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

II. PUBLIC HEARING:

With respect to the following applications, appropriate materials have been submitted to invoke the jurisdiction of the Board. Although additional information may be required prior to final consideration, it is the recommendation of the Staff that the Planning Board determine the applications complete and conduct a public hearing. A motion would be in order.

Vice Chairman O’Donoghue made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc, that the following applications are complete and available for a public hearing: S2019-013, S2019-016, SP2019-029, SP2019-030, SP2019-031, CU2019-019, CU2019-020, CU2019-021 and IMP2019-003. (Motion Carried)

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.

Chairman Harrington advised there was a waiver request for the Board to proceed with a hearing as they are still pending relief from the Zoning Board of Adjustment for square footage of the lot. Mr. Mitchell advised they have received ZBA approval for the square footage except that the, due to rounding-off information, they came down a little bit less than was shown on the ZBA plan. They had shown ZBA to be plus or minus and up until the time that they submitted the plans, they didn’t have a chance to speak to Glenn Gagne as he was out of the office. They filed the waiver just in case they have to go back to the ZBA. At this point, he is not sure that they do, but that will be Mr. Gagne’s call once he reviews the plan again but he understands what they are showing this Board on the plans tonight.
Chairman Harrington advised that it was a full Board tonight so only the full Board members would be voting.

*Alderman Levasseur made a motion to allow this application to proceed, which was seconded by Mr. Hebert. (Motion Carried)*

Chairman Harrington said if they have to go back to the ZBA that would have to be a condition. Mr. Mitchell said he understood.

Mr. Mitchell advised the Board that the project is located on Brown Avenue. It is a vacant lot just over 17,000 SF and it has sewer and water available. It is Tax Map 683, Lot 10 and they are proposing to subdivide it into two lots. They went to the ZBA for two variances. The requirement for the lot size is 7,500 SF but that square footage also has to be considered buildable land so they received variances for each of the lots for buildable land to be less than 7,500 SF. They also received variances for the lot width to carry all the way back 100 feet. The plans were then submitted to the Planning Board and a couple of questions have come up since the last plans were submitted. One question dealt with the lot areas, which they corrected on the plans submitted tonight. There were some drafting mistakes on the total areas. The total area of the lot is 17,305 SF. The second question was about the buildable area. He referred to a chart and the plan passed out tonight and said the buildable area as they considered it first when these plans were looked at they had the lot numbers reversed, which caused some confusion and why initially Mr. Gagne said one of the lots did not meet the zoning criteria. However, when they corrected those, they came up just 30 SF less than what they needed. In talking to Mr. Gagne, even though the Zoning Board application they submitted said that buildable area would be plus/minus 4,500 SF or 3,200 plus/minus he said the variance could not be plus or minus; it had to be that number. As such, he rounded to the nearest 100 SF of the buildable area on the plans so he believes they comply with the buildable area.

Mr. Mitchell advised that both lots will be on sewer and water. Water Works has required that they show the services to be at least 3 feet away from the lot line. They are a little bit closer and it is not on these plan sets, but they will comply with that. The site itself is very steep compared to most lots. For the buildings they are proposing, the top of the foundations will be at about the same grade as Brown Avenue, so from the street you will not be able to see that the lot is steep. The way they are trying to accommodate the steepness in that slope is that they would be putting in 10 foot foundations as opposed to 8 feet so the foundation will allow them to drop down to the backyard. They also have retaining walls in the rear and to the sides to help break up that slope. They also have a drainage detention area in the back of the lots where any of the water coming off of the roofs and the lawn area would go into that detention area and go into the ground so there will not be an increase in runoff going onto the adjacent lots. When the lots are developed, they will be terraced. The heights of the walls have all been verified and he believes they meet the zoning requirement. As far as the design of the walls, if the Board would want a
condition of approval that the building permit has to include design for all of the walls and everything else be submitted at that time, then they can do that.

If the building lot is supposed to be 7,500 SF, Alderman Levasseur asked how much of a reduction they asked for. Mr. Mitchell said on Lot 10, they asked for 3,200 SF of buildable land and on Lot 10A they asked for 4,500 SF where 7,500 SF is required.

With regard to the driveway entries, Mr. Leclerc asked if the sight lines will be okay for people getting in and out of there and with cars approaching from either direction. Mr. Mitchell referred to sheet #4 on the plan set, which shows that they meet the sight distance for both of those driveways.

Mr. Leclerc asked how close they are to the overpass. Mr. Mitchell said they are quite a distance away. Ms. Goucher said the property is basically across from Pine Island Park.

When they did their calculations for the sight distances, Chairman Harrington asked at what speeds they were calculating. Mr. Mitchell said they used the posted speed limit, which he thought was 30 MPH. He referred to sheet #4, which showed there is plenty of space between the line of sight and the existing pavement so they don’t have any bumps in the road that would get in the way.

Regarding the proximity of the driveways, Chairman Harrington asked if there was any concern with the closeness and distance between the two driveway curb cuts. Mr. Mitchell did not see that in DPW’s comments. They do require them to be a certain distance away from the lot line, which they comply with. They do comply with the separation from the lot line with each of those driveways.

Ms. Trisciani said she attempted to drive by this property and traveled at the posted speed limit and one of her concerns is that there was really no place for her to park or stop. She would like to see the sight distance done with a more realistic speed. She asked what the slope of the driveway would be from the road down toward the garage, even with the 10 foot foundation. Mr. Mitchell said there is actually about a one foot drop from the gutter on the road down to the garage slab. The road is right about at elevation 158 and the proposed slab for the garage is 157, so they will have just a little dip in the driveway so it comes down off the road and then goes back up to the garage, but there is about a one foot total difference between the slab of the garage and the road surface itself.

Ms. Trisciani said it looked like they were essentially going to be clearing every single tree off of these lots to build on them. She asked if there will be any trees left on once they start building. Mr. Mitchell said there will be some trees around the perimeter on the sides. The site itself is very brushy but it is not a treed lot per se; it is not a forest. There is a lot of brush. There are some places where there may have been material placed on there, fill that has been put on the lot over the years. They will be doing some landscaping in front of the houses. As far as the line-of-sight distance, once you cut the trees back from the front of
the road and you actually have a building there, there is some traffic calming because people see that there is something there. Ms. Trisciani disagreed with that point.

