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

II. LIMITED PUBLIC HEARING:

(Postponed from June 20, 2019)

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

   At the request of the applicant, this was postponed to August 1, 2019. No further notice to abutters.

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

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

   CU2019-015
   Property located at 9 Willow Street (Tax Map 360, Lot 1), an application for a conditional-use permit to provide 6 stacking spaces for fueling stations, where 9 are required, in the RDV Zone. T.F. Moran, Inc. for Tanveer Akhtier
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-thru restaurant window and 11 parking spaces in the RDV Zone. *T.F. Moran, Inc. for Tanveer Akhtier*

Nick Golon, a licensed engineer and senior project manager with TFMoran appeared on behalf of the Maverick Gas Station redevelopment team and Mr. Tanveer Akhtier.

Mr. Golon advised the project is located at 9 Willow Street. He showed a graphic of what the existing site looks like. They are across the street from Brothers Pizza and F.W. Webb with Dave’s Septic located behind them. Tax Map 360, Lot 1 is comprised of approximately 20,000 SF and zoned redevelopment district RDV. Currently it is a 1,500 SF convenience store built in the 1940’s with six pumps located in front of the existing gas station. There is approximately 215 feet of frontage along Willow Street and another 150 feet along Union Street. There are five existing curb cuts, which essentially comprises the vast majority of their frontage. There is not a whole lot of circulation mitigation that is provided here. Relative to the parking provided, there are really five dedicated parking spaces and they have six existing fuel pump stacking spaces.

Mr. Golon advised they are a 2,200 SF convenience store with a drive-thru window at the corner of the building. The gas station itself has eleven parking spaces, six fuel pumping spaces and seven stacking spaces as relate to the drive-thru window.

Mr. Golon said tomorrow is their one year anniversary of when they were last before the Board when they came in conceptually. With that conceptual plan, they are looking at a plan that is very similar but different in many respects. Although they previously proposed to limit a lot of their curb cuts with the previous design, through coordination with DPW they have been further revised. They met with the Board on July 19, 2018 and said they were going to move forward with a traffic impact and access study so they could better define traffic on the site as well as the adjoining areas as traffic was identified as one of the primary concerns relating to the project. Relative to the recommendations that were included within that traffic study, narrowing the existing curb cuts both on Union Street as well as Willow Street, which they have been able to accomplish. The results of that study at this point he does not believe they are being refuted. They have delays of increase of less than one second and queueing increases of less than one car. They have gone through some iterations that took some time to make sure they were applying the right ITE use codes to make sure that overall the traffic study was indicative of what’s being proposed. Relative to that traffic study, they asked for a waiver in relation to a PTEO stamping the plan. They will be removing that request as their traffic study has now been stamped by the appropriate official classification not being a PTOE.

From that traffic study preparation Mr. Golon said they moved forward with the Zoning Board. There were five items in which they were requesting relief and although it was not unanimous they were successful with the relief required to move forward with the plan,
which very much looks like what they presented to them. The only differences really being additional green space has now been provided and they have been able to provide more narrowing of the existing curb cuts.

In looking at what is being proposed, Mr. Golon said one of the things they spoke to when they were before this Board in July last year was the district in which they are located, that being the redevelopment district, which states “The intent of this district is to provide a transitional mixed use district that facilitates the redevelopment of areas lying between the central business district and the residential multi-family districts. The RDV district follows the access of an abandoned rail corridor that once supported industrial uses but now which represents an area of underutilized land and buildings. The provisions for this district reflect the need to provide flexible opportunities for redevelopment to a more productive mixture of commercial, industrial and residential uses subject to performance standards that will protect existing adjacent residential neighborhoods.” In looking at the notes from when they were before the Board a year ago, he said a few things jumped out at him. Mr. Lussier had commented relative to the drive-thru as to whether or not they could live with some reduced stacking if the traffic study came back and they felt comfortable with that volume. Mr. O’Donoughue mentioned they needed a shorter list of relief. They were asking for a lot of potential waivers at that time. There was also some zoning relief that may have been deemed in excess, which they were able to pare down. Mr. Long had mentioned landscaping being critical. They took those comments to heart and there were a couple things he is happy to say, relative to the application before the Board, there are several waivers that had been requested that they will withdraw and will be able to comply with. The PTOE designation was mentioned. In reviewing with City staff the granite curbing was put forth that was an important characteristic and if they were redeveloping the site they would need to redevelop it the right way. The extra money that goes toward that vertical granite curbing is important. Mr. Golon said they are withdrawing that waiver request and will provide the vertical curbing requested. There was also a waiver regarding bark mulch, which is in regards to no more than 30 percent of the landscaped area may consist of bark mulch on a site. They are again going to withdraw that waiver. In reviewing with their landscape architect, there are other opportunities than bark mulch. They are already calling for some bayberry groundcover. By swapping out a couple of the smaller shrubs with groundcover and a different orientation of those shrubs they can now achieve what is required.

Mr. Golon advised they have two remaining waiver requests in relationship to shade trees. The requirement is nine shade trees. In counting the trees on their plan they do have nine but a portion of those are located outside of their property and in the right-of-way. As part of the coordination meeting with Planning and DPW staff it was agreed that they could locate their trees there but the reality is they may be subject to removal at some point whether they grew too big or they were an encumbrance for something that DPW needed to do relative to the roadway or otherwise. He said they have a waiver to provide four trees onsite with five in the right-of-way so after construction they are going to have the required number, but knowing there is always the potential that DPW may need to remove them they provided that waiver request.
Another waiver request before the Board is relative to the building elevations. Mr. Golon said they provided a floorplan so there is an understanding of how they are going to use the internal space within the building but at this point they have not engaged an architect to provide elevations. The intent is this would be part of a design build where essentially they will give them the footprint in which to work with, they have evaluated the floorplan to know it works for the end user’s needs but those other components that go along with the architecture, that being the elevation, would come back to this Board at a later date prior to construction. What that provides is the opportunity for Mr. Akhtier to move forward with financing the project, to obtain a general contractor and to put all the necessary pieces in order and to do so in a logical way relative to his expenses. When they met a year ago that was one of the things they were very poignant about. This is not a developer, this is a store owner who is a very prideful man who wants to see his land redeveloped, but they had to be very pragmatic about how they did. Being that they would be back before the Board with the elevation they felt it would be an appropriate request and allows him to defer costs if for some reason they were unable to be successful with the project as proposed.

Mr. Golon said as they work their way down Willow Street it can be seen that the vast majority of parking spaces are located along the sidewalk. This is one of the key streets so they have a nice improvement. With what they are proposing they are going to have the opportunity to improve the sidewalk. They will have the vertical granite curbing. What was once a giant open curb cut will be reduced with that sidewalk parking located on the other side. He pointed out the location of the dumpster that will be screened with appropriate plantings. This would be one of the few areas they are still going to have some mulch because they have some massing of those plants. There will be a dedicated right turn and left turn exit. This would also be two-way so it will be full access enter and exit. Their intent with locating the driveway on the far side, similar to their original conceptual plan, they are trying to move traffic further away from the intersection to provide less congestion. He showed a graphic of the plantings depicting what will be provided. One of the improvements at DPW’s request is extending the curb so what you would see is a depressed curb coming up to a full reveal. From a practical standpoint it will limit the ability for people to pull into the space, but that is purposeful from the standpoint of they don’t want people pulling out of that space and backing in to Willow Street. They have improved the front intersection of the lot with the sidewalk with some nice massing to provide some landscape elements. They worked with DPW to make sure they have clear lines of sight in all directions. As they wrap around onto the Union Street side, originally there was a 48 foot curb cut and that has now been reduced to no more than 24 feet. The intent with the arrow is to discourage people from making a left turn because there is the potential for people trying to queue back to make the turn movement so the intent is that it will be more ideal for people to make a right turn otherwise they would use one of the other access points for the site. He pointed out the location of the trees and the improvement of the sidewalk. They will re-use the utilities relative to the building. The ADA space is located directly at the entrance.

Mr. Golon said they have had some more recent conversation with DPW as well as Planning
staff relative to the staff report before the Board. They have had an opportunity to progress with who their potential end user would be, which he believed was Hometown Irving who has three sites in Rindge, New Hampshire, one of which is a gas station with a drive-thru coffee so they have a nice comparison in which they can make here.

Mr. Golon advised they are asking for some conditional use permits. They have the stacking spaces for the fuel pumps, which exists today. Reviewing that with DPW that didn’t seem to be a sticking point. There are concerns with the drive-thru window and only providing seven stacking spaces. He said that is a reasonable concern and if they were trying to stick a Dunkin Donuts in there that would be problematic as this site is not made for that volume. What they would like to look at is they want to cater this site and this end user towards what is available for stacking spaces. They currently have the ability to provide seven. What they would like to do is evaluate the Rindge, New Hampshire site and show what they have as far as requirements for stacking and provide that as a supplement to DPW to show that their end user, whatever that may be, that there is adequate stacking for that use. As such, if the Board deemed it to be an appropriate condition of that drive-thru use, instead of limiting it to “it’s not a Dunkin Donuts”, they have to show analytically that their use doesn’t need more than the seven parking spaces or the seven stacking spaces provided. They thought that would be a good middle ground. It does limit the owner obviously to what he can have there, but he should know that. It limits it to a type of user that is appropriate for his site. As such, relative to DPW’s concerns, he reviewed that with Owen, who is reviewing the plans. He thought that was an agreeable condition. Obviously it is not up to him but from an engineering perspective that seemed logical if they are able to show that their end user needs that number of stacking spaces or less then they can't be overloading the site. Their thought process was that if the Board approves it in that fashion it provides that mechanism for the Board as well. From the standpoint if they ever decide to have a different end user the Board has a condition of approval that states they would have to come back to the Board to show that whoever that user is that the stacking spaces provided are appropriate for that use. That way it doesn’t become an enforcement issue. They are going to provide the mathematics that show what is provided is appropriate for their user.

In summation, Mr. Golan said they realize it is a little different, but they were hoping to get some feedback relative to the plan changes they made. It has been a long journey, they are at a year mark tomorrow with this project and they are hoping that they have gone about it the right way and that with the removal of several of their waiver requests it is more in keeping with the Board’s expectations.

Chairman Harrington said compared to what is there today, which has not been very well kept, he thought it was important for him to point out that similar to the comments he made when they did their design review before the Board, just the amount of what is going on in this small space is a little hard for him to come to grips with.

With regard to the five trees that are not on their property, the Chairman asked where they could put those on their property. In looking at the overall design plan, Mr. Golon said they could try to accommodate locations on either side of the sign. He referred to their sight
distance plans, which gives a good visual as to where trees could go and where they
couldn’t. In looking at the Union Street side, relative to the exiting turning movement as far
as their sight lines, there really isn’t that can go in that vicinity. It is encumbered by the drive
aisles, the bypass lane, the drive-thru lane as well as turning movements to get you up to the
pumps. As such, when they look along the Union Street side, there is no opportunity there.
Looking at the Willow Street side, he pointed out the sidewalk and they have an opportunity
to plant a tree on the end cap. In looking at the final location with their exiting turning
movement, the opportunity to have larger plantings more than a shrub does not present
themselves because of sight line. If it would please the Board, he said they could eliminate a
parking space because they have provided one extra. Ten are required and they have
provided eleven parking spaces. Part of that rationale was knowing that when they are
going to have less stacking spaces for their drive-thru that they provide an extra parking
space. The geometry of the lot doesn’t allow the extra stacking spaces but does
accommodate an additional parking space. The Chairman said that was appreciated but
wasn’t sure that really solved the problem. He concurred with Mr. Golon that in the future if
anything is planted in the right-of-way, even if the Board granted that as a condition, it could
someday go away. He assumed they could put trees on their own property but that would
then pinch their parking. They could take them out of the right-of-way and put them on
their property but that would then eliminate the possibility of getting a drive-thru. Mr.
Golon said that was a fair statement. The Chairman said that was what he was struggling
with.

