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

Chairman Harrington advised that agenda item #1 will be postponed to June 20, 2019, at the request of the applicant.

In addition, it was brought to his attention there may be some people in the audience that could possibly be there for Stanton Street. He advised that Stanton Street was not on the agenda tonight and it would not be added to tonight’s agenda. That item was continued to June 20, 2019 also.

II. Review of new applications for Regional Impact and comment by the Manchester Conservation Commission.

The staff has received and reviewed the applications listed below and the Planning Board should determine if any of the applications are likely to have impacts beyond the boundaries of Manchester, requiring regional review pursuant to RSA 36:54, 55, 56 & 57 or warrant comment by the Manchester Conservation Commission.

1. S2019-013
   Property located at 2874 Brown Avenue (Tax Map 683, Lot 10), a subdivision application to subdivide one lot of 17,377 square feet into two lots, with one lot to have 8,501 square feet and the other lot to have 8,804 square feet, both in the R-1B Zone. Eric Mitchell and Associates, Inc. for United Investors, LLC.

2. SP2019-009
   Property located at 48 Perimeter Road (Tax Map 721, Lot 7), a site plan application for a 30 space parking lot expansion with retaining wall and other site related improvements. TF Moran for St Mary’s Bank.
3. **SP2019-015**  
Property located at 32 Main Street (Tax Map 629, Lot 16), a site plan application for a proposed 6-unit residential condominium with the associated site improvements in the B-2 Zone. *Alan Yeaton for 32 North Main Street Property Management, LLC.*

4. **SP2019-016**  
Property located at 409 Elm Street (Tax Map 166, Lots 1), a site plan application to construct a 95,289 SF, 6-story multi-use building with associated site improvements including a 122-space parking lot in the CBD Zone. *Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. for Oak Leaf Homes, LLC.*

5. **SP2019-017**  
Property located at 9 Willow Street (Tax Map 360, Lot 1), a site plan application to construct a 2,121 SF convenience store with a drive-through window and 11 parking spaces in the RDV Zone. *T.F. Moran, Inc. for Tanveer Akhtier.*

6. **CU2019-013**  
Property located at 9 Willow Street (Tax Map 360, Lot 1), a conditional use permit application to provide 7 stacking spaces for a drive-through window, where 10 are required in the RDV Zone. *T.F. Moran, Inc. for Tanveer Akhtier.*

7. **CU2019-014**  
Property located at 9 Willow Street (Tax Map 360, Lot 1), a conditional use permit application to allow a restaurant with a drive-through window in the RDV Zone. *T.F. Moran, Inc. for Tanveer Akhtier.*

8. **CU2019-015**  
Property located at 9 Willow Street (tax map 360, lot 1), a conditional-use-permit application to provide 6 stacking spaces for fueling stations, where 9 are required by the Manchester Zoning Ordinance. *T.F. Moran, Inc. for Tanveer Akhtier.*

9. **SP2019-018**  
Property located at 785 Goffs Falls Road (Tax Map 871, Lot 1A), a site plan application to amend a previously approved site plan (SP-18-2018), to construct a 3,500 SF convenience store and fuel dispensing area consisting of 12 fuel pumps with associated site improvements in the B-2 Zone. *MHF Design Consultants, Inc. for Irving Oil Marketing, Inc.*

10. **SP2019-019**  
Property located at 670 North Commercial Street (Tax Map 276 Lot 4), a site plan application for a proposed renovation of approximately 40,000 SF of the existing 1st and 2nd floor of the Annex portion of 670 North Commercial Street to 34 residential units, consisting of 27 – two bedroom units and 7 – one bedroom units. *Brady Sullivan*
Properties.

11. CU2019-016
   Property located at 670 North Commercial Street (Tax Map 276 Lot 4), a conditional use
   permit to allow residential units in the AMX Zone. Brady Sullivan Properties.

12. CU2019-017
   Property located at 720 Union St. (Tax Map 12, Lot 27), a conditional use permit for
   further reduction in required parking as a result of increased seating indoors and
   outdoors in the R-3 Zone. To Share Brewing Company for 720 Union St. LLC

   Mr. O’Donoghue made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc, that the following
   applications do not have regional impact nor do they require comment from the
   and CU2019-017. (Motion Carried)

III. PUBLIC HEARING:

(Continued Items)

1. S2019-004
   Property located at 2108 River Road (Tax Map 557, Lot 5), an application to subdivide one
   lot of approximately 87 acres to create 1 lot of approximately 71 acres and 17 additional
   lots, all of which would be buildable and would be accessed from a new extension of
   Arthur Avenue, in the R-1A Zoning District. Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, Inc. for C&D Realty
   Trust

   At the request of the applicant, this application has been postponed until June 20, 2019. No
   additional notice to abutters.

2. S2019-009
   Property located at 932 and 964 Wellington Road (Tax Map 879, Lots 13 and 14), an
   application to consolidate two lots totaling approximately 5.3 acres and to subdivide them
   into 11 new lots and a new public street in the R-1A Zoning District. Joseph M. Wichert,
   LLS, Inc. for J&C Ryder Family Trust and Stanley J. Garczynski

   Joe Wichert appeared on behalf of the J&C Ryder Family Trust and Stanley Garczynski. Also
   present was Jon Rokeh, the engineer for this project.

   Mr. Wichert said there were not many changes from last month to this month. On the plan
   sets handed out, he said the intent is to consolidate Lots 13 and 14, which are currently
   owned by the Ryder Family Trust and Garczynski, and subdivide and create nine new
   building lots along with the two existing duplex houses. On the existing two houses, they
received variances to maintain the duplexes on lots that are undersized in the R-1A district. On the new lots being created, there are no waivers being requested. The total length of the new road is 472 SF off of Wellington Road to the center of the cul-de-sac. They are using underground utilities. They have proposed a 10 foot wide no-cut buffer along the three lots on the northwest corner of the property. That is not for perpetuity but for a period of 10 years. The property was looked at for wetlands delineation and there are no wetlands on site so there is no wetland impact.

With regard to the changes since the last hearing, Mr. Wichert said one of the things that came up was the driveway into 932 Wellington Road. He said at 964 Wellington Road, the driveway is on the east side of the property, which is further from the road and that is not a problem. However, at 932 Wellington Road, the driveway was on the east side as well, but that is close to the new road. They had shown a straight shot in and there was concern from staff that it was noncompliant for zoning purposes. As such, they have bent it around. The only advantage to this alignment is it increases the distance to the right-of-way line so it complies with the Zoning Ordinance and it allows for the four parking spaces, which is what they need to have for the two-family dwelling. They have changed the driveway configuration on 932 Wellington Road.

Mr. Wichert said they revised the lot numbering system per the request of the Assessors’ Office and the Planning Department. There was a shed that was formerly on Lot 13 that has been removed so the plan has been revised to indicate that the shed is gone.

Mr. Wichert said on the first engineering sheet, they have added a buffer along the south side of Wellington Road in front of 947 Wellington Road, which is the Gorski residence. They worked out the details with the Gorskis. The intent of that buffer is for it to be 35-40 feet long about six feet off the driveway, 22 feet back from the curb line. The shrubs are to be four feet tall minimum when planted. Obviously they will grow taller. Their only request to the applicant was once everything is resolved, they would like to have a look at the actual plant types, which they agreed to, and they have added some bark mulch on the bottom of the planting areas.

Mr. Wichert said on the northeast corner of the intersection, there is a 7x12 school bus stop area that was requested by MTA. On the engineering sheets, they added additional details. The drainage report was revised. In addition, they revised the sewer depths and some of the sewer lines. After the last hearing, they met with DPW on May 14th and went over their review memo and how they were going to accommodate those changes.