Ms. Trisciani asked if the infiltration pond will be shared with the two homes. With the retaining walls being much higher than they would normally be, she asked how they would maintain the pond and protect the property of the homeowners behind them from the fact that they are now clear-cutting a whole bunch of trees and vegetation that is keeping water off of their property. Mr. Mitchell said the purpose of the detention area to begin with is so that any increase in water coming off the site – because they are creating more impervious area and the flow of water will come off quicker once the development is finished – is to give a place for the water to settle so it doesn’t go off any quicker onto the site next door.

Ms. Trisciani asked who would be maintaining that. Mr. Mitchell said there will be a covenant and restrictions placed on the lot in a homeowner’s agreement between the two lot owners. That is all part of what they propose to do.

Regarding the parking, Chairman Harrington asked what happens when people who own these homes have people over. Mr. Mitchell said the garage allows for the parking of two cars and there is room in front of the garage for two more cars. If a fifth car is put into the turnaround, then they would have to move cars around, but there is at least four spaces with the garage and the area in front of the garage.

Ms. Charlebois asked if the garages will have two stalls, or two stalls with one door. Mr. Mitchell said they are two car widths wide and there will be two doors side by side.

In scaling the latest plan, Ms. Goucher asked if it would be accurate to say that they only have about 15 feet from the back of the house to the retaining wall so that those houses only have about 15 feet for a backyard. Mr. Mitchell said that was correct.

Ms. Goucher asked if the retaining walls are going to protrude up from the house side at all or if it was a retaining wall that will drop down and they will have to put a fence at grade. She was trying to determine if you will see part of a wall rising up or if the top of the wall will be flush with the backyard and then it drops down. Mr. Mitchell said the wall itself will basically be flush with the backyard. It may be up approximately 6 inches to a foot.

Ms. Trisciani asked about the two sets of stairs shown on the plan. Mr. Mitchell said there is a difference in grade from the front of the house to the back of the house. Ms. Trisciani said the stairs come off the back of the garage. Mr. Mitchell said they have the stairs that go down there which will take 6-7 feet in elevation. Because the back of the houses will be walkouts, they are proposing to have a 10 foot high basement as opposed to 8. The homeowners have to have a way of walking down the yard to get from the front yard to the back so those stairs will just get you down to the backyard on the outside of the house.

Ms. Goucher questioned why the stairs weren’t located adjacent to the garage. Mr. Mitchell
said the steps themselves could end up being just a set of steps, even precast with metal handrails that come up and not necessarily require any retaining wall. However, they are going to have to be deep enough down in the ground so they can be stable. They are not specifically tied to the garage footing.

Ms. Trisciana asked if the retaining wall just ends at the top. Mr. Mitchell said they would definitely want to have something there just for safety and it may only be 3 or 4 feet. It may be more of a railing than it is a fence. He thought it was important to have something on top for safety. She asked how people will access the infiltration pond for maintenance. Mr. Mitchell said the area that straddles the lot line where there are a couple steps down can be made available to get down to the back where the pond is. Ms. Trisciani asked what the distance would be from the edge of the infiltration pond to the neighbors’ property lines. Mr. Mitchell said between 15 feet and 18 feet perhaps.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

**Nancy Bridgewater** of 218 Riverbank Road advised this property abuts the back of her property. She was very concerned about potential flooding and traffic. She felt this subdivision would negatively impact the people that live below on Riverbank.

**Merle Paras** of 224 Riverbank Road advised that her property is directly behind where they want to build. She was concerned about privacy. She worried about children getting in and out on Brown Avenue given the high speed of travelers on the road. She asked what would be done with the fire hydrant in front.

There were no further comments from the public and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.

As far as the way the lots are going to be developed, Mr. Mitchell said there would be a terracing effect. There is about a 20 foot difference in elevation from Brown Avenue to the back of the lot. By dropping the house down 10 feet you take are of half of that and then sloping the backyard a little and then having a retaining wall down there would get back down to original grade. Mr. Mitchell said they would be willing to plant a row of evergreens along the back of the abutter’s property. There isn’t a lot they can do with breaking up the entire site from the back of one house up to the back of the other because it is always going to be there but by breaking up the sight line a little with some additional plantings, they would be willing to put those on the abutting property.

Chairman Harrington asked what types of homes they were going to build. The applicant said they were looking at 3-4 bedroom homes. They are willing to go down to 1,600 SF homes with 3 bedrooms.

Chairman Harrington said they cannot put their drainage onto somebody else’s lot. He asked Mr. Mitchell to discuss the infiltration system he designed. Mr. Mitchell said they
have a basin, or puddle area, on the back of the lots for any water that comes up quicker once the lots are developed. That area is an area for the water to puddle in the back but they have also put in stone and infiltration areas so the water will go down into the ground. Right now it may come down and infiltrate in the ground, but they are forcing more of it to go back into the ground so it doesn’t flow over the top so that the water that there will be no increase in runoff onto these adjacent lots when they are done. There will potentially even be a decrease because they are taking the water and actually putting it down into basins and then back into the ground. The Chairman asked if they looked at a build versus no-build condition. Mr. Mitchell said they did drainage calculations and submitted those to the City. There is no increase in runoff from the build post-development from what there would be pre-development. Chairman Harrington confirmed with Mr. Mitchell that that took into account the deforestation of the land.

Chairman Harrington asked if the house will have gutters with downspouts that will direct the water to certain areas. Mr. Mitchell said there will probably be gutters on the house. They also have underdrains that will take some of the water from behind the detention walls so that it isn’t going to load up in the backyard and push against the wall. It provides some relief so even the water in the backyard is going to go down into the ground and be a little bit slower because they are having a place to release it and that has been accounted for in their calculations as well.

The applicant advised that the current condition that the neighbors are facing is that there is a lot of water. They believe by cleaning up their property and removing all of the debris, along with the recommended infiltration pond, it will improve the abutters’ backyards.

Mr. Golden asked if any test pits have been done on this property. Mr. Mitchell said the soils were reviewed but they still need to do a test pit to verify the depth of the water table. But to get a machine down to the back of the lot, they wanted to make sure they were on the proper track. It is something they need to do before they begin construction.