The Chairman said that if the Board approved a use of a drive-thru restaurant, then the site
would be approved for any drive-thru restaurant. A Dunkin Donuts is not a different use.
They could probably make the case that they are a drive-thru restaurant just like this drive-
thru restaurant is. As such, he agreed with his point that would be great if the Board had
that leeway. If the applicant had to come back before the Board because Dunkin Donuts,
which presumably might have more traffic than what is being proposed here tonight, for
change of use, then he thought he could be swayed a little with that, but he is afraid that in a
year or two years, the owner may decide to change tenants. It could be an Aroma Joe’s or a
Pete’s Coffee, etc. Mr. Golon said he understood and that was in part why they were looking
at this and asking how they could absolve that concern. They know what they have for
stacking so that means whatever their use is has to be commensurate. They can’t have
something that is going to require more. Chairman Harrington asked if they would agree to
a flower shop drive-thru. Mr. Golon said if that is what the owner was requesting that would
probably make a lot more sense. Their intent with making that relationship to the stacking
available was it does provide that mechanism for the Board so if it was ever to change they
would have to come back to the Board and show that the stacking is adequate, which it
wouldn’t be for those types of uses that are of the greatest concern. The Chairman said he
was still concerned there was less stacking there than even what DPW is recommending
even for a restaurant but if it is true that they would have to come back before the Board if a
Dunkin Donuts or a Pete’s Coffee or any other heavier use than a guy handing sandwiches
through the window with Common Man or whatever is coming through then he might be a
little more swayed.
Mr. Golon said they don’t want to differentiate use because they understand that is an issue. They can’t say “it is this type of restaurant or that type of restaurant” that is impossible and would be too difficult for this Board to approve something in that manner. That is why they wanted to make it a relationship to the stacking spaces that are available; that anyone using that window would have to show that the stacking provided is adequate for their use. Their intent is to provide the math to show that the end user they are proposing currently seven spaces is more than adequate. In talking to that potential end user yesterday they could do a couple things to assist with getting people through their drive-thru. One is there is no speaker box. You pull up to the window directly to make your order. He realizes that Manchester counts stacking spaces from the window so from a counting standpoint that doesn’t really provide a benefit, but there is a secondary benefit because someone who is ordering at the speaker box there is only one space behind it, which is a problem. It would be much easier if someone could back up into that adjacent drive aisle. They aren’t going to have that. If somebody wants to order they are pulling all the way forward and stopping to make their order. They are not queued back creating the secondary queueing that could be problematic; they are pulling all the way forward. The feedback he was able to get from Hometown Irving was their customers like it more as it is more of a personal service, which he thought was a great thing, the service is faster and the opportunity for errors on their order are also diminished.

Mr. Golon said he had an opportunity to review that with staff and this was something that really came about in the last 48 hours as he was able to say who their potential end user was. He and Mr. Belanger sat down and it sounded plausible that conditioning the use of the drive-thru on the available stacking was a possibility.

Mr. Belanger advised that he and Mr. Golon spoke this afternoon. This is something that Mr. Golon and his team came up with relatively recently so he gave him some initial impressions but he thought they have some more work to do before they could give a definite answer on it. He thought one thing to point out, as Mr. Golon would agree with, is that at this point they don’t have any traffic study or other evidence before the Board as to what sort of traffic demand or stacking demand would be generated by this Hometown Irving at this site in Manchester. He thought Mr. Golon mentioned in his presentation tonight that he is going to look into the stacking demand that is being created now by the Hometown Irving in Rindge, which is where it is currently, and he expects he will get that information back to the Board so they can evaluate it but at this point they just don’t know what that is. His thought is if there is a traffic study done showing the traffic demand for this particular use at this site the Board could potentially lock in that user, but then every time there is a new user who would come in the applicant would need to go back to the Board and the Board would need to be made aware of that so presumably it would be trusting to the applicant or the property owner to bring that to the Board’s attention every time there is a change of tenant.

Ms. Charlebois asked if a traffic study from a town like Rindge of only 6,000 people be able to translate to Manchester of 110,000 people. Mr. Belanger said that would be certainly evidence that the Board could look at. Mr. Golon would submit it and provide the Board with that evidence but how persuasive they find it would be up to the Board. Mr. Golon said
that was a great question and something they talked about earlier today. They are not necessarily like comparisons as far as traffic so you do as any traffic study and you grow those numbers to be consistent with the area. They would measure what the traffic is during that peak hour in Rindge and what it is in comparison to Manchester and multiply so that way you have a like comparison. He agreed that peak hour traffic in Rindge, New Hampshire is probably not the same as on Willow Street in Manchester but what it would allow them to do is understand what their queuing is relative to the need based off the traffic that exists. That is a direct comparison that they can make to Manchester.

Mr. Lussier asked if they are still doing the staging plan that they talked about when they were in before in keeping the existing one going while the new one is being built. Mr. Golon said it would be the intent but the reality being that it is really going to be part of that building permit process and if it is not feasible, it’s not feasible. They are not trying to lock themselves into it. They provided a design they feel could accommodate it but it really comes down to the builder and the building permit and whether or not that is something that could actually be accommodated. They have tried to put the best foot forward with a design to accommodate that but the knowledge being it may not be possible.

With regard to the tree issue, Mr. Lussier thought in this particular location they did a great job in meeting the 30 percent requirement for landscaping. That area certainly needs landscaping down there and needs improvement in that area and he did not think trees are the things that are going to accomplish that. They are not screening a building or doing something like that so he did not think trees were the answer. He thought more green space and some great flowers and other plantings would be much more appropriate than trees and he thought they have done pretty well with that.

With regard to the stacking, Mr. Lussier said people are very adaptable. You will not be able to take a study from Rindge, New Hampshire and apply it to this case. That doesn’t make any sense. If it doesn’t fit people will go someplace else. It is quite an improvement to this area and he thought they are doing a good service to the area with the plan they have provided and they have gone a long way in answering most of the questions and fitting it pretty darn well within the criteria.

Chairman Harrington agreed that this is a much better improvement to what is there today but, of course, he has always had the option to put landscaping in.

Chairman Harrington asked if they gave any consideration to just eliminating the window and allowing the landscaping to be put back onto their property and then having people go into the store to get their sandwiches or have Irving with a service to go meet somebody at the curb and give them their order. Mr. Golon said part of what drives the ability to fund the project is having that leasable space, which is the window. In reviewing it with Mr. Akhtier that in large part makes or breaks the project knowing there is that source of revenue with that leased space.

With regard to the trees, Mr. Golon said their sticking point is five trees that are located
offsite. He has shown where they can add one. He said they are a creative group and they can probably make it two. That means they are short three trees and where could they fit three trees onsite. What he doesn’t want to do is just cram them in there when he feels like what they are presenting is really the better product. The trees are spaced appropriately. There is varying heights of the landscaping. They have some other considerations with overhead utilities and underground utilities. There is also a groundwater management permit that is associated with this site that really precludes them from managing their stormwater in underground systems such that they could recharge it. Needless to say, it hasn’t changed over the last year. This has always been a really tough site. In talking to DPW relative to their stack minimum and reviewing it with Mr. Belanger, it sounded like they went back and forth quite a few times trying to find the right language because everyone is a champion for seeing the site redeveloped but they need to make sure they are doing it the right way. He said they understand that and a lot of that is centered on safety so their intent with narrowing the focus as to how that window could be used was their effort to try and improve that safety factor.

Mr. Golon said if there was a number of trees that the Board could tell him was acceptable, he could work towards that. He thought having nine total trees was not necessarily something that is doable in a constructive manner. He said if they could find a way to put two or three more trees and rework some component of the layout that may be a possibility if that was something the Board would like them to further pursue. The reality is that is one of the key selling points of this project. This is a redevelopment. This a beautification of this corner. This is an intense improvement over what exists today and given the zone they are located in that specifically states they need a little bit of flexibility. If the flexibility they are asking for isn’t appropriate he asked that the Board let him know and they will see if there is a way they can be more in keeping with the Board’s expectations. In part, that was their effort in coming here a year ago to have a better understanding. He thought the owner and TFMoran had done enough, but if they are not there yet then they are looking for that feedback also.

Chairman Harrington said this was not an issue of trees for him. He said this is a much more improved site. This is question of whether the landscaping should be on their own property versus City property. He thought the only thing holding them back from doing that was the fact that they want a drive-thru window. He thought they could have a perfectly expanded convenience store and he thought they could have expanded gas pumps and he thought they could have beautification at this site but they were jamming in a drive-thru restaurant in a site that can’t contain it, which is why they are seeking all of that relief. He said DPW isn’t in favor of this as it is designed.

Ms. Trisciani agreed with the Chairman’s comments and thought they are probably looking at putting in way too much and it feels to her when you have to ask for this many waivers on a project maybe they need to rethink what they are trying to do. She asked how they are going to handle deliveries of fuel and inventory in that very congested spot. Mr. Golon said that was a conversation with both Mr. Belanger and DPW. Originally they were looking for two-way access in and out at this specific location for that purpose. In evaluating the
options, DPW thought it was better such that they would be making that turning movement. What they have done is provided an oversized aisle, which is their bypass aisle that is 16 feet wide to provide the opportunity, which is directly adjacent to their pumps. He pointed the location of where a delivery truck could park that would not obscure the ability to navigate the site. The thing with deliveries is they can be scheduled at off hours so it doesn’t create a condition where they would otherwise create a traffic problem.

Mr. Golon said he has heard it more than once that they are asking for all this relief. They asked it of ZBA and it was granted. Relative to what they are asking of the Planning Board, they have the three conditional use permits; one is an existing condition with the pumps.

The Chairman inquired how they will handle snow removal. Mr. Golon said snow would have to be removed from the property as there is not room available. That is noted on their site plan.

Mr. Belanger asked about the hours of operation. Mr. Golon said they would continue with what they are today and it should be indicated on their site plan. Mr. Belanger asked if it is 24 hours now and Mr. Golon responded that it was not. Mr. Belanger confirmed with Mr. Golon that it will not be 24 hours. Mr. Golon thought the hours of operation were something like 7:00-6:00.

Mr. Belanger asked Mr. Golon to give a brief overview of what the trip generation is now and what they expect it to be. Relative to a 1,500 SF convenience market with gas pumps, Mr. Golon said their trip ends looking at the AM peak hour are 45, weekday PM peak hour at 89 and their weekend Saturday peak hour at an aggregate of 92. They see an increase in their proposed trip generation total where their trip ends go to 104 during the weekend AM peak, the weekday PM peak is substantially the same at 110 and their weekday Saturday peak hour at 100. As such, the largest increase they really see is in the peak AM hour. That is not specifically driven by the drive-thru use. The drive-thru use is actually only creating 17 trips in and 17 trips out during that peak AM hour. That is based off the agreed upon ITE use codes so that is one trip every 3-1/2 minutes proposed for that drive-thru use. When thinking about how quickly a drive-thru operates, one trip every 3-1/2 minutes during that peak hour use doesn’t sound so terrible. They do see an increase in the overall totals because the store is larger. They went from a 1,500 SF store to something that is 2,200 SF so that incremental increase in the store size really generates larger numbers during that AM total. Of that increase a smaller portion (17 of them) are in relationship to the coffee use.

Mr. Golon realized there was a hiccup in their original study where there was shown a decrease during a certain hour and it was based off the way in which the numbers were carried over. That has been corrected so relative to the traffic study and DPW and the PTOE who stamped it, there are no questions as to the validity of the study numbers.

Mr. Belanger explained the existing traffic numbers were done by onsite measurements by TFMoran. They went to the site to figure out that there were 45 in the AM peak and 89 in the PM peak and 92 on a Saturday. Then the projected numbers for both the convenience
store and drive-thru window were based on the ITE manual. His non-traffic engineer read of it is just that the site is over performing for the Saturday peak hour. ITE did not expect so many trips in the Saturday peak so when they used ITE numbers it went from 92 down to 70 something, so T.F. Moran increased those numbers to reflect more use on the Saturday. Mr. Golon said that was accurate. He said it was just one of those odd conditions where the background traffic showed a differentiation from the ITE and it has since been corrected.

