with bats. They wanted to make sure the bats were safe.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

**Mr. Voyiatzakis** of 411 Lucas Road spoke against this project.

**Pat King** advised that she owns property on Map 796, Lots 12 and 13, and the proposed driveway entrance appears to be directly across from her parcel, Lots 12 and 13, and her abutter to the north has a driveway entrance to the north of the proposed driveway to the project. Her abutter to the south has an entrance south of the proposed entrance to the project and it appears that she is the only property directly across from the entrance. Her land is not developed at this time but she plans to put it on the market in the spring in part due to the interest she has had, which was probably stimulated by this project coming on line. She will be selling the land but her concern is how the proposed driveway might negatively impact any future entrance or access to her land and what that intersection would create as an additional traffic problem that may not have yet been taken into consideration.

**Elizabeth Voyiatzakis** of 411 Lucas Road thought this project was too dense and they are shoe-horned in. She thought they would find things are much wetter than when they cleared land last summer as the water table has come back to normal. In her area she has water that she hasn’t seen for four years. She said the bats may be safe, but she knows the deer have moved out of that area because they are coming from a different area when they come to her property. They are the abutting owners to the east, along the back section. She believes the applicants have underestimated how traffic will be impacted. She thought it will probably impact Ms. King. People already have come around Lucas Road trying to avoid traffic particularly if there has been an accident on I-93.

There were no further comments from the public and the applicant was given an opportunity to address their concerns.

With regard to density, Mr. Lewis said it is zoned RSM now and their allowable density is over 300 units and they only have 162. He encouraged people to drive by the Hidden Oak project, which is 152 units but is the same scale, and they could get a really good sense of the traffic and exactly what this project will look like.

With regard to the driveway entrance, Mr. Lewis said they had a lot of options and one thing they did not consider was a non-existent driveway across the street. They have a number of reasons why they settled on that location. If there is going to be something else developed across the street they would absolutely need to take that driveway into consideration, but it is hard for them to assess a driveway that is not there. As Ms. King said, there are two
existing commercial driveways opposite them. If they are not being lined up with one of those they wanted to be separate from them a certain distance.

Without knowing what the future development would be, Mr. Pernaw said he obviously could not opine on what might be needed for lanes, turn lanes and things like that. In just looking at the diagram that is before them, he could see there was a slight offset where the proposed driveway for the subject property is to the north of the one that was discussed earlier. That is a good thing in that left turn arrivals would not conflict. If the offset was in the other direction he could not say that. If some future development there is small or moderate, any future study would probably come to the same findings and conclusions that they don’t need auxiliary turn lanes and the driveway could be placed where the frontage is. He said that is conjecture on his part not really knowing much about what could happen there.

Alderman Levasseur asked if the traffic experts ever go back after the development is done to see if they were right. Mr. Pernaw said on occasion they do have that opportunity. Most of the times when they are doing a subdivision or whatever and it gets built they go back and they do it more for testing the ITE trip generation rates. That is the “Bible” that they use in their industry and the one that they have focused on over the years was single family residential detached dwellings and they did it over a dozen sites over the years and there was one exception where one site generated a little bit more than what ITE said and all the rest were below.

Given the concerns of Ms. Voyiatzakis of getting water on her land that she hasn’t seen in years, the Chairman asked what was going on there that may be upsetting the water table. Mr. Lewis was not sure she was insinuating that anything they did made that occur. He interpreted that just being the course of the climate. He explained they are not downhill from the project. He said their property drains entirely to the south into the wetland so he was not exactly sure where she was referring to on the property. He pointed out a few houses where there is some water that drains down and back onto Mammoth Road. That is an area where they have really taken a good look at and are not increasing any runoff.

Alderman Levasseur asked where the school bus will pick up children. Mr. Lewis said the school bus will pick up the children right on Mammoth Road at the entrance.

Ms. Goucher asked how many acres the project at Hidden Oak was. Mr. Socha said the lot size was larger than this but there was a lot more wetlands. In terms of their density calculation, he thought it was very similar to what this is in terms of buildable area. There is a more open space on Hidden Oak because there was a lot more unusable land.