When they said they reviewed the soils, Ms. Goucher asked if they meant just from the USGS soils map or if they actually took some soil samples out there. Mr. Mitchell said they based it on the slopes and what was on the soils map. For a determination of infiltration, they used the default numbers that those soils give. If they show that the water can go down quicker they can infiltrate more, but they used the default which is usually conservative on those particular types.

Ms. Goucher said in the past, staff has had experiences where lots that have been left alone for years – as obviously as this one has and especially with the ravine down from Brown Avenue – a lot of times people dump things onto the lot. Staff has found properties where people have discarded concrete from the end of cleaning out cement trucks. She knows it is not an easy site to get to and there is a cost involved, but she said there would be some concern as to whether or not they can accomplish all of what they are proposing if they are not sure what kind of soils they have or what the conditions are down below. Mr. Mitchell
said before they get building permits, they would have to make sure the walls out there are designed. As part of the design of those walls, you have to take a look at the materials underneath to make sure there is a proper foundation to do that. They can also include, if the Board would consider as a conditional approval, that soil testing be done on site to verify what is actually out there for debris and other information so the drainage can be accommodated before a building permit can be issued. Ms. Goucher said the problem with that is once the Board takes an action, they don’t see the other stuff that comes along afterwards.

Chairman Harrington said he would like to see more detail on the retaining wall; the elevations and what it is going to look like. Mr. Mitchell referred to sheet #6 and said that it is a typical reinforced retaining wall, which is you end up having a wall with a footing and then you put the blocks of the wall, which are precast concrete, and there is also fabric and stuff that goes down into the slope to help hold the slope back. They are Versa-Lok, which is the identical wall that the Airport used along Brown Avenue, which is in some places up to 30 feet high. Mr. Mitchell said what you are looking at for the stone isn’t just going to be one flat piece; it is going to have a little bit of an angle to it so as you look at the stone, it is just separate pieces. It isn’t going to be flat like a brick wall.

Mr. Mitchell said the basement slab elevation will be probably a foot or less than the top of the wall so the backyard is going to be fairly flat and then it will drop down another eight feet down to where the detention pond is. The applicant advised if the abutters were looking for more privacy, they could install a six foot high solid fence so when the people are in their backyard, they are not directly looking down at the neighbors and vice versa. They would have an 8 foot block wall and, on top of that, there would be a fence to help out with privacy concerns.

On page six where it shows the details of the retention wall, Ms. Charlebois said it shows there is a four foot high chain link post put in. Mr. Mitchell said it shows that it is a minimum of four feet tall and they can go taller. It is not directly on top of the wall itself - it is inside the wall a little bit and they would be willing to work with the abutters to show them different options. They don’t want to put up something that they are going to think is ugly if there is another option.

Ms. Trisciani asked for confirmation of what the drop is in elevation from the front of the property to the rear. Mr. Mitchell said it was 22 feet.

Ms. Trisciani asked if they had received anything back from DPW. Mr. Mitchell said they had not received anything back from DPW. Ms. Goucher said she reached out to DPW, but she wasn’t able to reach the engineer for his review.

On the issue of putting evergreens in the back, Alderman Levasseur asked how many they would need or how far away they would be planted, and what size they would be initially. Because the back of these yards are mostly grass right up to their fence lines, which is their
lot line. There will be no growth on their property when they put in their detention basin and there isn’t going to be much growth on other side of the property line. Because the detention basin is in there, and there is a little bit of a berm, they really don’t want to plant trees in the berm because if they blow over, then they might take the berm with it, which will leave an area for erosion. If they would be willing to plant on the neighbor’s property, it can be based on what they want. The applicant said he believed there were four abutters adjacent to the property, and he thought evergreens would be better because they would be green all year around and there wouldn’t be any dropping of leaves. He thought they should handle it on a case by case basis with the abutters.

Mr. Mitchell didn’t know if it was best to put a planted tree (shrubs are fine) on top of the wall or just behind the wall because if it blows down, the roots may affect the structural integrity of the wall itself. By talking about putting plants in their backyard, it wasn’t to hide what they are doing because you can’t. They are not putting 14 foot tall trees in that is going to hide it; it is really just to break up the visual affect to have something in the back that happens to be there that isn’t there now.

Chairman Harrington said there are a number of items that are still open, primarily DPW’s comments and a few changes that need to be made to the plans. He was also concerned that test pits haven’t been done.

Ms. Charlebois asked if it was ever considered to do just one lot and one house because it seemed like there was a lot going on and so much needs to be done to fit both houses on these proposed two separate lots. The applicant said they considered building one house in the beginning but they found it feasible to develop two lots, which was approved by the Zoning Board.

Chairman Harrington advised this public hearing would be held open until October 3, 2019. No further notice to abutters.

2. **S2019-016**  
Property located at 1860 Lake Shore Road/Kalisz Lane (Tax Map 482, Lot 1), a subdivision application to create two new buildable lots in the R-1A Zone. *S&H Land Services, LLC for Jeff & Shannon Owen.*

Peter Stoddard of S&H Land Services appeared on behalf of Jeff & Shannon Owen, the owners of 1860 Lake Shore Road. Also present was Jeff Owen.

Mr. Stoddard advised that this is an existing 1.25 acre parcel located in the R-1A zone. They are proposing to subdivide the lot into two new single family building lots and one remainder parcel for the existing house. The minimum lot size in the R-1A zone is 12,500 SF. These lots will be approximately 18,000 SF; 17,000 SF and 19,000 SF, all substantially larger than what is required in the zone. There are no steep slopes or wetlands on the lot. The existing house is serviced by City water and sewer. The proposed lots will be serviced by
City sewer and on-site drilled wells. The existing garage is falling down and will be removed. The existing driveway will be relocated to provide compliant parking off of Lake Shore Road. They are not requesting any waivers or variances and they have addressed all of the comments from DPW and the Planning staff.

Alderman Levasseur asked why they wouldn’t go with water on the other two lots. Mr. Stoddard said the water line runs down Lake Shore Road but not Kalisz Lane. They reached out to Water Works and were advised the regulations would require that any water line extension be extended along the entire length of frontage of the furthest lot down. They looked at that and it was about 320 feet of water line, which would have cost at least $40,000, so Water Works encouraged them to go with wells.