Mr. Wichert said at the last hearing there were some comments from both Board members and the public. One of the questions was relative to the homeowners association. He said the intent is to exclude the duplexes from the homeowners association if possible. He and Ms. Goucher had a brief discussion about it and that is not the norm so they talked to their counsel who advised it was possible to do. As such, that is a decision for the Planning Board to consider.
Mr. Wichert said Mr. Regas, who owns the residence at 1014 Wellington Road had a concern about a buffer and the impact to his property. At the hearing there was talk about possibly doing some kind of lot line adjustment. He spoke to Mr. Regas a few times. There was a very preliminary discussion about him possibly purchasing some land. The negotiation never came to fruition so that is off the table.

Mr. Wichert pointed out the existing shrub line. One of the items they were asked to look into was if they could put a buffer there. He said it is a pretty dense buffer as it exists. They were not sure there would be a benefit to add a second buffer. They have a 10 foot wide gas easement so if they were to put in a vegetated buffer, it would have to be outside of the gas line. He said it would create a 10 foot area of no man’s land, so they weren’t sure there was any benefit to that.

Mr. Wichert advised that a couple of abutters on Sky Meadow were present at the meeting and they asked about the same thing relative to a buffer. The Sky Meadow project was approved at the end of 2005 and when it was approved, the applicants actually owned both of these properties and they didn’t ask for a buffer at that time because they felt it was their right to be able to develop their property in accordance with the rules.

Mr. Wichert said there was some discussion about which lots would be gravity fed by sewer versus which would be pumped. Mr. Rokeh said after the last meeting, they addressed the memo from Owen and sat down with him to go over the changes they made on May 14th just to make sure they had addressed everything the way he wanted. From there, they had a couple of items that they had finalized. Owen actually gave them a couple of details that are now on the plan the way he wanted to see them. He had written an initial email saying he thought everything was looking pretty good. When they resubmitted everything, Owen went on vacation. With regard to the sewer, Mr. Rokeh advised that Mr. Wichert went out and double checked some of the inverts and the sewer line in Wellington Road ended up being five feet lower than what they assumed originally, so they were able to get a couple more houses served by gravity. The original drainage report that was turned in was missing some of the analysis, which is why DPW said it was incomplete. Everything was submitted to Owen on May 14th. Mr. Rokeh believed everything on the list has been addressed and are on the plans that are at the DPW right now.

With the gravity feed for the sewer line, Chairman Harrington asked which houses still will be left on ejector pumps and which ones will not. Mr. Rokeh said there are five houses now on gravity and the last four will be on the pumps. They moved the pump lines the way Owen requested. Chairman Harrington confirmed with Mr. Rokeh that they will stay as individual private pumps.

Chairman Harrington said there were a number of concerns from the neighbors behind the cul-de-sac area about the drainage. Mr. Rokeh said he did a Google overlay of it and
explained that the drainage for this development is into a detention pond. Basically what they have is a detention pond right at the same elevation as the outlets that go to the brook. He thought one of the things they were concerned about was whether the water was going to go towards them or into their pond, but it will not.

Chairman Harrington advised that Mr. Curry had joined the Board early in the presentation.

With regard to the bus stop, Mr. Long asked if there was curbing. Mr. Wichert did not believe the detail they were given showed curbing. The road obviously has curbing per the City standard. He said they envisioned it more like a sidewalk panel with no curbing. This is something Mr. Belanger provided – one that MTA had used before. Mr. Long asked if there was going to be a kiosk and Mr. Wichert said there would not be a kiosk. Mr. Belanger said he provided Mr. Wichert with a copy of a plan set, which had been approved by this Board a few years prior, with a similar situation where there was a cul-de-sac and it was the Transportation Coordinator for the School District who has requested these in the past. As such, Mr. Belanger said in communication with her, she said she would like to have a similar setup here. It’s not really an MTA public bus stop – it is just for school kids who live on the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Goucher said if the Board has concerns about the potential for runoff with the construction of the new houses, it is not uncommon for the Board to impose a condition that, when the house plan is submitted for a building permit, the grading around the house be shown so staff can review it.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

Harry Carter of Sky Meadow Way was concerned about drainage, the over development of the proposed subdivision, the location of the road, traffic and school bus safety.

Mr. Belanger advised he received a letter and some photographs late this afternoon from Mr. Regas who was concerned about the “void of arborvitae” at the northern back corner of his property.

With regard to the overcrowding raised by Mr. Carter, Mr. Wichert said all these lots fully comply with the R-1A requirements and on average their lot size on that side of the road is approximately 18,000 SF where the minimum required is 12,500 SF. They currently have 5.4 acres and they are trying to develop into 11 lots. He didn’t think they were overcrowding. They didn’t ask for any waivers. They only received variances to keep the existing duplexes on lots less than 25,000 SF with less than 200 feet of frontage, but they are still well above the R-1A requirement.

With regard to Mr. Carter’s concern regarding the location of the road between the houses creating all sorts of code issues, Mr. Wichert did not believe it does. The only concern that was brought up when they had the original one is the Zoning Ordinance requires a 20 foot
separation from the right-of-way to a new driveway, which they were short on but then they moved it over and it worked. As far as he knows, they comply fully both on the horizontal layout, the vertical layout and dimensionally it all works other than on two lot lines in the R-1A district normally the side yard setback would be 20 feet but because there are two-families it would double to 40 feet. Both of these setbacks are well in excess of 20 feet but less than 40 feet so that was part of what they got for zoning relief.

Mr. Wichert said there was a discussion about traffic and school bus stop issues. With nine lots, they don’t necessarily need to provide a traffic study and he did not believe one was asked for or suggested. They are providing a school bus stop as discussed previously.

Mr. Rokeh said since they talked about this before, one of the things that he could look into and work out with Owen when he gets back is putting in a cutoff swale along the rear. Most of the drainage in that backyard goes into the pond anyway. The way he had it drawn it all goes down to the pond regardless but he could look into doing either a berm along the back line or a cutoff swale that brings it into the pond that will automatically cut it all off. They would definitely end up with less drainage than what they have right now if they did that.

With regard to the concerns Mr. Regas forwarded to Mr. Belanger, Mr. Wichert pointed out the location of the approximate 18 foot gap of arborvitaes. He said it is a fairly long lot so his assumption would be somebody will probably put the house sort of toward the middle of the lot, which for a City property it would have a pretty good buffer.

Chairman Harrington advised that Mr. Carter had a concern about the spillage out of the retention pond possibly onto his property. He asked if spillage was going onto Mr. Carter’s property. Mr. Wichert pointed out the location of their outlet, which will go to the wetlands complex. It is not going sideways to the east; it is going north. Mr. Rokeh said that was correct. Mr. Wichert said they cannot divert it onto Mr. Carter’s property.

The Chairman asked who owns the area where the wetlands are. Mr. Wichert said the wetlands complex is owned by Lots A8 and A7. He pointed to an existing drainage easement that takes the water from Currier Drive and runs it all the way through the back, which is where their water goes now. They are not changing it.

Chairman Harrington asked if the detention pond, when it gets released, will not go onto their property. Mr. Rokeh said it would not and that it should go directly north into the wetland area. Chairman Harrington asked if it discharges through the subsurface. Mr. Rokeh said during storm events the water will start filling up, it’ll go into the lower outlets which are small and release the initial part. They are anticipating the water to go basically straight north and into the wetlands, the same as theirs goes right into the wetlands. He said their outlet is basically the same as theirs.

