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

II. BUSINESS MEETING:

(Current Items)

1. 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.

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

Mr. Hebert made a motion to approve S2019-016 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc. (Motion Carried)

Mr. Belanger advised that everybody would be voting this evening because there were nine members present.

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 are to be set prior to submitting plans for final approval;
4. Prior to submitting plans for final approval, the shed, garage and existing driveway associated with Lot 1 shall be removed and a new driveway shall be constructed;

5. A note shall be added to the plan stating: “Prior to the issuance of a building permit on each of the new lots, 1) a grading plan shall be submitted, reviewed and approved by staff and 2) the proposed tree clearing on each of the new lots shall be flagged on-site for review and approval by planning staff”;

6. A note shall be added to the plan stating, “All conditions subsequent to approval shall be completed within two years of final approval”;

7. 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;

8. 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);

9. 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;

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; and

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

2. **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.**

   Chairman Harrington advised there was a staff recommendation and the Board took a moment to review that information. There were also seven waiver requests to address.

   Mr. Lussier asked if the application should state to enclose 7,000 SF of the existing building because it is not a 7,000 SF addition. Ms. Goucher explained it is not currently an enclosed building but will be when they do the work they are proposing.

   Chairman Harrington invited discussion concerning the sidewalk. Ms. Goucher said during the hearing, there was a discussion about the cost of the sidewalk reconstruction and, after
the meeting, staff followed up with DPW and asked them – based on the linear footage of
the curbing and the square footage of the sidewalk – what they estimated the cost to be.
The figure in front of them came from DPW for work in the right-of-way. It is not an item in
the recommendation, but there was definitely two sides discussing this at the meeting so
they figured before the Board took an action, they should probably have that discussion and
decide what they want to do with it.

Mr. O’Donoghue asked what they have done in similar situations that are immediately
adjacent to those blocks. Ms. Goucher said the first one was the F.W. Webb facility and they
did some sidewalk and curb improvements. She didn’t know the exact linear feet or the
amount of work they did, but they filled in any of the areas that did not have sidewalks and
set some new curbing. Diagonally across the street, nine townhouses were built two years
ago and there was some sidewalk and curbing reconstruction done. The more recent project
was Century Roofing, almost across the street, and for that project the Board asked for the
curbing and sidewalk to be extended.

With F.W. Webb being a brand new facility, Mr. Hebert asked how that rounded up. Ms.
Goucher said they took over a building. Mr. Hebert thought they resurfaced everything. Ms.
Goucher didn’t remember the extent of it but said they did work there as it was part of the
site plan approval.

Regarding this application, Mr. Hebert and Chairman Harrington believed there was some
discussion about closing in the curb cuts.

Mr. Belanger said the estimate of $50,000 that the applicant gave during the public hearing
was for 130 total feet of sidewalk repair and curb placement and that was, as he understood,
for filling in all of the gaps in curbing along the sidewalk. There are a number of fairly wide
curb cuts along Beech Street and the curbing that is there has very little reveal left on it and
doing it piece meal wouldn’t look very good. Mr. Rhodes’ point was, if they did that, they
would probably need to do roughly 250 feet of curbing and sidewalk and that might double
the cost in their estimation to around $100,000. As such, they followed up with DPW and
inquired what they estimate for the whole thing from Cilley Road to Shasta Street, along
Beech Street, which was 330 linear feet approximately. DPW estimated that entire length,
curbing plus sidewalk, to be approximately $45,000 total. Ms. Goucher explained that this is
based on their standard cost per linear foot.

Chairman Harrington said the applicant represented a “fairly skinny lease” with the tenant
he has negotiated with so he decided to put a square foot number to that. Using the
$45,000 estimate from DPW, a five year lease that would equate to 51 cents per square foot
per year for those five years off of whatever lease he negotiated with the tenant and if he
only has a three year lease that goes up to 84 cents per square foot. As such it will be
anywhere between 51 cents a square foot to 84 cents per square foot that he will have to
absorb just to do this improvement in the lease, which he may not be able to get from the
tenant.
Mr. Lussier said he heard it was $5.00/SF warehouse type space and that this kind of cost would nix the whole thing. He said to him that was ridiculous because he is proposing a nice upgrade to that corner, which has been an eyesore forever. There are five large openings there and you can’t just do a piece of it; you will have to re-do most of it to do it right. As such, he thought the little bit of paint and some sealcoating to make it look nice on the sidewalk would be appropriate for the type of tenant he is going to have.