Chairman Harrington asked if they planned to clear cut the lots. Mr. Stoddard said that would be up to a future developer who buys the lots. The lots right now are very brushy and there is hardwood once you get into the lots. He assumed they would want to keep trees on the lots to buffer themselves from the abutting property.

Where the wells are to be located, Ms. Charlebois asked if that left enough space from each property and for the wells themselves. Mr. Stoddard said every abutting lot is on water and sewer except for Lot 24, which is all the way to the west. They have shown the location of the abutter’s leach field and there is ample room to be 100 feet away with the well on proposed Lot 1B. The reason it is shown as 100 feet, where you typically have a 75-foot well radius per the DES requirement, is because the Manchester Health Department requires a 100-foot setback. In this situation, Lot 24 is already stubbed out for sewer so when their septic system fails, they will be required to hook into sewer and then the radius won’t be an issue.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public. No one came forward and the Chairman brought the hearing back to the Board.

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

3. **SP2019-029**  
Property located at 291 Shasta Street (Tax Map 357, Lot 5), a site-plan application to construct a 7,000 SF building addition and 9 parking spaces for a warehouse in the B-2 Zone. Fuss and O’Neill for Shasta Street Properties.

Dick Anagnost appeared along with Ken Rhodes of Fuss & O’Neill. Mr. Anagnost said they are not constructing an addition; they are enclosing an addition that is partially enclosed and already constructed.

Mr. Rhodes said the applicant intends the property to be a small office with warehouse storage space for non-storefront users. There is an existing high clearance canopy partially
enclosed. The application seeks site plan approval to complete the enclosure of 7,000 SF of the canopy creating a controlled environment for inside material handling and shipping preparation. The last site plan approval said there was to be no storage of vehicles not related to the use on the property nor anything outside the canopy being stored. That hasn’t worked so this is a good opportunity to clean up the corner.

Mr. Rhodes advised Mr. Anagnost had initial conversations with the Planning staff to review the records to assess if there were going to be the need for a regulatory review just for this proposal. The response was that the history and their user performance had been erratic and the status of this has been very vague so they needed to go forward and do things. Although the canopy and structure existed, enclosure of a portion was judged to be a building addition. They went to the ZBA and they were advised for setbacks if they were just using the existing cover they could proceed. Because this was greater than a 5,000 SF addition, it triggered site plan review. The records indicated this was the last site plan that was approved apparently for Nuvo Furniture back in 2008. The elements on the site plan were just fine for the use going forward and really haven’t changed much from that approval. What is presented this evening is based on the 2008 endorsed approved site plan. This site plan essentially tries to depict that just the area under the existing canopy the panels will be refreshed and it will be enclosed. No water extensions are needed. This is just indoor heated space to finish the assembly of signs. Every one of the site elements from the 2008 site plan work. Right now there is a NAPA Auto Parts signs. There was never a sign approved at that location on the 2008 site plan. It will be taken out as the new user does not need a sign. He pointed out the dumpster and advised it will be moved underneath the canopy so it will be out of site. The only other changes from the original site plan are because there is 7,000 SF of new building area, three more parking spaces are required. A second handicap space was required and was put next to the existing handicap space. There were originally supposed to be three trees and there are only two. The gardens will be spruced up. Outside the limit of the canopy is paved and they will be adding a green panel that will be cut to the back of the sidewalk, which they will loam and seed and add a couple of trees.

Mr. Anagnost advised that when they were before the ZBA, the Board asked if they could place transom windows in the long sides of the building to let in natural light and break up the big tall metal sided structure. It is their intent to put windows but higher up in the structure, not at the street level for security purposes.

Mr. Rhodes showed elevations of the building.

Mr. Hebert said this has truly been an eyesore for quite a while and he was happy to see something happen there. He was glad to see that the fence would come down, the building would get enclosed and there was space to add the parking. He said it would be nice to take a blighted spot and dress it up.

Ms. Goucher advised there was a comment from DPW regarding sidewalk and curbing. Mr.
Anagnost said they were asked to close up the sidewalk, essentially straighten out and replace 130 feet of curb and reclaim the sidewalk. He said that is not in the cards for him because it would cost about $50,000 to reclaim the sidewalk and put in the curb. The Alderman said it would be nice to trade out the windows for the sidewalk if it was close. Mr. Anagnost said that could be a possibility if the Board were to consider that.

Mr. Leclerc asked where the entry will be. Mr. Anagnost advised it will be in the same place as it currently exists, on Shasta Street. Mr. Rhodes said there is a curb cut on Shasta Street.

Mr. Long confirmed with Mr. Anagnost that the windows will be going on both the Cilley Road and Beech Street sides.

Ms. Trisciani was concerned with the number of waivers being requested and why they were not willing to provide elevations. Mr. Anagnost said it doesn’t change much. All they are doing is enclosing a piece of the building that is already there and replacing the one tree that was supposed to be in the original site plan and reclaiming the exterior parking area and adding a landscape panel to make it look nice along Cilley Road with a couple of trees. Ms. Trisciani advised she would like to see all of that in a plan. With regard to the waivers, Mr. Rhodes said a number of them are related to existing conditions and the preparation of the plan was totally based on going back and essentially using the previous landscape and lighting plans that were approved and adding the landscape panel on Cilley Road. To meet the requirements without an additional waiver the landscape plan must be prepared by a landscape architect in the State of New Hampshire and all of the existing conditions then need to be certified as a survey. The last site plan did not have a boundary on it, which they would have replicated, and it became a much simpler narrative to come in and say the last site plan works well but to start opening those and creating those additional elements doesn’t add to the decision making information that the Board may be looking at here. They were trying to keep it as simple as possible. Ms. Trisciani disagreed and stated it would add to her decision making process.

Ms. Sanuth asked what the timing is of this project. Mr. Anagnost said the 30 day appeal period would expire and they would start construction as long as they could pull a building permit.

Ms. Goucher asked how they are going to put the sides under the canopy. Mr. Anagnost advised there will be a new slab. Mr. Rhodes said there will be a series of footings underneath the existing canopy along the existing column lines that go up to the roof and closes it off. It is just a dry space and there are no bathrooms and offices; it is a wide open assembly area where they can do their testing.

