



CITY OF MANCHESTER

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Planning & Land Use Management
Building Regulations
Community Improvement Program
Zoning Board of Adjustment

Leon L. LaFreniere, AICP
Director

Pamela H. Goucher, AICP
Deputy Director Planning & Zoning

Michael J. Landry, PE, Esq.
Deputy Director Building Regulations

MANCHESTER ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING / BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES Thursday, May 7, 2020 – 6:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: Chairman Robert Breault, Vice Chairman Jose Lovell, Michael Simoneau, Joe Prieto, Alderman Jim Roy

Alternates Present: Alderman Keith Hirschmann, Guy Guerra

Excused: Anne Ketterer

City Staff Present: Michael Landry, Deputy Director of Building Regulations
Sheila McCarran, Administrative Assistant II

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

II. PUBLIC HEARING:

(Current Items)

Michael Landry announced that the applicant for case ZBA2020-018, 205 and 211 Second Street, has requested the case be postponed to the next scheduled hearing which will be on June 11, 2020 at 6:00 pm. No further notice will go out and we are assuming that that will be a virtual meeting on that date and if that changes, new notices will be sent out.

1. **ZBA2020-013**
118 South Lincoln Street, R-2 Zoning District, Ward 9

Fernando Hilarion proposes to maintain a 6' high vinyl fence in the street yard where 4' is allowed, with a portion located within the required visual clearance area on corner lots and seeks a variance from sections **8.27(B)** Fences Walls and **8.27(E)** Visibility at Corners of the

One City Hall Plaza, Manchester, New Hampshire 03101
Phone: (603) 624-6450 or (603) 624-6475 Fax: (603) 624-6529 or (603) 624-6324
E-Mail: pcd@manchesternh.gov
www.manchesternh.gov

Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as per documents submitted through March 4, 2020.

Fernando Hilarion of 129 Rochelle Avenue said his case is very simple and straightforward. He said he would just like to maintain the 6' vinyl fence that was erected a long time ago. He said when he purchased the property in the middle of last year, the property was like that. He said it was through the City Inspector that he found out that the fence had been erected without any permits.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the Board.

Guy Guerra said Mr. Hilarion mentioned that the fence was up prior to him purchasing the property and he just wanted to confirm that. Chairman Breault said yes it was.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board and the Chairman asked if there was anyone in attendance wishing to speak in favor of or in opposition to this application or those with general comments to speak. No one came forward to this request.

Michael Landry said there was a voice message in favor of this application and the audio was played.

John Spezeski said he is the neighbor right next door at 171 Holly Avenue. He said he and his wife, Samantha, are in favor of this application and they think Mr. Hilarion should absolutely be able to keep his fence. Mr. Spezeski said he likes the fence and this house was rotting for so many years and someone bought it and now they are redoing the whole thing and he is so glad that they are redoing it. He said he hopes that everything works out with this. He has no problem with someone having a 6' fence in their front yard.

There were no further comments from the public and the Chairman closed the public hearing. Chairman Breault turned the hearing back over to the Board.

Guy Guerra asked if from looking at this property on the drawing, was it a corner lot? Chairman Breault said it is a corner lot. Mr. Guerra said the applicant has two front yards there. Chairman Breault said that was correct.

Michael Landry said if people were wondering, the right of way is wider than the pavement so his property ends and he still has some grass that he maintains. He said when we talk about being in that visual clearance area, it is just clipping it. It is probably less than four feet and it doesn't go close to the road.

Alderman Roy said he was down at this property and Mr. Landry is correct. It really doesn't go out and obstruct the view. He said it has been there for quite a while and he doesn't see any problem with this request.

Chairman Breault said he concurs with Alderman Roy and it is a four-way stop there so you

are forced to stop at the intersection. He said you have a pretty good visual up Holly Avenue.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he just wanted to confirm what everybody else was saying. He said he believes this meets the five criteria. He said his only issue was with the sight distance but after visiting this site, he agrees that it is not obstructing the view.

Michael Simoneau said he agreed with the other Board Members and he supports this request.

Jose Lovell made a motion to grant the following variance counts for case ZBA2020-013, 8.27(B) Fences Walls and 8.27(E) Visibility at Corners which was seconded by Michael Simoneau.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the variance was granted.

2. **ZBA2020-014**
126 Thornton Street, R-2 Zoning District, Ward 11

John and Sandra Skora propose to maintain two front yard parking spaces within the front yard setback and within 4' of the front lot line, maintain an existing shed located 2' away from the north side lot line and allow accessory structures to occupy 39% of the rear yard area, where 25% is allowed and seek a variance from sections **10.09(B)** Parking Setbacks and **8.29(A)3** Accessory Structures and Uses (2 counts), of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as per documents submitted through March 6, 2020.

John Skora was unable to connect to speak to the Board. Chairman Breault said Mr. Skora is in attendance but not able to speak.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the Board.

Alderman Roy said he was at this property yesterday and as he was looking over the property, Mr. Skora came out and was gracious enough to explain everything to him. He said He could tell the Board what is going on. Alderman Roy said most the fence that he is talking about already exists. He said Mr. Skora wants to change it to a nice vinyl fence and he also wants to close in around the existing driveway which has been there since 1989. Mr. Skora said he and his wife are getting older and they have two dogs and they don't want to be chasing them down the street.

Alderman Roy said as far as the back shed, it has been there for a long time as well as the above ground pool. He said both the properties, behind the pool and on the left hand side of

the house is a dead end. There are no abutters. The only abutter is to the right hand side by the shed. He is just trying to improve the aesthetics of his property and like he said, everything is already existing, the driveway, the pool and the shed and he just wants to change that fence because it is getting beaten up and then enclose the rest of the yard so he doesn't have to worry about the dogs getting out.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he was originally going to ask Chairman Breault if the Board should bump this case beyond the next case, but he thinks Alderman Roy made a fairly good argument. He said he just had a question. He said it seems like these folks came out for a fence permit which is in conformance and they were hit with some violations for some existing non-conforming issues. Alderman Roy said that was correct. Vice Chairman Lovell said it seems fairly open and shut. He said he likes that Alderman Roy was able to get out there and speak with the applicant in person and relay some of his wishes.

