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.

Mr. O’Donoghue made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc, that the following applications are complete and available for a public hearing: S2019-0001, S2019-0003, SP2019-003, CU2019-003, PDSP2019-001, CU2019-004, SP2019-001, SP2019-004 and CU2019-005. (Motion Carried)

Chairman Harrington advised that agenda item #7 would be heard at the beginning of the agenda.

7. CU2019-005
Property located at 468 S. Main Street (Tax Map 334, Lot 1), a conditional use application to allow alcoholic beverages in association with a restaurant establishment of less than 5,000 SF in the B-1 Zone. Patcharamon (Pat) Jansipsee.

Pat Jansipsee, owner of Lemon Thai & Sushi, said they currently lease 1,845 SF from SSP Realty, LLC for the operation of the restaurant. The restaurant opened on November 17,
2018. After they bought the restaurant, they spent a lot of money and time to renovate and make improvements. Today they are requesting a conditional use permit to allow them to serve alcoholic beverages in association with the restaurant operation. They will obtain a liquor license from the State of New Hampshire and comply with all requirements.

Chairman Harrington asked if there was no liquor license before. Ms. Jansipee said for just beer and wine. This request is to add spirits to their operation.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public and no one came forward with comments.

The Chairman closed this public hearing and said it would be deliberated in this evenings business meeting.

1. **S2019-001**

Properties located at 200 Joseph Street Ext. (Tax Map 861, Lot 12) and 220 Joseph Street Ext. (Tax Map 862, Lot 1), a subdivision application for a lot line adjustment between 200 and 220 Joseph Street Ext., in the R-1A Zone. *Joseph M. Wichert, LLS for Minnie M. Chung Living Trust and Deborah A. Hubbard.*

Joe Wichert appeared on behalf of the Minnie M. Chung Living Trust and the trustees are Ms. Chung, Mr. Fahey and Deborah Hubbard.

Mr. Wichert said this application is straightforward and the only unique thing about it is that it is a lot line adjustment but both lots are getting larger. He explained there is a paper street, the extension of Eugene Street, involved. Eugene Street starts off to the north of the subject property and it ends on Joseph Street Extension. The Hubbard residence is 220 Joseph Street and the Chung/Fahey residence is 200 Joseph Street and the paper street went all the way through to the back and stopped. That street was formally discontinued by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Ms. Chung and Mr. Fahey have done quiet title so they annexed their half of the paper street to their property, which is the City process. Ms. Hubbard is in the process of annexing her half of the paper street, the westerly half of Eugene Street Extension, onto her property. The only thing they are doing differently is, out of the 25 foot westerly half of Eugene Street, a 15 foot section identified as parcel A, is actually going to get annexed to the Chung/Fahey property and then Mrs. Hubbard will take the westerly 10 feet.

Mr. Wichert advised that they drew the plan up as if that 2,600, which is the easterly 15 feet, is going to be annexed so that will add 2,610 SF to the Chung property, which will increase it from the 21,750 to 24,362 SF. On the Hubbard property, they have it listed as going from 21,746 to 19,136 SF. The difference with that is generally speaking common law would give you ownership to half of the street. The City requires actual quiet title before you can count it towards anything. Because of that one issue, they have asked for waivers on topography
and buildable area. The subject lots are zoned R-1A. They have 100 feet of frontage and a 12,500 SF requirement. Both lots are already developed. There will be no additional improvements. It is more or less for Title work and cleaning up purposes.

Ms. Goucher asked how far along they are with the quiet title process. Mr. Wichert believed it was filed about two months ago so it will be another couple of months.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public and no one came forward either in favor of or in opposition to this application. There were no further comments from the Board.

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

2. **S2019-003**

Property located at 60 Revere Avenue (Tax Map 358, Lot 17), a subdivision application for the creation of three new buildable lots of 7,501 SF, 7,504 SF and 6,333 SF, in the R1-B Zone. *Norris Chisholms for the Heirs of Martin F. & Bertha I. Milne.*

Joe Wichert appeared on behalf of the Heirs of Martin & Bertha Milne and on behalf of Sirron Development. Also present was Norris Chisholms of Sirron Development.

Mr. Wichert advised that the Milnes own Lot 17 on Manchester Tax Map 358. Currently it has 202 feet of frontage on Revere Avenue. It has 121.6 feet on Longwood Avenue and 91.7 feet of frontage on Wayland Avenue. The Milne residence, which is a single family home, is in the middle of the property. The subject property is zoned R-1B, which requires 75 feet of frontage, 7,500 of buildable area and a lot depth of 100. The property as it is configured now is 21,337 SF so it is about 1,200 SF short of being able to be subdivided by Ordinance. As such, they went to the Zoning Board and obtained relief. On Lot 17A, which is the northerly lot, it is proposed as 7,501 SF of which all is buildable. It has 64.92 feet of frontage on Revere Avenue and 121.6 feet of frontage on Longwood. He said typically you would have a longer and skinnier lot and this one is backwards. The frontage is on Longwood and the depth doesn’t meet the 100 feet but the area makes it so the Zoning Board granted a variance for those issues on that lot. On the southerly lot (Lot 17B), it is 7,504 SF but it is inverted. They have almost 78 feet of frontage on Revere Avenue but the lot is not 100 feet deep. It is only 91.7 feet deep on Wayland Avenue. On the middle lot, they were granted a variance for inadequate lot area. They have 6,333 SF where 7,500 SF is required. Frontage they have 59-1/2 feet where 75 is required. On the north side they have setbacks of 8.7 and 8.1 where 10 feet is required.

Mr. Wichert advised that the building on the left is a garage. That is going to be removed and they are going to build a single car driveway on the south of the existing residence at 60 Revere Street. That is going to create the two legal parking spots for the middle house then
the other two lots can be developed.

Mr. Wichert said in the R-1B district, it is usually a 20 foot front yard setback, 10 foot side yard setback and 30 foot rear setback. When you have corner lots you have two front setbacks and two side yard setbacks. When they were at the Zoning Board, the ZBA stipulated a 20 foot setback on Lot 17A. He pointed out the neighbor’s house that is very close to the lot line so they pushed that setback out an additional 10 feet and then on Lot 17B, they agreed to a 15 foot setback instead of the 10 that was required. That change is a new revision, which was an oversight on their part when they submitted it the first time.

Mr. Wichert said they are complying with the stipulations of the Zoning Board. All the lots will be serviced by municipal sewer and water. He pointed out a pole that services one of the houses and the overhead wire nicks a little corner of the lot so they put a 60 foot easement over it to maintain that line. It is in an area that is encumbered by the building setbacks so it can’t be developed, but they wanted the Board to be aware of that. When they spoke to the Zoning Board, they were going to make sure with the new driveway and the line crossing that they had the proper clearance.

Because this is an older neighborhood and it is already serviced by overhead utility wires, Mr. Wichert said they are requesting a waiver to service the two new lots with overhead utilities instead of underground.

Ms. Charlebois asked which way the two new houses are going to face. Mr. Wichert believed 17B would front on Revere and 17A would front toward Longwood, but he has to verify what the zoning approval was for.

Ms. Goucher asked if Revere, Longwood or Wayland are under moratorium. Mr. Wichert thought Revere might be. He didn’t know that was critical for them because luckily they have water in both Longwood and Wayland and sewer in Wayland. It didn’t look like there was sewer in Longwood west of Revere but he pointed out a manhole they could tie into if they needed to. Ms. Goucher confirmed with Mr. Wichert that the plan would be if there was a moratorium that they would go from the side streets.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

Charlie Nagle, who owns the property at 41 Revere Avenue, said there is no parking as it is on the road and they are going to build houses where there isn’t enough property so it will make everything really congested and tighter and parking is already an issue in that area.

There were no further questions from the public and Chairman invited Mr. Wichert to address the concerns of the abutter.

Mr. Wichert thought the new houses will work out fine. He said they tend to have pretty
Chairman Harrington confirmed with Mr. Wichert the anticipation is that these will be single family residences.

Reading the Minutes from the Zoning Board, Alderman Levasseur said it looked like they voted to pass all the variances. With regard to the one concerning parking setbacks, he asked what happens during the winter when there is a snow ban and everyone has to move their cars off the street. In addition, he asked if they had perused the neighborhood to see how the odd/even parking was working. Mr. Wichert did not believe the street is posted as no parking. In a situation where there is a snow emergency everybody is going to have to park in the driveway. He thought the way they have it set up they could fit additional cars in the driveway in a snow emergency.

