

MANCHESTER PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING / LIMITED BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, March 5, 2020 – 6:00 PM
City Hall, Third Floor – Aldermanic Chambers

Members Present: Chairman Mike Harrington, Vice Chairman Michael O’Donoghue, June Trisciani, Robb Curry, Alderman Pat Long, Dan Leclerc, John St. Pierre, Andy Boyle

Alternate Present: Bryce Kaw-uh

Excused: Alternate: Chris Wellington, Barry Lussier

Staff Present: Pamela Goucher, Deputy Director Planning & Zoning; Jeffrey Belanger, Senior Planner; Jodie Nazaka, Planner

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

II. PUBLIC HEARING:

(New Items)

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

Mr. O’Donoghue made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc, that the following applications are complete and available for a public hearing: S2020-003, S2020-004, PDSP2020-001, PDSP2020-002. (Motion Carried)

1. **S2020-003**

Properties located at 271 Bodwell Road, an application to resolve an illegal subdivision and to adjust the common lot line between Tax Map 885, Lot 8 and Tax Map 885, Lot 9 by annexing 5,444 SF from Lot 9 to Lot 8 resulting in one lot of 20,440 SF and one lot of 32,675 SF in the R1-A Zoning District. Fieldstone Land Consultants for Elie Awad and Cawlin L Clough.

Mike Ploof, a land surveyor with Fieldstone Land Consultants was before the Board to present a subdivision and lot line revision of Tax Map parcel 885-8 owned by Cawlin Clough and 885-9 owned by Elie Awad. The purpose of the plan is to depict a subdivision between both those parcels and a subsequent lot line revision. The original area of Lot 885-8 was .34 acres with 75 feet of frontage and the final area will be .47 acres with 95 feet of frontage. The original area of 885-9 was .87 acres with 120 feet of frontage and the final area being .75 with 100 feet of frontage. Zoning for the site is R-1A, which requires 12,500 SF with 100 feet of frontage. They received a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment on November 20, 2019 allowing Lot 885-8 to have reduced frontage of 95 feet where 100 feet is required.

Mr. Ploof said there was some confusion in the past with regard to whether the two lots were

merged voluntarily or involuntarily. This plan is to clean up any confusion. If it was an illegal subdivision this plan will set the record straight.

Alderman Long asked for clarification of the current line. Mr. Ploof pointed that out on the plan as being the dashed purple line. The hatched area will be conveyed from the pink lot to the orange lot, which will make the orange lot a bit bigger allowing the existing driveway to be on its own lot without an easement. It will reduce the pink lot a little but they will still have 100 feet of frontage.

Ms. Trisciani asked if a portion of the driveway would still be shared. Mr. Ploof advised there will be a new curb cut from the road going into that new driveway.

Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

A representative of Jordan Family Trust appeared on behalf of his parents who are in Florida for the winter. They own the piece of property that would be on the upper part of the map. There is an area of uncertain title directly north of their lot. He was concerned as they have had problems in the past with that strip of property where trees were trees were cut unknowingly, unlawfully, etc. He said he would like the new line somehow officially marked while this job is being done so they won't have to pay for a surveyor later. As an abutter, he would like to know that piece of property with the garage is going to eventually have a house built on it.

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

Mr. Ploof said he spoke to the gentleman before and they intend on setting bounds on the new line. He said he could also agree to mark the corners while they are there to eliminate any confusion. Ms. Goucher said they would be required to set the bounds on that property if there are no bounds in place. That would be part of a normal condition this Board would put on.

Ms. Nazaka advised the applicant was before the Conservation Commission last night. Mr. Ploof said the main reason they were at the Conservation Commission was due to courtesy. They are not impacting any of the wetlands in the back. Everything is way up at the front of the lot. There 7-8 feet of elevation change from where the existing garage is to the back where the wetlands are. The ConComm didn't have any issues with this other than they requested they set wetlands placards along the delineated wetlands in the back.

To make it clear to the abutter that spoke, Ms. Goucher said by the surveyor of this property setting the markers on the corners as shown on the plan they are not lying claim to any of that area in dispute with this proposal. They are defining a lot area and the boundary based on their survey and that area in question is not being claimed by them on this proposal before the Board.