Chairman Breault said he also visited there today and he had the occasion to speak to Mr. Skora. He said it was basically the same story that Alderman Roy had. He said Mr. Skora is looking for the ability to fence in his property. He said he didn't see an issue with this as it is a dead end street and this property has been in his wife's family in excess of seventy years.

Chairman Breault asked the Board Members what their thoughts were on moving forward with this case. Vice Chairman Lovell said he would like to move on with this case.

Guy Guerra said it looks on the drawing that it is an existing drive to be a common drive. He asked if someone could explain that to him. Chairman Breault said he did have this property explained to him. He said this used to be the property of Mrs. Skora's father. He broke off the property to the south of it and built a home and a garage and subdivided the lot. He said he guesses you could say they have use of it because they own both properties and it is not designed necessarily to be a common drive. They use that parking in the front and they would like to continue to use that parking in the front of the property and leave the existing two-car garage and that other common drive to the home. Mr. Guerra said that makes sense.

Chairman Breault invited those in favor of or in opposition to this application or those with general comments to speak. No one came forward to this request.

Michael Landry said he just called and spoke with Mr. Skora and he has been listening to the conversation and he is unable to connect to the audio. He said there have been no comments about this case either in favor or in opposition.

Chairman Breault closed the public hearing and turned the hearing back over to the Board.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he wanted to check with Michael Landry to see if he is hearing from the applicant that he doesn't have anything else to say and does he agree with everything that the Board has said so far. Mr. Landry said he would call Mr. Skora and ask him.

Vice Chairman Lovell said the note for the existing drive to be used as a common drive, he assumed that that is just from an old plan and not a part of this case. Chairman Breault said that is correct. He said Mr. Skora represented to him today that he would prefer to leave that driveway committed to the other home and he would rather use the two spaces that they have in front of the property and maintain those.

Jim Roy made a motion to grant the following variance counts for case ZBA2020-014, 10.09(B) Parking Setbacks and 8.29(A)3 Accessory Structures and Uses (2 counts) which was seconded by Jose Lovell.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the variance was granted.

3. **ZBA2020-015**
71 Trenton Street, R-1B Zoning District, Ward 1

Ronald Losier proposes to create a third parking space in the street yard setback where one is allowed, with a driveway width of 36' where 24' is allowed and seeks a variance from sections **10.08(C)** Driveway Width, **10.09(B)** Parking Setbacks and **10.09(B)2** Parking Setbacks, of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as per documents submitted through March 17, 2020.

Ronald Losier of 71 Trenton Street said he would like to propose an additional parking spot indicated in orange on the map. He said what he is hoping to do is alleviate some on street parking on Ray Street. He said they have three vehicles of their own and his daughter and son-in-law visit often and they have family that visits often. They often times have to park cars on Ray Street. That certainly presents a problem during the winter months with snow banks on both sides. It makes Ray Street pretty narrow. He said an additional parking spot would allow them to keep their vehicles off of the street and maintain through traffic. That is why he is requesting the additional parking spots.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the Board.

Chairman Breault said part of his submission lists abutters and he asked Mr. Losier if he had approval from all of his abutters with the exception of Mr. Proulx. Mr. Losier said he did. He said that is a new construction on Ray Street and has recently been purchased. He said obviously, he wasn't able to get the new owner's signature.

Guy Guerra said that Mr. Losier is asking for a third parking space where one is allowed. He asked if there was a variance given for the second parking space. Michael Landry said if this Board was to grant this variance, it would encompass what the Board is looking at on the

plan. He said both of those spaces lead to a garage he believes. Mr. Losier said they do. He said the green area is right in front of the two car garage. Mr. Guerra said that is exactly what he was looking for. He just wanted to make sure that was a garage because it is not laid out on the picture and he didn't know if it was a garage or if he was pulling right up to the house. Ronald Losier said the house is a raised ranch so the garage is underneath the house.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the public and invited those either in favor of or in opposition to this application or anyone with general comments to speak. No one came forward to speak. He asked staff if there was any correspondence received by staff. Mr. Landry said there was no correspondence. The Chairman turned the hearing back over to the Board.

Vice Chairman Lovell asked Mr. Losier if he was aware of any other driveways in the area that are 36' wide like this. Mr. Losier said he is not aware of any. Vice Chairman Lovell said he used to live in the area on North Adams Street down closer to Webster Street in the more crowded part of it. He said parking on the street really isn't so bad even in the winter. He said he doesn't believe this fits the character of the neighborhood. He said he didn't see any other driveways in the area that were this wide and coupled with the fact that there are two garage parking spaces he didn't see the hardship here.

Alderman Roy asked Mr. Losier how many cars he could park in his garage. Mr. Losier said one of the parking areas in the garage is storage for an antique car. He said he uses the other garage often as a workshop. He said he has a table saw and most of the time they will park both his car and his wife's car outside. The additional parking space would allow for someone else to park off of the street in that spot. Alderman Roy said he understood that, but he does have two parking spaces inside as well. Mr. Losier said yes, but one is taken up with the antique car and the other is often taken up with power tools but when push comes to shove, he could move the tools aside and put a car in there if he had to. Alderman Roy said he agreed with Vice Chairman Lovell that he doesn't think that it matches the character of the neighborhood.

Chairman Breault said he did have a little bit of a problem similar to Vice Chairman Lovell with this and he agrees with him that he didn't see any other driveways this wide in the neighborhood.

Jose Lovell made a motion to deny the following variance counts for case ZBA2020-015, 10.08(C) Driveway Width, 10.09(B) Parking Setbacks and 10.09(B)2 Parking Setbacks which was seconded by Jim Roy.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the variance was denied.

There was discussion among the Board Members as to voting to grant a variance for the second space in the front yard setback. The Board decided to vote on count 10.09(B).

Jose Lovell made a motion to grant the following variance count for case ZBA2020-015, 10.09(B) Parking Setbacks, for the second space in the driveway which was seconded by Jim Roy.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the variance was granted.