With regard to the drive-thru, Chairman Harrington agreed with Mr. Lussier’s comments about being creative but he said unfortunately people can be creative in a very negative way that can affect traffic and affect a site and safety. The fact that there are going to be people sitting at a window saying what they want, having somebody run to a shelf and pick that out or do whatever they are going to do, come back to their window, have them pay for it and then people are backed up behind. He has more concerns about that than if they had a speaker.

Mr. Curry referred to Aroma Joe’s where you literally drive up to the window and place your order and it is a concept that Aroma Joe’s has mastered so far to be more efficient. There are only a few selections on the menu and it makes it convenient. No modifications can be made to the menu itself, which allows them to be a little more convenient. To help with the stacking there is a wrap system around their stores, which is missing on this site. The applicant’s wrap system does not show the same wrap system that they have at their locations that allow them to take that extra 5 minutes to do what they need to do and sit there. That is something he would have a concern of as far as the stacking goes.

With regard to the Chairman’s concern that they are searching around the store for things, Mr. Golon said they only have 100 SF allocated for the use. He wanted to make sure he was painting a clear picture as to what this use. He realized the code identifies it a certain way and it is ambiguous, it’s a drive-thru restaurant. It could be anything and there could be a concern that anything is going to be more than their site is going to accommodate. It was their effort to try and be more pragmatic, more pinpoint with what their use would be knowing that they only have a certain amount of space within their store to accommodate this use. The nature of the use would be limited in an effort to achieve this such that the owner could redevelop the store. He is hearing there are still some concerns and he realized there are new members since they were before the Board last time. They also have to take that into consideration. He also heard some positives that they want to see this site redeveloped. What has been conveyed to him by the owner is that the drive-thru makes it work. What he heard from at least the Chairman is that is a concern for this site. He asked if he could gauge some of the commentary from the other board members as well if that is an equal concern for the Board at large. The Chairman said the members of the Board are free to ask questions and he may be able to gauge an answer but he would not poll the Board for that request. That will be taken up in their deliberations during the business meeting.

Mr. Lussier asked if they are stretching things calling this a restaurant. Mr. Belanger said that is the language used in the Zoning Ordinance. It is serving food.
Ms. Trisciani asked if the 100 SF allocated for the restaurant area being leased out. Relative to the proposed coffee window, it was Mr. Golon’s understanding is it would be a leased space. Ms. Trisciani said she was concerned with their business plan and it might be a little bit out of this Board’s purview but she had a concern that he is telling the Board in one breath that in order to make this plan work they have to have the drive-thru and they have to be able to lease that space. She was struggling as a business owner trying to see how someone is going to come in and rent 100 SF and try to run a profitable drive-thru. That was a major concern she had and she didn’t see how this one piece is affecting the whole project.

Mr. Long did not have an issue with the trees or the stacking. Mr. Long asked about snow storage. Mr. Golon said they don’t have the opportunity for storage onsite so he envisioned they would have an opportunity to compile that snow in a central location, which would likely be the bypass aisle, such that it could then be loaded into a truck and removed. That aisle provides adequate space for a truck to park and for snow to be loaded into it such that it could leave the site. They realize it doesn’t always snow off hours and it can be during hours of operation in which snow needs to be stockpiled and removed so similar to other facilities they would find the least intense use of the property and compile that snow to that location such that it can be removed in a timely manner.

With the 11 parking spots, Mr. Long asked if there is something stopping the cars from going into the sidewalk. Relative to the parking spaces along Willow Street there is a raised curb that provides pedestrian safety. If it is something of interest he said they could look at putting in curb stops. They have adequate width of the parking spaces to provide that if necessary. Mr. Long asked how high that curb is. Mr. Golon said it is vertical granite curb so that would be a 7 inch reel.

Mr. Leclerc asked if the entry from Union Street was just going to be an entrance. Mr. Golon said that was correct. Mr. Leclerc said it looked like they were trying to direct people right to the pumps. Mr. Golon said that was correct. That was part of the review with DPW. The concern was they did not want it to be in and out as it was too close to the adjacent intersection. The concern was stacking along the main road preventing people from turning in. The intent is to discourage that. The idea is this is going to be new to the community; people will have the opportunity to learn this is the primary entry point to the facility so they would have the opportunity to utilize that entrance more frequently than trying to come through the other way and making a left turn. Mr. Leclerc said unfortunately people coming south on Union Street may take that hard right to get in to add to their stacking. Mr. Golon said they have sized that curb cut such that those turning movements can be accommodated but the intent is really to discourage that turning maneuver. Mr. Leclerc said the design looked contradicting because they have the arrows going both ways. Mr. Golon said he saw his point so it looked like they needed to get rid of an arrow.

With regard to the one-way entrance in from Union Street, Ms. Goucher said if someone is coming in from Willow Street and going to the pumps, when they leave they are either going around the pumps to go back out onto Willow Street or they will go in the direction through
the bypass lane in order to get out onto Union Street. She asked if that in and of itself will cause a conflict. She was concerned about the conflict because of the inability of someone getting gas being able to turn right out onto Union Street. She understands they made this change at the request of DPW, but it sort of just brings them back to some of those conflicts within the site and at the right-of-way points. Ms. Goucher said she didn’t think they could drive around the pumps if there was another car in there. Mr. Golon thought the reality is with the revised design, it is going to somewhat discourage the use of the pumps because it is a more limiting factor as far as access. The reality is it does somewhat discourage the use of those pumps and more so for utilizing the pumps that are more inboard to the site. A driver has the opportunity to pull into those pumps and it’s not dissimilar from a lot of gas stations in the City and surrounding areas where you have some fairly tight turns in and around the pumps. If they only have the two pumps then they will have more people stacking to use just two pumps if they feel like they can’t go to the other pumps. Mr. Golon said there are a total of six so they would have the three on one island and three on the other. He didn’t see it as being a discouraging ability to pull through to use those pumps. The idea is this is a tapered back curb so someone either entering or exiting through that would have the opportunity to pull through. He said understood Ms. Goucher’s point but what was shown was what was determined to be the most appropriate design through coordination with DPW. Ms. Goucher said they are looking at the safety of the right-of-way, which is their purview, and this Board is looking at the safety of the right-of-way as well as the safety of the on-site circulation.

Ms. Goucher asked how much clearance there is on the pump that is closest to Willow Street. Mr. Golon said it was 11 feet and that it exists like that today. The pump is in a tough spot and they are trying to do their best to realize a vision here and with tough sites like this, this is what is to be expected. There is going to be some feedback, whether it is positive, negative or otherwise and you try to work towards a common resolution to be able to redevelop a site that is sorely in need of it.

Going back to Mr. Long’s point about the wheel stops, Mr. Golden said the lack of wheel stops would mean that cars potentially would be overhanging the sidewalk but placing wheel stops there is a maintenance issue, specifically in the winter. Usually there is a landscape buffer to mitigate that difference. He asked if there was a solution for that besides just careful plowing. One of the things they looked at in redeveloping this site is there is give and take to do both portions and one of the things they discussed a year ago was if they wanted increased landscaping. There is a window of something that would be acceptable and they tried to find a balance. He wasn’t crazy about the wheel stops as they provide an impediment for tripping just like a curb would. He thought what was provided relative to the raised vertical granite curb provides that added element of pedestrian safety. There are sidewalks on both sides of the street as well. He thought this was a case of careful plowing.

In reviewing the plan, Ms. Trisciani said they have a speaker box on the plan. Mr. Golon said that will be removed from the plan.
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.

Mr. Belanger said there were two letters received from members of the public; one was from Edward Dubois and the other was from Jean Jede. Mr. Golon said one was from the State Representative for the area in support of the project.

Mr. Lussier confirmed with Mr. Golon that the pumps are staying basically where they are. He asked if they were proposing any update to the façade, the canopy or anything like that. Mr. Golon said it was not specifically stated in the application right now, but that would be a possibility and when they bring back the elevations of the building that would be something they could show as well.

Chairman Harrington asked if they could provide the circulation plan around the site and where the fill up is in relationship to the trucking. He also asked that the snow issue be addressed.

Mr. Belanger said Mr. Golon just became aware of this potential end user in the last 48 hours. He hasn’t had a chance to run it by the City Solicitor’s office yet. The legality of putting a condition that Mr. Golon mentioned about limiting the property to one particular user or to a user who does not exceed a certain number of stacking spaces is something that needs some clarification. He didn’t know from the City Solicitor’s perspective as to whether or not the Board has the authority to impose a condition like that. That is something staff needs to work on. They also don’t have a traffic analysis from Mr. Golon and his team as to what this end user would actually do as far as stacking. That is something the Board might want to look for at their next meeting as well.

Chairman Harrington advised this would be held open until to August 1, 2019.

(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: S2019-015, SP2019-021, SP2019-022, SP2019-023 and SP2019-024. (Motion Carried)

3. S2019-015
Property located at 71 Whalley Road & River Bank Road (Tax Map 675, Lots 26, 33, 34), a subdivision application for the consolidation of three lots of record, and subsequent re-subdivision, for the creation of one new buildable lot in the R1-B Zone. Joseph M. Wichert,
**LLS for Linh Ho & Dieu Ngoc Thi Hoang Le**

Joe Wichert appeared on behalf of Linh Ho and Dieu Ngoc Thi Hoang Le who own Lots 26, 33 and 34 on Manchester Tax Map 675. Currently there is an existing single family residence on the property, 71 Whalley Road. The lot is a “T” shape lot. There is a 59.67, 65.94 and an 84 foot lot as well as a 60x80 lot with frontage on River Bank Road. The existing house is serviced by municipal sewer and water. The sewer comes off Whalley Road but the water runs through the back lot on River Bank Road. The proposal is to create one new building lot, which they show as Lot 34A. That lot would have 84 feet of frontage but because the parent tract was only 80 feet deep instead of the required 100 feet. They received variances from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The subject property is zoned R-1B, which normally requires 75 feet of frontage and 100 feet of lot depth. The new lot as proposed will have 6,720 SF. The remainder lot will have 14,871 SF including the parcel that sits on River Bank. When they put in the house on the east side of Whalley Road or north side of Wall Road they extended the water main. Due to that in their preliminary discussions with Water Works they were advised they would not have to extend the water main to the end of the frontage. There is sewer all the way in front of the property. The area is serviced by overhead wires that located on the opposite side of the road and they have requested a waiver to overhead instead of underground utilities to service the new lot.

Mr. Lussier asked if there were any boundary disputes concerning the garden, landscaped area and fence that encroach on the properties. Mr. Wichert thought there was obviously a difference of opinion because they are 4 feet north of that and fence seems to be there. He didn’t know who set that pipe. There is no survey plan on file. They went through and did a full survey of the plot and that is where they say it is.

In his past role as the chairman of a Planning Board, Mr. Lussier said if there was ever a property dispute there was never anything that went forward. It had to be clear that the boundaries were sufficient in order to proceed so it would be nice to know that this is not in dispute. Mr. Wichert thought generally the way it has always been treated is they have a stamped survey that says where the lot line is. To date he did not believe there has been. Owen has talked to them about a survey that says they are wrong but they have not seen that. Usually he thought the past policy has always been should there be a boundary dispute that would be a civil matter between the two parties, not a matter of permit. Ms. Goucher said that is typically how that has been handled. If there was another party to come forward and start questioning it they would tell them it’s a civil matter but until the abutting property owner has brought their own surveyed plan for consideration staff has to respect the stamp of the licensed surveyor that is bringing the plan forward to the Board.