With the gas coming up from South Mammoth, Mr. Golden asked if there was a moratorium in the street. Mr. Lewis said he had not been advised of any moratorium. Mr. Socha said he had not either and explained that they plan on going up the edge of pavement and then neighbors will be able to utilize that too. If Mrs. King is looking to sell her property, by
having the availability of natural gas to that area should increase her property values and the houses to the left of them will also be able to utilize that main.

Mr. Golden asked if they sorted out the loading spaces with Mr. Gagne. Mr. Lewis believed they did. There is a zoning requirement of designated loading spaces. They are showing them behind the clubhouse on the site plan, which meets the code requirement.

Mr. Golden said only nine accessible spaces were shown where ten were required. Mr. Lewis said they added a space on the resubmitted plan. He believed they took care of that at the clubhouse. He believes they are all set with the zoning comments.

With regard to the pump station at the end of the road, Mr. Golden asked how much would be visible and if it would be better to be closer to the front of a building versus the rear of a building. Mr. Lewis said the pump station would be underground in a manhole basically. There will be an electrical panel, which they will screen it like they will the transformers and pole boxes.

Chairman Harrington asked if the pump station has a backup generator. Mr. Lewis said it will. The Chairman asked if that will be on the surface or in the pit as well. Mr. Lewis said they are not required to have a backup generator but Mr. Socha has asked them to include one so they will have emergency storage and a backup generator so they will have to have a pad for that and maybe a little doghouse type thing back there next to the electrical panel. Mr. Socha said it is going to be an awesome pump station and “this thing is going to be bomb proof”.

Mr. Hebert said that the driveway seems to be hidden behind a lot of trees. He asked if they were going to be doing any clearing of the roadway. Mr. Lewis said there will have to be some trimming back to have the proper site distance along there.

Mr. Hebert asked about site lighting. Mr. Lewis said they have residential style fixtures. They have a lighting plan. The lights are positioned enough to provide more security lighting along the drives and in the parking areas. The light fixtures are the same as they used at Hidden Oak. Mr. Socha said they are awesome. They are LED and very cost effective to run and they don’t burn out and they look pretty cool.

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

Mr. Socha thanked the Board for their time and consideration.

3. **CU2018-121**

   Property located at 67 Central Street (Tax Map 168, Lot 2), a conditional use permit application to allow two (2) dwelling units on the first floor in the CBD Zone. *Fuss & O’Neill, Inc. for Christos Tsiaras.*
SP2018-122
Property located at 67 Central Street (Tax Map 168, Lot 2), a site plan application for the change of use of approximately 10,500 SF from offices to seven (7) multi-family dwelling units in the CBD Zone. *Fuss & O’Neill, Inc. for Christos Tsiaras.*

IMP2018-120
Property located at 67 Central Street (Tax Map 168, Lot 02), an application to reduce the impact fees from a total of $23,359, with a $2,100 commercial credit applied, to $11,305 for the conversion of a 10,500 SF office building to seven (7) dwelling units in the CBD Zone. *Fuss & O’Neill, Inc. for Christos Tsiaras.*

Rick Lundborn of Fuss & O’Neill appeared along with Christos Tsiaras. The parcel in question is 67 Central Street. They were before the Board a little earlier in the year to approve a project for Mr. Tsiaras’ neighbors who are putting in the hotel on the three parcels that wrap around and across the street on Litchfield Lane. The first part is a conditional use permit to allow multi-family dwelling units in the central business district and then also a minor site plan for the change of use to those dwelling units after the fact of the conditional use permit.

Mr. Lundborn advised the plan is to basically renovate the structure itself and have seven dwelling units where previously there was commercial space. Today there are ten parking spaces striped out back of the building off of Litchfield Lane and the proposal is to have nine parking spaces striped off and a dumpster paddock, where there is really no dumpster enclosure today. They have already pulled in a water line and a gas line so some of the comments from DPW about cutting permits and things like that have already been taken care of. There really isn’t a lot going on other than the actual change of use and the upgrade of those few utilities. The received comments from the Arena Overlay District. The Fire Department is requesting that it be a sprinklered building and that there be a fire department connection. All of those things are obviously things that can be taken care of through the building permit process and the code review and there is no problem with that.