Alderman Levasseur asked how many bedrooms the houses will have. Mr. Wichert said there will be three bedrooms. The tax records reflect that the existing house has two bedrooms. The Alderman Levasseur asked if they are keeping the existing house the way it is or if they will tear it down. Mr. Wichert said in order to get the plan signed, the garage will have to be removed and they would have to pave the new driveway so at least that would be done and the intent is to sell the middle house as is, with two parking spaces.

Alderman Levasseur confirmed with Mr. Wichert there is a nonconforming three family in the neighborhood. He asked if they had six parking spaces for that building. Mr. Wichert believed that was Mr. Nagle’s property. He didn’t know exactly how many spaces he has or doesn’t have. The Alderman said they may be parking on the street.

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

3. **SP2019-003**
Property located at 55 West North Street (Tax Map 165, Lots 13 & 14), a site plan application for a proposed 40 vehicle surface parking lot in the R-3 Zone. *Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. for Ole Blue Eyes-Manchester, LLC.*

**CU2019-003**

Property located at 55 West North Street (Tax Map 165, Lots 13 & 14), a conditional use application to allow a surface parking lot as a principle use in an R-3, Urban Multifamily Zoning District. *Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. for Ole Blue Eyes-Manchester, LLC.*

Paul Chisholm, a licensed civil engineer and project manager with Keach-Nordstrom associates, advised that they are the surveyors and engineers for the project. Also present was Will Thosier of the Courville Communities representing the applicant and owner.

Mr. Chisholm said they are seeking approval for a site plan, a conditional use permit and an adjoining voluntary merger to support a new parking lot to service the existing Courville facility. Additionally, the applicant is asking for approval of a waiver to allow 20 foot light poles within the limited activity buffer as the site abuts a couple of residential properties.

Mr. Chisholm said lots 13 and 14 are where the new parking lot will go. They combine for slightly over 31,000 SF of total area and they are under common ownership of Ole Blue Eyes, LLC. Under a different LLC, but basically the same ownership is the Courville facility, which has existed and been in operation since the early 1990’s. The existing facility site has received various approvals from both the Planning Board and Zoning Board throughout that decade. The latest successful zoning action occurred in 1998, which basically allowed a slight expansion to their facility. When that was approved there was a stipulation attached to the agreement, which required 30 onsite parking spaces and 25 offsite parking spaces to run in continuum with the property. The Courville folks have maintained those parking agreements to this day and currently have offsite agreements across West North Street along the properties owned by Brady Sullivan and essentially that is where their employees park. Their employees park down there and walk up Chandler Street or around some of the adjacent streets to get into the main facility. Lots 13 and 14 have had a residential use. Today that is not maintained. The house and pool house are both dilapidated and the area is overgrown.

Mr. Chisholm advised that the neighborhood itself is actually home to both residential and business uses so it is kind of a mixed use block surrounded by West Webster Street on the north and West North Street on the south. The site plan proposes to merge both lots 13 and 14 and basically create a new 40 space parking lot, which will also have a full stormwater management system, landscaping, lighting and other site appurtenances. The new parking lot can be accessed either by Webster Street going into the existing parking lot and around the southeasterly corner of the existing facility or by Chandler Street. When vehicles exit the parking lot they will not be allowed to drive around the corner of the building and back up to Webster Street. He said that corner is a little too tight to support two-way traffic by current
standards and regulations so essentially cars will have to exit through Chandler Street and onto West North Street.

Mr. Chisholm advised that the majority of the parking will be located on basically what was Lot 14 and on Lot 13 and the house will be taken down, the lot will be cleaned up and there will be new landscaping and also a new walkway. He referred to the landscaping plan and said they are going to hire a landscape company and make it look presentable. A walkway will be constructed from the West North Street sidewalk to the parking lot to allow continuous connection all the way around the block for users of the building as they go for a daily stroll or something like that since there is no sidewalk on Chandler Street currently.

Mr. Chisholm advised the conditional use permit is required to allow a “commercial parking lot” in the R-3 zoning district. For all intents and purposes when this is built and constructed and the users are driving in and out of this parking lot it is basically going to feel like one site for the Courville community. However, they can’t actually merge the parcels due to financing purposes in relation to their HUD agreement with the government. As such, the parking lot on a separate lot is considered a principal use. The principal use of this parking lot is really what is triggering the requirement of this conditional use permit because it is in the R-3 zone. If the lots were to be merged, for example if Lot 17 (the existing facility) and these two lots were all merged together, this parking lot would be considered an accessory use and it would be allowed by right in this zone, but because of financing purposes that just cannot happen. Purely by the code definitions, the parking lot becomes its own principal use in this case. Mr. Chisholm said it was important to note that the parking lot will be specifically for the users of the Courville property and not open to the public.

Mr. Chisholm said the key thing here at the end of the day is to understand that this will look and feel like one property. What it does do is actually helps increase the safety of pedestrians and vehicles in the area because you will no longer have people walking from other locations to access the Courville facility so it provides much cleaner and safer access for pedestrians. At the same time, there will be significant landscape improvements. They are really going a little above and beyond on this property in particular so it is going to clean up the neighborhood and remove the eyesore that is the current state of the property and really redevelop it in a good manner. There is really not going to be any significant or adverse impacts to the natural environment or resources of the City. A stormwater management plan has been designed. Currently as it stands the stormwater system infiltrates the full ten year storm. They are working with Mr. Coviello, who had a couple of comments regarding the particulars of the drainage system, on getting those flushed out and that infiltration state will remain for that as well. One of the criteria is public utilities and community facilities and he said everything is basically in place to support this. There are really no additional utilities needed for the parking lot. It is basically drainage and there will be a little bit of landscaping that will require irrigation, which is all fed off the main facility.

Mr. Chisholm said they are asking for a waiver from Section 6.08(D)2, which is to allow a
light pole of 20 feet high in the limited activity buffer. He referred to the lighting plan and said there are actually two lights in the 50 foot limited activity buffer, which is probably best seen on the site plan. Everything to the left, north and south of that area is all within the limited activity buffer. Two 20 foot light poles are proposed. The way that it is set up with this is beneficial because the two light poles project into the middle of the site. He said they actually had a second lighting design for what it would take if there were 10 foot poles. At 10 feet high, eight poles are actually required. What they didn’t like about that plan is this site is actually being built up a little bit to be able to connect in with the higher site and also to promote the drainage onsite to provide separation of water table and things of that nature. With 10 foot poles there will be light projecting in all directions from the center light, which will basically be also pointing directly in the direction of the abutters. That is why they are proposing the two poles. If the Board feels strongly one way or the other on that they have the second design. They are comfortable with both but in terms of their professional opinion, having the 10 poles is not the way to go just because of how the light is actually projected toward the residential properties.

Being in the limited activity buffer, Mr. Chisholm said the big thing here is the adjacent residences. They have put the vast majority of the landscaping on this side of the site as an extra buffer. There is also an existing six foot stockade fence that will remain.

Mr. Chisholm advised that they received minor comments from the zoning group as well as DPW. The zoning comments were pretty minor and will not impact the project materially at all. DPW had questions in particular to drainage. They spoke to Mr. Coviello about those and he thinks they definitely have a path moving forward. He suspects what will happen is their underground storage area will get a little bigger. As he understands, new regulations came out for what the design storm is for the City on January 1st. Since this application was submitted on January 7th, they no longer design to the ten year storm, they design to the 25 year storm so that is one of the issues as well as the fact that this whole area is combined sewer so what is the best way to connect into the City system in terms of all that. He reiterated they are working with Mr. Coviello and he does not anticipate any issues there. They will be able to clean up all those comments prior to final approval and at the end of the day it is not going to affect the meat and potatoes of this application.

With regard to the trees they are taking down and the trees they are replacing them with, Mr. Leclerc asked if they are similar in size because obviously they are buffers along with the fence and he was sure the abutters would like to maintain as much as possible. Mr. Chisholm said there will be selective cutting. When they do surveys they do not pick up typically every tree and the diameter of the tree and things like that, you pick up the tree lines which shows and overall area. They don’t want to cut down trees just to put up new ones. They are going to selectively cut. Obviously they are going to be reducing the number of trees, but that is just to make way for the development and that will all be replaced in accordance with the regulations.
Mr. Leclerc asked if the parking was for guests or employees. Mr. Chisholm said mostly for employees and then overflow for residents or guests visiting the residents and things of that nature. Mr. Thosier said there are 25 offsite parking spaces being rented and they are putting in 40 so the 25 would probably be for employees and 15 for guests. Mr. Leclerc asked if the lot would be full most of the time. Mr. Thosier said there are three shifts as the nursing home runs 24 hours so there are nurses on all three shifts and residents are mostly daytime and evening. Mr. Leclerc was concerned for the people in that area and headlights and things like that late at night shining in people’s windows and things like that.