With respect to the applicant’s position, Mr. Golden said this area is under redevelopment. Northway Bank got built with sidewalk improvements and other improvements. Aroma Joe’s went in with the redevelopment. FW Webb put in an expansion with sidewalk improvements on Beech Street. There was just an approval for a redevelopment by the
railroad crossing for a roofing company, which DPW recommended sidewalk improvements. Beech Street is a Key street and part of that is a protected sidewalk with curbing. There is another application at 60 Beech Street, directly across from the one that was just approved, that is on the agenda tonight. All of this is in the last five years so he wanted to put that out there for consideration.

Chairman Harrington asked if fire suppression would be required. Mr. Rhodes believed the Fire Department commented if it is enclosed, fire suppression should be put in the building.

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. Long asked if the current metal siding would remain. Mr. Anagnost said they will be skinning the entire building.

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

4. SP2019-030
Property located at 60 Beech Street (Tax Map 266, Lot 1), a site-plan application for the change of use of 3,000 SF of the existing 5,200 SF building from retail sales and warehouse use to a pizza restaurant with no exterior improvements proposed, in the RDV Zone. **Joseph M. Wichert, LLS for 60 Beech Street, LLC.**

Joe Wichert appeared on behalf of 60 Beech Street, LLC. Also present was John Gimas, the manager of the LLC. They are proposing a change of use for the existing property. The subject lot is Lot 1 on Tax Map 266. Currently there is an existing single story commercial building on the property. The southerly part of the building Mr. Gimas uses for his business, Gimas Electric, which is approximately 2,200 SF. The northerly 3,000 SF in the past was used as retail. It has been vacant for a while and there is a tenant that is interested in using this space as a Domino’s Pizza. They will repurpose the 3,000 SF. Because of building code issues, they are going to add a door on the north side. Currently there is a chain link fence that runs along the lot line and ties into the northeast corner of the building that will be removed. The other fence will be extended to the end of the lot line, which would leave approximately a ten foot strip for which this door would come out on. The area is entirely impervious. It is asphalt now so there will not be any change in the lot coverage. They are currently at 97 percent where 85 is the maximum allowed, but he believed the property was developed prior to the Ordinance so it is considered grandfathered.

Mr. Wichert said the layout they are looking at this evening differs from the layout that was originally in the packet relative to the parking configuration. When they made the original submission, they went with how it was striped currently. They worked through it with Mr. Golden and during the zoning review, they had a different configuration of parking that ended up having 11 parking spaces. A lot of those parking spaces ran perpendicular to the
southerly lot line, which is the rails-to-trails land. After talking to staff, they have reconfigured the parking layout and they went with two spaces south of the ramp, four spaces south of the repurposed area and two spaces that will come in off the northerly curb cut. That gives them a total of eight exterior parking spaces. There is a parking space that Mr. Gimas uses for his vehicle at the end of the ramp, which is an internal space so that provides nine spaces. Under the current Zoning Ordinance, only seven spaces are required. There are two on-street parking spaces directly in front of the property.

Mr. Wichert showed the sign for the subject property, which is on City property, but they have a license from the BMA to maintain the sign there.

Mr. Wichert said there were three comments from DPW. The first was they wanted the northerly curb cut to be eliminated and the parking reconfigured. One of the problems they have with that is if they eliminate the curb cut, they will lose two parking spaces, which will have a substantial impact on the property. It will make it a more challenging to use. That curb cut has been there for many years so they would prefer to not eliminate it. They have reconfigured the parking and he believes the layout they have is acceptable to staff. Comment two was an access easement that will be needed from the City to allow for parking encroachments on the City right-of-way for turning movements. DPW was concerned about encroaching onto City property to get into the parking spaces. One of the items they are hoping they have eliminated with this reconfiguration of the parking is they have removed the southerly parking spot. This is a better movement and it can be accomplished without having to go onto City property. The third comment was the sidewalk in front of the building shall be upgraded to be resurfaced and delineated from the parking lot area, not flush as it currently is. He pointed out what would be turned into the storefront and said the commercial door will be replaced with more of a restaurant type double door. There will be two parking spaces that will sit in front and a row of parking spots at the end of the concrete ramp.

Mr. Wichert advised that they have asked for three waivers. The original two were for a landscaping plan and a land grading slope control and surface water drainage plan. Those two they asked for because the site is already developed and they are not really changing anything. The new waiver request they submitted was regarding the loading space. Under Article 10.06 (C) of the Zoning Ordinance they are supposed to have a 12x50 loading space that is designated on the property. That can be modified or waived by the Planning Board. Part of their problem is the distance from the end of the concrete ramp to the lot line is actually less than 50 feet so they can’t physically fit a 50 foot area in there.

Inside the restaurant will be configured with 12 seats but obviously the majority of it will be through delivery. The property is zoned RDV so the restaurant is allowed by right. They meet the parking calculation so they don’t need a conditional use permit for a reduction in the parking spaces.

Ms. Trisciani loved that they were continuing the redevelopment in this area. Given the size
of the lot she was okay with not having a stamped landscaping plan. She asked if they could come up with a way to add a few trees or some sort of green space to make it fit into the other redevelopment that the neighbors in that area have been doing. Mr. Wichert said they could look at possibly a street tree in a well.

Mr. Lussier thought a planter on each side of the doorway with some flowers might definitely enhance things.

With regard to the waiver for a reduction in loading, Ms. Goucher said the Planning Board cannot waive the loading zone 100 percent, but the Board can grant a waiver for a reduction in size. She and Mr. Golden were looking at probably being able to put a small loading zone between the parking spaces and the ramp. At the corner of the building, she said she thought they could probably put in an 8x18 foot loading zone and this Board could waive the 12x50 foot requirement to a smaller number. Mr. Wichert said they would work through it with staff.

Ms. Goucher asked Mr. Gimas if Domino’s would be doing some improvements on the outside. Mr. Gimas said they mentioned they would be resealing the parking lot. He said they would probably just clean up the brick on the front of the building. The canopy will be removed. He thought they mentioned painting the southerly portion of the building.

Ms. Goucher asked where the main entrance would be located. Mr. Gimas said where the canopy is located now.

Alderman Levasseur asked about the sign. Mr. Wichert said the sign is actually located on City property and they have a license to use it. The intent is to re-do the exterior of the sign so it will say “Domino’s” on it.