Ms. Goucher said staff didn’t put any condition in their recommendation in regarding this matter because of the discussion that was held. Clearly there were differences of opinion so staff just brought forward the issue and relayed the cost from DPW. She advised a condition could be added.

Chairman Harrington said the first waiver request was for existing conditions and elevation drawings. Ms. Trisciani said it was not a financial hardship to do and she thought it would have been more helpful to have that elevation. Ms. Goucher asked if Ms. Trisciani had an issue with the existing conditions, the elevations or both. Ms. Trisciani said it was more the elevations.

Mr. Hebert said the City already has a copy of the elevation drawings from when this building was built. He was not sure the reason of going out and having him spend more money to do this was necessary.

Chairman Harrington advised the reason he closed the public hearing saying they didn’t need that information because of the representations of the applicant; however, he agreed with Ms. Trisciani it is not precedent for this Board to approve an application with no elevations. Granted, an applicant can ask, as they have done in this case, and the Board can waive that section. He said he thought the applicant was pretty detailed in explaining what he planned to do with the building including the transom windows above and the replacement of the skin.

Mr. Lussier asked if the building elevations can be done relatively easy or if it had to be done and submitted by a registered architect. Mr. Belanger said the first thing the Board needed to be aware of is in anticipation that this discussion may come up the applicant’s engineer, Mr. Rhodes, sent staff a perspective drawing of what the building might look like, which is included in the back of the Board’s packets. As a technical matter, the Board cannot receive additional evidence after the closure of a public hearing so sometimes when a public hearing is closed things come in after and the Board doesn’t usually see it. Staff thought this might be a contentious issue and the Board might want to have that in their packets just in case. As a point of procedure, which may affect the Board’s decision, Mr. Belanger said if they were to say they need to see new elevation drawings from the applicant, they would need to hold another public hearing.

Chairman Harrington said he thought they had sufficient evidence to close the public
hearing. He thought a picture was painted good enough, at least to him, to understand what the applicant was planning to do there and the drawing provided is not at all dissimilar to what was presented, but he did understand Ms. Trisciani’s point. He wanted it on the record that it is not typical and has not been typical in his tenure as Chairman that they would waive this portion of it without really considering it. He said he took his queues a little bit, although Ms. Trisciani certainly was vocal about it during the meeting, but there wasn’t much dialogue regarding that as being a potential issue. He thought it would be a hardship to have the applicant come back before the Board at this point considering the type of project they are looking at.

*Mr. Lussier made a motion to grant the waiver from Section C of Appendix C for existing conditions and elevation drawings, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)*

Ms. Goucher advised that Mr. Curry had arrived to the meeting. The Chairman advised that Mr. Curry would not be voting this evening as they had enough members.

*Alderman Levasseur made a motion to grant the waiver from Section B of Appendix C, boundary lines, which was seconded by Mr. Hebert. (Motion Carried)*

*Mr. Hebert made a motion to grant the waiver from Section B of Appendix C, Elevation Contours, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)*

*Alderman Levasseur made a motion to grant the waiver from Section E of Appendix C, Landscape Plan and Stamp, which was seconded by Mr. Hebert. (Motion Carried)*

*Mr. Hebert made a motion to grant the waiver from Section F of Appendix C, Signage and Lighting, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)*

*Mr. Hebert made a motion to grant the waiver request from Section G of Appendix C, Utilities, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)*

*Mr. Hebert made a motion to grant the waiver request from Section 8.11, Dumpster Location, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)*

Chairman Harrington asked how the Board felt about Mr. Lussier’s potential solution for the sidewalks.

*Mr. Hebert made a motion to approve SP2019-029 per staff recommendation and with Mr. Lussier’s recommendation to sealcoat instead of replacing the asphalt, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (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 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;”

4. 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.”