Ms. Charlebois asked if they had a plan for snow storage and removal. Mr. Chisholm said snow storage would be pushed around onsite. As typical with a City lot, if they get historic snow one year or something they will have to move it off site. He said this plan also provides them more parking spaces than what was required with their original zoning approvals so depending on how operationally it works they may be able to put snow in a couple of spaces and kind of stack it up, but it will kind of be a play it by ear situation.

With regarding the conditional use for parking, Chairman Harrington said one of the criteria is whether it would be detrimental to abutting properties. He said he looks at parking lots as kind of a low level use of a piece of property even though for their purposes it is going to serve a use. He said some of the surrounding lots are not in the greatest condition. They are not kept up well and a lot of the wheel stops that are placed to prevent people from going too far are disjointed and plowed up. He asked why they would think this wasn’t detrimental to the abutting properties who see this as a low level use. Mr. Chisholm said it meets the regulations with the exception being the lighting, which he believes is the wise way to look at the lighting in this case. It will be cleaned up. Just knowing what this property looks like now, it is very rundown and overgrown. The whole thing is going to be manicured. In thinking about how much space they are actually dedicating in this application to new landscaping and cleaning it up, this is a little more than a third of the total area. They are going above and beyond with this landscaping design and having a fence in there than what is required. He does see it having some impact, but he does not see it having a detrimental impact. To him, the value they are getting out of the safety aspect of this overrides that completely. They will no longer have three shifts of 25 employees parking and crossing the street. He doesn’t know of any incident happening, but all it takes is one to be considered serious. To him the benefit here is really the safety component more than anything.

Mr. Thosier said this area is rundown, the house is dilapidated and falling down and it is an eyesore. He said Mr. Courville runs a very high end place and this next to him is uncomfortable and he wants it to look nice. He wants landscaping on the entrance. He is doing work on the back of the building to make sure that it marries and looks good and there is a sidewalk. He goes to far extremes to make everything look good and keep it looking good. He said it is fun to work for someone who has that much care with what he does.
Mr. Chisholm said they have to keep in mind that there are other parking lots in the area so this is not out of the character of the area by any stretch of the mind. The Chairman said that is why he was wondering why they need another parking lot. He said he appreciates Mr. Courville keeping his properties the way he does.

Chairman Harrington said the waterline comes down the lot and then it ends. Mr. Chisholm said that was irrigation. He said irrigation will be designed by an irrigation consultant later on. He believed that had its own process in the City so it will meet all those codes.

Ms. Goucher said she was conferring with Mr. Golden and they noticed something that was not caught on the zoning review. Five or 6 of those spaces are going away in order to make the connection. There is a technical issue because they are not merging the parking with the site. Even though the Planning Board can grant conditional use permits for a reduction in parking on site, the condition that the Zoning Board imposed was that 30 spaces had to remain on site at all times. In looking at the plan that was attached to the zoning review, it looks like they have the 30 spaces but those spaces have to be removed in order to get the drive through connection. As such, she believes right now the hearing should be kept open so staff can get clarification as to whether or not it has to go back to the zoning board. Mr. Chisholms asked if staff saw anything that will stop it or if they would just need to go back to the Zoning Board. Ms. Goucher did not believe it would be a hard ask to the Zoning Board because, at the end of the day, the ZBA made that stipulation because obviously they were concerned in granting the variances as to whether or not there was enough parking. Mr. Thosier said they are adding enough to make up for that 30. Ms. Goucher said the specific letter of the condition of the ZBA was 30 spaces had to remain on site and the only way they can keep that is if they don’t have that drive through connection because they are removing those spaces. Mr. Chisholm asked what the benefit would be to keeping the hearing open in that case and not just closing it. Ms. Goucher said when there is a variance requested generally the Board likes to know whether or not it was granted. If the Planning Board closes the hearing, they are closing it before they have the full results of the Zoning Board. Mr. Chisholms said they were fine with that.

Alderman Levasseur did not think anything that was going to happen with the Zoning Board was going to change his opinion about allowing this project to go forward. As such, he thought this Board could approve this application conditioned upon the Zoning Board approving what Ms. Goucher just talked about.

If the Board wants to go that route and they close the hearing tonight and they wait to take an action in two weeks, which would be typical, and they put that as a condition it is granted by the Zoning Board, it doesn’t affect the decision if they have put it in as a condition. If the Zoning Board has some issues, and they can’t meet the condition, they will have to come back to this Board. Chairman Harrington said the Board has done that on occasion and it has been primarily when they were pretty assured that the ZBA would approve.
Alderman Levasseur asked if they had already purchased the two properties that are in disrepair. Mr. Thosier said they have owned the property for a couple of years.

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 there were a couple different ways they could go. He said he could poll the Board to see if they would be willing to close the public hearing with the condition that they get ZBA approval or they could just keep it open.

Mr. Thosier thought it made more sense to keep it open.

Chairman Harrington kept this public hearing open until March 21, 2019 to allow the applicant an opportunity to go before the ZBA. He said there will be no further notification to abutters.

4. **PDSP2019-001**

Property located at 955 Auburn Street (Tax Map 380, Lot 6A:6C), a site plan application to amend a previously approved site plan (SP-23-2018), to expand the existing emergency department by approximately 20,100 SF in the C-2 Zone. *C.LD, Fuss & O’Neill for Elliot Hospital.*

**CU2019-004**

Property located at 955 Auburn Street (Tax Map 380, Lot 6A:6C), a conditional use application to reduce the required on-site parking from 1,125 to 1,089 in the C-2 Zone. *C.LD, Fuss & O’Neill for Elliot Hospital.*

Dick Anagnost appeared on behalf of Elliot Hospital as their development consultant. Also present was Brian Pratt and Paul Koneszka of Fuss & O’Neill. They were before the Board in August and are back to update the Board on the progress of the previous site plan application, which was approved and is underway and here to amend it with some changes they have had to make in the field as the result of conditions that were unknown at the time they began construction. When they were before the Board last time they were assessing their emergency department, which is way overtaxed, so they have filed an amendment to also expand their emergency department.

Mr. Anagnost advised this Board granted them approval in August and they began construction in October. The parking garage is up and they are in the process of doing all of their roughs at this point and fully believe they will deliver and begin parking in the garage on May 1st. As discussed earlier, they would have the parking garage in place before so they could relocate the spaces where they are putting the cancer center addition. The cancer center portion for demolition has been vacated by the Elliot. They are doing “make ready” in
there right now. They will be submitting for building permits in the next two weeks and will probably begin demolition there sometime at the beginning of April.

Mr. Anagnost said there has been a change in the parking garage in the way it is constituted for parking. He knew there was a comment from staff regarding the gates they put up. When they were before the Board last time they talked about gating one level and now they are gating all three levels. He explained a management decision was made Elliot to direct all employees to this garage now so it would be an employee garage now so they could free up even more spaces around the hospital for the convenience of their patients.

Brian Pratt of Fuss & O’Neill said originally they came in and had the parking garage approved, which is under construction now. The second phase was the cancer center addition, which was a demo of part of the existing hospital and a 16,000 SF addition with a garden. They are before the Board now to add on the emergency department expansion. Their emergency room is over utilized so they really need to gain some space. The plan is to fill in a portion of the existing parking area, expand off the existing building where the existing emergency room drop-off is. It is approximately 20,000 SF and they would shift the current ambulance entrance over, which would give them more room to add a parking and drop-off area directly in front. They would have a new canopy, one-way in loop around drop-off and then parking surrounding. There are 15 parking spaces there. Currently in that existing parking lot there are about 51 parking spaces and parking is a premium so they plan to do under building parking and there will be about 33 parking spaces there so they will only lose about 3 total spaces with this addition. There are some utilities in the area that will need to be relocated; a waterline, they will have to run gas to it and other than that it is a relatively minor impact to the site itself because it is expanding building over existing paved areas. There is no drainage impact; it is pretty much the same pre and post development.

Mr. Pratt said there are some other changes to the site that as they got into a little more detail they realized there were a few things they needed to change. Over on the cancer center side it is pretty much the same as they submitted. The canopy was expanded a little bit just as the architect designed it and got into the functionality of it.