Alderman Long confirmed with Ms. Goucher that the area of uncertain title will remain an area of uncertain title and this proposal is not encroaching on that.

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

2. **S2020-004**

Property located at 605 Old Wellington Road (Tax Map 645A, Lot 6), an application to subdivide a lot of approximately 1.6 acres into three lots of 20,022 SF, 17,954 SF, and 31,887 SF in the R-SM Zoning District. *Granite Engineering for 605 Old Wellington Development, LLC.*

PDSP2020-001

Property located at 605 Old Wellington Road (Tax Map 645A, Lot 6A), an application to construct 5 townhouse units with associated site improvements on a newly subdivided lot totaling 17,954 SF in the R-SM Zoning District. *Granite Engineering for 605 Old Wellington Development, LLC.*

PDSP2020-002

Property located at 605 Old Wellington Road (Tax Map 645A, Lot 6B), an application to construct 8 townhouse units with associated site improvements on a newly subdivided lot totaling 31,887 SF in the R-SM Zoning District. *Granite Engineering for 605 Old Wellington Development, LLC.*

Jeff Merritt of Granite Engineering appeared along with Pierre and Julie Bouchard, the owners and applicants from Old Wellington Development LLC.

Mr. Merritt said they have three applications all relative to the property at 605 Old Wellington Road; a subdivision application and two site plan/planned development applications. The Bouchards purchased this property in August of last year and upon purchasing it they took steps to rectify some zoning issues. There was an illegal apartment that was constructed above the garage on the property. In November they were before this Board seeking an approval for a planned development, which would lawfully permit that apartment to remain on the property. They received approval from the Board in November and that project has been completed. They mentioned at the tail end of their meeting that they might be back because they were working on some master planning for this property that wasn't ready for the November meeting. It is ready tonight and they are back.

Mr. Merritt said they passed out three plan sets to each of the Board members. He said this is Lot 6, Map 645A. The parent parcel is roughly 1.6 acres in land area. They are in the RSM zoning district. This parcel has frontage on three roads; Karatzas Avenue to the north, to the west is Old Wellington Road and then to the south is Eastern Avenue. There is a house next to Old Wellington Road and a garage that has a unit above it. Access to the property right now is from Old Wellington Road only. There is a single curb cut there.

With the subdivision Mr. Merritt said they are proposing to split this lot into three different parcels. The house, garage/apartment and driveway would remain on one lot and then they would create a second and third lot; one to the north and one to the south. The center lot (labeled as Lot 6 on the plan) will have the existing house and garage on it. The parcel would be about .46 acres in land area. Access would be in the same location that it is today off of Old Wellington Road. The house and garage all remain on that center parcel.

Mr. Merritt said the new lot to the north (labeled as Lot 6A) is about the same land area being .4 acres. That lot will have frontage on Old Wellington Road and Karatzas Avenue but access will be from Karatzas Avenue only. The third lot they are proposing is to the south of where the house is. That parcel (labeled as Lot 6B) also has dual frontage on Eastern Avenue and Old Wellington Road. The lot is about $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre in land area and access will be off of Old Wellington Road as opposed to Eastern Avenue.

Lot 6A Proposal – Stone Ledge Townhomes

Mr. Merritt reiterated this is the lot to the north at the corner of Karatzas Avenue and Old Wellington Road. He referred to sheet two of the plan set labeled Stone Ledge Townhomes, which is their site plan that illustrates the overall proposal. The intent is to construct five townhomes on the property. They would be split between two buildings; a two-unit building and a three-unit building. Access will be from Karatzas Avenue only. These are traditional townhouse units with garages underneath and then two floors of living above that. In addition to the parking in the garage of the townhouse they have exterior parking as well with two spaces in each of the driveways associated with the units. Obviously this is a new development so there are new utilities. They are using a closed drainage system along with a stormwater filtration system to both treat and mitigate the impact associated with the development. For sewer and water new utilities will be extended to this site; water comes off a main in Karatzas and sewer comes off the main in Old Wellington Road. They have a limited amount of lighting proposed on the site; one at the intersection of the driveway and one at the tail end of the parcel to light the common area throughout the development.