Mr. Belanger said it would be helpful to the Board if Mr. Rokeh described the standard by which engineers have to abide regarding discharge of water from one property to another.
In this case there is water going to this neighboring property that is not the one they are developing. Mr. Rokeh advised you can’t exceed the rate of flow. If you do a pre-analysis and whatever the rate of flow going off the property is before you do the development, the rate after development has to remain the same. The duration ends up increasing because you have more impervious surface but the detention pond collects all the water, holds it and releases it at a constant rate that doesn’t exceed the previous condition.

Chairman Harrington said the concerns of Mr. Carter were addressed and the photographs that were submitted with the letter were circulated to the Board members so he thought the Board was fully informed with what the public has concerns about.

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

3. S2019-012
Properties located at 122 and 200 McGregor Street (Tax Map 180, Lots 1 &2), a subdivision application to adjust the lot lines of Lot 1 and Lot 2, creating three new lots of 79,712 SF (Lot 1), 56,866 SF (Lot 2) and 110,651 SF (Lot 2A) in the B-2 and C-2 Zones. TF Moran for St. Mary’s Bank and PJC Manchester Realty, LLC

4. CU2019-010
Property located at 200 McGregor Street (Tax Map 180, Lot 1), an application for a conditional use permit to allow a reduction in required on-site parking from 69 spaces to 55 spaces in the B-2 Zone. TF Moran for St Mary’s Bank

SP2019-011
Property located at 200 McGregor Street (Tax Map 180, Lot 1), a site plan application amendment to a previously approved plan (SP-3-2012) for modified parking, access and traffic circulation in the B-2 Zone. TF Moran for St. Mary’s Bank

5. SP2019-012
Property located at 195 McGregor Street (Tax Map TPK5, Lot 2), a site plan application amendment to a previously approved plan (SP-29-2010 and SP-19-2007) for improved parking, access and traffic circulation in the ACH Overlay and AMX Zone. TF Moran for Brady Sullivan Millworks, LLC

6. CU2019-011
Property located at 122 McGregor Street (Tax Map 180, Lot 2), an application for a conditional use permit to allow a reduction in required on-site parking from 60 spaces to 53 spaces in the B-2 Zone. TF Moran for PJC Manchester Realty, LLC

SP2019-013
Property located at 122 McGregor Street (Tax Map 180, Lot 2), a site plan application for
construction of a new 1-story, 15,855 SF Rite Aid Pharmacy with associated site improvements in the B-2 Zone. *TF Moran for PJC Manchester Realty, LLC*

7. **CU2019-012**
Property located at 88 and 100 McGregor Street (Tax Map 180, Lot 2A), an application for a conditional use permit to allow a reduction in required on-site parking from 1,014 spaces to 214 spaces with an alternative parking arrangement in the C-2 and B-2 Zones. *TF Moran for Catholic Medical Center*

**SP2019-014**
Property located at 100 McGregor Street (Tax Map 180, Lot 2A), a site plan application for construction of a new 6-story, 220,560 SF, hospital addition, 94-space surface parking lot, and future 4-level, 327 space parking garage, with associated site improvements. *TF Moran for Catholic Medical Center*

Attorney John Cronin of Cronin, Bisson & Zalinsky advised he has been working on this project and is also a trustee at the hospital and has been for many years. Also present was Jason Cole, general counsel for the hospital, who has really quarterbacked this whole effort from its inception doing the negotiations with Rite Aid and St. Mary’s Bank and assembling the team of really talented and experienced people. Bob Duval has been doing the engineering with his team and Mr. Burns as well. Also present, as they were at the original hearing to answering any questions, was Rich Pizzi from Lavallee Brensinger, who has been the architect on the project; Scott Vlasak from Bruce Hamilton Architects, who is the consultant for Rite Aid. Steve Pernaw who spoke at the last meeting and has been working on the traffic. Bill Stevens and Steve Surrault were there from Harvey Construction.

Attorney Cronin advised this project started on its land use approval path with the hearing before the ZBA in early May. There were a number of variances that were required for this project to move forward. At the ZBA they classified those into a couple substantive variances and a number of procedural ones. The substantive ones because of the zone classification and this property having a zone line between B-2 and C-2 was the height of the building and the use of the hospital. That’s what was really driving it at the outset. He advised the variances were all approved. There were a couple lingering issues with the signage; one was the distance between existing signs then the classification and number of signs. Those two minor items will be heard by the ZBA on June 13th.

With respect to the various applications before the Board, Attorney Cronin said the conditional use requests are for the parking. This is now an integrated site where there are cross easements both for access and for parking. That will continue and there will be cross access and parking easements throughout both in the surface lot condition and the garage build condition. The good news is that collectively the adequate number of spaces overall are met.

In looking at the subdivision plan, Attorney Cronin believed there have been no comments at all. Those plans have been around for a number of months and he thought they met the
regulations and criteria. The bulk of time they spent at the last meeting related to the four site plans that were presented. There are three on the hospital side of the road for the three respective parcels; the CMC piece, the Rite Aid piece and St. Mary’s Bank. In response to the City’s request early on, which was a very meaningful request and something that took some effort to accomplish; the realignment of the driveways from the Mill West condominium. That was something that Mr. Cole and his team was able to accomplish. It resulted in Mill West getting some additional parking spaces and a section of fence that was never put up that is going to be an obligation of CMC to do. The Mill West site plan is minor in comparison to the other three.

When they left off the last time Attorney Cronin said there were a number of open issues. He took some notes and circulated a memo amongst their team to make sure those were addressed. He knows this application and the relative plans and documents have been overwhelming because it is a large project and it is detailed. There have been a number of meetings with staff, a number of submittals and he was somewhat surprised to see that the efforts to date have cost over $300,000 to process this application and the application fees alone are around $40,000 so he doesn’t want anyone to have an impression that there hasn’t been substantial effort to answer all of these questions and to meet the various criteria.

Attorney Cronin said the bollards were a question that showed up on the latest staff review. That is something they looked into and talked with the architect for Rite Aid and the principles of Rite Aid. He thought the staff report indicated there was a request for either stainless steel or granite. His recollection and his notes reflect that was a request but not a mandate. They went back to Rite Aid and had a discussion about that and the feedback they received that was a non-negotiable item for them. Granite in their view is brittle and it is not appropriate when you are in close proximity to vehicles that are moving and it creates a liability risk. Stainless steel, although it may look nice in the pictures, it is not something they believe is consistent with the architectural vision of their store. They think the stainless steel highlights the bollards and they become focal points when they are there. They spent a lot of time and effort and they have a number of stores and they use a standard bollard for two reasons; one they believe it blends in with the façade and it doesn’t become a focal point. They don’t want it to be a focal point and more importantly the methodology by how these are constructed with the tube and the concrete has sufficient strength that if it is struck it does its job so they were unwavering with respect to that issue.

Attorney Cronin said outside vending was a concern of the Board and they spoke to them about that. There was concern about its location and its visibility to McGregor Street. They had some flexibility to that and it was relocated to the Amory side of the building. It is a limited area. It will be screened in part by the existing St. Mary’s building and will not be visible to the front façade of McGregor.

Attorney Cronin said the lighting details were submitted. There were questions about the two different types of lighting that were going to be used. He thought they had the fixtures
that were presented the last time but some questions were raised about the stanchions or poles that would support them. Mr. Duval showed the poles of the existing CMC site and St. Mary’s and those are going to be continued so there will be two separate sets. The fixtures are consistent with what has been submitted in the package and that visual will give the Board an idea of what they will look like.