4. **ZBA2020-016**
738 Hooksett Road, B-2 Zoning District, Ward 8

John Sokul (Agent) proposes construct an urgent care facility with front yard setbacks of 11' along Hooksett Road and 15' along Campbell Street where 20' is required, with a side yard setback of 7.8' where 20' is required, with a free standing sign 0.5' from the front lot line where 5' is required, with a parking area with less the required 10' landscape perimeter, with less than the required 25' buffer between the B-2 and R1-A zoning districts, as well as parking spaces within 4' of the proposed building and a trash enclosure within the side yard setback and seeks a variance from sections **6.03(A)** Front Yard Setback - Hooksett Road, **6.03(A)** Street Yard Setback – Campbell Street, **6.03(C)** Side Yard Setback, **9.09(A)1** Signs, **10.07(G)** Landscaping, **6.08(A)** Screening Buffers, **8.29(B)** Accessory Structures and Uses and **10.09(A)** Parking Setbacks of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as per documents submitted through March 17, 2020.

John Sokul said he was an attorney at Hinckley Allen and an agent for the applicant. He said as Mr. Landry said, this is at the corner of Campbell Street and Hooksett Road. It is an existing closed down and boarded up Cumberland Farms site and it is proposed to be redeveloped and revitalized into a new Convenient MD facility. Attorney Sokul said the project team was present here tonight to speak briefly to the application. He said with him tonight was Michael d'Hemecourt who is from the developer, Harbor Light Advisors, David Sanderson from Convenient MD and Jesse Johnson from Bohler Engineering, the Civil and Design Engineers. Attorney Sokul said Michael d'Hemecourt would speak next.

Michael d'Hemecourt said as Attorney Sokul mentioned, one of the exciting parts of this project is being able to get rid of an eyesore. He said you've got a run down, boarded up former gas station that will be removed for an attractive Urgent Care facility, Convenient MD. Mr. d'Hemecourt said Convenient MD is very community focused and will be a great partner for the City far beyond the services they provide. He said they have really built a great reputation in New Hampshire and the surrounding states.

Mr. d'Hemecourt said on the development itself, they had a great meeting with the Planning Department back in February and heeded their advice on the design of the site. He said they placed the building up on Hooksett Road away from the residential and wetlands in the back. Referring to the plan shown on the screen, Mr. d'Hemecourt said on C-301, there is a curb cut on Hooksett Road and they are closing the curb cut on Hooksett Road creating a safer traffic pattern for cars entering and exiting the site from both directions to be able to utilize the signalized intersection. He said this will also create significantly less traffic than its former use. Mr. d'Hemecourt said David Sanderson from Convenient MD would speak next.

David Sanderson said he is the Real Estate Director for Convenient MD. He said they are an urgent care company based in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. He said they started in 2012 and they presently have 24 open clinics operating in New Hampshire, Maine and Massachusetts. He said there are nearby clinics in Bedford, Windham and Concord. What sets them apart from other urgent care facilities is their scope of service. Most clinics can treat approximately 25% to 30% of patients that would normally present themselves in an emergency room. They are more of a hybrid between that local operator and the emergency room and they can treat upwards of 70% of patients. The reason for the broader scope of service is that they are larger facilities, all prototypical at 5,000 SF, ten to twelve exam rooms and their staff comes directly from an ER background with an average of fifteen plus years of direct ER room experience. Lastly, they are federally licensed to operate more complex equipment which allows for procedures, x-ray, lab work, EKG's, IV hookups, etc.

Mr. Sanderson said looking from the cost perspective, they partner directly with the insurance providers. They are not affiliated with any hospitals and that allows them to provide a less expensive service versus the traditional emergency room experience. As an example, if you were to go to a hospital for a strep throat, by the time you are triaged, lab work and overhead fees, it is going to run you \$1,500.00 to \$1,800.00. Since they have the majority of those capabilities to run the same tests, if they don't have any hospital administration overhead fees, you can get that same service for approximately \$250.00, often times less when you would just be responsible for your copay. He said from a real estate perspective, because of the value they offer, the insurance companies that they work with are often directing patients to arrive to their facilities from further distances away and as a result, they may not be as familiar with the trade area. When their patients do come, they are coming in a state of duress. They have symptoms anything from shortness of breath, maybe they have a nail through their hand, or a child in the backseat screaming with an ear infection. He said the point being that they are all very stressful situations. It is very important for them to be visible and prominent right on top of the road with maximum signage at this building.

Mr. Sanderson said the last thing he wanted to say about Convenient MD is their civic and philanthropic commitment to the community that Mr. d'Hemecourt mentioned. He said if they are fortunate enough to open in Manchester, he can assure that they will sponsor every little league team, they will be in every parade and they will contribute in every way possible. He said they annually participate in over 300 community events throughout their 24 clinics and they give away a ton of free health care. They give free flu shots to everybody,

free sports physicals to those in need and they also have a direct line to the local school nurses who are often the most dialed in when it comes to being aware of children not receiving the proper vaccines and health care. They simply direct any deserving child to come in and they will provide any needed care free of charge.

Jesse Johnson of Bohler Engineering said they are the site Civil Engineer for this project. He said he did want to say they had a preliminary discussion with City staff and showed an early layout of the project to get some thoughts and ideas and the design the Board has before them incorporates a lot of their requests and a lot of the changes staff asked them to do. It was a very cooperative process. He said one of the first things they did was take that existing building that sat closer to the residential zoning district and use to the northwest and moved the building up towards Hooksett Road as far as they could and put the parking behind it. That was a big improvement over the existing conditions now and as Mr. d'Hemecourt mentioned, they closed off that access to Hooksett Road and now just have the primary in and out off of Campbell Street.

Mr. Johnson said the rest of the layout is fairly conventional. The building was a prototype of Convenient MD and they just laid out the parking to maximize it to meet their parking needs which does happen to coincide with the requirement for Manchester's zoning regulations as well. They then made improvements like extending the utilities to the facility, dressing up the landscaping significantly as it is a fairly blighted site. They are proposing to put a six foot solid vinyl fence along the northwest to help with screening to the abutting property to that direction. They also enhanced that with additional landscaping and trees throughout that area and throughout the site. There is a decrease in impervious surface from what exists there now and a significant improvement on storm water infrastructure with adding deep sump catch basins, a water quality inlet and then cleaning that runoff, essentially, before it gets discharged toward the wetland as it does now. They feel that is also a significant improvement over existing conditions.

Mr. Johnson said he wanted to point out that he didn't see listed on the notice, but they don't technically have the 5% interior parking requirement that is required on the landscaping. It is 1.9% and when they initially submitted it, they had a calculation that they felt covered the 5% but after it was submitted, staff said they did need that requirement and to just make sure they mentioned that with their variance request. He said the landscape section is mentioned but he just wanted to make sure that that specific requirement is also being acknowledged tonight.