With regard to the architectural, Mr. Merritt said they are identical on both projects. He referred to a rendering that the applicant put together to show what the units look like in a three dimensional rendering and to also illustrate the face of the building that will be viewed from Karatzas Avenue. One of the comments they had after the initial submittal was that the elevation that faced Karatzas Avenue did not have windows on it so the applicant added six windows to dress up that elevation. From this elevation you can see the garage below has a dormered front and a man door on the left of the garage door. Below that is some hard line drawings of the very traditional townhouse units with a garage and man door on the first floor and then two floors of living above. On the rear side of the buildings each unit will have a deck. The first floor of living will have a kitchen and dining/living room along with a bathroom. The top floor will have a master bedroom with two smaller bedrooms to it and a full bathroom.

Eastern Crossing Townhomes

Mr. Merritt advised that Eastern Crossing is on the corner of Eastern Avenue and Old Wellington Road. He referred to the site plan (sheet C2) and said it was very similar in terms of unit style. They are the same footprint. The configuration of how many units are in each building is different. Here they have a three unit and a five unit building. The site to the north had five units and this development would have eight units. Similar to the other plan they have internal parking spaces in the garage and then two additional spaces exterior to the garage as well. Access is from Old Wellington Road as opposed to Eastern Avenue. When they started this project access was actually proposed off of Eastern Avenue. They did some

design on that layout and then they also went out and did some test pits on the site and they found that given where ledge is out there it was advantageous to pick a spot where the driveway could come in at a higher elevation and have a longer driveway so they could get this development up higher on the lot, which would reduce the amount of cut on the site. There will also be a closed drainage system out here. There will be a pond on the corner of Eastern Avenue and Old Wellington into a filtration system. It mitigates their peak rate of runoff and it also treats their stormwater. Sewer and water are all new utilities to the site. Both come off Old Wellington Road and are brought up through the heart of the site. There will be modest amounts of light. They have one towards the driveway entrance onto Old Wellington, one at the corner as you come up around the curve and then one at the very tail end which helps illuminate the way coming up. All lighting proposed is ten feet. They are carriage style and are full cut off. The architecture is the same thing. The side of the building facing Eastern would have six windows and would be seen from Eastern Avenue, which was again a request of staff upon submittal.

Alderman Long asked if the Fire Department has commented yet. Mr. Merritt said they had one comment, which was that the units needed to be sprinkled.

Alderman Long asked about sidewalks. Mr. Bouchard said sidewalks are a big cost issue that they are trying to get a handle on and what they can do to be accommodating without breaking the bank is the major concern. He advised Mr. Merritt has been working with DPW to get some input and Mr. Bouchard said what they would like to do is offer something a little bit less than a full scale sidewalk around the entire property, which he said was kind of weird that was where their starting point was. There was a comment from somebody from the school system that indicated their primary concern was Old Wellington. Mr. Bouchard said they are looking to do a fairly modest development. There are substantial developments all around them including building probably 200 yards down the road that is probably 20-30 units and they were not required to do sidewalks at all on Old Wellington. There are no sidewalks on Old Wellington. He said they are not opposed to it but they would like a little fairness.

Mr. Merritt said they touched base with DPW this week primarily to discuss the sidewalk but they also discussed the comments. In talking with them they discussed the topography out on Old Wellington Road. The typical Manchester sidewalk section includes curb, a grass panel and then a sidewalk. In this instance, they talked to DPW whether it would be acceptable to omit the grass panel in between which would save excessive excavation along the frontage of Old Wellington Road and DPW did not object to that. They also talked to them about curbing. In this area and on Old Wellington specifically, there is bituminous curb and along Eastern Avenue there is concrete curb. The typical requirement granite curb. They talked with Mr. Friend Gray from DPW about the possibility of maintaining the curb that is out there today and building the sidewalk adjacent to that and he was not opposed to that. From their perspective, Mr. Merritt said a potential compromise here that would achieve the network that the City is looking for and would kind of mitigate some of the costs would be construction of the sidewalk from Eastern Avenue and Old Wellington from that intersection along Old Wellington to the intersection of Karatzas. He said hopefully that would meet the intent of what the School District was trying to get in terms of walkability. DPW was aware of the cost associated with replacing the curb out there and didn't seem opposed to that sort of compromise.