With regard to landscaping in the new surface lot during the interim phase, Attorney Cronin said some landscaping will be done on the north side of the lot facing Amory Street to dress that up during the interim phase.

Attorney Cronin said there was a question about how the employees access the hospital from the surface lot. There will be a service entrance only with a sidewalk to the northeast corner of the building. That particular entrance will be marked with an “Employees Only” sign. There are only 26 spaces in that surface lot for the benefit of CMC.

Attorney Cronin said the parking garage details were a matter of substantial discussion at the last meeting and there were concerns not only expressed at the public meeting but in the follow up meetings about the way the plans were depicted and the ramps. Initially the plan showed a grid area that caused some apprehension and some concerns about whether the counts matched up. They went back and revised those plans. Mr. Pizzi of Lavallee Brensinger also did some work to address some staff concerns about the support posts within the garage. It was his understanding there was concerns within the garage in the parking areas that some of the supports encroached in the clear space. Mr. Pizzi revised that so all the clear space is provided and there are no posts within the limits of the parking spaces. The grid sections were taken care of and the counts were established and confirmed so he believes that issue was resolved.

Attorney Cronin said initially there were concerns about the aesthetic appearance of the dumpster wall and there was a request that the wall match the building as shown. That has been done on the two visible sides and the inside facing the dumpsters will be CMU.

Attorney Cronin advised a member raised a question about what impact the Exit 6 interchange redesign would have. They contacted DOT and their alternative is to construct a single point urban interchange. The Attorney could not say whether that preferred alternative would actually get built but if it does it will result in a 10 percent reduction in northbound volumes coming from the Amory/McGregor intersection and there will be a 35 percent reduction in southbound volumes heading toward the intersection. The DOT study for that preferred alternative shows that the weekday PM peak hour 10 percent reduction in northbound volumes coming from Amory and McGregor and 30 percent reduction in southbound volumes. He said it was a really good question and it was worthwhile pursuing and it seems if that does happen it will do nothing but improve the traffic flow in this particular intersection.

Mr. Duval advised the utilities have been worked through with all the utility providers, with
Water Works, Manchester Sewer and with DPW as to drainage. They went over the utility locations as well as the type of utility service being provided. They also met since the last meeting with the NHDES to verify that the approach to drainage that they are taking with this project will be permissible according to the Alteration of Terrain standards and they have acknowledged that is the case and they have agreed on an approach. Given that this is a highly developed urban site it is impractical to do the standard AoT practices that would be appropriate to new development sites and DES has a protocol to deal with this. They have met and gone through that protocol and there is agreement between them and DES about this approach moving forward and that is reflected on the plans that were submitted.

Attorney Cronin requested that Mr. Duval address landscaping in the interim phase. Mr. Duval referred to the plan showing which landscaping would be provided at which time during this project. He showed a slide showing all of the landscaping associated with this project including some additional new landscaping across the street. The initial construction will increase the parking field for St. Mary’s and will be creating a new driveway into the middle of the site that lines up with the new driveway for 195 McGregor. Everything on the 195 Lot and the east side of the Amory Street entrance will all be fully constructed and fully landscaped. The next phase is the Rite Aid construction. All of the Rite Aid site will be constructed to a point where it is ready for a Certificate of Occupancy. All of the front landscaping will be done. A portion of the back landscaping will be done and the central portion of the boulevard will be done to the extent that it is possible allowing construction traffic continue to use that boulevard. Most importantly and what he thought spurred the question last time, all of the landscaping on the Amory Street side that is screening the interim surface parking lot and the future surface parking lot would be constructed at this time. Lastly, the work that is associated with CMC would take place and once that work is complete all of the remainder of the landscape that is physically on the CMC property would be constructed including the interior surface lot landscaping, the perimeter landscaping that is not already constructed, the inside interior landscaping islands and the landscaping buffer between the Rite Aid property and the CMC building in the back as well as the narrow strip along the side, which is no less than 4 feet wide and has been provided with special soil mixtures to make sure there would be survival of trees and shrubs that are put in that 4 foot median.

With regard to the construction staging, Attorney Cronin advised he spoke to Mr. Stephens about how he handles tight urban sites when doing construction as far as his workers and staging. Mr. Stephens is currently working on the parking garage that is in a very tight area. It is his responsibility as the contractor to make sure the project is properly staged and he gets employees back and forth. In that particular case he made arrangements with the owner of that lot on Second Street next to the dog park and he shuttles workers back and forth. He expects they may have to do that in this particular project at various times, but they are a company that has been around for a while and they have a track record of success and this is not foreign to their operations. He instilled in Attorney Cronin the confidence that he does not see that an issue to move his equipment and his men in a safe and meaningful manner around that intersection and things will change at different levels of the project.
Ms. Trisciani referred to sheet 17 on the plan set and said in the upper right hand corner they called out a vinyl stockade fence. There are some notes to the left that indicate Rite Aid and she was confused because she couldn’t find any vinyl stockade on the CMC plan. Mr. Duval thought that was a leftover detail when they separated this into packages. Not all the details were separated apparently into the right package. He confirmed there is no vinyl fence in the CMC package. The Rite Aid package clearly calls out that the dumpster stockade is a brick wall so there is no vinyl fence. Mr. Duval said that will be removed from the plan.

Chairman Harrington asked if they have made a decision if a parking garage is actually going to be built or not. Attorney Cronin said “definitively no”. He explained when this project came before the Board to review it the parking garage was shown. The numbers came in to build this addition in the $150 million plus and another multiple millions to build a garage. The Board does not want to go forward with this without having the ability to build a garage because they believe it may be necessary. The can function with the surface parking lot and the hope is that it will be built simultaneously so there won’t be any gap at all. He said there position is they definitely want to do the garage. They hope to do it with no break but they realize there may be a need to take a deep breath and a pause, look at the numbers and wait some time before they build it.

Mr. Duval said there is a footprint, elevations, a floor plan, a layout of the garage and dimensions of the garage. The structure has been approximately sized.

Chairman Harrington confirmed the garage is designed for 326 cars. If it turns out they need to build a 400 or 500 car garage they will come back before this Board. Attorney Cronin said they are not asking for anything more than 326.

With regard to the bollards, Chairman Harrington said he went to a few local Rite Aids and there were no bollards at the Rite Aid on North Elm Street. There are two column pillars. He took photos of the façade and certainly what is depicted in the conceptual plan doesn’t even show those bollards. It shows the building and the elevations but there are no bollards around it. Chairman Harrington said they didn’t really need to have bollards they just need to have protection from somebody driving into their building. Mr. Duval said chains like Rite Aid have a book of standards. There are hundreds and hundreds of pages that have the standards they have to follow with a new prototype store and this is a new prototype store. In fact, that was one of the requirements of the deal was that this be a prototype store to replace their existing legacy store. The prototype requires a number of things, bollards just being one of countless items and the reason they showed the bollards is because that was the standard when they started this project. Up until September 2018 it called for 62 bollards laid out as shown essentially covering the two front facades of the building. He pointed out the Rite Aid criteria at that meeting was to have the full coverage but they were just changing their standards. They went back to Rite Aid and asked if they could use the new standards that came out at the end of last year and they said yes, which is why they can now show the plan that shows less than half of the bollards that just covers approximately a
third of the McGregor Street façade and maybe half of the interior façade. They have settled on a smooth brown bollard made by a particular manufacturer and they are not willing to change that without seeking an executive level waiver, which is certainly time consuming and possibly puts them in nonconformance with their standards.