Attorney Sokul said he did go into explaining why the variances requested are justified under the variance standards. He said he wasn't going to repeat what he wrote there. They think it is a great project. They have incorporated staff suggestions into the design elements and they think it is going to be a big improvement to the area and as Mr. d'Hemecourt noted, a lot less traffic will be generated by this facility than the former gas station. Cutting off the curb cut to Hooksett Road is an important safety consideration and anybody that has spoken here as part of their team is prepared and ready to answer any questions the Board may have.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the Board.

Guy Guerra said one of the questions that he has with this is, it looks like when he looks at the site plan for the building itself, the top right hand corner would be the main entrances to the building itself. He said that tells him that the back of the building for the most part is facing Hooksett Road. He said Hooksett Road is one of the key streets leading into Manchester. There is a lot going on and the Board has worked with a number of different car dealers to create some really good looking locations around there. He said they are across from the Burger King, moving down to the bank and they have done a wonderful job down there. He said he has a hard time looking at the side of their building against Hooksett Road. That is just his personal opinion and he would like to see it rotated 90 degrees and have the back of the building against the west side which would allow more of a view for the people driving by. He said Convenient MD's have put up good looking buildings. He thinks it would be better served rotating it sideways. He said he also appreciates removing the curb cut on Hooksett Road. He thinks that is a great idea.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he does agree with a lot of what Mr. Guerra said, especially with the back of the building facing Hooksett Road. He asked the applicant if they looked at any smaller footprints as he is assuming that this is a standard footprint for Convenient MD. He didn't know if there were any smaller ones that they have taken a look at and if so, what did they find.

Michael d'Hemecourt said they did look into if they could get it smaller but it really comes down to the services that Convenient MD provides and it doesn't allow them to be able to offer the services that their business provides to cut down the footprint. He said to quickly touch on the rotation of the building comment as well, the issue there is that they can't fit as much parking on the site if they rotate it the way it was mentioned.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he understands that with a smaller footprint, it essentially comes down to less profit so it is obviously less of a desirable project to make it smaller. He said they did look at a smaller footprint and asked if they were able to rotate that in any way so they aren't looking at the back of the building.

Mr. Sanderson said in terms of the look of the building, you are not looking at a back of a building. If you look at all Convenient MD's locations, they are very attractive buildings and it is not like that is the back of the building. The view of that is going to be just as good as the other side. In terms of the aesthetics and the look, it is not going to be looking like you are looking at the back of the building. It is going to appear that you are looking at the front of the building there.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he didn't see any visualizations or anything like that of what it would look like from Hooksett Road. He said he just can't picture it. Jesse Johnson said they actually looked at a number of iterations and layouts for this lot. This is what they landed on after looking at the building even being against Campbell Street. They looked at having the

entrance off of Hooksett Road. They looked at maintaining a building on the back where the current one is. They looked at all four sides. The issue with the southwest side of the lot is, if you can tell from the hatched area that is along there, it is an offset off the property line which is an existing easement for the City's drainage infrastructure that runs through the lot. That immediately puts them off of the property line a pretty decent distance for the building itself. They could put parking in there and take advantage of that, but they can't put the structure, obviously. He said also, the geometry and the angle of it, if they tried to go perpendicular to Hooksett Road and stay out of that it really almost pushes them to the middle of the lot where you could maybe get an access off of Campbell Street and have one row of parking up against the building and the middle and access aisle and that is about it. You would probably have anywhere from 10 to 12 parking spaces and no more. It really was a function of this lot, not only the geometry, but the easement restrictions.

Guy Guerra asked if this was going to stay consistent with the way that all of the Convenient MD's are built? He asked if they were keeping with the same design. Mr. Johnson said this was going to be the same design as all of the other Convenient MDs. He said they would be happy to email an elevation if that helps. He said this is the prototype of all the other stores. Mr. Guerra said then he had to disagree with him on the side that is going to be facing Hooksett Road. He said he is very familiar with the Convenient MDs. He said the front corner of the building where they do their big entrances, where the big stone post is in the corner, if it is going to stay consistent, that all looks great. He said it is inviting from the point that it is going to be coming from northeast off of Campbell Street. Unless they spend a fortune and fake a front on that, that is all just triage and exam rooms that are going to be running down along that side. It is not ridiculously attractive. The beauty part of those buildings is the stone work and everything else that is going to be by the northeast corner of their building.

Vice Chairman Lovell said it sounds like the gentleman speaking was about to address his comment and he was going to say if you would entertain them emailing the Board a visualization during this meeting, right now, he thinks it would be good to see it. Chairman Breault said he agrees that it would be helpful.

Mr. Johnson said he could email it and asked what email to send it to. Mr. Landry provided the email address. Jonathan Golden said he could give Mr. Johnson a permission to show the PDF if he has it on his computer. Mr. Johnson said he just emailed it as well.

Vice Chairman Lovell asked if when they rotated the building to the south side of the lot, it was mentioned that they weren't able to get as much parking. He asked if they happened to know off hand how many spaces they would lose. Mr. Johnson said it was about half. He said if you look at the conventional layout like they have here where you have the central access aisle and parking on both sides, they would be able to have the parking up against the building but they would be able to have that extra roll of parking which would end up being along Campbell Street. That would get omitted because of the building proximity being too far into the middle of the lot. They would lose twelve to thirteen spots. Vice Chairman Lovell said that is because of the easement he was talking about before. Mr.

Johnson said that was right and because of the angle of it, the way it pushed you to the middle.

Chairman Breault said the elevations are showing on the screen. He asked the Board if anybody had any questions regarding it. He said he thinks it is not a plain looking building and has some character. He is assuming the east elevation facing Daniel Webster Highway, route 3, is the one in question.

Guy Guerra said that is the side that he is looking at there. He said when he looks at this entire plan, there is a lot that they are asking for on this. He said he has a question with making sure that there is a lot of greenery put on that corner. It seems like a lot of it has been removed. When you add that to a sign that is going to be a half a foot off of the property line, when you look at the way the building is going to be rotated and the side of it, they are asking for a lot for that piece of property. He said he gets that it would be a great use for it. He said he gets that it is kind of a blight looking property as he speaks, but his personal opinion is that he would like to re-look at it as they are asking that much for what is going on there.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he just wanted a point of clarification that they are looking at the east elevation and that is what is facing Hooksett Road. He said that satisfies his concern with the façade that they are looking at from Hooksett Road. He said he agreed with Mr. Guerra's points that they are asking for a lot here. He said of course that is a terrible, blighted corner and has been for a long time and he would love to see something go in there but maybe the Board shouldn't jump at the first thing that comes along.