As part of their variance approval, Mr. Wichert said they got a reduction on the front yard setback to 15 feet. That was done just to make the lot more developable and hopefully reduce the need to go back later on should somebody want to add a deck, etc. onto the house. Because the lot is 80 feet deep, they have 45 feet of setback, they have the 35 foot deep building envelope but they have a 64 wide so the net for what would normally be on a 55x50 lot is kind of similar, they will just have to configure the house to be a little narrower
Chairman Harrington asked if they have any plans yet for this. He asked if they were going to sell it or develop it. Right now Mr. Wichert believes the intent is to keep it and build.

Mr. Golden asked if there was a plan to add an easement for the water line that services Lot 32. Mr. Wichert said that had not been brought up. It was his understanding that at one time Lot 32 was owned by the same property owner as 71 then it was developed and sold to a family member, which is when that water line got installed. There are implied rights to it so they are showing it on the plan but didn’t put a fixed easement on to it.

If they were to put an easement around that water line, Ms. Goucher asked if they would run into issues with the variance for the buildable area. Mr. Wichert said they probably would. Mr. Wichert said there are two items; the first being the water lines are approximate only because there is no record of what was done but if it becomes an issue they could make sure that the subsequent Deeds for the reconfigured Lot 34 has a reference that there is a right to maintain that water line.

Ms. Goucher asked where they were going to run into lot area problems. Mr. Wichert said if they ask for a 20 foot easement to cover the entire line coming in from River Bank all the way over. There is also the assumption that if staff tells him that it is substantially different from what he has to have he may have to go back to the Zoning Board for that. Ms. Goucher said they could have that discussion. Mr. Wichert said they would investigate before the business meeting.

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.

SP2019-021
Property located at 140 Blaine Street (Tax Map 196, Lot 9), a site plan application to change the use of an existing building from a landscape contractor to a machine shop in the B-2 and R-3 Zoning Districts. S&H Land Services for 254 Rockingham Auburn, LLC

Tom Huot of S&H Land Services appeared along with Dave Irwin, owner of the LLC and also the owner of Irwin Precision and Thomas Irwin, son of Dave Irwin.

Mr. Huot advised the proposal is to change the use of the existing commercial building located on 140 Blaine Street. It is currently listed as a nonconforming use as a landscaping company. The proposal is to have it as a nonconforming use as a precision machining shop. They are not proposing to change anything physically outside of the property. All of the changes are coming inside with the use. The building pretty much takes up most of one of the lot. They are not actually proposing to change anything outside with the exception of adding a dumpster and dumpster pad, which shows up on the drawing with the appropriate
fencing. They received a variance in April of this year to allow the nonconforming use and to also allow for the existing pavement that exceeds the impervious calculations. They also received a variance for parking. They are going to propose to have basically an 11 foot non-illuminated sign on the front of the building on Blaine Street.

Mr. Huot advised they are requesting several waivers mostly due to the configuration of the property. The first one is elevation drawings since they are not actually changing the building. The next one would be for a landscape plan. They are not proposing any landscaping basically because of the site. He read through some staff comments about the area on Cleveland Street where it is overgrown and Mr. Irwin has agreed that they will be willing to clean that up and where they can add some landscaping they will do that there is just not a lot of land to work with on this site. They are also requesting a waiver from the utility plan because they are not proposing any utility work. They are requesting a waiver from the pedestrian walks and curbing to be extended on Blaine Street. The reason for that is the existing parking spaces are on Blaine Street so if they were to curb that there is nowhere else on the lot they could put that parking. That is what has existed. Where the parking is and not having the curbing does not prohibit people from walking there. It is paved in front so even though it is not a sidewalk it is used as such currently. They are requesting a waiver to basically allow the dumpster and the existing loading dock to be closer than 50 feet to the residential zone. The residential and the B-2 zone basically split the property. There is nowhere on the property they could put a dumpster that would comply because of the limitations of where the building is and the shape of the lot.

Dave Irwin explained that they are a job shop where people send them prints and they quote different parts to make for different industrial machinery. They are not a large production shop. They do a lot of R&D and small run production from maybe 1-50 parts. Deliveries normally come in a small flatbed truck and they pull the stock off by hand. Once in a while they will get a large truck and they will unload that but it normally takes less than a half hour. All of their equipment and everything will be inside, nothing outside. It is a clean operation. They run a rotary air compressor, which is a lot quieter. As far as the quietness, all of the office and inspection areas are on the right side of the building, which would kind of buffer anything from the tenants on that side. Most of the larger equipment would be on the Cleveland Street end of the building, which there really isn’t an apartment house until you get further up the street. It is a very quiet operation. There is no hammering or punch presses; it is just droning machinery basically. He said they have already started cleaning up the area of brush and plan to finish that up. His plan eventually is to paint the building. He has been in business since 1990 and they have been renting. He wants to retire so now he decided to buy a building to own something and something to pass on to his son, who is the manager.

Chairman Harrington asked about the hours of operation. Mr. Irwin said they are 7:00-4:00 right now, but he couldn’t say that it won’t go to 5:00 sometimes. They only run one shift.

Mr. Belanger said there was a note on the plan that the hours of operation are 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM so if Mr. Irwin expects them to go a little bit later they may want to update that
note. Mr. Huot said they would do that.

Mr. O’Donoghue confirmed with Mr. Irwin that all raw materials would be stored inside.

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 said from his point of view he loves the use and likes the fact that they have a precision machine company staying in Manchester.

Chairman Harrington closed this public hearing and it will be deliberated later this evening in the business meeting.

5. **SP2019-022**

   Property located at 284 Hanover Street (Tax Map 94, Lot 4), a site plan application to change the use of an existing building from professional offices to veterans’ housing in the R-3 Zoning District. 

   *Northpoint Engineering, LLC for the State of New Hampshire Department of Employment Security*

   Jeff Lewis of Northpoint Engineering appeared along with John Rauscher from the Northeast Veterans Outreach Center and Anthony Mento from SMP Architecture. They are before the Board for a change of use site plan application. This project is Tax Map 94, Lot 4, which is 284 Hanover Street. This building has two separate and distinct parts of it, but it is attached as on 9,000+ SF building. This is historically and most recently been a professional office building. It is owned by the State Department of Employment Security. The zoning is R-3/PO so it is urban multifamily with the professional office overlay so the office was a permitted use and the multifamily is a permitted use. About a year ago there was a previous prospective buyer of this property from the State developer who was apparently looking to convert this building into 10 multifamily units, which exceeded the density allowed in the R-3 zone as well as the existing building exceeding the lot coverage. They actually obtained a variance to change the use from professional office to a 10 unit multifamily and then that project did not advance. In discussion with the zoning staff they felt the proposal that Mr. Rauscher’s group would like to move forward with does fall within that variance that was approved so they believe they got past any potential zoning issues and are moving forward with a plan to the Planning Board for a change of use.

   Mr. Lewis said Northeast Veterans Outreach Center is a nonprofit use out of northern Massachusetts who has been around since 1985 providing services for the veteran community in multiple towns throughout Massachusetts. They provide a variety of services; social services, employment services, housing services, so they have a pretty good reputation in Massachusetts and have done a lot of work and part of their endeavor now is to expand into New Hampshire and provide their services here. Mr. Rauscher is their New Hampshire program coordinator so he is overseeing this effort. This project will be one of their first projects in New Hampshire so they are really looking for the right site and this really meets a lot of their needs. They wanted to be centrally located and right in
Manchester and find an area that they can really become well known and offer the services centrally within the State and certainly within Manchester.

Mr. Lewis said they would be looking to convert this into what they are calling a 7 unit multifamily but it is really emergency housing for homeless as well as a permanent apartment component. The first floor of the building would be renovated from office to two halves of an emergency shelter. One side of it would be a male shelter area that would have one congregate style apartment with four double occupancy bedrooms. It would have a livingroom, a kitchen and bathroom area. There would also be two additional emergency beds on the other side for female veterans, which would have a separate entrance into the building and really be a totally separate unit from the male veterans’ area. They would also have a small office area on the first floor for the staff, which would be 4 or 5 people. They are looking to get in and do this right away. They have a Purchase & Sale Agreement just about in place with the State and are really looking forward to moving forward with this right away by the end of the summer. The second and third floor would be a permanent housing aspect of the project; 3 one bedroom apartments on the second floor and then some SRO single occupancy rooms on the top floor with 3 additional beds. They are looking at about 13 total beds in this facility if it was fully occupied and then 4-5 staff on the property.

Mr. Lewis said they are not proposing any additional site improvements right now they are just looking to purchase the building and go right inside with some renovations to convert it from the office area to the emergency and permanent housing units. Accordingly, they don’t really have any other improvement plans so they have requested waivers that are typical for change of use plans from providing topography of contours on the plan as well as landscaping and site lighting.

Mr. Mento said there are some specific items that need to be provided within these two buildings for housing of this type much of which is egress and fire separations between the two buildings. If this moves forward then their office will be doing a full code review. Their preliminaries have been done to this point and the building will service the needs of the community and their client well.

With one of those improvements being fire suppression, Chairman Harrington asked if they are going to be required to put a sprinkler system in. Mr. Mento said that was correct. There are sprinklers in the building currently that comes off of Hanover Street on the southeast corner that services the lower level of the brick portion of this complex. They are going to fully sprinkle the full building on all floors and put a fire alarm system throughout and take care of a number of other items. Assuming this moves forward, the Chairman said any condition would have to be taken care of. Mr. Rauscher said they are planned.

Mr. Belanger asked for clarification of what is going on the third floor of the building. Mr. Lewis said there are going to be three beds on the third floor. When they submitted the site plan application they had identified that as two units. There will be three bedrooms on the third floor and whether it is divided into three units each with one bedroom or the way they had anticipated it at the time they submitted this was a one bedroom unit and a two
bedroom unit. Mr. Belanger asked if there would be a common bathroom facility. Mr. Mento said on that level it would be a shared bathroom and it is just a single room for a bed. It is kind of a landing space. It is emergency housing. Mr. Belanger asked if there would be a kitchen on the third floor. Mr. Mento said there will be a small kitchen.

Mr. Long said this is something that is very much needed, especially in this area. He liked the fact that they were going after this. He asked what the emergency shelter looked like and what the capacity would be. Mr. Lewis referred to page 2 of the plans and pointed out the ramp that is on the Hanover Street side of the building. The part of the structure that has the bow window on the right was the original white house and then there is a connector in the brick portion behind it. The design would be for eight male emergency beds on the first floor on the top of the page with their own kitchen and bathroom. The two female beds would be on the lower left of the right hand picture where it is hashed and says “common area”. The contract they have with the Manchester VA right now is for eight emergency beds. That would mean they would have six men in the male section and two females in the female section or a combination thereof of eight people. The goal would be to have permanent supportive housing on the second and third floors so there would be case managers for those veterans. It is a 24/7 program which means they have staff onsite 24/7.

Mr. Rauscher said the goal is to go from emergency beds to apartments. The plan they have right now with the Manchester VA is to work with their VASH system (veterans assisted supportive housing), which is basically HUD and Section 8, to either make it project based or voucher or a combination thereof so that veterans would have subsidized housing and case management as well the same site.

Mr. Rauscher said the total capacity of people would be 19 maximum. Ideally they are looking at one person per apartment. Mr. Long confirmed with Mr. Rauscher that they would try to accommodate veteran with a spouse. The only children he would foresee is if a single female veteran had a child and they would be in the female section which is completely separate from the rest of the building. The contract they have right now is not to handle children; it is just for the veterans.

Mr. Long asked for a breakdown on the staff. Mr. Rauscher said there is one 24/7 and then his office would be there, they would have a case manager on site, a development and/or an outreach person would come and go from there.

Ms. Goucher said she knew the goal was to get housing available for veterans as soon as possible. She asked if she could assume there would be doing some cleaning-up of the front of the property. Mr. Rauscher said “absolutely”.