Attorney Cronin explained that Rite Aid didn’t come to them and say they would like to have a store in the middle so you can build your hospital addition. They went to Rite Aid so they don’t have a lot of power to move Rite Aid because they are content to stay in their tired mall because they do a lot of business there. It is a very productive store as it is so this is a situation where they have the positioning to say you have to do this or else. He thought everyone would prefer not to have bollards but they are there for a reason in the day and age we live in today.

Chairman Harrington said he understood and their projects are much more important to the City than bollards around a Rite Aid; however, aesthetics do matter and it is really unfortunate that Rite Aid would take that position because it looks more industrial versus appealing.

Attorney Cronin asked if a decision could be rendered this evening during the business meeting.

If there is no garage being built Chairman Harrington asked if the design is being built currently as the “temporary parking area” meets all of the City standards as a standalone parking lot. Mr. Duval said it does.

Ms. Charlebois asked if they received comments from the Highway Department or the Traffic engineer. Ms. Goucher said they did not get anything back from them.

Chairman Harrington asked if they had discussions with DPW and/or Traffic. Mr. Duval said they have and received some initial comments and those comments were responded to in the package that they resubmitted to Planning. They have had some follow up discussion with Ms. Clarke and Owen before he left on vacation as well as Mr. Connors. He has not been made aware of any substantive problems. They have agreement on the sewer, water and drainage. They have agreement on the construction standards of the pavement in the parking lots. They have general agreement on the offsite improvements and they answered the detailed comments that they got from Ms. Clarke regarding the Amory Street improvements in that package. They haven’t seen any acknowledgement or feedback that all of those comments have been addressed, but he feels confident that they are largely addressed and if there are any remaining items they are of a housekeeping nature.

Chairman Harrington advised it is not typical that they even close a public hearing without having comments provided by DPW.

Ms. Goucher said as of last Friday, when the staff was trying to pull things together, the last
comment they had from the traffic engineer was that they had received the information but not had a chance to look at it. It was the same with DPW. Planning staff was hoping to get some comments before tonight’s meeting. She said if they had gotten any information from DPW yesterday or today that those items had been addressed, that would have been helpful but the Planning staff can’t dictate what the DPW review schedule is.

Attorney Cronin said they need to get this moving because they have time deadlines they have to meet so as not to jeopardize this project. Mr. Duval said they have a tight schedule with Rite Aid and St. Mary’s Bank to get the work done as quickly as possible and they need to abide by those contractual obligations.

Ms. Charlebois asked if the general agreements about offsite improvements would include the intersection on Amory into the new entrance where the old Rite Aid is. Mr. Duval said they agreed on the three lane section. He showed it to Ms. Clarke and Mr. Connors earlier this week. Attorney Cronin said there is a significant development agreement that expresses that obligation.

Mr. Duval said the plan showed what Kristen asked for in one of her earlier comments. It shows if there is enough room to bring in a left turn lane, which was her primary objective. He said they show that it is possible using the survey they had out there to lay this out with acceptable lane widths and taper lengths, etc. She had a secondary goal of making sure that the plan was complete and showed all the elements that would be required including the quadrupole loop detectors. She had questions about where those conduits would be run, where the pole boxes would be installed, etc. That was all addressed and they also had a discussion about signalization of the crosswalk across the new boulevard style opening as well as relocating signal heads. There is one new signal head that will be required and then there is relocation of two City streetlights. They also agreed on adding a new streetlight just to make sure the intersection is adequately lit. He believes they have addressed everything she has been looking for they just need her review and acknowledgment of that.

Mr. Hebert asked what a two week delay would cost on the project. Attorney Cronin said it is not so much the delay. The closing is scheduled with Rite Aid in July. If that gets pushed off and the schedule shifts the big concern that he was hearing from Mr. Stephens and his team is they will be looking at construction in the fall. They can’t anticipate what the weather is going to be. Winter conditions add a significant amount of cost to a project and, more importantly, if you can’t get the site prepped for asphalt you are looking at not a two week delay but back into the falling spring, which blows the whole thing up. That is where the real issue is. It is not the two or three weeks between now and July, it is what’s tacked on at the other end of it. Mr. Stephens said they are trying to close with Rite Aid so they can get started on those projects so the plan is to close as soon as they can after the appeals process here. That will enable them to get started. He agreed with Attorney Cronin’s description of what a delay would do to the project.

Mr. Hebert said a gentleman from CMC mentioned that they were behind the eight ball from
the get go. He didn’t see any hardship for this Board not to close this meeting today. No one at the staff is going to get the reports back from the Departments and this will give them the leeway to move forward with getting their financing in place. He was in favor of closing this tonight.

Mr. Long asked if they were confident that there are no substantial issues with Departments that will come up. His perception is they are feeling confident that whatever issues they come up with they could work with staff and it is not substantial to come back for a hearing. Mr. Duval said that was correct. They have been talking to staff for months about this project. In the case of DPW, they have been talking with them for over a year about how they would handle the utility relocations so he is not expecting any surprises. There are always comments just as there are unknown conditions once you start digging, but he feels they have a good enough handle on the site and how to make it work that he is not expecting anything substantial to come up.

Mr. Trisciani said she understood what they were saying and she is supporting of CMC doing this. They have done great things for the community and she thinks would be a great addition to the community; however, she has serious concerns closing this out with so many open items. She respected their confidence that they have these worked out but she unfortunately does not have the same level of confidence without hearing or seeing it from DPW representatives that they are okay with this. She feels if they were to close this out tonight it kind of becomes an “anything goes” at that point.

Alderman Levasseur advised he read the memo that was drafted online and sent to the Board members today. He said there were probably 25 open items and whatever the concerns were they replied no problem. He said they agreed with every single question, they gave an answer for every single request and they gave a positive response to every single request. Mr. Duval said there were about 25 Planning comments and another 20 from DPW. Mr. Duval said this wouldn’t be just “anything goes”. If the comments were just the ordinary course of business comments they would just do it. If there is anything substantive that comes up the risk is theirs because, as the Chairman pointed out, they would have to come back, re-open the public hearing and almost start over again. He said there is no downside for the Board in doing this; the downside is on their side.

The Alderman said if they close the public hearing today they could still continue to do what they need to do and if there are some other issues concerning any DPW issues they could just come back and deal with that and that wouldn’t hinder anything else they want to get down now; which is basically just close with Rite Aid and get ready to get the asphalt going. He didn’t imagine that would have anything to do with what would concern DPW. Mr. Duval said if it is just an ordinary detail that doesn’t rise to the level of a Planning Board issue, they would just move ahead. If it was something where they significantly had to change the layout for example or reduce the number of trees or do something that changed the lighting dramatically, etc. they would need to come back to the Planning. He is confident they are talking technical issues here, not wholesale changes to the site plan.
Alderman Levasseur gave kudos to staff because they pointed out 25 things they wanted to discuss and that showed a lot of detail by the Planning Department. They pointed out a lot of things that you have to be pretty experienced in that Department to notice. He said he learned a lot by reading them. He thought they did a good job in their responses to the concerns of the Planning Department and did not see any reason why they shouldn’t just close this tonight and move this ahead as fast as they can.

Attorney Cronin said another thing that might give comfort to some of the Board members is that he has not ever seen such a comprehensive Development Agreement. He believed Devine Millimet drafted it, but it is the best work he has seen as a Development Agreement. Is has all those assurances built right into it and that has been submitted and is part of the package. He added they are amenable to tweak that if there are some concerns.