Chairman Breault said he would like to address the landscaping plan. He said the applicant submitted a landscaping plan and he assumes that that is what they are representing they are going to install.

Mr. Johnson said he could speak to that. He said as you can see, there is a considerable amount of plantings that have been proposed for the project. He said there are five trees and a number of shrubs. He said they have a landscape schedule on there. The side that everybody was concerned about along Hooksett Road, if you can look along the face of that building, you will see a mulch bed and a continuous line of plantings that would be along the foundation of the building and also surrounding that sign. What you would typically see around a building to help frame it and have that curb appeal, you would want to have it at this type of prominent location. It also wraps around the corner going up Campbell Street. Essentially, the two faces of that building not only have that nice character of the building itself, but then they enhanced it with the landscaping all along the perimeter of it and a few trees placed along it. This is a significant improvement over what was there prior.

Attorney Sokul said they are asking for quite a few variances, but he would like to point out that it is a small corner lot and there is an existing City drainage easement on the site that is a development constraint and there are wetlands to the west. In working with City staff, they did ask them to pull the building as close to the streets as possible and in doing that,

you are left with a very small workable area. He said he thinks from the sizable lot and for those features, eliminating the access to Hooksett Road with an elevation that looks just like the front except that it doesn't have doors to the east, and with the landscaping shown on this plan, he thinks it is a good project design for that lot in that location. He said they want the Board to be happy with it and they would be happy to answer more specific questions, but with the comment, "don't take the first thing that comes along" they think this is an excellent project and he just wanted to make that point.

Alderman Jim Roy asked the applicant if they went before the Planning Board already. Mr. Johnson said they have not been before the Planning Board yet. Alderman Roy said he appreciated all of the information the applicant has given the Board, including the traffic study. He said that was very nice. He said the applicant could correct him if he is wrong, but even though they are asking for a lot of variances, he thinks he figured out that half of them are due to the roof overhang with all the setback issues. Mr. Johnson said to some extent that is right but not fully. He said most of them are to the overhang but also additional ones got added when there were interpretations that they didn't necessarily agree with, such as the parking having a zero setback to the building. If you look at where the foundation of where the building is in relation to those parking stalls, it is a five foot offset but the overhang which is represented in the dashed box if you will, that extends over the parking. The staff felt that they should be conservative and request that just in case there was an interpretation issue. The staff also asked them to put the dumpster over on the side that would infringe on that. A lot of those things came as a result of meeting requests from staff as was mentioned from Attorney Sokul.

Alderman Roy said that is exactly where that dumpster should have gone because we really don't want that seen. He said he agrees that there is extensive landscaping on the Hooksett Road side. This is going to be a huge improvement to that corner.

Alderman Roy said he had a question about the rotation of the building. He asked if they rotated the building, where would the curb cut be. He said you would start getting near the corner and you would have problems with that or you would have to go out on Hooksett Road which is much more traveled. Mr. Johnson said that was the issue. When they looked at rotating the building and putting the back up against that southwest side, they couldn't have an access off of Hooksett Road because it would put it too close to the intersection and they would have conflicting traffic movements. They would still have to do it off of Campbell Street, but you would have to come in kind of where they are now to try to get as far away from the intersection as possible. It just only allowed them to have one row of parking and the minimum access width to address those. That was it.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he wanted to comment on what Attorney Sokul mentioned about his statement "don't jump at the first thing that comes along". He said he should have phrased that a little bit better. He said he doesn't think this is a terrible project and he does think it is a great improvement. He said he should have said the Board shouldn't necessarily jump at the first project. He said he just wanted to talk this through and just basically get a little bit more information.

Michael Simoneau said the gas stations and convenience stores before this have always had a difficult time here. He thinks it had a lot to do with the access from Hooksett Road. He said he thinks moving the access to Campbell Street is a great idea and it is going to create a good safe haven for cars going in and out. He said he thinks we all agree that it is currently an eyesore. The Convenient MD has always kept all of their locations clean. He said he visited one a few years back and he was very impressed with the site. He said he thinks this is an opportunity. He said he would agree with Attorney Sokul that this is a unique piece of property and it creates challenges for a tight building but he thinks they have really done their due diligence and have created something that would fit. In looking at the elevation charts, he thinks it is going to look nice from Hooksett Road, Campbell Street and all around. He said he thinks this is a plus for the City of Manchester and he is actually for this project.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the public and invited those either in favor of or in opposition to this application or anyone with general comments to speak. No one came forward to speak. He asked staff if there was any correspondence received by staff. Mr. Landry said there was no correspondence. The Chairman turned the hearing back over to the Board.

Chairman Breault said he thinks we have had quite a bit of discussion on this application and he is in agreement that this is a favorable project for the City. He said it would clean up a very blighted corner and he thinks the applicant has done a fantastic job looking at what could be done here and satisfy all of the requests from staff. They have a wetland issue, an easement issue and it is not like they are trying to pigeon hole something in here that doesn't fit. They could fit it in another way but he thinks this is the best way to do it.

Michael Landry said he received an email in real time from Attorney John Cronin and he said he goes by this site daily and he likes the use. He said they built a facility in Belmont and he wasn't a fan of the signage so he just wanted to express some concerns about the signage. He said he hopes that the signage is better here and he thinks that the Board should see all of the signage, both in the context of the building and the site before any approvals.

Chairman Breault addressed Mr. Landry and said the free-standing sign, a half a foot from the lot line where five feet is required would be the only thing that he is concerned about. He said he would assume the signage on the building is within the terms of the Zoning Ordinance.

Guy Guerra asked Mr. Landry if it was the purview of the Board on the design of the sign or is the Board just looking at the location of the sign. Mr. Landry said the Board is really looking at the dimensions. He said the variance is for the location of the sign and if you look at the plan, the pylon sign looks to be twenty feet wide and the only thing that got called out on that was the setback. He said he doesn't know that we have seen the full sign package, but the note in the Zoning Ordinance says the size and the height as well as the three building signs are all to comply with the Ordinance. He said we haven't called out any counts on those so they will need to conform to the Zoning Ordinance. He said this project would

be going for site plan review and the Planning Board would have its opportunity to take a look at the aesthetics here.