Ms. Goucher told the Board she has been meeting with Mr. Rauscher on and off for a while and they have been trying very hard to find a location in Manchester that they could get in veteran housing. If any of the Board members were to go on to the Northeast Veterans outreach Center website and look at the housing they have developed in Massachusetts, they would see some really nice buildings that they have rehabbed.
Ms. Trisciani asked what their goal is to have this open and start functioning as a home. Mr. Rauscher said he would love for it to be right now. He said he has to demonstrate to the VA that by October 1st, which is the Federal fiscal year, that they are underway.

Chairman Harrington confirmed with Mr. Rauscher that his organization was a nonprofit. The Chairman asked if he ever foresees a time that there would be a doubling up of the beds in each apartment. Mr. Rauscher said the need is there. The goal would be for them to use this as their headquarters in New Hampshire and to develop further properties in addition to this for future use.

Ms. Goucher said when she and Mr. Rauscher had some meetings over the past year, he mentioned that because they have been successful in Massachusetts, they have found that more and more veterans from New Hampshire have crossed over the border for housing they have in Massachusetts. This is why they are trying very hard to establish their presence in New Hampshire and this would be one of their first homes in New Hampshire.

Mr. Rauscher said currently there is no veteran owned, veteran managed, veteran only emergency housing in New Hampshire. There are shelters in New Hampshire that accommodate and prioritize veterans. Harbor Homes and other agencies have gone to great lengths, but there is no veteran only emergency shelter in New Hampshire and they want to make theirs the first.

Ms. Trisciani asked what their plans were for the basement level aside from the office. Mr. Rauscher said conference rooms and meeting rooms.

The Chairman asked if they pay real estate taxes or if they were tax exempt. Mr. Rauscher said he didn’t know the answer of that from Massachusetts. He said Massachusetts has a lot more money than New Hampshire does so they may give tax breaks on property taxes. He said they are a 503C(3) corporation. Ms. Charlebois said if they meet all the requirements as a nonprofit in the State of New Hampshire they will not be paying real estate taxes. They would just have to apply for it through the City of Manchester Assessor’s Office.

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.

Mr. Lewis said he failed to mention that they had comments from DPW and one of them was regarding repaving the sidewalks on both frontages. Knowing that was a cost that they weren’t expecting and also knowing they have impact fees to pay, he was asked to talk to DPW about that and see if that is really needed here. It may affect whether or not they want to move forward down the road with any waiver of impact fee requests. He asked if they could have until the next business meeting to work that out with DPW.

Ms. Goucher confirmed with Mr. Lewis that they would be okay with the Board to wait two weeks to make their decision.
Mr. Long asked if they would have to pay both school and fire impact fees. Mr. Belanger said both. He explained that single room occupancies are exempt from school impact fees but multifamily uses are not. Fire impact fees are for all of the uses: office, SRO and multifamily. Ms. Goucher said it sounded like there are more SRO’s than they first thought.

Chairman Harrington closed this public hearing and it will be deliberated on August 1st.

6. **SP2019-023**  
Property located at 61 Beech Street (Tax Map 361, Lot 16), a site plan application to change the use of an existing 3,850 SF building from commercial sales and repairs to a contractor’s yard in the RDV Zone. *Joseph M. Wichert, LLS for Beech Street 61 Realty, LLC*

Joe Wichert appeared on behalf of Beech Street 61 Realty, LLC, which is Paul Modzeleski, who also owns Sentry Roofing. Similar to the last couple applications, this is a change of use site plan. The subject property is Lot 16 on Tax Map 361. The street address is 61 Beech Street. He believed in its previous use they sold floor cleaning supplies and things like that. The property has been abandoned for a while and is in need of a little TLC and upgrades. Mr. Modzeleski would like to move his business operation to this facility. The property is zoned RDV so the use is allowed by right. He thought there was a site plan done back in 1971 for one of the previous uses. The parking configuration they are showing is almost identical to the other one. The 1971 showed the north line as being straight with a little bend to it. Due to the bend it leaves a little gap in the middle that they had called to be repurposed and striped for an access panel for ADA spot and then subsequent to the site plan being approved there was an old loading dock type of shed that has either been removed or in the process of being removed.

Mr. Wichert advised they are asking for a series of waivers, basically the landscaping plan, landgrading, slope control, surface water drainage and topography. The reason for all three of the requests is because the site is fully developed and the intent is to reuse and repurpose the existing facility with improvements, but necessarily no significant changes. The property coverage is almost 96.4 percent where 85 is allowed but because it pre-dates the Ordinance he believed they were considered grandfathered for zoning purposes. As part of the construction improvements there will be a series of overhead doors put on the north side of the building and other interior building upgrades. There used to be a weird little bump on the north side of the building where he thought they displayed vacuums and cleaners and things like that. That has been removed. They are in the process of trying to clean this up and make it suitable for the new use of Sentry Roofing.

Mr. Wichert said they got comments back and he thought the only item they are opposed to is paving the southerly section of the sidewalk. He said it is not perfect, but there are no large holes in it or large humps. They believe people could walk through it without there being a danger of tripping. They have no opposition of paving north of the curb cut but they were hoping to not have to repave the southerly section now and let the applicant do it after he has gone through this, maybe in the next year or two. It would allow him to get set up,
spend his money on upfitting the building and getting into it. Obviously it is the front door so if it becomes an issue for safety or if clients or employees have problems going in and out he was sure he will go through and repave this area. He said there are two ways they could do it. One would be a small overlay but that probably wouldn’t last and eventually they would be back exactly where they are. It would make more sense to get rid of it and repave the entire thing, but that is an additional 65 feet of offsite improvements when there is existing sidewalk there. They asked that the Board consider that request when they make their decision.

Mr. Wichert said the site has a chain link fence pretty much all around the perimeter. They are calling for replacing the chain link fence along the north line with white vinyl to buffer the residential units.

With regard to parking, Mr. Wichert said they only need four spaces by Ordinance and there are 18 spaces total on the property.

Mr. Lussier said it looked like the sidewalk in front of the building is a sidewalk to nowhere and leads to a pile of dirt. Mr. Wichert said that was correct. He thought what DPW was hoping that they would have one continuous sidewalk but the problem is unless the City improves the strip of dirt, there will not be a continuous sidewalk all the way through.

Chairman Harrington asked if there was some relief in terms of the timing of putting that sidewalk in. Mr. Wichert said they didn’t talk timeline. He said there is going to be a significant investment in the property just in what they are doing. His assumption is after things settle out because it will continue to degrade it will get to the point where it will just be cheaper to re-do it and he is sure at that point in time he would. He thought it would be a period between one to five years.

Ms. Nazaka asked what the intent was for the metal rack behind the building. She also asked if the existing chain link fence along Beech Street and along the back of the building would be maintained, replaced or slats added to it. Mr. Wichert said they were not looking to replace the section that abuts the rail trail. The other section is actually taller than what is allowed by the current Ordinance and they would prefer not to lose that ability. They could look at if they could weave some slats into it for screening. Ms. Nazaka asked about outside storage. Mr. Wichert believed there will be outside storage of material such as shingles, pallets and vehicles.

Ms. Goucher said if there is going to be outside storage, the Ordinance requires an 8 foot high screened fence. As such, if they are going to put some storage in the back area somehow it would have to be screened. Mr. Wichert said the screening requirement is 8 feet but the zoning requirement prohibits 8 feet on the street side. Ms. Goucher said they have an 8 foot fence there now. Mr. Wichert said if he asked to replace the existing 8 foot fence with a new 8 foot fence he would be told he couldn’t do it by-right. He said they could look to keep the poles and see if there is a way they can repurpose the fence.
Ms. Trisciani asked what other improvements are planned for the Beech Street facade. Paul Modzeleski of Sentry Roofing said they would be putting a cultured stone finish on the bottom and a vinyl shake on top and a section will be covered with new aluminum. They are going to repurpose the flower pots to add greenery. The whole façade of the building will be replaced. He said this building will look brand new when they are 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 closed this public hearing and it will be deliberated later this evening in the business meeting.

7. **SP2019-024**

**Property located at 503 Maple Street (Tax Map 413, Lot 12), a site plan application to demolish an existing 4,000 SF building and construct a 1,133 SF drive-thru restaurant with associated site modifications in the B-1 Zone.** *TFMoran Inc. for GC Pizza Hut*

Bob Duval of TFMoran appeared along with Rob Harberson, project architect from Market Square Architecture. They are talking about a teardown and rebuild of an existing nightclub located at the corner of Maple and Lowell Streets. It is directly across from Central High School. They are proposing a 1,300 SF Pizza Hut restaurant that features a pickup window where people can come to the restaurant and either drive up to the pickup window or they can park either on street or on site. There are five parking spaces, one dedicated to the delivery person, but the others could be used by employees. The peak employee count would be three on the peak shift and the other spaces would be available for customers in addition on street parking.

Mr. Duval said the drive-thru label has caused a little bit of confusion. This is a pickup only window and it is used for pickup of food that is preordered using the Pizza Hut application. Payment is taken at that time, you would be scheduled a time, you would drive to the store and come in on the Maple Street side then there is one-way circulation through the lot and either park or stop at the pickup window at your appointed time and pick up your order. If you are early and the order is not ready or you haven’t pre-ordered or you haven’t prepaid, you would be asked to park and clear the window. For that reason, they are providing two stacking spaces and it is fully anticipated this will be adequate for all conceivable conditions and it is entirely within the control of the restaurant where if they feel like a customer is taking too long at the window they just simply ask them to park and they can serve the next customer. As such, there is no excess stacking associated with this use. This is not a conventional fast food drive-thru use. There is no order board, order window or speaker. The only transaction that will happen at the window is simply picking up preordered and prepaid food.

Mr. Duval thought the benefit to the neighborhood was clear. In the existing condition trash was sprinkled all around the exterior of the building. With the new plan there will be a dumpster in the rear corner of the facility so that will eliminate that nuisance. The reason
for that existing condition is that the building entirely occupies the entire site. It is a tired old building in relatively poor condition and he thought everyone in the neighborhood, himself included, would be happy to see this replaced with a new building. He showed a rendering of the new building. There is a walk up counter for walk-in customers who aren’t using the drive-thru pickup. That is where you would go if you hadn’t preordered or prepaid. The industry is really moving toward pre-order by app and pre-pay models so there is very little congestion associated with this.

Mr. Duval said they have requested a waiver from a traffic study. They are providing a traffic letter. They have followed the requirements of the traffic letter where they are providing an estimate of trip generation and the basis for their trip generation. There is no ITE accepted land use code for a pizza only restaurant. There is really only fast food restaurant with drive-thru window and no indoor seating, which he did not think was really applicable to the type of trips that are generated by this facility but being the closest comparable use that is what they used for comparison purposes. He believes it actually overestimates trips. Using that land use code based on the square footage of this store there would be approximately 48 total trips; 24 cars coming in and 24 cars leaving. By way of comparison, the existing 4,400 SF nightclub would generate 50 or 51 trips so at worst case the traffic is comparable to the nightclub but, in fact, he believes it is going to be much better and much less intense. That is the one waiver that a full traffic study is not necessary. He pointed out that even for a fast food restaurant it talks about significant traffic and effecting signalized intersections, etc. which this is clearly not the case in this situation.

Mr. Duval advised the other site plan waiver is for a drainage study. Again, they have a building that entirely occupies the lot in the current condition and the proposed site plan is actually approximately a quarter of the size of the existing building. The lot coverage is nearly 100 percent impervious and in the proposed condition, because they have an opportunity even by providing onsite parking, there is now a landscaped buffer to the east, a little planting island near the exit to the north, there is room for a landscaped buffer to the south and there is even some room for some landscaping around the perimeter of the building. Originally the pushed the building up to the sidewalk to provide more screening to the residential use to the east but, at the suggestion of staff, they pushed the building back and added some room for ornamental plantings along the front as well as street trees along the front side and tree wells. With all those improvements the lot coverage drops to 77 percent therefore on this small lot there is a reduction in runoff from the pre to the post condition so they are asking for a waiver for the drainage study. The lot being as small as it is only 5,600 feet, even in the present condition, it actually contributes a very small amount of water to the City drainage system and it will be reduced from that in this condition.