Mr. Pratt said from the parking lot behind the boiler building right now the pedestrians walk down the sidewalk and enter into the existing building. They are not going to want the employees parking in that lot to come down through the cancer center entrance so they are going to want to direct them to the main hospital entrance. As such, they are adding some stairs because there are some grade changes between the parking lot and the lower parking lot. They are going to add a sidewalk and a striped pedestrian pathway to give them a safe designated spot to walk so they are not just filtering down through the parking area.

Mr. Pratt said they also had a minor change to the footprint and explained that after the original approval the hospital decided they wanted to also upgrade the linear accelerator,
which is a treatment device for the cancer center. It is inside a concrete vault and in order to fit it into the building they had to bump out the face of the building a little bit so it is a really minor change there.

Mr. Pratt said once they started excavating for the parking garage they found there was extremely hard ledge in the corner. Originally the lower level was going to mimic the upper level so there was going to be parking in the same configuration just stacked three on top of each other. The ledge came down into that area and because of the proximity of the hospital’s sensitive equipment they really wanted to avoid blasting so what they did on the lower level was actually lost a few parking spaces. He said they are going to do a short little curb retaining wall and they are going to lose 12 parking spaces on that lower level. The circulation still works the same they just don’t have those 12 spaces. He pointed out where there was exposed ledge and advised it would be separated with the little curb wall and the drainage will be collected by catch basins.

Mr. Pratt said another change they had was the water line. When they started to install the water line it made sense to bring it in from a different location than was previously planned. Originally they were going to bring the water line in off of Cypress Street and they ended up bringing it down internal from the hospital just to avoid conflicts in the area.

With regard to the conditional use permit, Mr. Pratt said technically they are short on the number of parking spaces required. The reason for that is the existing 500+ space parking garage is technically on its own lot. It was something to do with the financing they did years ago. That parking garage is dedicated for the hospital so they have enough parking if they include the spaces there, but they technically need a conditional use permit because it is offsite parking.

Mr. Long asked if the linear accelerator (radiation treatment equipment) was all under code with respect to radiation emanating from the building. Mr. Anagnost said it was encapsulated in vaults with lead lining and all of that kind of stuff. He explained the linear accelerators that exist today are going to be replaced with new models and the newer models needed a little more room so they are expanding the footprint of the vaults. Mr. Pratt said they have a physicist they have been working with that actually designs the shielding that is either three foot thick concrete or a combination of lead. What they showed was the worst case scenario. It might actually get a little smaller than that.

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

Chairman Harrington closed this public hearing and it will be taken up at the next business meeting.
5. **SP2019-001**

Property located at 100 Hitchcock Way (Tax Map 645, Lot 35), a site-plan application to add approximately 91,640 SF to an existing 121,447 SF medical center and add 444 parking spaces, with associated site improvements, in the C-2 Zone and Lake Massabesic Protection Overlay District. *Fuss and O’Neill for Dartmouth Hitchcock Clinic.*

Brian Pratt of Fuss & O’Neill appeared along with Dr. Steven Paris of Dartmouth Hitchcock and Richard Pizzi of Lavallee Brensinger Architects.

Dr. Paris said this project is to expand services at their existing building. They are going to do several things. One, they have an ambulatory surgical center, which has been in the building since it opened in 1998 that needs to be expanded and moved. They are going to move it into a new facility that will have more operating rooms, more endoscopy suites and they will be able to take care of a larger number of patients. They will also have pre and postoperative areas that are specific for adults and children to be more patient friendly. They will be expanding their radiology services and will have a fixed MRI in the building. Right now they have a mobile unit. The second floor of the building will have additional office space for more services as well as an infusion suite to deal with the growing need for patients that have biologic infusions, which is clearly a more modern therapy that is only to grow over time. These are to be added to their existing services in the building.

Chairman Harrington interrupted the presentation saying that, in order for them to move forward with the applicant presenting tonight, he had to get a consensus from the Board that they are okay with moving forward given the fact that they still need to go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment on February 14th. They have asked for a waiver from the Board to allow them to present tonight without the variance being granted. Alderman Levasseur asked about the variance. Additionally, he thought there was a major issue because the State did not approve the traffic study. The Chairman advised the traffic issue would be addressed if they heard the application. Ms. Goucher said the waiver request the Chairman was talking about is because of the variance they need from the Zoning Board for relief on the wetlands. This Board would not typically be taking an action on the application until at least two weeks from today, which would be after the ZBA has taken an action on the variance. She said the other issue the Alderman brought up would be part of their discussion during the hearing tonight if the waiver is granted and they go forward.

Alderman Levasseur said they went before the Conservation Commission last night and asked if they knew there was a ZBA issue.

Mr. Long said normally the Zoning Board makes their decision prior to it coming to the Planning Board. The waiver is that this Board is going to listen to the presentation, keep it open and take an action after the Zoning Board renders their decision. He said he did not have an issue with it, nor did Alderman Levasseur.
**Mr. Long made a motion to approve the waiver, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)**

Mr. Pratt continued with the presentation. He said Dartmouth Hitchcock is located at 100 Hitchcock Drive, which is off of Edward J. Roy Drive that is off Wellington Road near Exit 8 off of I-93. The existing site has 121,000 SF. He pointed out the parking lot, which is kind of like a half circle. When they designed this back in 1998, the plan was eventually that they would probably expand into the area in the back, which is what they are before this Board for now.

Mr. Pratt referred to the existing conditions overview and pointed out the existing access drive, the parking area, the existing facility and the future expansion area. He referred to the site plan and advised that they have a 91,000+/- SF building addition. The footprint is about 42,000-43,000 SF so it is two full stories as well as some area in the basement for storage and mechanical equipment.

Mr. Pratt said they are connecting into the existing area, extending the loop to match what the existing site has. They have a perimeter drive aisle that goes around the whole outer perimeter of the parking area. They are extending that all the way around. There is another drive aisle that goes around the side of the building and they are extending that across then they have another main drive aisle that cuts through.

Mr. Pratt said they have a patient drop-off area, which will be the main entrance for the new addition and they also have a patient pickup area where patients will be picked up after surgery to keep them away from the main entrance.

Mr. Pratt referred to the grading and drainage plan and said the way they designed the site is that there is a high point. Basically through the middle of the parking lot they have a really wide landscape island that kind of separates the high point so everything from that island going to the west will be picked up by catch basins and then routed over to a giant stormwater infiltration system. It is just a big detention infiltration pond. There is a sediment forebay to remove large sediment and any floatables and trash will be picked up in that area. On the other side everything from the highpoint going to the east would flow through the parking lot and will get picked up by various catch basins routed to a sediment forebay and then a very large stormwater infiltration basin.

Mr. Pratt advised that all utilities come in from the west side. He showed a blow up of the existing loading and MRI pad area where they will have to do some water main and gas main relocations and some stormwater improvements. The current MRI pad has a mobile dock that has a corridor that connects to it so people can be treated internally and get right into the trailer without going outside. As part of this, they are going to actually double that. They are going to keep pretty much the same area where the existing MRI pad is but they are going to add another one as well as a building corridor so everyone will have to come through this corridor and either come into one or two of those. These pads are set up for
other technology as well such as PET CT’s, mobile MRI’s and any other mobile treatment systems they have.

Mr. Pratt said Dartmouth Hitchcock really wants to do a nice job with landscaping and match the current theme. They have large landscape islands and trees. They have a significant amount of landscaping surrounding all the internal islands and around the perimeter. They also have landscaping around the building so there is some nice landscaping around the sidewalks, the drop-offs, the loading areas, etc.

Mr. Pratt said lighting will match the existing lighting on site right now. It is LED poles, typical like you would see in a regular parking lot. At night every other pole will turn off so it will be dimmed at night to be considerate of neighbors.

Mr. Pratt said they have submitted this to the City agencies and have gotten comments back from DPW, which were really minor and they have addressed those comments. It was basically just adding snow storage and adding some notes to the plan. They received no comment related to the site from the Fire Department. Manchester Water Works just had some questions about how they were relocating some water mains, which they responded to but haven’t received feedback. They received comments from the Traffic Department.