Alderman Levasseur asked if they would have security lighting and cameras due to the location. Mr. Gimas said there is an existing wall-pac lighting now. If they need to be replaced they will be replaced. Mr. Gimas said they were brand new. He believed there were overhead streetlights in the area.

With regard to the license from the BMA for the sign being in the right-of-way, Ms. Goucher asked if Mr. Gimas would want to pursue a revocable license from the BMA for some additional parking, the right to park on part of that space. She said the BMA has granted some revocable licenses to a number of businesses recently. Mr. Wichert said they would be more than happy to approach the BMA to do that.

Alderman Levasseur asked about the property that is owned by the City. Mr. Wichert said Aramark uses it for their headquarters. There is a curb cut off of Clay Street and they have paved the old railroad bed so there are about 15 parking spaces on the south side of that building.
Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public. There were no comments 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.

5. **SP2019-031**

*Property located at 327 Silver Street (Tax Map 361, Lot 4), a site-plan application to construct 5 townhouse units and repave a parking area in the RDV Zone. Silver Street Manchester, LLC, owner.*

Ben McCurrie, manager of Silver Street Manchester, LLC advised they were before the Board to talk about the redevelopment of this lot located in the RDV zone. He showed a photo taken about a year ago prior to them taking ownership. It was a lot that was utilized as a two-family dwelling and the rest was utilized as storage of cars, trucks and car parts. They are sandwiched in between a couple auto dealerships and auto body shops. In the last 30 days they razed the building. Their proposal is a five unit development townhouse style.

In response to conversations with Mr. Belanger and the various City departments over the last 30 days, they made a few revisions to their plan. The revision handed out tonight was the most up to date based on comments and feedback from the City and various departments. They have applied for two waivers on this project; a landscape architect waiver and a utilities diagram waiver. With regard to the utilities, they are just reutilizing the current services there except for the water. They are looking to terminate the inch and a half line and bring in a two inch line off the main. They are utilizing the same sewer connection and just relining it. Prior to razing the previous building they scoped the pipe and capped it at the street in order to get the demo permit. He believed it was Gene Colburn who gave them the green light from DPW to reutilize that same line. With regard to the landscape architect, he said they are requesting that waiver just due to the nature of relationships they have with local nurseries and farm stands and will be utilizing the services of their landscape designers.

Mr. McCurrie said they went back and forth with DPW and a few of the comments they are fully on board with is revitalizing the sidewalk in front. There are a few patches on the existing Silver Street façade that they have no problem revitalizing. They had to rework the parking lot as well.

Alderman Levasseur asked what the cross street was. Mr. McCurrie said it was in the middle of Beech and Maple.

With regard to the utilities, Mr. O’Donoghue asked Mr. McCurrie if he would have a problem with making underground utilities a condition of approval and he said “not at all”.

Mr. Belanger asked Mr. McCurrie to elaborate on how the façades of the units will meet the
walkway. Mr. McCurrie said right now pretty much the only hiccup they are dealing with is the sidewalk leading into the five units. Per the plan per spec they are looking at a foot and a half sidewalk. A sidewalk is not required but a foot and a half sidewalk is on their plan with just an asphalt curbing. With the elevation in that space the grade is roughly around 95. With a foot and a half curbing they are looking at maybe one step going into the units. He thought they need to rework whether or not there is going to be a sidewalk. Right now per plan they have two steps leading into each individual unit. These units are not being sold, they are just being held onto as market rate apartments.

The Chairman asked if the steps are recessed into the building. Mr. McCurrie said they are proposed to come off the building. The Chairman said it was a pretty small sidewalk to which Mr. McCurrie responded that is why they are going back and forth about just eliminating the sidewalk because it is not needed per regulation. If it is eliminated the steps would just go down into the parking lot.

Chairman Harrington asked about landscaping. Mr. McCurrie said the front façade landscaping would have to stay there. They would probably have to dial it down as to how many plantings they do. The side buffers and the front buffer on Silver Street would all remain the same. They would be adding seven indigenous trees to the property where only six are required. The landscape buffers include the island with spruce trees, hydrangeas, and pear trees.

Ms. Goucher cautioned the applicant concerning the steps. Whereas they don’t have setbacks to worry about, she said they may want to think about pushing the building further back. As it is shown right now, she thought they would have a very hard time building it because the steps are going to end up in the drive aisle. She said they also need a landing. Mr. McCurrie said they are not looking at landings, which is why he said a maximum of two steps going in. That is about 15 inches of space that they require. That is why they were talking about perhaps eliminating that foot and a half of proposed sidewalk. Ms. Goucher thought there would still be a few issues but she thought they could work them out.

Mr. Hebert asked if this was slab on grade. Mr. McCurrie said there will be a full foundation. Mr. Hebert asked if there would be windows in the basement. Mr. McCurrie said there would be daylight scuttle windows, which he believed were 24x12 inches. There will be no living space down below. Mr. Hebert said it is going to be required to have a landing. Mr. McCurrie said if they have three steps and above they would need a landing and they are looking at two steps into the building.

Alderman Levasseur asked what the setback is from the property line. Mr. McCurrie said the setbacks on the side and rear are zero. Right now at the rear setback they have five feet then there is a seven foot bulkhead and then the building so realistically 12 feet so they could push up against the rear setback. Alderman Levasseur said it looked like a really good sized lot.
Alderman Levasseur asked if they could use toters. Mr. McCurrie said he was told if he was under six units they could use toters. Ms. Goucher said the regulations require a dumpster. Alderman Levasseur asked if you need a waiver for that and Ms. Goucher said they would. The Alderman thought toters would be fine there.

Alderman Levasseur asked if they needed two parking spaces per unit. Mr. McCurrie said they need one and a half.

Alderman Levasseur asked what the size of the building was. Mr. McCurrie said the building is 80x30 and that will leave them just under 900 SF per unit.

Mr. Belanger advised that the applicant is working with DPW on a few calculation issues with their drainage analysis and a few details that DPW is looking for as well.

Ms. Goucher said typically when they have dense City lots like this, the existing buildings that are right up against the properties are shown. Just for the Board’s reference, if they were to look at the back of the property here, there is a three family building that is right on the property line and she thought there was also one on the west side. She mentioned that because there are zero setbacks for the RDV zone; however, there are requirements that there be separation with walls on adjacent properties. She asked if they could get their surveyor to show the edge of the building. When they are right up on the property line, it will have a bearing when they go to get a building permit to make sure that they have the clearance.