Mr. Harberson said there are certain prototypes for different size restaurants that Pizza Hut has in their brand line. This is their smallest one that is designed for walkup and carry out there is no dine in. There is a very small public space. Most of the building, probably about two thirds to three quarters of it is kitchen, most of that is storage of either cold things or dry things. There is even a very limited kitchen and sink. With regard to the exterior, they were pleasantly surprised from what he grew up thinking about a Pizza Hut this is somewhat
different and fits a little bit more into a residential neighborhood. Most of the exterior is brown clapboard siding which relates very well to the scale of the neighborhood around it. On the primary corner where the entry is there is glass storefront entry, which creates great visibility from both where the cars are at the pickup window and on the pedestrian side on the pickup side. There is a porcelain stone tile that creates two vertical elements on both the drive up side as well as the street side. It is basically a metal storefront, metal awning and a red siding material as a vertical metal siding as well, which to him sort of feels like with the canopy like it is the modern version of an awning. The back service side is also clapboard, it just continues around with an aluminum parapet cap. It is a relatively simple building but certainly materials that are well within the scale of a walkable neighborhood.

Mr. Duval said they received a handful of variances for this site to enable the existing building to be torn down and this building to be constructed. Every effort was made to respect the residential neighbors on either side by adding plantings as well as a fence for additional screening on the east side. Mechanical equipment was moved forward to be further away from the residential properties. In fact, they moved it outside of the 50 foot buffer. They were able to do that by pushing it closer to the customer entrance.

Mr. Duval advised they received some comments from DPW. When the staff was prepared they hadn’t had a chance to sit down with DPW and go through their comments but they since have and they have resolved all of the comments. He said all but 4 of the items were to just add a note to the plan, add a sign to the plan, clarify this detail and add that detail and all of those things have been done and all of those things are in the plans before the Board. He said Owen hasn’t had a chance to review and signoff on these items, but they are in the plan set they completed today and passed out tonight and they will go through that with Owen to make sure he is satisfied that all of these items are taken care of. The few items that are not are as follows: One of his items was in regard whether the sewer service was to be new or existing. He said in the site plan the intended sewer service is at the south end of the building. There is a grease trap and sewer connection right into Maple Street. The intent is to use the existing sewer service. There is a note on the plan that requires the contractor to verify the location, size and condition of that pipe by TV or otherwise to make sure it is suitable to handle the flow from this building. Presumably it is because there has been a succession of bar and nightclub restaurants on this site for years. His concern was not that the site couldn’t be sewered so much. If you go into Maple Street, which was recent repaved, there is a moratorium in place so that makes the cost of trenching and repair of the trenching much greater as there is a special degradation fee and a special detail so they are really talking about whether or not that comes into play. It is their hope that the existing sewer is of suitable condition that it can be reused on site and they don’t have to go into the street but if they do then they have already added a note to the plan that the appropriate degradation fee and patching would have to be done. The good news if they do have to go into the street the existing sewer line is only 3-4 feet off the curb line so there would be very little disruption to the street. The bad news is you still have to pay the degradation fee and do that big patch.

Mr. Duval said another comment was there appears to be only one space marked for
employees on site so they clarified that with Owen that there is only one space marked for employees, which is the space next to the dumpster which is really earmarked for the driver. The other four spaces, including the handicap space, would be available either for employees or for customers. It is something that can be managed by Pizza Hut. He said his own feeling is that it would be better for employees to park onsite because they are there for an entire shift and that makes there be less competition for the neighborhood on street spaces, especially since most customers are just driving up, parking for a few minutes, walking in to retrieve their order and then driving off.

Mr. Duval said there were two more questions; one was if the stacking was sufficient and as he described the operation of the window at the time Owen wrote his memo he wasn’t aware that they discussed this and he believes he is comfortable with the use of the window, not being a use that is likely to have a stacking problem. He said Owen asked if there were pedestrian counts on Maple Street. Mr. Duval said they hadn’t taken pedestrian counts and in discussing the reason behind his question he was concerned there may be a lot of high school traffic going to and from this location and he wondered if the existing signage on Maple Street was enough for an increased amount of pedestrian activity going back and forth across the street. Mr. Duval said the hours of operation are Monday-Thursday 11:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Friday-Saturday 11:00 AM to 12:00 midnight. They don’t expect a lot of lunchtime traffic because they are only selling medium and large pizzas as well as desserts, wings and drinks. Again, there is no place to sit down. Having talked through that with Owen, they agreed what was really in question was what kind of signage needs to be provided. There is already an existing school crossing sign and Owen said there really should be one on the other side so they have added a sign on the other side to the plan and the intent is to match the existing sign and have two school crossing signs to indicate where that crosswalk is located. His only concern was there may need to be a more attention getting sign such as flashing yellow lights around the crosswalk. Mr. Duval suggested that the appropriate thing to do would be just to work that out with staff and review it with him and Kristen Clarke and if the signage is not sufficient they would provide a bond for the slight increase, which he thought was only $1,000 or less for a flashing light type sign. If that turns out to be something the City wants to see after this store is open for a certain period then they would be happy to provide that.

Mr. Duval advised that Pizza Hut is very eager to get started. They hope to get this started and built before the end of the year because this being a prototype store it is something they can put together quickly. Being a little bit unfamiliar with the way things work in New England they had probably had a too short due diligence period so they are about to run out of that period, which is another reason they hope they can bring this to a fairly speedy conclusion.

Ms. Nazaka asked Mr. Duval to elaborate on the need to go to the BMA for the removal of parking on street. Mr. Duval pointed out the location where the on street parking would be affected where there is going to be a new driveway curb cut next to another cut. There are currently two spaces on Maple Street; one space would be occupied by this driveway so there would be no parking there. He pointed out the location of a no parking driveway sign.
The driveway goes to an area that used to be a garage but now it is just part of the inside bar space so this sign would be moved because the new driveway is actually located in front of that sign. As such, they would have to go to the BMA to move that sign and remove parking. As there would be no driveway, it would just be green space buffering the neighbor so there would be room there for an additional parking space so the on street space count will stay the same essentially, but the no parking driveway sign would be relocated just west of the new driveway.

Mr. Lussier thought they needed to look further at the on-street parking. He said he has occasion to go by their competitor on Amory Street on Friday afternoons and there are usually 5-6 delivery vehicles that take up all the parking spaces and that says nothing about employees and people who are trying to pick up orders themselves. Mr. Duval said there is one delivery driver on their shift in this prototype; one car/one delivery driver and three employees so there is enough onsite parking for that. It is true that there is going to be competition for on street parking for those people who want to drive and park but the idea is that there is a good through put on that drive-thru window that if people are following instructions properly they will drive up at the time their order is ready, take their pizza through the window and they will never even have to park.

If the Board was inclined to approve this project, Ms. Goucher asked if Pizza Hut would be willing to adopt that little pocket park across from it, which is just a dirt pile right now. Mr. Duval said they hadn’t discussed that with their client but he fully expected being a national brand that is very image conscious that they would look favorably on that. Ms. Goucher said that is a pretty sad little patch of grass/dirt that could use some love. Mr. Duval agreed one hundred percent and always wondered what Corey Square actually was.

Ms. Trisciani asked what happens when someone pulls up and they haven’t already ordered or their pizza is not ready. Given Maple Street is one way, she asked if they would have to leave and drive around the block. Mr. Duval said he pressed Pizza Hut hard on this point to make sure he understood how this worked. They said their store personnel are instructed that if the order is not ready when the customer shows up or if the customer tries to pay at the window, they will be told to leave the window area and they will have to drive off and make room for the next person. That is how they run their business and how they manage it. He thought the handicap space may be available, but basically with the employees parking on the lot other than the handicap space there really wouldn’t be anything available there typically so they would have to make the loop around the block. In making that loop it will probably give them enough time for their order to be ready.

Mr. Harberson said this is different than a Dunkin Donuts or McDonalds that has a drive-thru menu board. The difference with pizza is that you have to think about it ahead of time and order it ahead of time to get it when it is ready. As such, you don’t have the drive by person who says “I’m going to get a cup of coffee” because that’s not possible. As such, that volume is sort of excluded from this because it is all planned ahead. Even the new pick-up apps and things like that it is still purchased and paid for ahead so it is just pick up and go.
Mr. Duval advised this is the B-1 business district and this is clearly a neighborhood business. They look for high density residential neighborhoods and this is exactly that.

Chairman Harrington confirmed with Mr. Harberson there will be a canopy over the pick-up window.

Chairman Harrington asked about on site trash receptacles other than the dumpster. Mr. Duval said they hadn’t really thought about that. He said you are finding fewer and fewer public trash cans anymore because people are abusing them and dumping gratuitously in them.

The Chairman asked about snow removal. Mr. Duval said it will be hauled off site as there is no room for snow storage and there is a note to that on the plans.

Ms. Goucher said the driveway is only about 13 feet wide when you go in. The radius from Maple Street to that driveway, and then the turning movement along the building - both are very tight. She asked if trucks and SUV’s would be able to swing in and swing around without going into other lanes. Mr. Duval provided a P vehicle, which is a large 18 foot vehicle, template with Owen and showed it is able to make both those sharp turns. Ms. Goucher confirmed with Mr. Duval that vehicles would not have to swing out into Maple Street.

Mr. Lussier inquired about delivery vehicles. Mr. Duval said they deliver with single unit small trucks and they take their deliveries off-peak.

Mr. Leclerc said this reminded him of a pharmacy pick up where orders are pre-done and people pick them up. He thought their pedestrian counts are going to be lower than they think because high school kids are the ones that use the app to order. Given that he thought more safety for pedestrians should be thought about because during school hours, especially because Central is pretty much an open campus so they allow the kids to do what they want between periods. Mr. Duval said the way it was left with Owen was that they would add an extra sign to the plan but they would also commit to working out with him and Ms. Clarke what they think is the appropriate signage to go there and then they will bond for that and install it if necessary after a suitable time.

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 deliberated at the next business meeting.

Chairman Harrington closed the public hearing portion of the Manchester Planning Board of July 18, 2019.
III. BUSINESS MEETING:

Chairman Harrington called to order the business meeting of the Manchester Planning Board of July 18, 2019.

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*

Chairman Harrington advised he was going to abstain from this vote as he was not in attendance at the last meeting. Ms. Charlebois abstained from voting as well.

The Chairman advised there was a staff report and the Board took a moment to review that information.

Mr. Belanger said there was a 1997 approval by this Board imposing a condition that there be a 200-250 foot buffer and the Minutes reflect there was a condition to impose a treed buffer so the City Solicitor’s office has instructed staff that in order for this project to be approved, this condition has to be amended such that it allows for this to go forward. As such, the Board would be approving an amendment to a prior condition of approval, which would remove the requirement that there be a 200-250 foot treed buffer.

Ms. Trisciani confirmed with Mr. Belanger that this was with the exception to the Court ordered buffer that is further down.