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

6. All new trees depicted on the plan shall be planted as 3-inch caliper, deciduous shade trees;

7. Any dumpster or other trash containers shall be stored within the limits of the canopy;

8. The monument sign on Shasta Street shall be removed from the property, as represented at the public hearing;

9. Transom windows shall be installed along the Beech Street frontage of the newly sided building;

10. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the sidewalk along the building’s frontage from Cilley Road to Shasta Street shall be sealcoated, and a yellow line shall be painted across the 5 curb cuts in line with the curbing;

11. All material changes to the approved plan, including changes to signage, shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board at a public meeting;

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

13. 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
14. 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.

3. 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.

Chairman Harrington advised there was a staff recommendation and the Board took a moment to review that information. The Chairman advised there were three waivers to address.

Chairman Harrington advised they are looking to not provide a landscaping plan. Ms. Goucher said they agreed to put one street tree in, which is part of a condition, but it is not necessary for the landscaping plan per se.

_**Mr. Leclerc made a motion to grant the waiver from Section 8.3 (C), Landscaping Plan, which was seconded by Mr. Hebert. (Motion Carried)**_

_**Mr. Leclerc 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)**_

With regard to the waiver request from Article 10.06(C), Ms. Goucher advised that the Board can’t eliminate a loading zone; that is a function of the Zoning Board; however, there is a concrete ramp on the site and if the Board chose to reduce the dimensional requirements of a loading zone and had that be indicated as the loading zone for the site, that would be appropriate if the Board so chose.

_**Mr. Hebert made a motion to grant the waiver from Article 10.05(C) of the Zoning Ordinance, for a dimensional waiver of a loading space, which was seconded by Alderman Levasseur. (Motion Carried)**_

Chairman Harrington said the site plan was pretty straightforward. Ms. Goucher believed the applicant will be submitting another request for a revocable license for the actual use of the paved area for his vehicles backing up. This plan technically works without it, but just so it is on the record he believed he was going to pursue that with the BMA, but it is not tied in to anything with the staff’s proposed conditions of approval.

_**Mr. Leclerc made a motion to approve SP2019-030 per staff recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Lussier. (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 plan shall be amended to include one street tree, with a minimum caliper of 3”, within a tree well, in front of the building;

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

5. The applicant shall supply a copy of the BMA license for the off-premise sign, prior to issuance of a sign permit for the free-standing sign;

6. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the property owner shall restripe the parking lot and sign the HC space, as represented on the approved plan;

7. If the Planning Board grants waivers from the Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations, the plan shall contain notes 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”;

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

12. 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.

4. **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 advised this was pretty straightforward.

   **Mr. O’Donoghue made a motion to approve CU2019-020, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc. (Motion Carried)**

5. **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.*

   Mr. Belanger advised if the Board was inclined to approve this there will need to be a condition of approval that the Planning Board’s approval is contingent upon approval by the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the necessary variance. Ms. Goucher said it has to do with the parking.

   Chairman Harrington inquired if Mr. Dionne had applied to the ZBA yet. Mr. Belanger said last he knew he had not and he assumed he would be on the November agenda.

   **Mr. Hebert made a motion to approve CU2019-021 contingent upon approval by the Zoning Board of Adjustment, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc. (Motion Carried)**

   *(Tabled Item)*

6. **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.

7. **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. **SP2019-032**  
   Property located at 100 Byron Street (Tax Map 435, Lot 9B), a site plan application for a proposed 9,150 SF, 5-story building addition along the north side of the existing Nylon Corporation facility in the RDV Zone. *Fuss & O’Neill for Nylon Corporation of America.*

2. **CU2019-023**  
   Property located at 100 Byron Street (Tax Map 435, Lot 9B), a conditional use permit application for a reduction in required on-site parking in the RDV Zone. *Fuss & O’Neill for Nylon Corporation of America.*

3. **SP2019-033**  
   Property located at 9 Willow Street (Tax Map 360, Lot 1), a site plan application to construct an addition to an existing convenience store, add automobile sales to the lot, and reconstruct a parking lot in the RDV Zone. *T.F. Moran, Inc. for Tanveer Akhtier.*

4. **CU2019-024**  
   Property located at 235 Harvard Street (Tax Map 267, Lot 15), a conditional use permit application for a reduction in required on-site parking, where 13 spaces are required and 9 spaces are provided in the R-3 Zone. *Steven Durost for Richard Capers.*