Chairman Harrington asked where they stand with easement agreements. Mr. Duval said they had a discussion with DPW staff, which is where that comment originated. They have agreement between sewer, water and DPW that all the utilities on the site will be private utilities and DPW was not interested in the form or location even for that matter of private utilities on private property. That point was very clear and he made sure he understood with DPW. On this site there is only one area that has public utilities on it and that is the footprint of old Wayne Street that was discontinued, but it was kept for a 40 foot wide easement for utilities. There is a public utilities easement here. This is an existing easement. It has always been shown on the plan and it will continue to be an easement that runs in favor of the City and actually those trunk lines, drainage and sewer in particular, will continue to be used both in handling the flow that comes down Wayne Street as well as the source of service for the development of this property. It is explicitly agreed with the utility providers it will be private utilities on private property. There is another lengthy easement document that has been prepared by CMC and their team that will be provided to the City and they simply refer to the plan and the location of the utilities shown on that plan and give the right to each of the easement holders to repair, replace, maintain, etc. those easements as shown on the plan, which will be recorded along with the easement itself, so they feel that situation is adequately covered in this particular regard.

Attorney Cronin said when they met there was a question about the easements and his first question was “since when has the City been scrutinizing private easement”. He doesn’t remember ever doing one prior to an approval because you really can’t draft it until you know what you have but to satisfy some of the concerns he suggested putting a paragraph into the Development Agreement that cross-references the plan that is going to be a recorded document and that satisfies the legal obligation for the creation of an easement. Because they thought it may be of further concern, Mr. Cole had the actual draft done, which looks great, but until the plan is approved it is really meaningless because it is all full of blanks. However, if it gives the Board comfort to have it he would be happy to give them one of the nicest looking easements he has ever seen, but until the plan is approved it really doesn’t do that much for them. What does something for them is the Development
Agreement and those easements are specifically referenced in there and cross-referenced to the plan.

Mr. Lussier said they basically have nine public hearings going on at once here. He asked if there was a possibility that seven or eight of them could be closed to let them proceed with what they need to do and possibly keep one or two of them open for anything that might come up for further discussion. Ms. Goucher said they could close all of them, they could close none of them or they could close some of them. She said they needed to keep in mind that some of the plans are contingent on the other. It was her opinion they should probably do all or none.

Mr. Hebert said he was in favor of closing the whole thing.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public. There were no comments from the public and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.

Should the Board decide to close this public hearing on all of the applications, Chairman Harrington reiterated if there was a substantial change they would have to reapply, pay application fees and there will have to be a public hearing. Attorney Cronin said the application fees were concerning to him but he did not have any problem coming back to the Board.

Chairman Harrington said that would be his only caveat should the Board decide to do that and there have already been some Board members who indicated their willingness to close. He assumed there will be some fairly broad language if a recommendation is drafted in favor that things like working out agreements with DPW and Traffic. He said the worst situation he thought they could see themselves in and the Board could see themselves in is that it gets looked at as if they gave a blank check and they get into some sort of finger pointing competition and that is where his comments about good will came in part and which he believes CMC will act in good will. He wanted it clearly on the record that is the case and the Board, and the City for that matter, doesn’t want to get into that. Mr. Duval acknowledged this doesn’t mean they stop working with staff. If anything, they would re-double their efforts to work with staff and get all these issues sorted out quickly so the plan can be signed and they can actually start construction as soon as possible because that is the real goal.

Chairman Harrington said that is a goal they all share and it is a fabulous project that is very valuable to the community.

Chairman Harrington polled the Board regarding closing the hearing.

Ms. Trisciani and Ms. Charlebois were not in favor of closing the public hearing.

Ms. Goucher said the difference in this project is typically staff would have had that second round of comments from DPW so they could tell the Board that it looks like there are very
few outstanding issues. Unfortunately, staff does not have that. It doesn’t mean that what is really left is some minor comments; that may very well be the case. Staff wishes they had something that they could say looks like all of the comments that Mr. Duval referenced have been taken care of.

Ms. Goucher said it sounded like Mr. Pernaw gave Ms. Clarke information and it sounded like she received what she asked for. It would have been great if staff had an email from Traffic that said “everything is pretty good”. That is the reservation staff has.

Mr. Long has never heard CMC or TFMoran having an issue with the City so he didn’t see a free for all here. This is going to be a good working relationship and it always has been. He thought they have respect for the City and if the Department wanted something he does not see there being an argument on that. That is why he is comfortable closing all of it.

Chairman Harrington said his leanings in this come down to good will so there is maybe 5 percent missing from this puzzle and he would expect in all good will if the Board closes this that CMC and their engineers will provide the same good will to staff and the City in doing what is necessary to get this done. He truly believes that is going to be what occurs. Mr. Duval said they will absolutely do that.

Chairman Harrington closed the public hearing on all the applications and it will be deliberated at the next business meeting.

(Current 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: SP2019-018, SP2019-009, CU2019-009 and PDSP2019-002. (Motion Carried)

8. **SP2019-018**  
Property located at 785 Goffs Falls Road (Tax Map 871, Lot 1A), a site plan application to amend a previously approved site plan (SP-18-2018), to construct a 3,500 SF convenience store and fuel dispensing area consisting of 12 fuel pumps with associated site improvements in the B-2 Zone. *MHF Design Consultants, Inc. for Irving Oil Marketing, Inc.*

Chris Tamoula from MHF Design appeared on behalf Granite State Convenience along with Rusty McLeer. The application was before the Board last September. At that time they were permitting a 3,000 SF convenience store with a fueling canopy along the front with six
fueling islands as part of Irving Oils site development. They had access curb cuts along South Willow as well as along Goffs Falls Road. They applied for three waivers, which were all granted. One for the width of the driveway, one for the landscaping setback along the side lot line and the additional waiver for the freestanding sign along the front of the site. Since that time Irving Oil has partnered with Common Man Roadside Convenience. The size of the store has increased from 3,000 to 3,500 SF. The fueling canopy is the same size. Nothing has really changed along the front of the site. They added one additional parking space in the front of the site based on a recent comment from Zoning. The dumpster was reduced in size and they also added an emergency generator behind the building.

Mr. Tamoula said they received comments from staff on June 6th and he added some minor utility notes to the plans. The three waivers ultimately got approved; one was for the driveway width to increase, one was for increasing the driveway width from 36 feet to 49 feet and decreasing the South Willow Streetscape from 25 feet down to 21 feet and increasing the freestanding sign area from 32 SF to 127.5 SF and it increasing the height from 6 feet to 22 feet; all of which they still need waivers for this evening.

With regard to the waivers they still need, Ms. Goucher advised one of the things that changed with this application – because of the additional 500 SF that was added – is that they now encroach into the South Willow Streetscape 25 foot buffer in additional locations. It is still the same waiver the Board granted them before, but the impact is slightly larger with this plan.

Mr. Leclerc asked what the relationship is between The Common Man and Irving Oil. Brad Pernaw with the Common Man Roadside Granite State Convenience advised they were thinking of The Common Man Restaurant, which is outstanding. They want the Board to think of their Hooksett Welcome Centers and the general store concept. Rusty McLeer, of Granite State Hospitality was also present.

Chairman Harrington said when he was reviewing this plan, even though it was previously approved, everything was nicely detailed, nicely highlighted, appropriately sized and it made his job much easier and he assumed staff probably felt the same way. He thought the work that the engineer did in providing this as part of their application was very helpful and nicely done.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public. There were no comments from the public and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.