Attorney Sokul said he wanted to echo what Mr. Landry said. All of the signage complies with the Ordinance requirements except the location of the pylon. He said they did need to go to Planning Board review so the actual aesthetics of it can be looked at, at that time. He said they would be complying with code for the size of the signage and those types of things. He said he is not sitting with the project team and Jesse from Bohler Engineering can correct him if he is wrong, but that is his understanding. Jessie Johnson said that is correct. He said they actually have a table showing compliance of all the signs for the project right on the same plan, which is shown in the upper right corner of the view screen now.

Alderman Roy said early on in the conversation there was a comment made about parking that the applicant wanted to make the Board aware of. He asked if there was another section that they would have to be recognizing if they are making a motion. Jesse Johnson said he thinks it is a landscaping section. He said the section was referenced but it is just another requirement within that same section. Mr. Johnson said we are at 1.9% interior landscaping where 5% is required and they just want to make sure the Board understands that under the generic head of "Landscaping" because that calculation came up in discussions with staff after they submitted their original application. Mr. Landry said we don't need to add a count. He said let's consider the 10.07(G) count to include the ten foot landscape perimeter as well as the interior and he said he was sorry that it wasn't called out separately and he appreciated Mr. Johnson for calling that out. He said the counts that are listed in the agenda are a complete list and 10.07(G) does include the 5% requirement.

Guy Guerra said relative to the sign, it looks like the facade that is going to be against the Hooksett Road side is going to have the corner side which is going to show both on Campbell Street and Hooksett Road. He asked if there was a necessity for the pylon sign further down to be that large. He said he is assuming that if they made that sign smaller, they could at least get a little more room against Hooksett Road. Mr. Johnson referred to the site plan and said if you are traveling down Hooksett Road, towards the intersection, you won't be able to see any signage that you would typically see associated with a Convenient MD that is on the building. That pylon sign is critical for people traveling in that direction towards the intersection to be able to know that it is there so they can get into the proper lane to turn onto Campbell Street. He said their abutter, the City of Manchester property adjacent to them, is very wooded right up to almost the curb line. If you are traveling, it is hard to even see the building so that pylon sign was intended to give some type of visibility for anybody that might need to use the facility coming from that direction.

Jim Roy made a motion to grant the following variance counts for case ZBA2020-016, 6.03(A) Front Yard Setback - Hooksett Road, 6.03(A) Street Yard Setback – Campbell Street, 6.03(C) Side Yard Setback, 9.09(A)1 Signs, 10.07(G) Landscaping, 6.08(A) Screening Buffers, 8.29(B) Accessory Structures and Uses and 10.09(A) Parking Setbacks which was seconded by Michael Simoneau.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy
Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the variance was granted.

5. **ZBA2020-017**
170 Baker Street, RDV/B-2 Zoning District, Ward 9

Jason Donovan (Agent) proposes to construct a one-story 5,430 SF bank with a drive-thru, with a 4' landscape perimeter around the parking area where 10' is required and with pavement other than site access within 10' of the street lot line and seeks a variance from sections **10.07(G)** Landscaping and **10.09(A)** Parking Setbacks, of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as per documents submitted through March 20, 2020.

David Latulippe of CJ Developers said he was representing Bangor Savings Bank and also present was Chris Nadeau from Nobis Engineering. Mr. Latulippe said as stated, they are in a split zone and they have a unique piece of property. The property is comprised of a couple parcels which were made when the City discontinued Baker Street years ago to make room for Queen City Avenue, so you have this odd shaped parcel in two zones. He said they have a lot of different setback lines that they had to try and fit into. Right now, the current property as it sits does not conform. The buildings are right on the property line and there is little to no landscaping on the entire property.

Mr. Latulippe said there is no buffering at all and there is parking just about everywhere there's not buildings. He said it is three different automotive uses and they are using that outer parcel lot between Baker Street and Queen City Avenue pretty much as a car storage lot. He said they want to bring this property to a new use, a very attractive use. They want to remove those older blighted buildings that sit right along the old railroad tracks and bring it into conformity. What they are requesting, because of the uniqueness of the site and they got pinched to make full circulation around and they wanted the parking hidden from the main street, so the building becomes the feature versus the parking. It also allows them to eliminate all of that parking along Baker Street between Baker Street and Queen City Avenue. That will all be fully landscaped. What they are looking for, instead of having a ten foot parking lot buffer, they would provide a four foot parking lot buffer. He said as you can see, their neighbors do not have any parking lot buffers so this will be an improvement to the neighborhood along with a lot of other improvements that they can do.

Mr. Latulippe said currently, there really is no storm water management system on the entire property. On an environmental standpoint, they have located two underground storage tanks that are actually underneath the buildings so they can't be removed yet. Those will be removed and dealt with once they are able to remove the existing building. It is not an attractive property as it sits right there on a very prominent corner. They will be removing the billboards that sit on top of the current building and like he said previously, they will be adding all that landscaping on Baker Street and re-grading that so there will be a

much more attractive look than what is there now. Mr. Latulippe said landscaping-wise, they have little to no landscaping on the current site. This is just over .3000 SF and they will be adding 10,000 SF of landscaping and lawn to the property. They are excited and Bangor Savings is excited to be coming to this location and they think there will be a great improvement.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the Board.

Guy Guerra said he is very familiar with this property as well. He said it used to be Ruel's Cycle and Woody's Tires and all sorts of stuff going on there that isn't pretty. He said he thinks this is an awesome use of cleaning up that corner and adding landscaping at the intersection of Queen City Avenue and South Willow Street. He said cleaning up the site of those buildings along the railroad tracks is great, getting a nice clean looking building there. He said because it is off the end of Baker Street, he is not opposed to the four foot setback with landscaping as opposed to none there now. He said he thinks this will be a great improvement to that particular intersection.