5. **SP2019-034**  
   Property located at 235 Harvard Street (Tax Map 267, Lot 15), a change of use site plan application for the conversion of a retail store to outpatient medical services in the R-3 Zone. *Steven Durost for Richard Capers.*

6. **SP2019-035**  
   Property located at 99 Manchester Street (Tax Map 116, Lot 8), a site plan application for a change of use from congregate housing to a dormitory with office space on the first floor in the CBD Zone. *Matt and Jody Wilhelm for 99 Manchester St LLC.*

7. **CU2019-026**  
   Property located at 2 Keller Street (Tax Map 874, Lot 1C), a conditional use permit application for a reduction in required on-site parking, where 116 spaces are required and 60 spaces are provided in the B-2 Zone. *Allen and Major Associates, Inc. for 70 Keller Street, LLC.*

8. **SP2019-036**  
   Property located at 2 Keller Street (Tax Map 874, Lot 1C), a site plan application to change the use of an existing building from retail to an automobile dealership and warehousing, reconstruct a parking lot, and add site improvements in the B-2
Zone. Allen and Major Associates, Inc. for 70 Keller Street, LLC.

9. SP2019-037
   Property located at 707 Chestnut Street (Tax Map 25, Lot 1), a change of use site plan
   application for the conversion of 4,271 SF of Financial and Professional Services offices to
   Medical Services offices in the R-2/PO Zone. Cronin, Bisson & Zalinsky, P.C. for Chestnut
   Office Group, LLC.

10. CU2019-018
    Property located at 707 Chestnut Street (Tax Map 25, Lot 1), a conditional use permit
    application for a reduction in required on-site parking in the R-2/PO Zone. Cronin, Bisson
    & Zalinsky, P.C. for Chestnut Office Group, LLC.

11. CU2019-022
    Property located at 20 Blaine Street (Tax Map TPK3, Lots 47, 48, and 49), a conditional
    use permit application for a reduction in required on-site parking, where 51 spaces are
    required and 40 spaces are provided in the B-2 Zone. Roberto Velez for Roger Ballard
    and Boyd Watkins.

12. CU2019-025
    Property located at 159 Frontage Road (Tax Map 873, Lot 15A), a conditional use permit
    application for a reduction in required on-site parking for the use of an indoor sports
    facility, where 120 spaces are required and 90 spaces are provided in the IND Zone. The
    Sports Mill.

   Ms. Trisiciani made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc, that the following
   applications do not have regional impact and do not require comment by the Manchester
   CU2019-025. (Motion Carried)

III. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

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

   Ms. Goucher advised the Minutes were not posted so the Board was unable to review them.
   Those will be reviewed at the next meeting.

2. Update of the Master Plan.

   Ms. Goucher said the Master Plan process was interesting and fun. There was a lot of
   positive energy and positive comments from the people who attended the Planapalooza.

   In addition to the Planapalooza going on at The Palace and The Double Tree, Ms. Goucher
said they also had a public hearing Monday night at The Oddfellows building for the HUD component of the HUD five year comprehensive plan, which she attended with one of the consultants who was in charge of data gathering and getting that information for the HUD plan. In her opinion, that was a very successful meeting for that component of the project.

Ms. Trisciani said overall it was a great event. She thought the Planning Board probably needs to do a better job when they get the draft and really get the word out to get as much input as possible because the key to making this whole plan successful is having public input.

Ms. Trisciani said she was incredibly impressed with the level of detail and knowledge they had coming into the Friday morning session. She thought they were incredibly thorough and very thoughtful and somehow pulled all of that together out of a lot of disparate meetings for Tuesday night’s presentation.

Ms. Goucher said they have already been airing the sessions. Public TV covered the Thursday night visioning session, the three sessions on Friday, the three sessions on Saturday, the event at The Oddfellows on Monday night and they covered the presentation on Tuesday evening. She encouraged the Board to try to catch at least the presentation.

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

**875 Elm Street**

Ms. Goucher advised that Red Oak purchased the former Citizens Bank building and they have proposed some changes to the awning as well as some signage on the building. A condition of the approval when it was granted a couple of years ago was that signage had to comply and be reviewed by the Planning Board at a business meeting.