With it being only one way in, Alderman Long was concerned about Lot 6A because kids would be walking down Karatzas with no sidewalk. Mr. Bouchard said they are looking to focus on Old Wellington Road.

Mr. Belanger asked for clarification on the curbing. Mr. Merritt said there is concrete curbing on Eastern Avenue, which DPW does not like. Along Old Wellington is bituminous curbing. He explained they talked to Mr. Friend-Gray about retaining the curbing that was out there and putting the sidewalk on the back side of the existing curbing instead of ripping up the street and putting granite curbing in there and Mr. Friend-Gray said that would be a better solution than no sidewalk out there.

Mr. Belanger advised that the Board's regulations require a ten foot wide sidewalk; either a four foot grass panel plus a six foot walk or the ten foot sidewalk with street trees and tree grades. If they are looking to minimize that, which he understands based on the topography that would require a waiver. The other thing is the Board requires vertical granite curbing in the right-of-way, which DPW standard specifications also requires. The Board's regulations also require that the Board shall mandate a sidewalk if it is a continuation of an existing sidewalk, which this would be in this case because it is coming off of Eastern Avenue.

Chairman Harrington asked Mr. Merritt if he was asking verbally for waivers from those requirements. Mr. Merritt said they submitted this with no sidewalks proposed at all. The comments came back requesting it and acknowledging that the Board has the right to ask for it. If the Board decides that it is appropriate to have sidewalks then they would request that section be waived down to something of a compromise. The Chairman recommended, if they are asking for some relief, that they do it in writing ahead of the next hearing.

With regard to Mr. Merritt stating that DPW was okay with the bituminous curbing on Old Wellington, Ms. Goucher asked if the reveal was high enough to protect kids walking there. Mr. Merritt believed so and stated that they could measure it. He said it is high berm, which is bituminous, but it has a higher berm and it appears to be that. He thought there would be enough for it to support a sidewalk behind it but he would have to measure it to be fully sure.

Chairman Harrington asked if they were going to have either a monument sign or signage out in front at the driveway. Mr. Bouchard said they were not anticipating doing that at this time.

The Chairman asked if the townhouses are going to have sprinkler systems. Mr. Merritt said that was a comment they received the other day from the Fire Department so they will need to be sprinkled.

Chairman Harrington asked how they were planning in both of these to handle snow removal. He asked if there was a stacked area somewhere. Mr. Merritt said it is pretty traditional in that they have areas around the perimeter that are identified for snow storage. In a year like this he said it would certainly be fine, but in record years it would be like any other site that it would have to be removed offsite.

Chairman Harrington asked about trash pickup. Mr. Merritt said there is a note on both plans that it has to be private so containers would be kept inside and it has to be picked up by a

private trash company; it is not the responsibility of the City. The Chairman asked if they were planning to have a dumpster and Mr. Merritt said they were not.

Chairman Harrington asked if the units would be rentals or if they would be sold. Mr. Bouchard said they are working through the financial aspects of this right now. Their first goal would be to have a single investor/buyer for some number of the units. He and his wife would actually like to end up owning some number of the units themselves at the end of the project.

Ms. Trisciani said she assumed the drawings they provided were just examples of what they would be doing and they would update those to accurately reflect what they are building on the property. Mr. Bouchard said the plans the Board was looking at were plans from Alternative Designs. The plans are a four unit construct and they are stepped. They don't have a four unit building onsite. The idea is that each of the units will be identical to this but they will need to get Alternative Designs to engineer three separate buildings; a two unit, a three unit that is stepped and a five unit that is stepped. They are envisioning a two foot step would make most sense for the five unit building to have perhaps two two-foot steps along that building. Ms. Trisciani said she would like to see what they are actually going to build.