With regard to the waiver the Board just granted, Mr. Pratt said part of the property is in the Massabesic Lake Watershed. He pointed out the limit of it and advised that Massabesic Lake is on the east side so it kind of clips through the corner of the parking area. Within this district there is an increased setback from pavement to wetlands. Normally it is 25 feet and in this zone it is actually 50 feet. The variance they are going to the Zoning Board next week for is because this wetland area is actually a manmade detention pond built as part of the original construction in 1998. The existing parking is already less than 25 feet away from it and what they are proposing to do is just extend that external access drive around so they are not maintaining the 50 foot setback that is required. It is kind of a technicality because this isn’t really a wetland; it is a manmade retention pond. It is there for stormwater treatment. Because it has been saturated for 20 years it has met the characteristics of jurisdictional wetlands but the Ordinance doesn’t distinguish between manmade wetlands, stormwater treatment facilities and natural wetlands. As such, they are asking for a reduction to allow this pavement to be less than 50 feet from this detention pond.

Mr. Pratt advised they went before the Conservation Commission last night and they were in support of it. He has discussed it with Manchester Water Works with their water quality people who regulate the waivers and variances in the Massabesic Lake district. He said he received a letter from them and they are fully in support of it. They are collecting all the stormwater onsite with a closed drainage system and they are routing it to a massive stormwater infiltration system. They are actually increasing the quality of the stormwater because some of the area that flows to the existing detention pond will be collected and routed to the new treatment system.
Mr. Pratt said they have to go to the Alteration of Terrain Bureau at NHDES and they have really stringent standards on stormwater treatment, stormwater peak flow mitigation, etc. so they are providing full treatment for at least the first flush so whenever you get an inch or two of rain that will all infiltrate into the ground so all the sand and oils will be removed by this. They have sited it mostly outside of the Massabesic overlay. They also have to go to the Department of Environmental Services for a sewer permit. The reason for that is because they are extending a new sewer service outside of the building and their flows will be over 5,000 gallons per day. Whenever you have over 5,000 gallons per day and you do sewer infrastructure you need a permit from them, which they will submit through DPW.

Paul Konieszka of Fuss & O’Neill advised they prepared the traffic study for this project. To follow up on the Alderman’s point, he said he received comments back both from the City and State regarding the traffic study and there are some revisions that will be required, but he will go through what has been done to date and the information that they have.

Mr. Konieszka advised they went through the scoping process with the State back in October 2017 and the study area was defined as the Wellington Road corridor from Mammoth Road all the way through Edward J. Roy Drive including the Hitchcock Way intersection. They did counts during the typical morning and afternoon peak periods including the site drive. One of the projects that was decided to be included into the base network into the no build condition was the gas station/convenience store proposal that was to be located on the site on Edward J. Roy Drive on the west side of the road. It had not been approved and it was under appeal and it is currently in the courts, but it was felt that at least something was likely to be developed on that site so that was to be used as part of the no build condition before their development was going to be considered for part of the project. The traffic study showed that the existing network was already under duress. The Mammoth Road intersection with Bridge Street and Wellington Road and the proximity of the southbound ramp intersection, they are about 650 feet apart and there is a lot of stacking and a lot of demand to get to the southbound ramp. It was interesting because about 60 percent or so of the eastbound traffic is trying to get to the interstate from east of Mammoth Road. Three hundred to four hundred cars are trying to get onto the southbound onramp and another three hundred to four hundred cars are trying to get on the northbound onramp to the east so there is a lot of traffic on that stretch of Wellington Road that is already related to interstate traffic to and from the interstate. That really isn’t related to the development further to the east.

Mr. Konieszka said the opening year of the project is expected to be in 2020 so they had to do an opening year projection and a ten year design year for 2030 with a growth rate of one percent a year plus the known traffic in the area. As far as the traffic generation of the site, since they had an existing site there of approximately 120,000 SF, they used that information to develop a rate commensurate with what is already going on out there since a lot of the uses are going to be similar. Although as an ambulatory surgical center if that area is
expanded beyond what is already out there that may be a lesser generator but nonetheless the information they had was the best available at the time. Given that trip generation rate this project was expected to add about 280 trips in the morning of which most of them are coming in, about 235 coming in and about 290 trips coming out total in the PM peak of which 202 of those are coming out of the site. This is all new traffic being added to the network because it is a new use that is not like a gas station or a Dunkin Donuts where you have pass by traffic that you would really have to consider.

Based on the traffic count numbers, Mr. Konieszka said they ran an analysis based on these numbers and came up with some suggestions regarding mitigation of some of the offsite impacts they saw as a result of the development. First of all at the Hitchcock Way intersection there is a bit of a site distance issue looking in either direction. As such, they propose that they would be clearing the sight triangles in that area to provide better sight distance so exiting traffic has a better view of traffic coming down Edward J. Roy Drive. They heard at a meeting in the neighborhood a few weeks back that speeding along Edward J. Roy Drive was a concern and they had originally come up with some ideas to maybe alleviate the speeds and they also had come up with a proposal earlier to facilitate right hand turns into the site driveway but the right turns actually tend to slow down the traffic on Edward J. Roy Drive so the existing driveway is going to stay essentially the same with the exception of the clearing of the sight triangles looking left so that exiting traffic can see oncoming traffic and come out onto Edward J. Roy Drive in a safe manner.

Mr. Konieszka said on Edward J. Roy Drive itself, they are proposing extending and restriping the pavement to provide about 250 feet worth of queueing space, which is where the peak queue was calculated to be the bulk of that traffic coming out of Edward J. Roy Drive is right hand turns, which overlaps with the left hand turns coming in so those turns are moving at the same time. This would all be within the existing pavement and they have done largely with striping and pavement markings. It also accommodates what the proposed driveway for the Z-1 or some other development comes in to that area, that driveway is located across from the condo development. One of the things they looked at in addition that they provided in an addendum to the traffic study was the traffic coming out of the Wellingwood Drive area. There was a lot of concern regarding the ability of traffic to get across and enter Edward J. Roy Drive and get to the light. There is a lot of oncoming traffic that uses the whole roadway, particularly in the morning when a lot of the residents are leaving. There is about 25 left hand turns coming out of there. They did some calculations regarding how the additional traffic would affect their ability to get across and they found the delays would be on the order of about 25-30 seconds with a queue of roughly one car waiting at the Wellingwood driveway to get across. They may be blocked by the right hand turns initially but as that right hand turn exiting and, as he said the northbound left hand turn is overlapping with that so they are not able to get out while the northbound left hand turn is coming in so those two movements are overlapping and that queue empties out to the point where they should be able to get across and over into that lane once that movement is completed through the signal cycle. There is also some striping improvements they have
proposed near the corner to provide a bit of a shoulder to narrow down the wide expansive pavement there just to give the through traffic a little bit of direction in terms of maintaining a motion along Edward J. Roy Drive without encroaching on the driveway in that area.

Mr. Konieszka said the next improvement they propose to do is an improvement that has been talked about for quite a while and it was also brought up in the Z-1 traffic study. If you are driving eastbound on Edward J. Roy Drive from the northbound off ramp intersection, which is to the west, there are two lanes coming eastbound and then they narrow up into a little bit of a shoulder. The shoulder pinches in a little bit to try to direct the traffic into one lane, although the pavement is wide enough for two lanes to get by that area, and then the left hand turn lane opens up and it provides about 350-400 feet of storage there from the stop line. Since they are going to be adding to that left hand turn, they are proposing to trim back that island and provide a full lane for left turns and a full lane for through and right turning traffic at the light. They would also provide advance signage to tell people what lane to go into; left lane for Edward J. Roy Drive and the right lane for Wellington Road eastbound so people would approach the intersection knowing which lane to be in. This improvement would go about 600 feet, which is what they expect the queue to be in that area but there is also still two lanes to the west of there so if the queue extended even beyond that 600 feet there would still be enough room for that.

Mr. Konieszka said they have also suggested some timing modifications to the different intersections along the corridor, which they are coordinating with the City and the DOT. The DOT has jurisdiction over the signals at the two ramps and they have some concerns about the impacts on those ramps. There is limited ability to actually do much widening on Wellington Road and there is already an existing issue out there regarding queueing at the ramps so adding lanes on Wellington Road is a long term issue that has been there that really isn’t within the purview of the project to address but nevertheless there may be improvements that they are able to do regarding signal timing, some striping changes for example at the southbound off ramp. He said there is pavement there that allows for two lanes but it is not formally striped as two lanes. Right now it operates as a through and a left along that left curb line and a right hand turn, which is the heavy movement going into the City. One of the comments they received from the State is that they would be willing to discuss formalizing that lane separation in that area as long as it doesn’t adversely impact queueing on the ramps. That is their big concern regarding coordination in this area. They want to make sure that the off ramps are not impeded by anything that may be happening along the corridor. Whatever they end up with eventually in terms of a coordination plan discussion with the City and the DOT there will have to be a balance between the amount of east-west flow as well as the operations of the off ramps so it doesn’t affect things in the interstate.