_Vice Chairman O’Donoghue made a motion to amend the 1997 condition in its entirety, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc. (Motion Carried)_

_Mr. Long made a motion to conditionally approve S2019-004 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)_

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and plans shall be submitted for final approval;

2. The applicant shall obtain sign-off from all City reviewing agencies, including the Planning Department, prior to submitting plans for final approval;
3. All new boundary monuments, excluding those in the proposed right-of-way, are to be set prior to submitting plans for final approval;

4. Figure 2-4 of the Highway Division’s Standard Specifications, showing the construction of mailboxes, shall be included with the plan set prior to final approval;

5. A note shall be added to the plan stating, “A 20-foot, treed buffer shall be maintained along the southwesterly property lines of Lots 5A and 5Q”;

6. The plans, with details, shall depict the removal of the pavement at the cul-de-sac bulb existing at the end of Arthur Avenue such that the road continues straight to the proposed extension of Arthur Avenue. The existing right-of-way boundary shall remain, and the driveway from the house on Lot 556-56 shall extend to the new pavement line of Arthur Avenue;

7. A homeowners’ association comprised of the owners of all lots within the subdivision shall be created for the purpose of maintaining the detention basins and any other shared, private utilities. Prior to final approval of the subdivision, the applicant shall submit for review a declaration of covenants and restrictions for the homeowners’ association, which shall be recorded concurrently with the subdivision plan;

8. Prior to final approval, the applicant shall submit executed documents dedicating the proposed streets for public use, consistent with Appendix D of the Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations;

9. A development agreement that binds the property owners, their heirs, and their successors to performance in the timing of the construction of public improvements and dwelling units shall be executed prior to final approval. The agreement shall be accompanied by a financial surety that is suitable to guarantee construction of the required public improvements, in accordance with Subsection 4.14 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Regulations;

10. The plan shall contain a note stating, “No certificate of occupancy shall be authorized until all required improvements have been completed, unless addressed by the provision of a financial guarantee, pursuant to the requirements of Subsection 4.14 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations;”

11. The plan shall contain a note stating, “All conditions subsequent to approval shall be completed within two years of final approval”;

12. The plan shall contain a note stating, “An excavation permit from the Manchester Department of Public Works is required for all work within the public right-of-way. All work shall conform to the City of Manchester Standard Specifications”;
13. Easement documents allowing City access to drainage features located outside the public right-of-way shall be submitted for review to the Department of Public Works and the Planning and Community Development Department prior to final approval and shall be recorded concurrently with the subdivision plan;

14. All conditions subsequent to final approval shall be noted on the recorded plan, or the notice of decision shall be recorded simultaneously with the plan, pursuant to RSA 676:3;

15. Prior to final approval, the applicant shall provide to the Highway Department a digital file in AutoCAD, .dwg format with boundary lines and horizontal and vertical features based on N.H. State Plane Coordinate System (NAD83/92-NGVD 88);

16. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit one set of mylars for recording, one complete set of mylars to remain on file with the Planning Department, and four complete paper sets;

17. The applicant shall provide the Planning Department with the recorded plan number within 30 days of final approval;

18. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided for in Subsection 4.13 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the Planning Board shall hold a hearing to revoke this approval, pursuant to RSA 676:4-a;

19. The school impact fee of $4,589 per single-family dwelling unit shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for each dwelling unit; and

20. The fire impact fee of $571 per single-family dwelling unit shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for each dwelling unit.

2. **S2019-011**

Property located at 270 Stanton Street (Tax Map 507, Lot 64A), a subdivision application for the creation of 8 new buildable lots in the Partnership Park Subdivision utilized by the Manchester School of Technology. The proposal also includes a 300’ extension of the existing dead-end hammerhead roadway, with a new cul-de-sac and granite curbing in the R1-B Zoning District. Fuss & O’Neill for the Vocational Partnership of Region #15

Chairman Harrington advised there was a staff recommendation and the Board took a moment to review that information.

Mr. Golden offered a slight modification to condition #10 to get deeper into the detail of the Conservation Commission comment as well as comments that were raised at the public hearing regarding the trash. As it reads, it would just be continued on stating “Further, all refuse and debris on VOPAR property shall be removed prior to signing of the plan.”
Mr. Long said there was an issue with respect to tree clearing, which he believed was going to be done in phases as they build the houses. He asked if that was still the case. Mr. Golden said it is and the phasing plan is incorporated into the plan set as well.

Mr. Long confirmed with Ms. Goucher that there was a waiver regarding the length of the cul-de-sac that needed to be addressed.

**Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver for cul-de-sac length, which was seconded by Ms. Sanuth. (Motion Carried)**

**Mr. Long made a motion to approve S2019-011 per staff recommendation and with the modification to condition #10, which was seconded by Mr. O’Donoghue. (Motion Carried) (Opposed: Curry)**

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and plans shall be submitted for final approval and signature;

2. The applicant shall obtain sign-off from all City reviewing agencies, including the Planning Department, prior to submitting plans for signature;

3. Prior to signing of the plans, the applicant shall have Board of Water Commissioner approval for the water main extension;

4. The applicant shall obtain the required State approvals prior to submitting the plans for signature, and abide by all conditions set forth therein;

5. All new property corners, excluding those in the proposed right-of-way, are to be set prior to submitting plans for signature. The monuments along the new streets may be bonded and set prior to final ROW inspections;

6. New street addresses shall be secured from the Highway Department and shown on the plan along the parcel frontage, prior to submitting plans for signature;

7. If the Planning Board grants a waiver for the length of the cul-de-sac, the recorded plan shall contain a note to memorialize the waiver, including the description and date of the approval of the waiver;

8. The plan shall contain a note stating, “No certificate of occupancy shall be authorized
until all required improvements have been completed, unless addressed by the provision of a financial guarantee, pursuant to the requirements of Subsection 4.14 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations”;

9. The applicant shall submit fully executed street dedication documents, to the satisfaction of the Highway Division and the City Solicitor, prior to final approval;

10. The two conditions of the Manchester Conservation Commission shall be stated on the plan and wetland boundary markers shall be installed on the specific lots, as required, prior to a Certificate of Occupancy for each of those lots; Further, all refuse and debris on VOPAR property shall be removed prior to signing of the plan;

11. The applicant shall submit proposed deeds, public and private easements, restrictive covenants, declaration of the Homeowners’ Association, and all legal documents for review and approval prior to final approval and the applicant shall record all such documents – except the deeds – concurrently with the subdivision plat;

12. A Subdivision Improvement Agreement addendum shall be executed that binds the developer, its heirs, and its successors to performance in the timing of the construction of public improvements, private improvements and dwelling units, prior to final approval. This shall reference the 2008 addendum, as well as the financial surety currently being held by the City of Manchester;

13. The applicant shall submit a bank check, Irrevocable Letter of Credit, or other financial guarantee, satisfactory to the City, to provide surety for the completion of all public improvements, prior to final approval;

14. Prior to tree clearing, the developer shall demarcate the proposed clearing for each lot for Planning Staff inspection;

15. Prior to a Certificate of Occupancy for each house, a school impact fee of $4,589 per dwelling unit and a fire impact fee of $571 per dwelling unit shall be submitted;

16. The applicant shall record the subdivision plat, easements, restrictive covenants and Declaration of Homeowners’ Association within 30 days of final approval and shall provide the Planning Department with the plan number and the book and page numbers of all such documents;

17. Periodic reports from the engineer of record, certifying that the construction is
proceeding per the approved plan, may be requested from City staff. At the completion of the project a certified letter from the projected engineer stating that the project was built per plan shall be submitted;

18. Any signage for the subdivision, such as a free-standing sign at the entrance, shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review at a business meeting;

19. Any material changes to the plan shall require approval from the Planning Board at a new public hearing;

20. Prior to final approval, the applicant shall provide a digital file in AutoCAD.dwg format with boundary lines and horizontal and vertical features based on N.H. State Plane Coordinate System (NAD83/92-NGVD 88);

21. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit one set of mylars for recording, one set of mylars to remain on file with the Planning Department, and four complete paper sets; and

22. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided for in Subsection 4.13 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the Planning Board shall hold a hearing to revoke this approval, pursuant to RSA 676:4-a.

3. **SP2019-016**

   Property located at 409 Elm Street (Tax Map 166, Lots 1, 4, 5, 11 & 12), 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*

   Chairman Harrington and Ms. Charlebois abstained from voting on this application.

   Vice Chairman O’Donoghue advised there was a staff recommendation and the Board took a moment to review that information. He also advised there was a waiver that needs to be addressed.

   *Mr. Lussier made a motion to grant the waiver, which was seconded by Mr. Long. (Motion Carried)*

   *Mr. Long made a motion to approve SP2019-016 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Lussier.*

   Mr. Long inquired what the school impact fee was. Mr. Golden said the total school impact
fee is $202,740.

Mr. Long modified his motion to approve SP2019-016 per staff recommendation including the payment of impact fees which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani.

With regard to the balconies, Ms. Sanuth asked what the body of enforcement was with respect to anything this Board could have as a condition. Ms. Goucher said it is in the public record that Mr. Dupont represented that he would not allow balconies to be used for storage. There is nothing stopping the Board from adding one more condition if they chose.

There were no further comments and the Board proceeded to vote.

(Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and plans shall be submitted for final approval;

2. The proposed street lights shall be reviewed and approved by DPW and Planning staff prior to submitting plans for final approval;

3. A note shall be added to the plan stating that no event parking will be allowed;

4. Full color building elevations shall be incorporated into the final plan set prior to final approval;

5. A construction staging plan shall be added to the plan set prior to final approval;

6. A certified letter from the project engineer shall be submitted stating that the project was built per plan, prior to a Certificate of Occupancy.

7. The applicant shall obtain sign-off from all City reviewing agencies, prior to submitting plans for final approval;

8. The plan shall contain the following statement signed by the owner or developer: “It is hereby agreed that, as the owner of the property, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the site improvements for the duration of the use;”

9. The plan shall contain a note stating, “No certificate of occupancy for the residential units shall be authorized until all required improvements have been completed, unless addressed by the provision of a financial guarantee, pursuant to the requirements of Subsection 4.14 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations;”
10. The plan shall contain a note stating that excess snow shall be removed from the site so parking spaces and drive aisles are not compromised;

11. The plan shall contain a note stating, “All conditions subsequent to approval shall be completed within two years of final approval”;

12. All material changes to the approved plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board at a subsequent hearing;

13. The applicant shall submit a Notice of Merger prior to final approval of the plan set;

14. The proposed building signage and any additional building lighting shall be reviewed and approved by the Arena Overlay Design Review Committee;

15. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit seven paper plan sets to the Planning and Community Development Department; and

16. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided for in Subsection 4.13 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the Planning Board shall hold a hearing to revoke this approval, pursuant to RSA 676:4-a.

**IMPACT FEES:**

Prior to a CO, a school impact fee of $3,125/unit shall be paid for 60 residential 1 & 2 bedroom units, and $508/unit shall be paid for the remaining 30 studio units. (Total of $202,740)

Additionally, a fire impact fee shall be paid for both the residential and non-residential uses. The following fee schedule is required:

- Fire Impact Fee (residential): $4,980.00 (studio’s)
- Fire Impact Fee (residential): $30,720.00 (1 & 2 bedroom)
- Fire Impact Fee (non-residential): $4,490.40

Total Fire Impact Fee required: $40,190.40

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

   **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 on the existing 1st and
2nd floors of the Annex portion of 670 North Commercial Street to create 34 residential units, consisting of 27 – two bedroom units and 7 – one bedroom units, in the AMX Zone.

Brady Sullivan Properties

Chairman Harrington advised he was not present for the public hearing so would abstain from voting on this application.

Chairman Harrington advised there was a staff recommendation for SP2019-019 and the Board took a moment to review that information.

Mr. Leclerc made a motion to approve CU2019-016, which was seconded by Mr. Long. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)

Vice Chairman O’Donoghue advised there were waivers that needed to be addressed.

Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Appendix B, Section B to not provide a surveyed plan of the property, which was seconded by Mr. Lussier. (Motion Carried)

Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Appendix B, Section C to not show structures and uses, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)

Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Appendix B, Section D to not provide parking, loading and circulation plans, which was seconded by Mr. Lussier. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)

Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Appendix B, Section E to not provide a landscaping plan, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)

Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Appendix B, Section F to not provide a lighting plan, which was seconded by Mr. Lussier. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)

Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Appendix B, Section G to not provide a utilities plan, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)

Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Section 9.1 to not prepare a traffic impact analysis, which was seconded by Mr. Lussier. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)

Mr. Leclerc made a motion to approve SP2019-019 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Long. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Harrington, Charlebois)
Conditions of Approval:

1. The Planning Board approval is specifically for the conversion of office space into 7 one bedroom units and 27 two bedroom units on the first and second floors of the annex portion of the building;

2. Final approval of the change of use site plan shall constitute approval of the BUDP (Building Use and Development Plan) for this property;

3. As represented in Public Hearing, should the BMA support the encroachment of the parking spaces into the City accepted Public Highway, the applicant shall submit to staff an easement, license or other instrument customarily granted by the City for such an encroachment to be filed or recorded with the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds. Should the BMA deny the request to encroach into the Public Highway, the applicant shall remove the existing 10 parking spaces;

4. The applicant shall obtain official sign-off from all City reviewing agencies, including DPW, Planning, Fire, and Water Works. Final sign-off shall be provided to the Planning and Community Development Department prior to submitting plans for final approval;

5. Prior to submitting plans for a building permit, the applicant must submit a plumbing plan and fire suppression plan for the apartments for review and approval by Manchester Water Works;

6. Any mechanical equipment located on rooftops shall be screened appropriately and reviewed by the Heritage Commission;

7. All material changes to the approved plan, including any changes to signage and site lighting, shall be reviewed by the Heritage Commission and reviewed by the Planning Board at a business meeting;

8. The plan shall contain the following statement signed by the property owner: “It is hereby agreed that, as the owner of the property, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the site improvements for the duration of the use;”

9. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and a building permit secured. Seven paper copies of the plan sets shall be submitted for final approval; and

10. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided for in Subsection 4.13 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the Planning Board shall hold a hearing to revoke this approval, pursuant to RSA 676:4-a;
11. The plan shall contain a note stating, “All conditions subsequent to approval shall be completed within two years of final approval”; 

12. Prior to a CO for residential units, school and fire impact fees shall be paid. A school impact fee of $3,125/unit and a fire impact fee of $512/unit shall be paid; 

13. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit seven paper plan sets to the Planning and Community Development Department; and 

14. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided for in Subsection 4.13 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the Planning Board shall hold a hearing to revoke this approval, pursuant to RSA 676:4-a. 

5. **SP2019-021**  
   Property located at 140 Blaine Street (Tax Map 196, Lot 9), a site plan application to change the use of an existing building from a landscape contractor to a machine shop in the B-2 and R-3 Zoning Districts. **S&H Land Services for 254 Rockingham Auburn, LLC**

Chairman Harrington advised there was a staff recommendation and the Board took a moment to review that information.

Chairman Harrington advised there was a waiver request for elevation drawings as required by the Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations.

*Ms. Charlebois made a motion to grant waiver #1 for elevation drawings, which was seconded by Mr. Lussier. (Motion Carried)*

*Ms. Charlebois made a motion to grant waiver #2 for a landscape plan, which was seconded by Mr. Curry. (Motion Carried)*

*Ms. Charlebois made a motion to grant waiver #3 for a utility plan, which was seconded by Mr. Lussier. (Motion Carried)*

*Ms. Trisciani made a motion to grant waiver #4 for sidewalk construction, which was seconded by Mr. Long. (Motion Carried)*

*Ms. Charlebois made a motion to grant waiver #5 for dumpster in limited activity buffer, which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani. (Motion Carried)*

*Mr. Lussier made a motion to approve SP2019-021 per staff recommendation with the addition of cleaning up the frontage on Cleveland St., which was seconded by Mr. Curry.*

Mr. Belanger advised that the applicant stated something about there being no outdoor storage. There is note on the plan as of now stating that there wouldn’t be. The variance
they received mentioned that there would not be outdoor storage so this Board is covered from that respect, but if that was of interest to the Board that could become a condition of approval as well. He didn’t know if there was any danger of there becoming outdoor storage but given that was something they said during the hearing it was something to think about as an additional condition.

Mr. Lussier advised as long as the Zoning Board required it, he was satisfied.

Chairman Harrington asked what if he sold the property and there was a new buyer and that note was not on the plan. Mr. Belanger said it would be better if the note was on the plan.

Chairman Harrington asked Mr. Lussier if he wanted to revise his motion and Mr. Lussier said he did not.

Mr. Belanger said if the use were to change they would have to come back to the Board for a change of use site plan anyways so they would have another opportunity to impose that condition.

Mr. Long asked about the patch of grass.

Mr. Lussier amended his motion to clean up the frontage on Cleveland Street and seed it, which was seconded by Mr. Curry.

(Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and plans shall be submitted for final approval;

2. The applicant shall obtain sign-off from all City reviewing agencies, including the Planning staff, prior to submitting plans for final approval;

3. The applicant shall obtain all necessary State and Federal approvals, as applicable, prior to final approval;

4. Prior to final approval, the applicant shall clear the brush on the property’s frontage on Cleveland Street and seed the area for grass;

5. The plan shall contain the following statement signed by the owner, “It is hereby agreed that, as the owner of the property, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the site improvements for the duration of the use;”
6. The plan shall contain a note stating, “No certificate of occupancy shall be authorized until all required improvements have been completed, unless addressed by the provision of a financial guarantee, pursuant to the requirements of Section 4.14 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations.”

7. The plan shall contain a note stating, “All conditions subsequent to approval shall be completed within two years of final approval.”

8. All material changes to the approved plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board at a public hearing;

9. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit seven paper plan sets to the Planning and Community Development Department;

10. Prior to applying for a certificate of occupancy, a signed and sealed letter from a NH licensed professional engineer shall be submitted to the planning staff certifying that the site improvements have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans;

11. An excavation permit from the Manchester Department of Public Works is required for all work within the public right-of-way. All work shall conform to the City of Manchester Standard Specifications; and

12. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided for in Section 4.13 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the Planning Board shall hold a hearing to revoke this approval, pursuant to RSA 676:4-a.

6. **SP2019-022**
   Property located at 284 Hanover Street (Tax Map 94, Lot 4), a site plan application to change the use of an existing building from professional offices to veterans’ housing in the R-3 Zoning District. **Northpoint Engineering, LLC for the State of New Hampshire Department of Employment Security**

At the request of the applicant, this application will be deliberated on August 1st.

7. **SP2019-023**
   Property located at 61 Beech Street (Tax Map 361, Lot 16), a site plan application to change the use of an existing 3,850 SF building from commercial sales and repairs to a contractor’s yard in the RDV Zone. **Joseph M. Wichert, LLS for Beech Street 61 Realty, LLC**

   Chairman Harrington advised there was a waiver request to not provide a landscaping plan.

   **Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver for providing a landscaping plan, which was seconded by Ms. Sanuth. (Motion Carried)**
Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Section 8.4, land grading, slope control and surface water drainage, which was seconded by Ms. Sanuth. (Motion Carried)

Mr. Long made a motion to grant the waiver from Appendix B, topography, which was seconded by Ms. Sanuth. (Motion Carried)

Ms. Goucher said the past user was for vacuum sales and they had a lot of the products out in front of the building. She did not expect that the applicant would put anything out there, but the Board may want to entertain whether or not they want a condition to not have anything displayed in the front of the building.

She said they may want to add a condition that there will be no outdoor storage, products or vehicles unless screened and that there will be no display of product in front of the building. Chairman Harrington said he was comfortable the way it was.

Ms. Trisciani asked if they wanted to add anything about a timeline to do the sidewalk that in front of the main building. The Chairman said the applicant represented that he was going to do it but just needed time because of all the other expense. Ms. Trisciani felt a five year timeline for that to be completed was too long. Ms. Goucher thought the applicant would do it when he feels it is not a benefit to his property to look like that. Ms. Goucher suggested the timeline could be three years after issuance of a CO.

It was agreed to elaborate on condition #4 to state “Further, the southerly portion of the sidewalk will be rebuilt within three years of receiving a certificate of occupancy”.

Mr. Leclerc made a motion to approve SP2019-023 per staff recommendation and to modify condition #4 by adding “Further, the southerly portion of the sidewalk will be rebuilt within three years of receiving a certificate of occupancy”, which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani. (Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and plans shall be submitted for final approval;

2. The applicant shall obtain sign-off from all City reviewing agencies, including the Planning staff, prior to submitting plans for final approval;

3. Any new signage, which must comply with the zoning regulations, shall require a sign permit through the Planning and Community Development Department;

4. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the property owner shall construct new sidewalk extending from the north property corner abutting Tax Map 361, Lot 15 to the northerly corner of the site driveway, to match the City of Manchester Standards.
Further, three years after issuance of final Certificate of Occupancy, the property owner shall reconstruct the sidewalk along the building frontage, to match the City of Manchester Standards;

5. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the property owner shall restripe the parking lot as represented on the approved plan;

6. The plan shall contain a note stating that “There shall be no outdoor storage of products or vehicles unless screened by an 8’ tall solid fence.”

7. If the Planning Board grants waivers from the Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the plan shall contain a note to memorialize the waivers, including the section number, description, and date of the approval of the waivers;

8. The plan shall contain the following statement signed by the owner: “It is hereby agreed that, as the owner of the property, I will construct the project as approved and as shown on the enclosed set of plans. Further, I agree to maintain the site improvements for the duration of the use;”

9. The plan shall contain a note stating, “All conditions subsequent to approval shall be completed within two years of final approval”;

10. The plan shall contain a note stating, “No certificate of occupancy shall be authorized until all required improvements have been completed, unless addressed by the provision of a financial guarantee, pursuant to the requirements of Subsection 4.14 of the Manchester Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations”; and

11. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit seven paper plan sets to the Planning and Community Development Department

(Tabled from March 15, 2018)

8. **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.
9. **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. **SP2019-027**  
   Property located at 3000 Goffs Falls Road (Tax Map 750, Lot 20), a site-plan application to reconfigure an existing parking lot of 790 parking spaces and add 69 parking spaces, two drainage features, and additional site improvements on two lots totaling approximately 35 acres in the IND and R-1B Zoning Districts. Hayner-Swanson, Inc. for the Business Finance Authority of the State of New Hampshire.  
   *(Conservation Commission review required)*

2. **SP2019-025**  
   Property located at 1888 South Willow Street (Tax Map 852, Lot 2B), a site-plan application for the redevelopment an existing 20,030 SF building and new 875 SF addition with associated site improvements to accommodate an auto dealership in the B-2 Zone. VHB for Tidal Creek LLC.  
   *(Conservation Commission review required)*

3. **PDSP2019-003**  
   Property located at 537 Union Street (Tax Map 20, Lots 1, 2, 5 & 9), a site-plan/planned development application for the expansion of an existing funeral home with associated site improvements and parking in the C-1 Zone. Granite Engineering, LLC for the Healy Family Revocable Trust.

*Ms. Charlebois made a motion that the following applications are required to go to the Conservation Commission for comment: SP2019-027 and SP2019-025. The following application does not require review by the Conservation Commission and does not have regional impact: PDSP2019-003. Mr. Leclerc seconded the motion. (Motion Carried)*

IV. **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**

1. Review and approval of the Planning Board Minutes of May 1, 2019 and May 16, 2019.

   *Chairman Harrington made a motion to approve the Minutes of May 1, 2019 with amendment, which was seconded by Mr. Long. (Motion Carried)*

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

   With regard to the Edward J. Roy Drive case, Ms. Goucher said, according to the City
Solicitor, there are going to be two different meetings at the end of August.

With regard to the Manoukian project on Coolidge Avenue that went to court because the Board did not allow a fourth extension, Ms. Goucher said that is under advisement by the judge right now.

Ms. Goucher thought they would probably have the results of those cases in the next 60 days.

With regard to the Master Plan, Ms. Goucher said there are several meetings that the staff and Chairman will be involved in next week. At 6:00 Wednesday evening, the consultants will be doing their community kickoff meeting in the Chambers.

Mr. Lussier made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani. (Motion Carried)

ATTEST: _____________________________________________________

   Michael Harrington, Chairman
   Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD:   September 5, 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