Ms. Trisciani asked if there is a poured basement if they had to worry about space in the back for an egress. Ms. Goucher said she would like to prevent the issue they had with the property that is under construction on Massabesic Street and she said it was pretty much the same scenario where everything was really tight and there were issues when they went to get their building permits. They had to go back for variances for the bulkheads and just a lot of little things. She said getting it ironed out now is better than after the fact.

Ms. Goucher asked what the dimensions were, center to center, on the units. Mr. McCurrie believed they were 16 feet x30 feet.

Alderman Levasseur asked what the exterior finish would be. Mr. McCurrie said it will be vinyl shakes and vinyl clapboard.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

**Marie Bolster** advised she was an abutter on the rear side of the proposed building. Her building is approximately 18 inches to the fence and where the refuse containers are proposed right now will not be favorable for her tenants due to any odors from the trash. She was also concerned about parking and headlights shining into the apartments.
Mr. McCurrie said he was open to suggestions concerning the location of the refuse containers. With regard to the two parking spaces the abutter mentioned, Mr. McCurrie said they are going to have a couple of trees back there that should diffuse the light from headlights.

Chairman Harrington continued this public hearing to October 3, 2019 to allow the applicant to address some of the outstanding issues.

6. **CU2019-019**

   Property located at 302 Lake Avenue (Tax Map 666, Lot 39), a conditional-use-permit application for the expansion of a Convenience/grocery store up to 8,000 SF in the R-3 Zone. **Rafael Lora for Lago Grande Realty, LLC.**

   Rafael Lora appeared with his architect Alan Yeaton. They are proposing to install a walk-in cooler.

   Alan Yeaton said he has been working with Mr. Lora for a couple years on several different projects. With this project they were looking at how the store could be expanded based on the demand of his clientele. His big problem has always been with refrigeration because he makes a couple trips to Boston to buy produce and his clientele really likes the fresh produce he is able to sell but he needs additional refrigeration. This was the only place on the site he thought was ideal. They went to the ZBA to get a variance because it is in the front yard setback on Maple Street. It is not attached to the building; it is a separate entity. They are going to enclose it with a wood frame to further insulate it but also to not make it not look so commercial but look more architectural with panels at the base, siding at the top and a screen around the compressors for both noise and visual so you won’t be able to see any of that from the street.

   Mr. O’Donoghue asked if it was a chiller or a freezer. Mr. Lora said it was a walk-in cooler that also has a freezer. Mr. O’Donoghue asked if the freezer part was ammonia based. Mr. Yeaton said they sourced used refrigeration systems in Ohio with new refrigeration units to go with it and basically it is a six foot freezer section and a ten foot cooler section. There is one door that goes into the refrigeration and there is an internal door that goes into the freezer section. Mr. O’Donoghue said he would like to know what the freezer piece is driven by just as a curiosity for him. Mr. Yeaton said he would get that information for him.

   Alderman Levasseur asked if they needed to get approvals from the Health Department. Mr. Yeaton said they will do that after they get the approval from the Planning Board.

   Alderman Levasseur confirmed with Mr. Yeaton the compressors are new.

   Mr. Hebert asked if there was any access to the cooler from the interior of the building and Mr. Yeaton said there was not. Mr. Hebert asked if they were going to dress up the aluminum siding on the unit with something else or if it would just be a freezer box. Mr.
Lora said it would have a wood frame to make it look the same as the building.

Ms. Charlebois asked what the plan was for delivery trucks. Mr. Lora said there is enough space in the parking lot for them to park and unload.

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

Ms. Charlebois confirmed with Mr. Lora that he will be restriping the parking lot.

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

7. **CU2019-020**

Property located at 262 West Erie Street (Tax Map 579, Lot 14), a conditional-use-permit application to construct an accessory dwelling unit within the garage of an existing house in the R-1B Zone. *Walter J. Hebert for John Ryann.*

Chairman Harrington said there was a waiver request to be heard by this Board tonight prior to going to the ZBA.

Walter Hebert appeared on behalf of John Ryann, the owner of 262 West Erie Street. They are proposing to have an accessory dwelling unit built inside an existing footprint garage at 262 West Erie Street.

Mr. Belanger said the waiver that is in play for the Planning Board is from Section 4.3(B) for allowing this Board to hear an application prior to getting the necessary zoning relief. He is proposing to put a door on the façade of the house to access the accessory dwelling unit. He is positioning the door such that it is perpendicular to the façade so it is not all that apparent as opposed to a door that would be flush and parallel with the façade but that technically violates the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance requires that when an accessory dwelling unit is put in there can be no door put on the façade of the house. That is what Mr. Hebert will be going to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for to obtain relief.

*Alderman Levasseur made a motion to allow testimony tonight subject to ZBA approval, which was seconded by Mr. Long. (Motion Carried)*

Mr. Belanger asked Mr. Hebert to walk the Board through what he was looking to do on the exterior as far as materials and what it will look like.

Mr. Hebert said nothing is going to change. They are going to take the garage door off and add windows on the north side where the parking will be to keep it in line with everything else that is there. It will be virtually unnoticeable other than windows instead of a garage door. It is a dead-end street and it is the second to the last house on that street.
Mr. Hebert said they are basically just adding room. Mr. Hebert said they are making three rooms in the garage.

Ms. Goucher said there was quite a bit of discussion in the Department about the placement of the door and ultimately the Director ruled it was considered as part of the primary façade.

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

Chairman Harrington closed this public hearing and it will be deliberated at the next business meeting and one of the conditions will be that they get ZBA approval.

8. **CU2019-021**
   Property located at 360 Wellington Hill Road (Tax Map 645B, Lot 179), a conditional-use-permit application to construct an addition to a house and use it as an accessory dwelling unit in the R-1B Zone. *Steven Dionne, owner.*

Chairman Harrington said he would entertain a motion to approve the waiver to allow the applicant to be heard.