Mr. O’Donoghue asked if the Red Oak sign on the side of the building conforms to Code. Ms. Goucher said if it doesn’t it would certainly have to get a variance. She thought it complied but she was not 100 percent certain. She said Manchester is fairly generous in the Central Business District so she had a sense it complies. The logo as they are proposing is what she thought the Board should take a look at.

Alderman asked if the one at the top on the side of the building was painted or if it was a sign. Ms. Goucher advised what they submitted said “channel letter set” so it is not painted. The Chairman said it was LED.

*Mr. Leclerc made a motion to accept the sign package as long as it is within the parameters of the City’s code, which was seconded by Chairman Harrington. (Motion Carried)*

**252 Willow Street (SP2019-010)**
Ms. Goucher said a few months ago the Board approved a project on Willow Street called *The Factory on Willow Street* - a project that looks to bring some apartments, artist lofts, retail uses, mixed uses and an outside amphitheater. At the time they presented the project they didn’t have all the details worked out and that was fairly clear during their presentation. They had an idea of the number of units, they had the square footage and with that application they also needed a conditional use permit for reduced parking, all of which the Board granted.

As is typical with the Planning Board’s approval, one of the conditions was that any material change needed to come back to the Planning Board at a public hearing. They are proposing a change and she advised the applicant she would bring it to the Board’s attention tonight. If the Board feels this is a material change that needs to have a new public hearing, then they will move forward in that direction but if they are comfortable with the change being handled administratively with staff, they will go in that direction. Ms. Goucher proceeded to describe the change.

Ms. Goucher reminded the Board that they were going to remove a back part of the southerly portion of the building. They have since determined that that portion of the building makes more sense to retain but they actually are going to remove a middle section in the back. It is almost a one for one in terms of the building area. Visually they are not proposing any changes from the front. The demand for parking will go down slightly so it will not affect any need for additional conditional use for parking reduction and they would like to work with the staff in trying to finalize it before we sign a plan.

Ms. Goucher showed the plan as approved and the area that was going to be removed versus the new area proposed to be removed.

Mr. Hebert advised he was going to abstain from voting on this and Mr. Curry voted in his place. None of the Board members expressed a concern about the change.

*Mr. Lussier made a motion to approve the modification as represented and the applicant to work with staff in getting the final plans ready for signature, which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani. (Motion Carried) (Abstained: Hebert)*

675 & 685 Coolidge Avenue (SP-19-2015)

Mr. Belanger advised that the Superior Court recently denied a motion for reconsideration on the Coolidge Avenue Estates’ appeal. As such, that is probably the end of the litigation unless the applicant/property owner appeals to the Supreme Court.

Chairman Harrington said the discussion the Board had regarding this particular motion to deny was helpful in the Court coming to that kind of a decision.

North Bedford Street/171 Spring Street (SP-30-2018)
Chairman Harrington said he has heard from some of the workers in the Millyard with the construction of the hotel, they are having issues with the sidewalk and trying to get to and from remote parking areas now that they have really blocked off Bedford Street. He asked if there was anything that could be done to make it a little bit better. He said people are actually walking on the railroad tracks. Ms. Trisciani said they are because some of them park in the Bedford Street lot at the Morgan Building and the only way to access is to either go all the way down, across the street and around and then back up again so they just walk on the railroad tracks to 150 Dow.

Ms. Goucher asked if there was anything the construction people could do to better address that. Ms. Trisciani didn’t believe so unfortunately because where they have to keep their safety area and where all their equipment is, there is really no other way. Most of the parking lot that is held for the Dow people is right on the Spring Street side so essentially they have to go out of the parking lot, walk down, cross Commercial Street, walk over and then there is a set of stairs that will bring them back up once they get past the parking lot.

Ms. Goucher said she would contact DPW to see if they could work with the construction company to see if there is any other solution. The Chairman asked if a portion of the fence could be opened so a path could be made. Mr. Leclerc said he would talk to Harvey and the superintendents tomorrow.

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

ATTEST: _____________________________________________________

Michael Harrington, Chairman
Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD:  November 21, 2019  ❑ With Amendment
❑ Without Amendment

The above minutes are a summary of the meeting and are not intended to be verbatim. Audiotapes are available in the Planning and Community Development office for a limited time.
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