Mr. Lundborn said DPW’s only real concern had to do with a couple notes being added to the plan, which are pretty typical. One being that they would like a note saying all the work has to conform to the City of Manchester specifications and any work in the right-of-way would require an excavation permit, which he presumed they must have gotten when they did the water line replacement. They also wanted them to add a note on the plan clarifying snow storage because it is a pretty tight site. They will put a note on the plan that requires snow to be removed from the site if it can’t be stored there. The only other thing DPW was requiring was a note discussing erosion control if during construction erosion became an issue that appropriate interim measures would be taken. He did not think there would be any erosion because there isn’t really any earth moving being done on this project, but they can add that note.
Mr. Lundborn said the only thing that was interesting to his client was the discussion of the trees. He has owned the building for quite a while and there haven’t been trees in front of the building pretty much the entire time. He showed a picture of the front of the building that is being renovated and pointed out a darker pavement patch and explained that was actually an exploratory excavation done by Water Works when they were poking around for some valves a while ago. There is another one just like it in front of the door. He didn’t know about historic street trees there and he would not argue if they went back and looked at pictures from before 1964, but the applicant has no recollection of there being trees there.

As far as repairing the sidewalk, Mr. Lundborn said it is passable today. Obviously if it is a bone of contention they would ask that they could coordinate that with the adjacent project and have it all done as one piece because they are replacing the sidewalk in front of their place as well.

Mr. Lundborn said a waiver was filed for the impact fees for the project. Instead of doing the impact fees for the residential units they requested it be done as townhouse units because they do not foresee there being a huge demand on services in the City. These will be smaller units and there probably won’t be children living there and they are already in the City core so the services are already there. They thought that was a fair compromise.

Alderman Levasseur asked about parking. Mr. Lundborn said there are nine parking spaces proposed. Basically one of them from before is being gobbled up for the dumpster enclosure. The dumpster would be on wheels and could be rolled out into the lane.

Mr. Golden advised that per zoning, the access aisle and parking space for the accessible space needs to be 20 feet long. Mr. Lundborn said they have plenty of room to do that because the aisle is 30 feet wide.

Alderman Levasseur asked if they were going to use toters and Mr. Lundborn responded that they were going with a dumpster, which is what has been used there all along. Ms. Goucher said the requirement is when you have more than four units you are considered a commercial use, which requires a dumpster.

Mr. Leclerc said the face of the building is old and tired. He asked if they were going to do anything with the windows and the façade. Mr. Lundborn advised they were just renovating the inside. The glass was replaced a few years back as were the opaque panels. There is no plan to change the face of the building. The sides and the back will be cleaned up and refreshed.

Mr. Leclerc asked if it would be two units on the second and third floors and three units on the ground floor. Mr. Lundborn said they are going to utilize the basement. He explained there is the parking lot ground level, the street level, which is a little bit higher, and then a second level.
Ms. Trisciani asked if the basement level apartments would just be well windows. Mr. Lundborn said there are well windows down along the bottom. She asked if that is all the lower level apartments will have for windows in the front. Mr. Lundborn said possibly.

Ms. Trisciani thought they needed to provide some level of landscaping and she asked what their thoughts were for lighting, particularly security lighting in the parking area and entryways. Mr. Lundborn said he did not believe there was going to be a plan to change any lighting. There is some lighting underneath the canopy in the front and some in the back as well. They will probably have some safety lighting mounted to the face of the building, down lighted near the rear of the building. He said they were just trying to keep it how it is and are just renovating the building. Ms. Trisciani understood that but from her perspective as a Board member she would like to see something a little bit different. The reality is lighting and safety for an office that is in use from 9:00-5:00 is very different than lighting and safety when you are now putting people in there 24/7. She thought that needed to be a huge consideration and she thought they needed to consider some sort of landscaping plan. Mr. Lundborn said they will benefit from the parking lot lighting adjacent to them from the hotel project. Ms. Trisciani said they cannot count on what the hotel is doing and what is approved for the hotel and they needed to be concerned with their property and what they are creating for a safe space for their residents. Mr. Lundborn pointed out a ten foot landscape strip that is with the other parcel. Ms. Trisciani stressed that she needed to see details from their own parcel, not from what they are proposing that their neighbors may do and may keep intact because they can’t control their neighbors. Mr. Lundborn said this is really just a change of use site plan. They are not proposing to build anything new other than inside the four walls of the building.