Mr. Konieszka advised they received comments from the City traffic engineer, Kristen Clarke, who raised concerns regarding the capacity and some of the volume capacity ratios at the existing intersections. Even in the no build case, which indicates there is already an issue up
there and concern with the amount of traffic that might be added from this project, the State has also raised a couple of technical questions regarding some of the calculations. He said they are in the process of addressing those now and getting their approval of updated numbers. What that is going to do, based on their comment about being understated by six or seven percent is that basically raises the no-build condition to a worse condition and then they are more on top of that. Once they address the numbers to their satisfaction and get those approved for design purposes then they can move forward into tweaking the timing and coordination discussion regarding trying to make the signals work as effectively as they can with this project in place.

Chairman Harrington said the Board just got some of this information today from the State and they have a big black check mark that says “not acceptable” so he thought they needed to do more work in getting that taken care of. Mr. Konieszka advised that work is being done now and they anticipate very shortly to be sending updated calculations to the State so they can get those numbers approved for design purposes.

Alderman Levasseur said he went to the presentation by Dartmouth at the actual facility, which is beautiful. He asked if they had done traffic studies with different scenarios. He asked what scenarios they are dealing with here on this Board and if that is the same thing that NHDOT got or did they just give the State one scenario and that is what they are focused on. Mr. Konieszka said they got the same report that this Board received, which included a scenario with and without the gas station in the 2030 design year. The Alderman asked if the scenario NHDOT put the “X” on was for the scenario without a gas station being put in. Mr. Koneszka said it was related to the overall development of the base network. There needs to be additional correction factors added to the base traffic number that they had and that would apply to both scenarios. Essentially it would change the base network by about six percent and then they would add the gas station traffic on top of that and then they would add their traffic on top of that. They did a scenario with both of those in place and then they did a scenario with just Dartmouth in place. Once they change those base numbers and then add all the traffic back into it, then they will have new results to be able to tell what the difference is between just the Dartmouth scenario and then with both of them in place. In the report as it stands now, the difference is that some of the queues are smaller. The capacity is better with just Dartmouth as opposed to both of them, especially at the Edward J. Roy Drive intersection because there is less traffic and fewer movements going around that intersection in that case. Their traffic doesn’t generate as much new traffic although their total trip generation is comparable to theirs.

Alderman Levasseur thought he would only be interested in the scenario where it is currently. He said that was an interesting aspect of it, but he did not see why the gas station should be included in this at all. Mr. Koneszka advised it was decided at the scoping meeting back in October 2017 that that project be included because it was a known project at the time. The status was still unknown at that time whether it was going to be approved. It was known that something would be probably built on that site at some point so since there was
a recent traffic study for some kind of development on that site, it was the decision of City staff that should be part of the study. He said they did the extra scenario without it just to show whether or not there were additional improvements being required to accommodate their traffic as well as theirs as part of the study.

Alderman Levasseur asked if he was comfortable with the scenario of both of them being there at the same time and thinking it is okay to go with.

Ms. Goucher clarified when they do any kind of traffic scoping meeting with DPW and the applicant, they always include all known projects and while there hasn’t been a final action on the gas station, it is still a known project. That is typical of all projects that traffic studies are done on as well as any build-out. That is the norm.

Alderman Levasseur said he didn’t know if that hurts, benefits or it is not a factor. That is something he would need to know whether he was going to vote on this or not. To him it is an important factor because when you look out at 2030 the numbers get a little more scary. Just reading information from DPW and NHDOT, the entrance into Dartmouth currently will feed both lots because they are going to build another lot on this site. He asked if there was a way to bring another entrance to the back lot that they are going to put in. He asked if that would provide mitigation because they would have a longer way to drive their people so they wouldn’t be blocking or backing up. Mr. Pratt said they looked into that a little bit. There is currently a secondary access drive out of the back of the property that comes down into the cul-de-sac at the end of the Edward J. Roy Drive. There is a lot of residential traffic that comes into Fox Hollow and there are some speed issues. If they are doing competing movements when everybody is coming home at the end of the day and people are leaving from the secondary drive he thought that would be a safety issue. The Alderman asked if it could be an entrance only and not an exit. Mr. Koneszka said entering traffic is not the issue. It is really exiting traffic in the afternoon that gets to be the issue. If they had a lot of exits at the emergency driveway they would actually be adding to the competing traffic flow on Edward J. Roy Drive at the site driveway.

Mr. Curry asked about speed ramps and along that area and traffic mirrors at the entrance. Mr. Pratt said they considered doing some speed tables near the entrance. They coordinated with and caught up with the City DPW and they were opposed to having the speed tables there as it is a maintenance issue for them. He said it is really more of an enforcement issue if people are exceeding the speed limit. Maybe there is some police action such as a speed sign that would calculate the speed or a patrol officer out there to try to educate and get people to slow down.

Chairman Harrington advised before the Board tried to come up with some creative ideas, he suggested they needed to update their data, which is in order for the Board to be able to make an intelligent decision on which way to go. The Board really needs to get a better handle on what these intersections are going to look like regardless of what the traffic is
Chairman Harrington asked what the difference was between Mr. Konieszka as a traffic research engineer versus a certified traffic engineer. Mr. Konieszka explained that a PTOE is a certified traffic operation engineer. He said he is not a PTOE. They are a PE but they have also gone through a certification process with the Institute of Transportation Engineers to meet the requirements of the PTOE. The Chairman asked Mr. Konieszka in his line of work if what he does is study traffic flows. Mr. Konieszka said he has been doing this for 32 years and they have a PTOE in their office who they consult with on a regular basis regarding issues just like this.

Mr. Konieszka said the City traffic engineer is a PTOE so she is reviewing the study as well and she is aware of the comments the State has made. She did not know if the person reviewing it at the State is a PTOE, but Mr. Konieszka knew he was a traffic engineer and he is reviewing the whole study. He isn’t just reviewing the State jurisdictional issues, which has led to some of the comments he has raised as part of this. He thought between the two of them it is getting a thorough review and he thought the comments can be relatively easily addressed. The issue is it is just going to raise the level of overall background traffic in the no build case even before they get there to a higher level of congestion that will need to be addressed, whether or not this project is there or not. They have made some suggestions based upon what they feel the issues are that they are contributing to and he thought they would be able to further refine that as they continue more coordination with the City and the State. He thought between all of them they could resolve these questions to everyone’s satisfaction.

Mr. Belanger asked if they had confirmed through survey or other means that there is insufficient right-of-way to add an additional left turn lane at the eastbound approach on Wellington Road. He said that seemed to be one of the suggestions from DPW. Mr. Pratt said they haven’t done any real designs or anything. Mr. Konieszka said it was not necessarily only on Wellington Road that they have to deal with it; then they would have to have two left hand lanes to accept it on Edward J. Roy Drive so there would need to be enough width on Edward J. Roy Drive to accept that. That would only exacerbate some of the concerns that the condos had on the east side because then there would be two lanes of traffic coming at you and maybe limiting their ability to be able to exit out of that driveway.

Mr. Belanger thought the concern from DPW was that right now, in the no build condition 2018, they have 383 total cars on that eastbound approach and with the development they are looking at 666, which is a significant increase on that approach, and they are trying to figure out how they can address that with mitigation without increasing the width of the road and adding a second turn lane. He asked if they had any thoughts on what they would suggest for additional mitigation if not another lane. Mr. Konieszka said they are lengthening the left turn lane because that is the predominant movement. The left turn in
and the corresponding right turn out is already a substantial movement and those are going concurrently. That left hand turn is about two thirds of all eastbound traffic along the corridor and that part of Wellington Road. With sufficient green time they should be able to get all of the cars out. The question is how long to make the cycle to be able to accommodate all the other movements that are out there. On Old Wellington Road on the southerly approach there is a left and then a shared left through right so they have two left turn lanes coming out of there and they have the width on Wellington Road to be able to accept it. They did not have the width on Edward J. Roy Drive to be able to provide a second left turn lane. He said they could mitigate the increase by providing more green time but who would have to wait to be able to accommodate that movement. That gets to be the tradeoff of all that. There are lots of issues to play with in evaluating what you can and can’t do within the space that you have.