Chairman Breault said he agreed with Mr. Guerra. He said the site is somewhat blighted now with a lot of old buildings and this would definitely be an improvement to that corridor which is also a corridor to South Willow Street and is seen by many people.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the public and invited those either in favor of or in opposition to this application or anyone with general comments to speak. No one came forward to speak. He asked staff if there was any correspondence received by staff. Mr. Landry said there was no correspondence. The Chairman turned the hearing back over to the Board.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he agrees with the Chairman and with Mr. Guerra. He said this is probably the only site uglier than the last case with the gas station that was previously before the Board. He said he loves what they are proposing to do with the landscaping in that little appendage. He said this is a very good use of the site. He believes it serves the public interest, is in the spirit of the Ordinance, substantial justice will be done and the values of the surrounding properties will almost certainly be improved when something like this moves in. He said he thinks the hardship here is easily identified in the shape of this odd lot.

Alderman Roy said he agrees with all of the previous Board testimony. He said this is a huge improvement. He said this was a blighted area.

Jose Lovell made a motion to grant the following variance counts for case ZBA2020-017, 10.07(G) Landscaping and 10.09(A) Parking Setbacks which was seconded by Joe Prieto.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the variance was granted.

6. **ZBA2020-018**
205 and 211 Second Street, R-3 Zoning District, Ward 10

Daniel D. Muller, Esq. (Agent) proposes to consolidate Tax Map 314, Lots 12 and 13 and establish a warehouse use without a required loading space and seeks a variance from sections **5.10(E)** Warehousing or Wholesale Storage and Distribution Facilities and **10.05(2)** Loading Off-Street Number of Spaces, of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as per documents submitted through March 30, 2020.

Michael Landry announced that case ZBA2020-018 would be postponed until the June 11, 2020 ZBA Meeting at 6:00 PM in a virtual setting.

7. **ZBA2020-019**
630 Harvard Street, R-3 Zoning District, Ward 7

John Cronin, Esq., proposes to reconstruct two nonconforming wood framed portions of the building, where one portion is approximately 14' x 63' in size with a 0' street yard setback from the Prescott St. lot line and the second portion is approximately 20' x 40' in size with a 0' setback from the Harvard St. lot line where 10' is required in both instances, where the applicant requests that the variance for reconstruction be valid for seven years, where two years are allowed by the Ordinance and maintain the street yard parking along Hall Street with undersized parking spaces within 4' of the building and property line, with no parking bumpers or landscape buffer and which require backing into a public way and seeks a variance from sections **11.05(A)** Non-Conforming Structures, **10.09(A)** Parking Setbacks, **10.06(A)** Parking Layout, **10.07(K)1** Parking Bumpers, **10.07(D)** Parking Maneuvering, **10.07(G)** Landscaping and **10.02(F)** Business Parking in Residential Districts, of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as per documents submitted through March 30, 2020.

Attorney John Cronin said this property on Harvard Street is the former Genest Bakery and was bought from the City about two years ago now. He said the building was in deplorable condition packed with junk and a lot of water damage. There has been an ongoing effort to restore the property. He said he believes that Alderman Hirschmann was not happy with the condition of the two out buildings. He said they agreed with him that they would like to take those down, but if they did, they don't have an immediate need to rebuild them. He said they did not want to lose their prior non-conforming rights. After some discussion with Mr. LaFreniere and the building staff, they said that maybe the way to go would be to seek a variance with respect to the parking that has existed since probably 1930. They think that is a valid pre-existing prior non-conforming use as well, but the thought was that once they were here, they would get it cleaned up.

Attorney Cronin said the site was occupied by a specialty woodworking firm that makes

cabinetry for industry, commercial banks, churches and that sort of thing. They have been there for twenty-five years. The other owner that owned it didn't pay the taxes and it has been vacated and they are in the process of repurposing the property. That is what they are seeking. He said if they can't get the variance to take those buildings down, they will keep them as is and do their best to keep them clean and neat. He said they have been corresponding with Alderman Shea when he was the Alderman in that district. He came to the property many times to view the progress and they also had communication with Ms. Miller who was the head of the Neighborhood Watch in that area and they have been very good to them and very pleased with the ongoing improvements.

Attorney Cronin asked the Board to look favorably on the variances and he will waive the reading of the five criteria and rely on the information in their submittal.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the Board. There were no questions or comments from the Board. The Chairman turned the hearing over to the public and invited those either in favor of or in opposition to this application or anyone with general comments to speak. No one came forward to speak. He asked staff if there was any correspondence received by staff. Mr. Landry said there was no correspondence. The Chairman turned the hearing back over to the Board.

Alderman Roy said he went by this property the other day. He said it has been an eyesore for quite a while. He said of the sections that Attorney Cronin is talking about taking down, one of those buildings is partially burnt and the other is in total disrepair. He said when he does that, it is going to improve the neighborhood and he believes that his argument for the criteria is right on point. The only thing he has angst about is the time period that it is going to last seeing that the normal period is two years and they are asking for seven and he gets it. There is a hardship here, especially with the economy right now because of the pandemic. Alderman Roy asked Attorney Cronin if he would be willing to go to four years. Attorney Cronin said, how about five years. He said the only problem with it is they are two years in now and it is such a specialty purpose and if they got someone tomorrow, they would probably have to come back for variances and planning so it is not going to be a quick process. He said he would hate to take them down and lose the right to rebuild them. Alderman Roy asked Attorney Cronin if he said they are already two years into the seven years now. Attorney Cronin said no, he is saying that they have already owned it for two years and they are still in process of doing renovations.

Attorney Cronin said they had a couple of people look at the property. One tenant would have been terrific there but their senior management is based in Maine. They came down and looked at the immediate area and vetoed it. That is something that they worked about nine months on. That was a concern. They are sensitive at getting the right fit. They have had some tenants that have been interested in going there and they haven't embraced them because they don't think it would be consistent with the neighborhood and they personally wouldn't want to bring it to the Board for approval. They are just not the right type of uses for that area. He said if you know the general area there, on that section of Harvard Street, the owners do a really nice job keeping their properties well kept. He said they think it best

to keep it nice and they want to keep that consistency going forward. Attorney Cronin said he supposes they could come out in five years and ask for an extension if they were continuing to make improvements. He said he would hope that the Board, although it may be different members, would look favorably on that. It is always hard when you take something down and give up your rights not knowing what the future is going to hold. Alderman Roy said he agreed with Attorney Cronin and said they have done extensive improvements there already and he is right. That is a really nice area up there and they deserve to have it done right. He said he would listen to what the other Board Members had to say about the seven year grace period.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he agrees with Alderman Roy that two to two and a half times the usual period is sufficient.