Mr. Curry said since they are changing the use of it, so they should want to change the presentation of it. If they leave it as an office building it is fine. If people are going to live there, they are going to look at this as part of their community which means they want it to look a certain way. They want it to present a certain way. They want it to have lights that they can feel secure it. That is the greenery, perhaps potted plants in the front. It doesn’t have to be trees, but there could be potted plants or awnings; things that say “this looks like a home versus an office”.

Mr. Lundborn asked his client what he was willing to do. Mr. Tsiaras said he didn’t really know how much space they had for landscaping. If they were talking about putting a couple trees out front he did not have a problem with that. If they were talking about putting some lights on the back of the building for security, he did not have any problems with that either. But as far as trying to create a lot of landscaping, he said the lot directly to the right of them is the Nixon Building and because the way the planning was back then (1964) the lots were right next to one another so their parking lot abuts his building. Up until the time that E&R left there and demolished all that E&R was actually connected to his building so now that they are gone there is a little bit of space there and that 10 foot area is going to hopefully be beautified by the hotel that is coming in. As far as the windows are concerned, they were
talking about putting in some more windows on the terrace level floor, which is the bottom floor, in order to allow more light in. He believes they met the requirements of the Fire Department. Since they are putting in sprinkler systems they don’t need windows that are big enough to get a fireman through with his equipment. He thought “it is what it is at this point”.

The Chairman said he was struggling with the fact that they are in the overlay district for the arena and as buildings either get sold or redeveloped it gives an opportunity to get the other buildings to come more in conformity to what the look and feel and the texture of that area is going to be. Something that happened in 1964 the Board obviously didn’t have any control over, but something that is now happening today there is a bit more control over and there is input from residents that have told the City what they want their downtown to look like. He thought their building had a beautiful façade, there is brick and some nice lineal features and to just put apartments in it without any thought about how it actually fits into that area was doing a bit of disservice to how that could actually look, even though it might cost some money to do so.

Ms. Goucher pointed out that while currently the parking in the rear has a 33 foot wide drive aisle, the requirement is only 22 feet. As such, there is the ability to put 4-5 feet of landscaping on either side of the parking spaces and still maintain the parking spaces. The comment that there is no space isn’t really accurate; there is no space as it is currently drawn because that is how it exists today but if they were to just move the parking spaces in and have a 22 foot aisle instead of a 33 foot aisle, they would have some space there for landscaping. Mr. Tsiaras said that would be wonderful but during the winter if it snows they push the snow to either side of the parking space and that would take up parking. The only other way they would be able to do it would be at each snow storm remove the snow from the parking lot rather than pushing it to either side, which becomes pretty costly.

Ms. Trisciani said in reading the arena district design review notes, under architecture, they came up with some ideas also, even just exterior sun shades or adding fenestrations or something as simple as window box treatments. There are things that could be done to the physical building to help improve and make it a little more inviting from a residential standpoint. It doesn’t necessarily have to be taking parking spots out to do landscaping; there are other creative ways to bring that about.

The Chairman said he saw this as an opportunity to do something different than what is there today. He said the Board would be open to ideas if there are cost effective ways to do that.

Alderman Levasseur asked if they were going to paint the exterior of the building. Mr. Tsiaras said they were. The Alderman asked what color. Mr. Tsiaras said they haven’t really decided on the color. He knows his wife and son seem to like the gray tone the Nixon’s painted their building. The Alderman said he liked that color. He asked if they were going to paint the front of the building on Central Street and Mr. Tsiaras said it is brick.
Alderman Levasseur asked if there were awnings on the front. Mr. Tsiaras said there is an awning over the door with a light. They will probably change that lighting to update it and provide more light.

Alderman Levasseur asked if they were good with the electric. Mr. Lundborn said the electric is coming from the transformer at the hotel. He wondered if they were going to have to spend a lot of money on upgrades. He said there are some really cheap things that can be done to beautify a building like shutters, painting the front of the building and little window awnings.

Chairman Harrington asked if there will be new HVAC units and where they would be located. Mr. Tsiaras said they would be on the roof. The Chairman asked if they would provide screening for those units. Mr. Tsiaras said “most probably”. He said they would be glad to look at anything. They will be talking to the design people to see if they can do something with the windows to try and beautify the area as well as with landscaping. He said they would like landscaping to and they want to make the building as appealing as they possibly can.