Ms. Trisciani asked if there was going to be some kind of association or covenants because once you put people in there you are kind of setting up a free for all for where trash can go and who is controlling that it stays in the garage and that they have to hire a private contractor so things don't pile up. Mr. Bouchard reiterated that they are trying to work through all this to try to understand exactly what the financial side of this is going to be. He said they are going to be designed as individual units so one potential way to approach at least the eight units on this building is to make this into a condominium. If they were to do that then the condominium association would have all of those bylaws in place. It is a high probability right now but without getting to the point where they can approach a single investor who might be interested in acquiring the whole thing and make those decisions themselves that is why they are a little bit stymied at this point. It's just where they are in the process. If they are not going to condo it, she said she would have them seriously consider and look for where they would put a dumpster on site to control trash.

Ms. Trisciani said on one of their plans it looked like the driveway entrance on Karatzas Avenue they are using hay bales as a barrier. Mr. Merritt advised that was for erosion control during construction.

In their consideration for a condo, Mr. Long asked if it was for both lots or if they would be single associations wherein 6-A would be one and 6-B would be one. Mr. Bouchard said they would be separate.

Chairman Harrington asked if what they represented to the Board was not actually what they are going to build because it is not the right increments of units but the depictions are what they are planning to build with the pitched roofs. Mr. Bouchard said "absolutely". Ms. Bouchard advised that they have already given Alternative Designs a retainer to do that work. The Chairman asked if they were given a timeframe of how long it would take them to complete something like that. Mr. Bouchard said it would be approximately 3-4 weeks.

Ms. Goucher inquired if the renderings they got from Alternative Designs were based on the 22-1/2 x 30-32 size. Mr. Bouchard said the plans from Alternative Designs are exactly what as shown in the footprint and the façade is exactly as their plan.

In looking at the landscape plan, Ms. Trisciani asked if it was accurate that all they are considering is the required minimum of shade trees. Mr. Bouchard said what they haven't figured out is the beds around the buildings themselves. There are some opportunities for plantings but they just haven't figured it out. Ms. Trisciani said that was another step they need to take and show the Board what their other plans are because right now it is a little bit light.

Mr. O'Donoghue confirmed with Mr. Merritt that all utilities would be underground. The only overhead they have is to get power from Old Wellington Road across to their side of the road. It drops there then it goes underground, but the service for the utility would be underground.

Mr. Belanger said on the plan they are showing right now they have a sewer manhole shown at the top of the parking lot. It looked like it was half on the pavement and half off the pavement. He asked if they were intending for it to be half on and half off. Mr. Merritt said it is likely that when they addressed some of the comments that they pulled the pavement back five feet to maintain that buffer. He said he would look at it because you wouldn't want the manhole on the curb line. They would either pull it fully in or fully out.

From the way the plans were drafted Mr. Belanger said it looked like there was a line that was going over a setback line and the Zoning Review Officer had an issue with that. Mr. Merritt said they would fix it.

The Chairman Harrington turned the hearing over to the public.

Dale Keddie of 645 Old Wellington Road, which is a small condominium complex. They are concerned where the entrance and exit on Karatzas Avenue will be and if headlights will be shining into their property. She asked if there were any plans to make some type of barrier on Karatzas Avenue by the sidewalk so that wouldn't impair their property. She asked if the house and garage are occupied. She asked if the pool would not remain and Ms. Goucher said that was correct. She advised the Board to go out and take a drive around the property to see how the condos would be placed to be sure there is enough room for them to be built because it looks really tight, especially on Karatzas Avenue. She would like to know who would own the units. They were also concerned about lighting from the development would shine onto their property. If and when this is approved, she asked if there would be blasting. She was also concerned about construction equipment coming in and out from the site.

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

Mr. Merritt pointed out that there was a significant buffer and he thought it was a reasonable place to put a driveway and he didn't think it was anything out of the ordinary to have a driveway in that location. He thought there was good screening on the adjacent parcel.

With regard to whether or not the house and garage are occupied, Mr. Bouchard said the apartment above the garage is currently occupied. The house is not occupied and they are looking for a renter.

Mr. Merritt said because the pool is deemed a structure and it would be across a property line it has to go. One of the sheds on the property that exists today has to be moved out of a rear property setback. There are two accessory structures; one is a shed and the other is a treehouse on the lot off of Eastern Avenue that have to come down as well. There is also a minor modification to the stairs on the deck that have to be made to facilitate that.