Chairman Breault said he agreed with Vice Chairman Lovell. He said he thinks that five years is an unrealistic time frame given the circumstance of the situation of the economy and the level of work that they have to undertake in this building. He said although they have made strides in the last couple of years cleaning it up, they have a ways to go. These two structures should come down. They are in disrepair and they are a hazard the way they sit. He said he would be in favor of a five year term.

Michael Simoneau said he too would be in favor of a five year term.

Jim Roy made a motion to grant the following variance counts for case ZBA2020-019, 11.05(A) Non-Conforming Structures, 10.09(A) Parking Setbacks, 10.06(A) Parking Layout, 10.07(K)1 Parking Bumpers, 10.07(D) Parking Maneuvering, 10.07(G) Landscaping and 10.02(F) Business Parking in Residential Districts for a period of five years which was seconded by Michael Simoneau.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the variance was granted

8. **ZBA2020-020**
268 Goffstown Road, R-1B Zoning District, Ward 12

Steve Poduchowski proposes to maintain 6 parking spaces that are within 4' of the property line and/or building, without required parking bumpers, where vehicles must back out into the public way, with undersized parking spaces and drive aisle, without a 10' landscape buffer and with a driveway width of 32' where 24' is allowed and seeks a variance from sections **10.09(B) Parking Setbacks** (10 counts), **10.06(A) Parking Layout**, **10.07(D) Parking Maneuvering**, **10.07(K)1 Parking Bumpers**, **10.07(K)4 Parking Screening** and **10.07(G) Landscaping**, of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as per documents submitted through March 27, 2020.

Steve Poduchowski of 268 Goffstown Road said he is seeking these variances in order to extend the existing driveway to the back side of the property in order to create angled parking spaces. He said the existing parking spaces are tandem parking spaces and because of the inconvenience of tandem parking spaces the tenants who live in the building don't always park in the parking spaces and end up parking mostly on Maxwell Street. This can create some safety considerations being so close to the stop sign on Maxwell Street and just overall congestion on the road. He said the existing driveway along the lawn side does not have any buffers currently.

Chairman Breault turned the hearing over to the Board. There were no questions or comments from the Board. The Chairman turned the hearing over to the public and invited those either in favor of or in opposition to this application or anyone with general comments to speak. No one came forward to speak. He asked staff if there was any correspondence received by staff. Mr. Landry said there was no correspondence. The Chairman turned the hearing back over to the Board.

Alderman Roy addressed Mr. Poduchowski and said when he went by the property it looks like he is currently parking seven vehicles there and he is now saying he going to go down to six vehicles and he asked if that was correct. Mr. Poduchowski said they are currently parking six vehicles here. He said there may have been a guest when Alderman Roy went by. He said they will be losing one parking space but what they lose they hope to gain in convenience. Alderman Roy said that was his point. They are actually downsizing the number of vehicles there. Mr. Poduchowski said that was correct.

Chairman Breault said he is somewhat familiar with this property knowing one of the former owners. He said this existing parking situation has been like this for years and it is somewhat problematic because of the way they back in. He said he thinks this is an improvement on the congestion of the parking and its effect on Maxwell Street. He said Maxwell Street is a very narrow street and this whole little block consisting of three or four properties being pie shaped, he thinks this is only an improvement to what they have.

Vice Chairman Lovell asked Mr. Poduchowski if he was planning on adding new pavement to the back fence line and replacing the existing pavement. Mr. Poduchowski said they are going to be replacing the existing pavement and are going to be seal coating where you see the compact car spot and the steps.

Chairman Breault said the applicant has made some improvements to the property rebuilding the porches and has done a nice job improving that property. He thinks this application is worthy of consideration.

Vice Chairman Lovell said he thinks this is a bit in excess and he is kind of on the fence about it. He said if other Board Members agree with the Chairman, then he thinks he is ok with this since it is a safety improvement on Maxwell Street. He said he does think it is in character with the neighborhood.

Jose Lovell made a motion to grant the following variance counts for case ZBA2020-020, 10.09(B) Parking Setbacks (10 counts), 10.06(A) Parking Layout, 10.07(D) Parking Maneuvering, 10.07(K)1 Parking Bumpers, 10.07(K)4 Parking Screening and 10.07(G) Landscaping which was seconded by Michael Simoneau.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the variance was granted

Alderman Hirschmann said less parking on Maxwell Street was the goal of this case and agreed with the decision made.

Michael Landry announced that that was the last case and the public hearing was closed and the Board moved on to the business meeting.

III. BUSINESS MEETING:

1. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

1. Annual ZBA Meeting and election of officers.

Chairman Breault said as he stated at the last meeting, he would like to serve another year as Chairman of the Zoning Board. He asked if anyone else was interested. No one came forward to this request.

Guy Guerra made a motion to elect Robert Breault as Chairman of the Zoning Board of Adjustment which was seconded by Jose Lovell.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy, Hirschmann, Guerra

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, Robert Breault was elected Chairman of the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Robert Breault made a motion to elect Jose Lovell as Vice Chairman of the Zoning Board of Adjustment which was seconded by Jim Roy.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy, Hirschmann, Guerra

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, Jose Lovell was elected Vice Chairman of the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

2. **Review and approval of the ZBA Minutes of March 12, 2020.**

Michael Simoneau made a motion to accept the ZBA Minutes of March 12, 2020 which was seconded by Joe Prieto.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the minutes of March 12, 2020 were accepted.

3. **Any other business items from the ZBA staff or Board Members.**

No new business was brought up.

Jim Roy made a motion to adjourn the ZBA Meeting of May 7, 2020 which was seconded by Guy Guerra.

Yeas: Breault, Lovell, Simoneau, Prieto, Roy, Hirschmann, Guerra

Nays: None

Upon a unanimous vote, the ZBA Meeting of May 7, 2020 was adjourned.

Each case file is available on-line at <http://www.manchesternh.gov/Departments/Planning-and-Comm-Dev/Zoning-Board/Project-Applications>. Or search for "Manchester NH ZBA Project Applications".

The order of the agenda is subject to change on the call of the Chairman.

Attest: 
Robert G. Breault Chairman
Manchester Zoning Board of Adjustment

APPROVED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT: August 13, 2020

- Without Amendment
- With Amendment