The Alderman asked if they could put trees on the sidewalk and Mr. Golden said they could and there was room for two trees. The Alderman asked the applicant asked if they were okay with that. Mr. Tsiaras said that is City property. He said he would love to have the City come in and put a couple trees there. The Alderman said the hotel is planning to put trees out front. The Chairman said there have been street beautification programs and façade programs. Ms. Sanuth said there is a program, but currently there is a job creation component so it really generally works with projects that either present day are mixed use or have an element of commercial that have that job creation component. There are restrictions with the funding source, but she said she would be happy to share more information with anybody who would like to take a look at it.

Alderman Levasseur said he would talk to the Highway Department to see what they can do about getting some trees there. Mr. Tsiaras said he would appreciate that. He liked what the City did across the street with the trees at the courthouse and thought it would be really nice to parody that.

Mr. Golden said with all the elements in the arena overlay design guidelines (landscaping, lighting, art, painting, materials, windows) if they are proposing new windows the arena overlay commit will want to see where those windows are going in so he thought there was some follow up needed.

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.
The Chairman said he was leaning towards leaving this open and having them work with staff to bring in some design elements and possibly some landscaping for the Board to review; something that is a little more in keeping with the overlay district.

It was the consensus of the Board to keep the hearing open until January 17, 2019. No further notice to abutters.

4. SP2018-123
Property located at 2500 River Road (Tax Map 557, Lot 7), a site plan application to demolish four dormitories and construct 93 parking spaces in the C-1 Zone. T.F. Moran, Inc. for Southern New Hampshire University.

Jeff Kevan of TFMoran appeared along with Lawrence Chasney from the University. Mr. Kevan said they constructed a dormitory building that just came online this past spring. As part of that they are taking down what is called the lower suites. They have all been fenced in and taken offline already. As part of the development those will all be razed. They will redevelop or renovate the driveway/roadway and the parking lot so they will come in and reclaim the pavement, smooth out some of the grading, curb it and put in gravels and repave the area. They will also widen the driveway, which right now varies and they are going to a 24 foot driveway. As part of this they are going to take out the guard building that has a little fence and they will restripe that road so it goes straight through and they will just have some pull off areas on either side. In the area where they are taking the buildings down, it is being proposed to install a parking. They have a couple terraced areas so they would construct a parking lot with 111 spaces.

Mr. Kevan said new lighting will be put in. There are Eversource poles that have some lights on them that the university leases. Those will all be removed and they will put in the standard lighting that they have along the roadways and parking lots out there, which is a shoebox style light, completely shielded and downcast. In addition, they have a landscape plan that shows landscaping in and around the parking lot and the sidewalk. The other benefit to the work that is being done is that right now drainage just works its way down to the river, but they are curbing the area and collecting it in catch basins. There are two storm tech systems that will provide stormwater treatment and discharge back to an infiltration basin. That water will make its way down to the river.

Mr. Kevan said currently in Manchester 1,137 parking spaces would be required per regulations. The existing number of spaces out there is 827 and they are proposing to increase that to 906 so there is an increase in Manchester. The total amount required for the overall campus is 2,953 and this will bring them to 3,167 spaces. The way they handled ADA spaces on campus is instead of this parking lot needing “X” number of ADA spaces, they place them in front of each building so they are in close proximity to where people would be going. They are adding 111 spaces in this parking lot, but in creating some of these driveways and smoothing out the grades as well as some parking spaces along the perimeter.
road, it ends up with a net add of 84 parking spaces total on campus.

Ms. Trisciani asked if they had addressed DPW’s concerns about snow storage. Mr. Kevan believed they had some snow storage areas shown. They have actually dropped their curb down in certain sections so they can push snow off without beating the curb up. They have planned for snow storage and they have more than enough area to push the snow to and store it on site.

Mr. Belanger asked if the 84 parking spaces coming on line were in Manchester. Mr. Kevan said it was 84 total. Mr. Belanger confirmed with Mr. Kevan a total of 79 parking spaces were being added in Manchester.

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.

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

The Chairman concluded the public hearing of the Manchester Planning Board of January 3, 2019.

III. LIMITED BUSINESS MEETING:

Chairman Harrington called to order the limited business meeting of the Manchester Planning Board of January 3, 2019.