*Mr. Hebert made a motion to allow testimony subject to ZBA approval, which was seconded by Mr. Long. (Motion Carried)*

Steve Dionne said he is looking to create an accessory dwelling unit for his parents. He is looking to put a 12x24 foot addition on the back of the house that would have a living room, kitchen/dining room and in the existing basement there would be a master bedroom and a bedroom. It is virtually one space when you get right down to it because you would be heading right out the bedroom into the living room. The siding will be vinyl to match the home. They are going to do a flat roof basically using a duct board system and the deck will be enlarged on top of it to the same size as the addition below. The rails will match what is existing or he will possibly upgrade those with PVC as opposed to the pressure treated that is there now. He would be keeping it the same style as the home. It is a colonial. The windows are going to be the typical six over six. It will keep the same look as the neighborhood and not really encroach on anything that is not there already.

Chairman Harrington said the drawings looked really nice.

Chairman Harrington asked about parking. Mr. Dionne said right now they are working out some parking issues, which he knows he has to go to the ZBA for. Right now, the property is basically nonconforming. The parking spaces in the front of his house don’t meet the criteria for the existing home. He has a two car parking garage right now which he is told is his parking and the paved area out in front of his house is hardscape although they do park
there. It was nonconforming when it was built. Now he needs that extra space for the accessory dwelling. With Planning they looked at several different options. He has a corner lot so they thought about putting a curb cut on Whittington Street but then he would end up with a 45 foot driveway and if he was the neighbor of someone who had a 45 foot driveway he would be wondering what kind of people are actually living in that home. He would like to put the driveway to the right hand side toward the adjacent property. With the granite curb that is there it would be a matter taking out two pieces of granite curb and that would give him everything he would need to get an additional car in place.

Mr. Belanger advised Mr. Dionne’s house and parking are compliant as they are. He explained that these ADU’s are deceptively complex because all kinds of zoning issues come up. He has two compliant parking spaces in his garage, which is all he needs for a single family home but he wants to add an accessory dwelling unit, which requires a third parking space and a 20 foot long driveway is not quite long enough to comply with zoning to add a third parking space in that front driveway so he is asking for a variance to add onto the side of it in.

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.

9. **IMP2019-003**

Property located at 67 Middle Street (Tax Map 152, Lot 14b), an Impact Fee waiver request for the conversion of commercial space into (1) one-bedroom apartment, and (1) two-bedroom apartment in the Amoskeag Corporation Housing/R-3 Zone. Peter Franck.

Peter Franck, owner of the office condo unit within the Heritage Green Condominium at 67 Middle Street, addressed the Board. He is seeking a waiver from the impact fee. He does not believe the conversion from the commercial space to residential space will have a negative financial impact on the City and will actually have a positive impact. The space was used for legal offices and they had occupants of 5-7 people over there and the conversion of this will actually have less occupants. The one bedroom is for one person and the two bedroom for two people. He does not believe these are family oriented units and should not have an impact on the schools. The Fire Department has been defending this building since 1840 from fire and when he purchased the unit, it did not have a wired fire alarm system and now it does so he thought that was a positive for the structure. Surely the increased value to the two units from the one and the renovations done will increase the assessed values, which should generate additional revenue for the City over the long term. The building is currently half residential. There are four units on the other side and there are two commercial units and they are just converting the one to residential use at this time.

*Alderwoman Levasseur made a motion to waive the impact fee of almost $7,000, which was seconded by Mr. Hebert.*
Ms. Trisciani was concerned it doesn’t meet the requirements for a waiver. Chairman Harrington agreed.

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

Mr. O’Donoghue said this did not meet any of the criteria for a waiver and it meets all of the criteria for the impact fee.

Mr. Belanger advised that none of the alternates would be voting this evening.

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

Chairman Harrington concluded the public hearing of the Manchester Planning Board September 5, 2019 and convened the limited business meeting.

III. LIMITED BUSINESS MEETING:

The Chairman advised they would deliberate agenda item 2 first.

2. IMP2019-003

Property located at 67 Middle Street (Tax Map 152, Lot 14b), an Impact Fee waiver request for the conversion of commercial space into (1) one-bedroom apartment, and (1) two-bedroom apartment in the Amoskeag Corporation Housing/R-3 Zone. Peter Franck.

Chairman Harrington reminded the Board Alderman Levasseur made a motion to waive the impact fee, which was seconded by Mr. Hebert.

*The Board voted and the motion failed. (6-3)*

Mr. O’Donoghue said the building and structure as presented meets the Ordinance so the fees are applicable in this case.

*Mr. O’Donoghue made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani, to deny IMP2019-003 because it does not meet the criteria for an exemption.*

Mr. Hebert was in favor of waiving the impact fee. Mr. Long said he felt justified to waive the impact fee to encourage residential development.

There was a discussion amongst the Board members regarding their feelings of whether or
not impact fees should be charged.

*(Motion Carried)*

1. **CU2019-019**

   Property located at 302 Lake Avenue (Tax Map 666, Lot 39), a conditional-use-permit application for the expansion of a Convenience/grocery store up to 8,000 SF in the R-3 Zone. *Rafael Lora for Lago Grande Realty, LLC.*

   Chairman Harrington thought this was pretty straightforward.

   *Mr. Hebert made a motion to approve CU2019-019, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)*

   *(Tabled Item)*

3. **SP-01-2018**

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

   Remain on table.

**IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**

1. Review and approval of the Planning Board Minutes of June 6, 2019 and July 18, 2019.

   Ms. Charlebois advised she reviewed the Minutes of June 6, 2019.

   *Mr. Long made a motion to approve the Minutes of June 6, 2019 with minor grammatical changes, which was seconded by Chairman Harrington. (Motion Carried)*

   Mr. Leclerc advised he reviewed the Minutes of July 18, 2019 and there were very minor corrections to be made.

   *Mr. Long made a motion to approve the Minutes of July 18, 2019 with minor corrections to be made, which was seconded by Ms. Sanuth. (Motion Carried)*

2. Update of the Master Plan.

   Ms. Goucher said staff has been pretty busy, especially Ms. Nazaka, over the last week or so trying to get ready for the Planapalooza event next week. She said they are doing pretty
well as far as trying to reach out. They are making progress on trying to get some of those on-the-table meetings. She handed out a schedule of the Planapalooza events to the Board members and said she hoped to see the Board members there.

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

   No other business items were brought forward.

   *Mr. Leclerc made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. Hebert. (Motion Carried)*
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