Mr. Merritt pointed out the location of two single lights which are carriage style lights, ten foot full cutoff fixtures. He showed an illumination plan showing that there is no spillage of lighting onto the adjacent property across the street.

Mr. Merritt said there would likely be blasting at least for the southern development that dictated the way they took access to that property in order to get it as high on the property as they could. For things like sewer lines, water lines, etc. it is likely that there will be some trench blasting.

Chairman Harrington asked if blasting were to occur they will have a certified company go through all the protocols. Mr. Merritt said blasting is heavily regulated so not anybody can blast. There will be a blasting company that would come out depending on the charge and the proximity of the houses, etc. they would necessarily do a blast survey if it warranted it, if the requirements were met to do a blast survey. It is a well-regulated side of construction. The Chairman asked about hammer drilling. Mr. Merritt said that was another option and it really depends on how much they have to remove and the type of ledge that it is.

With construction Mr. Merritt said there are trucks that come in and out. They have an erosion control plan set up. Part of that is defining where the trucks come in and out. There is a stabilized construction exit and erosion controls in place during construction. He said there will be a period where the roads are utilized with some construction vehicles and trade vehicles.

Chairman Harrington asked if they did any calculations on cut and fills, how much they would have to bring in and what would stay onsite. Mr. Merritt said they haven't but those could be done. They didn't do the cuts and fills because basically they tried to maximize the height. On the southern development one of the reasons they took the access off of Old Wellington versus Eastern Avenue is because Old Wellington is topographically higher and by pulling a driveway off of Old Wellington Road they can get a longer driveway, which means they can climb grade for a longer distance, which puts the development up higher, which reduces the cut. He said they did their level best to minimize construction costs out there.

Chairman Harrington asked for clarification on the turning radiuses. Mr. Merritt said the dimensions are very similar to what there is with a commercial development where there is a 22 foot access aisle and then they would be what would be a parking space of 18-1/2 feet and then an extra four feet between the face of the parking space and the physical building itself. That is a standard dimension in the City for making parking spaces accessible. This is a

traditional layout so they do not expect an issue with turning movements.

Chairman Harrington asked who will own this development if some day it turns into a condo and a condo association. Mr. Bouchard pointed out this will be their third development in the City of Manchester. They have done condos in the past so they are very familiar with the process and they know exactly how to get that done and get it done effectively if they decide that is the route they are going to take. It is just a matter of getting to that point.

Chairman Harrington inquired which other projects they own. Mr. Bouchard said the first project he did was Bridgewell Farms, which is 1,000 feet from this project as the crow flies on the corner of Bridge Street and Mammoth Road. That was a 13 unit townhouse style development and they were condos. The other development is about a mile away; Mammoth Oaks, further north on Mammoth Road and it has nine detached single family units. That was a project they started in 2007 and finished 2016. They were both condominium projects.

Mr. Boyle asked if headlights from cars exiting the site would go into the condominiums. Mr. Merritt pointed out the driveway and advised you would come to a stop sign on this development's property and then you would take a right or a left depending on where you want to go. There would be an instantaneous point where there would be headlights shining across the road, however, there is significant vegetation out there as well as a separation between that area and the units.

Chairman Harrington advised Mr. Merritt if they were going to request relief on certain items it would be better that the Board get it earlier in the process so they have a couple days to review it and perhaps go to the site and take a look at the impact of those waivers.

Ms. Trisciani said she would still like to understand what they plan for covenants for the association and things like that.

Mr. Kaw-uh asked if there was a particular reason the driveway at Eastern Crossing exits out towards Wellington instead of just directly south. Mr. Merritt said it has to do with topography.

Chairman Harrington kept this hearing open to March 19, 2020. No further notice to abutters.

Chairman Harrington closed the March 5, 2020 public hearing.

III. LIMITED BUSINESS MEETING:

Chairman Harrington called to order the limited business meeting of the Manchester Planning

Board of March 5, 2020.