Chairman Harrington asked if there were any changes that Irving was going to do versus what they are doing. Mr. Tamoula said there is no change from Irving’s plan to their plans.

Chairman Harrington confirmed with Mr. Tamoula that it is take-out and there will be no seats.
Chairman Harrington asked if this is part of their upcoming business plan. Mr. Pernaw said it is and they have a site under development up in Plymouth on The Tenney Mountain Highway and this is site number 2 they are readying to develop with Irving. He said it is a partnership with Irving Oil, not a joint venture.

Ms. Charlebois asked where the vacuum is located. Mr. Tamoula said it might be a good catch on Ms. Charlebois’ part. Ms. Goucher thought they were on the back on the last plan where the back parking spaces were. Mr. Tamoula looked at both the old plan and the new plan and didn’t see the vacuum location. The Chairman said that detail could be worked out with staff.

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

9. **SP2019-009**

Property located at 48 Perimeter Road (Tax Map 721, Lot 7), a site plan application for a 30 space parking lot expansion with retaining wall and other site related improvements in the IND Zone. *TF Moran for St. Mary’s Bank*

Jeff Kevan of TFMoran appeared on behalf of St. Mary’s Bank. This is the operations center located at 48 Perimeter Road. Right now they have approximately 127 parking spaces out there. During some of their shifts and special events they have at the location, they have a need for additional parking spaces so they were looking for somewhere between 20-30 additional parking spaces. The topography is pretty tough. If you come up the hill off the back there is about a 10-15 foot grade where the treed area is. There is actually a flat spot, which is why they selected that location to add the 20 spaces. It is all graded such that the drainage comes down, similar to what they did when they first moved in when they put in a hard pipe detention system. Those aren’t suitable for infiltration so they are doing underground detention and then a tie in and it goes into the system in Perimeter Road. In addition to that, on the opposite side of the site, there is a spot where they are showing an additional 10 spaces. This drops off to the side a little bit. This basically will fulfill their need for those additional spaces during those shift changes and training and other special events. They have provided landscaping and lighting along the additional parking spaces. They requested a waiver to not provide a traffic study and he believed the staff supported that.

Mr. Hebert asked how close the new additional parking is to the airport fence on the right hand side. Mr. Kevan said it was 24-26 feet off the property line.

Ms. Goucher asked if any additional positions will be created. Mr. Kevan said during their normal operation, the parking lots are 90 percent full just on a normal time period during the day. It is just for shift changes and events.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public. There were no comments from the public and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.
Chairman Harrington closed this public hearing and it will be deliberated at the next business meeting.

10. **CU2019-009**

Property located at 766 and 778 Gold Street (Tax Map 438, Lots 5A and 5C), an application for a conditional-use permit to allow 135 parking spaces where 215 parking spaces would be required, in the B-2 Zoning District. *Allen and Major Associates, Inc. for AMR Real Estate Holdings, LLC*

**PDSP2019-002**

Property located at 766 and 778 Gold Street (Tax Map 438, Lots 5A and 5C), an application for site-plan and planned-development approval to construct an approximately 44,875-square-foot automobile dealership and service center and to maintain an approximately 6,000-square-foot building to be used as additional service area, with associated site improvements, in the B-2 Zoning District. *Allen and Major Associates, Inc. for AMR Real Estate Holdings, LLC*

Brian Jones of Allen and Major Associates, appeared along with James Mularkey, the project architect with Curtis Architectural Group; Giles Hamm with Vanesse Associates who are traffic engineers and Gus Mayer, the general sales manager with Prime Subaru.

Mr. Jones advised the property is located at the corner of Gold Street and John E. Devine Drive. It is a 6.3 acre parcel. It is the location of the former Suzuki dealership and before that it was Volkswagen. BJ’s Warehouse is to the north, Hannaford is toward the right by J.D. Byrider and Sunbelt Rental and Walmart are across the street on Gold Street. The project is within both the general industrial zone and the general business district. It is kind of a strange zoning breakup in this area, but it is two zones. The automotive use is allowed in the general business zone. It is not allowed in the industrial zone; however, they got a variance to allow it in both zones.

Mr. Jones said the project is a new 54,564 SF Prime Subaru dealership and it is intended to replace the current dealership at 764 Second Street. They will be relocating from Second Street to this location. There is more space, a new facility up to date with Subaru global standards so there are a lot of benefits there. There will also be some modifications to the existing smaller building. 6,000 SF exists today. It is owned by the proponent. They are going to rehab the exterior so there is some synergy between the buildings and consistent character across the site. They understand this is a planned development. The project also involves a lot merger and they have filed that application. They also filed a conditional use permit as part of this application. That is specifically about parking for this property. They have requested a conditional use permit to reduce the required customer and employee parking spaces from 238 to 134. The proponent has 70 dealerships as part of the Prime Automotive Group. They are not all Subaru they are all different brands. They are very familiar and comfortable with employee count and what they have. There are 60 employees
that will be on site and there are 50 spaces for service visits not counting vehicles within the building and then there are 20 spaces for people shopping so that is 135 spaces. That is what they want for customer and employee parking. The “magic” number for Subaru was to have 450 inventory spaces and that is what this site has.

Mr. Jones said drainage is all subsurface. There are a couple subsurface systems; there is one out in front and another in the back. Those are comprised of chambers and pipe where it stores the water temporarily and discharges it to the existing drainage infrastructure. There is also a small bio retention area for some infiltration. They have applied to DES and have been issued an Alteration of Terrain permit for the project so the drainage has been pretty well vetted. They have also received comments from staff and addressed those. They have received comments from Water Works and those have been addressed. They received comments from DPW and they were generally just details and some tweaks to curbing within the right-of-way and sidewalk within the right-of-way. They haven’t formally responded to DPW yet, but he is confident those are minor issues.

Mr. Jones advised the utilities all tie out into John E. Devine. They are not doing any utility work in Gold Street. He pointed out the locations where they will tie into the existing sewer and water services. Those were both installed fairly recently so they are going to reuse those service connections for this building. Gas and electric both come off Gold Street. They prepared a comprehensive landscape plan. The landscape plan as part of the site plan has the species and the count and the perennials and shrubs, etc. The plan also depicts the trees within the right-of-way, which is a City requirement, the open space, the landscape islands within, etc. They also included a lighting plan for this use and the photometrics and they are all dark sky compliant. He showed the building elevations and representative photographs.

Mr. Mularkey said the photographs show the Board exactly what the materials are going to be on the building. They are very simple with clear glass and silver metal. There is a blue tower in the corner and Subaru has since changed that and it will be stone. There are just the two materials and the two colors. There is blue band across the top and the signage itself is blue.

Mr. Mularkey referred to the elevations and said the colors are not representative. He showed the John E. Devine main entry. There are three service bays on the left, the tower in the middle and the showroom entrance in the center. The front of the building on John Devine is pretty much all clear glass with a small amount of silver metal and the feature tower and all of the other sides are silver metal with glass on the west John Devine side and a little bit more internal to box off the showroom. He referred to the floorplan and explained how the building works, how it operates and how the cars flow in and out of it.

Giles Hamm, managing partner with Vanasse & Associates, advised they completed a very comprehensive study for the project and working with City staff. City staff scoped out five intersections to study; South Willow Street at March Street, John E. Devine Drive and Gold Street, March Street and John E. Devine Drive and John E. Devine at Gold Street. They
looked at both AM, PM Saturday midday conditions. In terms of traffic generation they used standard ITE standard trip generation numbers. There are about 1,600 daily trips on a weekday, 110-143 during the peak hours and obviously busier on Saturday with 238 trips in the midday peak hour.