(Tabled Item)

1. **SP-01-2018**
   Property located at 55 Edward J. Roy Drive (Tax Map 645, Lot 34B), a site plan application to construct a retail motor fuel outlet with eight fuel dispensers / 16 fuel pumps and a 6,500 SF building, including two fast food restaurants and convenience store with onsite parking, loading, landscaping, and lighting in the B-1 Zone. *MHF Design Consultants, Inc. and Z-1 Express for Victory Distributors, Inc.*

   Remain on table.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

1. **Review and approval of the Planning Board Minutes of December 6, 2018.**

   Review and approval of the Minutes was tabled until the next meeting.
2. **Any other business items from the Planning Staff or Board Members.**

**On Demand Training**

Ms. Goucher reminded the Board that next Thursday at 6:00 PM was the On-Demand Training with the New Hampshire Municipal Association.

**RFP for Master Plan**

Ms. Sanuth inquired how many responses were received from the closed RFP for the Master Plan. Ms. Goucher advised that they received four responses.

**Central Street Hotel Project**

Alderman Levasseur asked when people come to the City asking for projects, it would be interesting to know how many of them actually follow through or don’t follow through. He thought it was probably one or two that don’t follow through. He referred to the hotel on Central Street and advised that he keeps getting a lot of questions about it. He hasn’t seen any work on that project at all.

Mr. Belanger said they haven’t pulled any building permits yet. They are working toward that. There have been some financing issues they have been working on, but they are continuing to move forward. Their approval lasts for a year. He believed they got it in June so they have some time to do it. They are going in front of the Zoning Board next Thursday and will likely be coming back before this Board in February because there is going to be a change based on a lot line they are changing. They plan to keep everything exactly the same from a person on the street looking at the hotel, but there is a lot line issue they are dealing with, which he will explain to the Board in February.

The Alderman was happy to know they are still going forward.

**Chunky’s**

Alderman Levasseur asked about the status of this project. Ms. Goucher said one of the outstanding conditions the Board imposed on them was a letter of credit for some of the issues that have been outstanding and staff just received a letter of credit a few days ago. She and Mr. Golden were speaking with the engineer over the last 24 hours. They had to get some updated FAA approvals because the apartment building they are now proposing on the site is four stories and they are in the flight path so that has recently been taken care of. With any luck she might be signing those plans tomorrow.

Ms. Goucher advised that Planet Fitness is very anxious. They have their permits in to fit up the place and they have basically been on hold until the developer takes care of their conditions of approvals so staffs can sign the plans.
**Bedford Street Hotel Project**

Alderman Levasseur recalled there was a letter of credit issue and he asked if that was ever rectified. Mr. Golden said the developer was back before the Heritage Commission. They had aesthetic changes; they removed the pool but added some rooms to make it more financially viable due to the remediation of the lot. That project is also moving forward. They do not have permits yet. He believed they were hopeful to start construction in the spring.

Ms. Goucher advised that the developer was back before the BMA and she thought with the recent action by the BMA, the project will move along quickly now.

**Hackett Hill Road**

Alderman Levasseur advised that the property was foreclosed on and the City ended up taking that property back and there is no plan to put any residential uses in there now even though that is what the person who had it wanted to do. The Mayor rejected it out of hand, and it went through foreclosure.

**Rezoning Request**

With regard to the rezoning request on the south end with the pig farm, Alderman Levasseur said that was received and filed by the committee and then it was upheld by the Board. He added that they did not provide a plan to the BMA.

**Villagio’s**

Ms. Goucher reminded the Board Villagio’s was before the Board for a conditional use to expand and staff has been following up with them. Apparently the restaurant owner was just recently able to get the lease back from the property owner so until that lease was in place, the restaurant owner was not moving forward with the expansion. Ms. Goucher believed their approval was valid through February so she may be coming back requesting an extension for that project.

**55 Edward J. Roy Drive**

Mr. Hebert asked if there was any update on this project. Ms. Goucher said there is supposed to be a hearing on the 22nd or 30th of this month and something on February 14th. Peter Chiesa has it on his schedule so she thought at the business meeting in February she would be able to update the Board.
Mr. Hebert made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. O’Donoghue. (Motion Carried.)

ATTEST: _____________________________________________________

Michael Harrington, Chairman
Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD: April 18, 2019

☑ 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.
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