1. **S2020-003**

Properties located at 271 Bodwell Road, an application to resolve an illegal subdivision and to adjust the common lot line between Tax Map 885, Lot 8 and Tax Map 885, Lot 9 by annexing 5,444 SF from Lot 9 to Lot 8 resulting in one lot of 20,440 SF and one lot of 32,675 SF in the R1-A Zoning District. *Fieldstone Land Consultants for Elie Awad and Cawlin L Clough.*

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

On a lot line change, Chairman Harrington asked if the Board would have them pin and identify every boundary of that lot. Ms. Goucher advised that both parcels have to have markers at the corners. Mr. Belanger advised that was a requirement in the regulations that all corners need to be marked. Ms. Nazaka believed the surveyor indicated that they are not there currently.

Ms. Goucher said they are not going to have anyone put markers on the questionable land unless that is accurately surveyed and then if Mr. Jodoïn hires somebody and they come up with something different then that is a civil matter between the two parties. She thought by putting the markers on the northerly line, which is required of the surveyor, if that person who potentially buys the house on that lot start encroaching over into the parcel in question there is probably some legitimate “well here is the markers right now”. It would be worse if the area in question was trying to be grabbed by the person that is doing this property subdivision. That is not what is happening. Ms. Nazaka said it also sounded like what Mr. Jodoïn was saying is that the current survey before the Board shows that he owns more land than he thought he did so she did not believe he was upset.

Chairman Harrington advised that everyone can vote on this.

Alderman Long made a motion to approve S2020-003 per staff recommendations, which was seconded by Ms. Trisciani. (Motion Carried)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Conditional approval of this plan shall be valid for one year, during which time all conditions precedent to final approval shall be completed and plans shall be submitted for final approval;
2. The applicant shall obtain final approval from all reviewing agencies, including Planning staff, prior to submitting plans for signing and recording the subdivision plan;
3. All new boundary monuments are to be set before submitting plans for signing and recording;

4. New parking for the existing single-family house shall be constructed prior to submitting plans for final approval, and the existing pavement on Lot 9 shall be removed, eliminating the connection between the two lots;
5. Prior to submitting plans for signing and recording, placards noting the presence of wetlands shall be installed at intervals no greater than 50 feet along the edge of the wetlands on both proposed lots;
6. A school impact fee of \$4,589 per single-family unit and fire impact fee of \$571 shall be paid prior to a CO for any new single-family dwelling unit on Lot 9;
7. All conditions subsequent to approval shall be depicted on the final plan for recording;
8. All material changes to the approved plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board at a public hearing;
9. The surveyor 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) prior to signing the plans;
10. To submit plans for final approval, the applicant shall submit one mylar for recording, one set of mylars to remain on file with the Planning Department, and five complete paper sets;
11. The surveyor shall provide the HCRD recorded plan number to the Planning Department within 30 days of final approval; and,
12. Should any condition precedent or subsequent to this approval not be met in the time periods provided 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.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

1. **Review and approval of the Planning Board Minutes of January 2, 2020, January 16, 2020 and February 6, 2020.**

Mr. Curry advised that he reviewed the Minutes of January 2, 2020 and January 16, 2020. There were only minor corrections to be made and those were provided to the staff.

Mr. O'Donoghue made a motion to approve the Planning Board Minutes of January 2, 2020 and January 16, 2020, which was seconded by Mr. Leclerc. (Motion Carried)

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

Alderman Long asked if anybody would like training from the Municipal Association. Ms. Goucher said that it is a full day event. There is also the opportunity to get the Municipal Association to come in and do a two hour overview. They did one in the last year or so for the Zoning Board. She said staff likes to encourage Board members to obtain additional education or training.

Ms. Goucher asked if the Board would prefer to see if the Municipal Association would come and do their two hour presentation as opposed to taking time to go to the day-long event they have. She advised she would get the information to the Board at the next meeting as to what their options are.

Ms. Goucher advised there were a fair amount of applications, including a couple that are the remands back from the Courts and she suspected they may take some time as far as the hearing goes. As such, if it is okay with the Board she suggested that they split April into two public hearings. Chairman Harrington advised he would leave that up to staff to determine that.

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

ATTEST: _____

Michael Harrington, Chairman
Manchester Planning Board

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD:

With Amendment
 Without Amendment

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

Transcription by Lori Moone, Planning & Community Development