With regard to illumination, Mr. Long was concerned that they would have a permanent glow up there. Mr. Pratt said they are all dark sky compatible fixtures. They are all downcast and shielded and meet the regulations. They are sensitive to that so at night half of the lights will turn off so it will really dim things. There is also a good buffer of woods and they are not directly adjacent to any homes. There will be a good stand of trees at least 200 feet between any adjacent homes so he did not think it was going to cause any issues.

Mr. Leclerc asked about the hours of operation. Dr. Paris advised currently the office is open until 8:00 PM Monday-Friday and 6:00 PM on Saturday and Sunday. He said most of the traffic leaves around 5:00 PM so the traffic is from 5:00-5:15 PM. If you leave at 5:30 there is no traffic. It is really right around 5:00. There is no issue as far as the traffic going in in the morning because the flow into the space is unimpeded so their traffic in the morning is controlled by the light and there is no backup on the road then.

Ms. Trisciani asked what time they open in the morning. Dr. Paris said there are maintenance people there at 6:00 AM. Most patients arrive around 8:00. There are a few that arrive between 7:00-8:00, but very small numbers. Ms. Trisciani asked what time does the regular staff arrive. Dr. Paris said ninety five percent of the staff comes in between 7:30-8:00.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

Andy Shaka of 66 Cutler Lane said it is a very small road they live on but it is a really special place. They don’t have much of a backyard, which he knew when they bought the home, it flows right into wetlands right behind the house and then it is just woods all the way back to the existing Hitchcock facility. It is incredibly peaceful. It is dark. It is quiet. There is truly no place like it in Manchester. He feared there will be a permanent glow. Right now he can see a little bit of the facility and some street light, which is not a big deal, but with the proposed addition to this parking lot it is just enormous and no matter what at the end of the day if this occurs there will be a lot of trees cut down and it will be a wide open space with lights.
The retention ponds are going to rip out a lot more trees coming straight towards their properties and if it is not done properly he thinks it will be devastating to himself and his neighbors.

**Earl Johnson** of 320 Leda Avenue said all of their houses back there have wells and the massive retention pond is basically right across the street from his well. His well is probably about 60 feet from the retention pond. All four houses right behind there all of their wells are right in front of their properties. He went to a well company and an independent lab and they all thought they would be affected by all the salt and whatever goes into that retention pond. He was concerned about illumination once they cut a lot of those trees down.

**Dave Coviello** of 46 Cutler Lane said “Ditto to my neighbor Andy who mentioned a lot of things he was going to say”. He asked where the present retention pond for the present property. With regard to lighting, he said there is plenty of buffer zone for trees right now but if they put the retention pond on the right hand side of the development there will be no more buffer zone of trees. He asked why the retention pond has to be so large. He said he has been living in the Wellington Road area for the last 40 years and the infrastructure really has to be looked at. He said Exit 8 when you get of I-93 northbound you go through the ledges and there is only room for one row of traffic to come off that. He gets off that exit every morning between 7:30 and 8:00 and it is starting to back up over Wellington Road on I-93. He said that ramp should be widened 2-3 feet to get an extra lane in so when they come around through the ledges people going to the left will bear to the left, anyone going down towards Bridge Street would bear to the right. A directional sign could be put in between the ledges. As far as Wellington Road going up to Edward J. Roy Drive, there is no way they are going to do it with just two lanes. They are going to have to have two lanes going to the left to go onto Edward J. Roy Drive. He felt sorry for the people in Carlton Place because anybody on the inside lane of a two lane going into Edward J. Roy Drive are not going to get over to that exit because there is only a few feet to move over. There is a large study that has to be made about that. He hoped the lighting would be “friendly”. He was concerned about the wetlands.

**Bob Casella** of 86 Cutler Lane thanked the Board for giving them the opportunity to speak tonight. He understands why they want to build the facility. He thought it was necessary and will add a lot to the community and he wished them well with the project. He hoped they would take into serious consideration the impact it will have on the homes that are directly behind the new parking lot. He asked how much of an encroachment will happen as a result of the parking lot into the existing tree line. That would give them a pretty good indication how far back the tree line will become. With that information they might have a better idea of what they might request at a future hearing with regard to a fence or a natural fence that might be put in there. He hoped that going forward when they begin to plan to build this facility that they will give a great deal of thought and consideration and hopefully a good deal of money to protect what they consider to be a very important part of their properties.
There were no other comments from the public and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.

The Chairman advised that staff received a note dated July 29, 2019 from an individual, which he read into the record as follows: “I received the abutter letter and I am not in favor of adding new section to the hospital unless we have entrances in and out. One way in and out will be a nightmare. I live at 50-35 Edward J. Roy Drive and have a hard time getting out of the complex. Thank you.”

The Chairman read an email correspondence from Alderman at Large Dan O’Neill, which was read into the record as follows: “Unfortunately I cannot attend the Planning Board hearing this evening due to an event at my son’s school but wanted to reach out and say that I am in full support of the Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center application before the Board this evening. I greatly appreciate their efforts to meet early and often with City staff. I also appreciate their commitment to meet with the neighbors, understand the neighbors’ concerns and they did, in fact, hold a neighborhood meeting that was well attended. I believe the proposed expansion will greatly help Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center in their efforts to provide quality healthcare to the citizens of the City and the region. I am asking the Planning Board’s favorable consideration of this application. Thanks.”

Chairman Harrington invited the applicants to respond to the neighbors’ concerns.

Mr. Pratt said they were aware of the concerns of the residents on Cutler Drive. They met at the neighborhood meeting and it was briefly discussed then and then they corresponded through Alderman Stewart. He came up with some measurements to figure out exactly what the existing woods would be. He agreed that there is a very large wooded buffer right now. Taking a quick measurement to where they are cutting trees for that infiltration basin there will be 225 feet from Mr. Shaka’s wood line to where they cut trees. That is where the detention pond will be located and there is no lighting. From that same tree line to the parking lot, which would be the closest paved surface, it would be about 500 feet. A direct line of site to the parking lot he will still have 450 feet of wooded area and if he looked through the detention pond it would be 225 feet. Elevation wise they are about on the same level. With 40 foot tall trees in the spring he thought there would still be a very dense buffer through there. The trees are taller than the house and with the parking lot facility being generally the same elevation of his lot, the trees should still provide a good buffer. The City Ordinance requires ten feet and they have well over 225 feet.

Mr. Pratt said no wetlands will be disturbed as part of this.

There was another question about wells and how the stormwater would affect them. Mr. Pratt said this has to go to the Alteration of Terrain Bureau of the Department of Environmental Services and they have very strict stormwater requirements. They have to
provide full stormwater treatment for every drop of rain that hits any of these developed surfaces. That is why these detention ponds are so large. They can’t be lowered because they have to design them above water table. Fully treated infiltration is a great method of treating groundwater and they are doing full infiltration for at least the first inch of rainfall that flows through.

With regard to the location for the pond, Mr. Pratt said they are kind of shoe horned in where they can put this because of the wetlands.

Concerning encroachment into the existing tree line, Mr. Pratt pointed on the plan the section of trees that will be removed for the parking lot as well as the trees for the stormwater.

With regard to the question concerning Wellingwood Drive, he said their driveway is very close to a major intersection. He said they will have to wait a little bit until traffic clears out. It is not a great situation. They tried to see what they could do. Their access comes out past a private property. They reached out to that property owner to see if they would be willing to potentially move that driveway. They would have to either buy some land or get an easement. The owner understood the situation and respectfully declined to meet up to discuss that. They tried to come up with some other creative options as well for that area. They thought if they could put a “Do Not Block” stripe there that would leave some gaps that way when there is no traffic coming and there is still a queue that one or two cars could get out. They ran that by DPW staff and basically it doesn’t really fit in that situation. It would be more if there was a backup further up that was creating queues that would allow a car to drive over that. Technically you are not supposed to stop on those so if they had a “Do Not Block” on that side the person leaving when they came over and stopped in that they would be breaking the law. They did everything they could. They really tried to vet out multiple options to try and fix that and it just turns out it is just not in a great location and the queues will be increased a little bit because of the increased traffic. By formalizing the lanes and pushing them back it will help the stacking. It will help formalize them and get them in the right spot and leave that right turn free.