Mr. Long confirmed with Mr. Jones there is no on street parking anywhere on John E. Devine Drive and Gold Street.

Chairman Harrington asked where the mechanical equipment was. Mr. Mularkey said there are roof top units. The way it is designed it is basically a dish and the equipment sits in the middle. He said if the Chairman was concerned about sight lines he wouldn’t see them. Because the building is so deep and the equipment sits in the middle of the dish it is automatically 2-1/2 to 3 feet down below. When you run the sight line with a 27 foot high perimeter you won’t see it from the street. The units themselves are about 6-1/2 to 7 feet tall including the curb.

Chairman Harrington asked about parking for display vehicles. He explained there are a number of auto dealers in the City that tend to park in their green scape. The dealers have the rationale that if they pull a car up close to the street and put it on the grass it sells in a matter of a few hours. He said if that is something they are considering or their general sales manager would be thinking about doing in the future, he would prefer to actually have a built in display area in the grass area. He referred to what Honda on Auto Center Road did with a built in display area in the grass area where they can park a car. Mr. Mularkey said that tends to happen with the smaller dealers. When they get to Prime size they are familiar with this problem and it is just not going to happen. Everything they need to accommodate this operation is already designed into the site. Mr. Jones said they have a 10 foot setback for parking, which is what they have shown. In looking at the perimeter, it is already all inventory parking that wraps John E. Devine and Gold Street. The Chairman agreed that they had “a heck of a display area”. Mr. Jones said they have accomplished what the Chairman was talking about without breaking any of the rules. He pointed out a couple concrete pads they have included as part of the site design and they are included in the parking calculation as well, but that would be the only place where they would be within a landscape area.

Assuming the Board felt comfortable with closing the hearing and getting them an approval, Chairman Harrington said one of the conditions of approval is that they can’t park their cars on the green scape. Mr. Mularkey said “absolutely” and Mr. Jones said “understood”. Mr. Mularkey said Prime wouldn’t have a problem with that.

Mr. Leclerc said he lived in that neighborhood and he was looking forward to it being developed because it looks like heck right now. He said his son has a WRX, which is a fun little car to drive” and it would fit between those trees very easily. That’s why as a follow up he said he is going to be the “junkyard dog” out there and if he sees it he will report it. He is looking forward to the site being cleaned up and he is looking forward to a nice product. He asked if they have a builder yet. Mr. Mularkey said they do not. Post approval they will
engineer the building, which will take about eight weeks, and then they will put it out to bid. It will probably take another 4-6 weeks and then they will try to get going prior to winter. Mr. Leclerc said all the landscaping is going to look so much better than it does right now.

Chairman Harrington reminded the Board this is a planned unit development so the second building must stay in keeping with the main building. Mr. Mularkey said they are basically re-skinning the entire building using the same material so they will look identical.

Chairman Harrington asked if they did any environmental studies. Mr. Mularkey said they ran regular geotech. They haven’t specifically looked at environmental. Normally when they do geotech there is a pretty early and obvious sign if there is something like an oil plume or whatever but the geotech was normal and clean.

On the idea of the planned development and the consistency with the smaller building, Mr. Belanger asked if both sides would be pitched. Mr. Mularkey said it goes down about a 1-1/2 to 2 feet right at the edge and then there is a gutter running along the sides of the building. That is the nature of how pre-engineered structures are designed so there is not much they can do about it. Mr. Belanger asked if there would be glass on the sides at all or would it be entirely the metal cladding all the way around. Mr. Mularkey said where ever there is an opening they just leave the opening and then the rest of it is clad. Most of the existing is a combination of masonry and vertical metal panel right now. That will all be changed with the smooth silver panel.

Ms. Goucher asked if there were any thoughts of putting the blue band around the smaller building or were they afraid of bringing too much attention to it. Mr. Mularkey said he would be more worried that Subaru would have an issue with it because they are specific where they want the blue band.

Ms. Goucher asked where the openings are and if, where the garage doors are, if there will be some glass in it like some of the other doors. Mr. Mularkey said if there is glass there now it will stay glass. If there isn’t, it will just be painted to match the adjacent panel. Ms. Goucher thought it would be nice to have some more glass in that building because it is very boxy. Mr. Mularkey said you won’t see much of it when the new building is in place.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public. There were no comments from the public and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.

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

Chairman Harrington closed the public hearing of the Manchester Planning Board of June 6, 2019
IV. LIMITED BUSINESS MEETING:

(Tabled from March 15, 2018)

1. **SP-01-2019**

   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 the table.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

1. **Review and approval of the Planning Board Minutes of February 7, 2019, April 4, 2019, April 18, 2019 and May 1, 2019.**

   Ms. Charlebois reviewed the Minutes of February 7, 2019 and pointed out corrections to be made.

   *Mr. Leclerc made a motion to approve the Minutes of February 7, 2019 with amendment, which was seconded by Ms. Sanuth. (Motion Carried)*

   Ms. Sanuth reviewed the Minutes of April 4, 2019 and April 18, 2019 and submitted changes to be made to staff.

   *Alderman Levasseur made a motion to approve the Minutes of April 4, 2019 and April 18, 2019 Minutes with minor corrections as submitted, which was seconded by Mr. Hebert. (Motion Carried)*

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

   Ms. Goucher said there is a proposed sign request for a building on South Willow Street and there is a Board member who will probably recuse himself from this action. At the previously approved State Farm building that has been purchased by Alderman Levasseur, there is a request for an electronic sign. One of the original conditions of approval by the Board when it was approved for a State Farm Insurance office was that any changes were to be reviewed by the Board.

   Alderman Levasseur said the proposed electronic sign will have a picture of him and the things he will be able to do. He said he will also be advertising a lot of other people’s businesses as a public service. That was his plan to help out the community. If there is a lost dog that could be put up on the sign. There is always something that is going on in the City.
Chairman Harrington asked if this sign meets the regulations. Ms. Goucher said an electronic sign is allowed. She thought the size and type has already been reviewed by the zoning officer.

The Chairman said there were more members present than can vote tonight. There are 10 members and only 9 can vote.

Chairman Harrington advised that Mr. Curry would not vote on this and Alderman Levasseur recused himself.

**Mr. Hebert made a motion to approve the sign, which was seconded by Mr. Long. (Motion Carried)**

Chairman Harrington said on North Main Street where Tires, Inc. is located, they are storing all sorts of tires out on the side of their building, which also happens to be where the rail trail is. He said it is hazardous and they should be removed. Ms. Goucher said she would bring it to the attention of the enforcement officer. Mr. Lussier said it is now JR’s Tire and Speed Shop.

Mr. Long asked for a status on the Master Plan.

Chairman Harrington advised he met with staff to discuss putting together a steering committee of anywhere between 9 and 11 members. They are working on that and have identified groups they would like to see as part of it but they haven’t come up with any names yet. Staff has been working with the consultant to nail down a date for the meeting with staff. Ms. Goucher said it looked like it would be the week of July 22nd. It is for three days and she believes it is Monday-Wednesday, but that has not been confirmed yet. Staff has a conference call with them on Monday.

Ms. Goucher said what TPUDC likes to do as consultants is, while there is the “think tank” that will be fairly demanding in terms of the time commitments, they also suggest having a number of ambassadors where any number of people can actually have group meetings and get input.
Mr. Hebert made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Ms. Sanuth. (Motion Carried)

ATTEST: _____________________________________________________

Michael Harrington, Chairman
Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD:  August 14, 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