One of the other comments they touched on with Mr. Koneiszka was Wellington Road. Mr. Pratt said what happens now is there are two lanes on Wellington Road coming from the highway and then it bottlenecks down. The purpose of that was to try and merge all the traffic into one lane that way somebody coming up the left lane didn’t end up accidentally getting stuck in the left turn lane. It is a valid idea but in the situation where the queues are backing up so far that is creating a bottleneck. What they are doing is cutting it back to make it a full two lane width and creating some advanced signage and people will know to be in the left lane. It creates at least the 600 foot queue and then it actually allows the queue to stack a lot further back. That improvement will significantly help that situation.

Mr. Pratt said they are re-doing all the lighting in the back so they are getting rid of the
floodlights. All of the lighting will be downcast so that will significantly help any throw that light is sending out through the woods.

With regard to the letter received, Mr. Pratt said it was not feasible to try to bring traffic through one of the abutting streets. That would be a really big detriment to the other neighborhoods. While it is feasible because they do have frontage on Leda, it is not a realistic option to divert their traffic through the residential neighborhoods.

With regard to the neighbors’ concerns regarding the location and size of the retention basin, Ms. Goucher asked if the area in the curve going back to the gated access was ever looked at for a retention basin. She said the proximity to that location from the houses on the other side is much further than the clearing they are going to do to the other neighbors. In looking at the soil map, she said it looked like some of the soil conditions are the same as the ones where they are putting the retention basin so she wondered if that was considered. Mr. Pratt said they looked at that a little bit. It is a lot flatter up there so it is more conducive to basically just berming it up and letting it infiltrate in the flat area. In the other area it is a pretty steep down gradient to a swale so they really don’t have the capacity in that area to treat as much. She asked if they didn’t want to do chambers under the parking lot. Mr. Pratt said cost was a factor as well as the grades. They have to have separation to seasonal high water table and if they did chambers under the parking lot they really need a 10-15 foot water table and they do not have that under the parking lot.

Chairman Harrington said one gentleman asked about the existing retention pond that is there, which is now the wetlands. He asked if they could use that and make it bigger. Mr. Pratt said that was a good idea. It was designed and built in the late 1990’s. The stormwater rules and requirements have significantly changed since then to provide treatment. When this was designed it was designed as just a detention basin so all its function is to just slow down that water so the water comes into it and then it slowly drains out. They do provide treatment but the newer designs have a sediment forebay, which is almost the size of that existing detention basin and the sediment forebay is just that first treatment method. It is designed to get the sand. They have a couple drainage pipes that outlet into that. That is where you will get your sediment accumulation. It is right near the parking driveway so it makes for easy inspections.

Chairman Harrington advised the applicants to get their calculations updated, try to come up with some scenarios to mitigate the traffic and then they can come back before the Board who can then make a determination as to whether they need any additional review. Mr. Pratt said they have been working diligently to update the calculations and it is really just a background growth rate that they had to update. They are updating those, coordinating with DOT to make sure they are happy with the new update and then they will work with Ms. Clarke of DPW and the DOT to figure out the signal timings and any additional mitigation that may be required.
Ms. Goucher advised the Board that the architect was at the table and asked if the Chairman wanted to discuss anything about the architecture of the building.

Mr. Pizzi of Lavallee Brensinger said the general intent is to be cohesive with the existing building, which is a masonry building with punched openings. They have extended the original concept but also integrated what has become the Dartmouth Hitchcock brand with facilities they have built throughout the state, which includes a combination of a white metal panel and glass. Essentially the building is a combination of those three primary materials. It is only two stories so it is actually shorter than the existing building and is made to be an inviting facility and complement the existing.

Mr. Leclerc asked if the present hours will be continued once the new project is open. Dr. Paris said those are the hours when the majority of patients are seen and there are some cleaning personnel that are there afterwards. They are not expecting to expand hours. There might be a post-op patient that is recovering and leaves at 9:00 PM instead of 8:00 PM but there will be no patients coming in. The appointments and patients coming in are such that they expect everybody to leave roughly at 8:00 PM.

Mr. Leclerc asked if it would be possible to superimpose the addition and parking lot onto the Google map so people could get a better understanding of the buffer, etc. Mr. Pratt said he would do that.

Chairman Harrington held this public hearing open until March 7, 2019 and said there would be no further notice to abutters.

6. SP2019-004
Property located at 40 Lake Avenue (Tax Map 168, Lots 3, 13, and 14), an application to amend a conditionally approved site plan for an approximately 82,000-square-foot hotel with 98 parking spaces to allow Lot 3 to remain separate and merge only Lots 13 and 14. Fuss & O’Neill for Botnick 5 Ventures, Inc.

Rick Lundborn of Fuss & O’Neill appeared along with Mike Myers, the owner’s representative from AAM 15, the hotel company that will be constructing the hotel and managing it.

Mr. Lundborn said they are before the Board tonight to amend the previous approval from June to merge Lot 13 and 14 and leave Lot 3 on Central Street as a standalone lot. Essentially what will happen is the lot line will be abandoned so Lots 13 and 14 would become one lot. That will allow those two parcels to be on one parcel of land. Not unlike the original project that was done two years ago, they had an environmental issue with one of the lots so for the purposes of financing it is easier for them to leave the lot on Central Street by itself. They received a variance from the Zoning Board that would allow them to have standalone parking on a lot within the Arena Overlay district so that cleared the path
for this amendment. Everything else is exactly the same. The plans handed out address everything that was brought to their attention as a condition or through staff review previously.

Chairman Harrington said this was pretty straightforward. He opened it up for public comment. No one came forward either in favor of or in opposition to this application.

Alderman Levasseur asked if the lot on Central street doesn’t affect the project. Mr. Lundborn said the bank doesn’t want to own it. Mr. Myers advised that in working with DES they found some environmental issues. Those issues are being addressed right now in conjunction with DES. The lender did not want to have that lot in the chain of Title so what they have done is while the parcels are still owned by Botnick 5, they have a 99 year lease on all three parcels, which they have executed, so the bank has asked that they not take Title to the lot on Central Street until DES sign off is anticipated in the next year. They will come back to this Board upon that cleanup and a consolidation of all three parcels. Mr. Lundborn clarified with staff that they will file a lot merger request.

Chairman Harrington closed this public hearing.

Chairman Harrington closed the February 7, 2019 public hearing of the Manchester Planning Board.

III. LIMITED BUSINESS MEETING:

Chairman Harrington called to order the February 7, 2019 limited business meeting of the Manchester Planning Board.

(Current Item)

1. CU2019-005
Property located at 468 S. Main Street (Tax Map 334, Lot 1), a conditional use application to allow alcoholic beverages in association with a restaurant establishment of up to 5,000 SF in the B-1 Zone. Pat Jansipsee.

Chairman Harrington said there were eight members voting so alternate Mr. Wellington would vote tonight.

Mr. Leclerc made a motion to approve CU2019-005, which was seconded by Vice Chairman O’Donoghue. (Motion Carried)

(Tabled Item)
2. **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. **Update from the Planning Board Chair of the interviews with the consultants for the Master Plan.**

Ms. Goucher handed out a letter for the Board to review. She advised staff tried to outline the reasons one of the consulting firms rose to the top and provided information why they felt that way. Since the Master Plan is a product of the Planning Board, staff was hoping the Board would take a look at the letter and understand this is the consultant that the selection committee would like to move forward with. If the Planning Board authorizes the Planning Director to begin the negotiations with the consultant, and then request the appropriate funds from the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, staff can get things underway.

Mr. Wellington asked if there was a set budget that was already pre-established because he did not see the cost as one of the determining factors. Ms. Goucher advised that they did not put in their RFP a specific budget. The last time they developed a Master Plan, they did it in house and it has been quite some time since they paid a consultant for a Master Plan. They did some research around the towns in the vicinity of Manchester and beyond and the costs were all over the map but all of them were quite a bit higher than they initially expected. The team that was recommended, that all of the selection committee felt was the unanimous decision, was not at the top or at the lowest, as far as their proposed fee.

Chairman Harrington said from sitting in and being part of the committee he was there for all four interviews and this one rose to the top and the committee voted unanimously to move forward with this consultant.

*Mr. Long made a motion to authorize the Planning Director to begin negotiations with the consultant and request funds from the BMA so a contract can be entered into, which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani. (Motion Carried)*

2. **Any other business items from the Planning Staff or Board Members.**
No other business items were brought forward.

*Mr. Leclerc made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Vice Chairman O’Donoghue. (Motion Carried)*

ATTEST: _____________________________________________________

Michael Harrington, Chairman
Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD: June 6, 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.

*Transcription by Lori Moone, Planning & Community Development*