

NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD  
February 5, 2004

A meeting of the Nashua City Planning Board was held on Thursday, February 5, 2004 at **8:00** PM in the Auditorium at City Hall.

Bette Lasky, Chair conducted the meeting.

Members present were:       Bette Lasky, Chair  
                                  Ken Dufour, Vice Chair  
                                  Mike Lowe, Mayor's Representative  
                                  Ald. Richard LaRose, Ald. Rep. (in Aud)  
                                  Ald. Kathryn Vitale  
                                  Steve Dookran  
                                  Steve Farkas

Also present:                   Kathy Hersh, Community Dev. Director  
                                  Mike Yeomans, Deputy Planning Manager  
                                  Rick Sawyer, Planner III  
                                  Karen Berchtold, Planner II  
                                  Howard Coppari, Planner I

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

January 15, 2004

Mr. Lowe said there are two sets of minutes.

Mrs. Lasky said one of them is from the Annual meeting.

**MOTION** by Mr. Lowe to approve the minutes

**SECONDED** by Ald. Vitale

**MOTION CARRIED 4-0-2, Mr. Farkas and Mr. Dookran abstained.**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Yeomans said there are three items in the Board's package:

The preliminary agenda for the February 19, 2004 meeting.

Revised site plan report for the industrial building on Murphy Drive (noted as Old Business #3 dated February 5, 2004).

Technical Review meeting sheet dated Monday, February 2, 2004 with one new project on it.

**REPORT OF CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE & LIAISON**

Mr. Dufour said the CIC had a wrap-up meeting this week, and within the next couple of weeks, they will have it before the Board for review.

Mr. Farkas had nothing to report.

Ald. Vitale had nothing to report.

Mr. Lowe said the Planning & Economic Development Committee has met twice since the last meeting, and they are doing long term planning, and suggested some of the Board members stop by, especially when they are discussing the Nashua Regional Planning and the DPW. No dates are set, and they discussed long term planning, especially what is already in place that we will be doing in the next year or two.

**OLD BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLANS**

1. **WRS Realty, LLC, & Karen Y. & Paul E. Kerouac (Owners) - Proposed consolidation and lot line relocation, 593 & 605 Amherst Street, Sheet H - Lots 106, 107 & 123, Zoned "GB" General Business. POSTPONED FROM JANUARY 15, 2004.**

Mike Bavaro, Sr. Vice President, Town Fair Tire. Mr. Bavaro introduced himself, and said with him is Bill Keating of Dubois & King and John Whipichowski, construction manager of Town Fair Tire. He said he is happy to be before the Board for the second time, and they are looking to open up a second retail tire store on Amherst Street.

He said they have been in business for thirty-five years, and operate sixty-one stores throughout New England. He said their business will employ about ten people, and the store manager and other employees will come from the Nashua area. He said their main business is the sale and installation of tires. He said they also install custom wheels. They do not do any large truck service work, or any auto repairs. There is no auto body work, no tune-ups, no brake jobs, or front end repairs. With regards to wheel alignments, they make the adjustments, but do not sell any of the parts.

He said the store will be open on Mondays from 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Tuesday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Saturdays

from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and will be closed on Sundays. He said there will be a wheel display with about 65 wheels on display, for customers to shop for tires. He said there will be a waiting area, too.

He said the service center will have six bays, five for tire service and one for readjustments on alignments. The operation is such that customers come into the store, shop for tires, and the car goes in for service. It is a first-come first-served business, and usually customers can get in and out in an hour for four tires.

He said they will have to dispose of the junk tires; they will have a casing disposal cage in the rear of the property, with privacy slats. The tires are taken out on a weekly basis by a company called Lakin Tire out West Haven, Connecticut. The casings are taken to a burning facility plant, in Sterling, Connecticut, where they are burned as energy, and the remainder of the tires are then sold to countries in South America. None of the tires are dumped; they are either burned for energy or sold out.

He said that this store will have one delivery per two to three days, each delivery is about 75 tires, and the truck will be there only during business hours.

Mr. Yeomans stated that there are two cases, one is a lot line and consolidation plan, and one is the site plan. The comments heard were site plan comments.

Mrs. Lasky said they will now read into the record the site plan advertisement.

#### **OLD BUSINESS - SITE PLANS**

- 2. Town Fair Tire Center, Inc. (Applicant) WRS Realty, LLC, Paul E. Kerouac (Owner) - Proposed of the existing buildings and the construction of a 6-bay, 6,960 square foot retail tire building with associated access, parking and site improvements, 605 Amherst Street, Sheet H - Lots 106 & 123, Zoned amendment to NR2007 for change of use from office and outdoor display to retail, and the demolition. "GB" General Business. POSTPONED FROM JANUARY 15, 2004.**

Mr. Bill Keating, Dubois & King. Mr. Keating said he will address the subdivision plan first. He said what happened is that there were two lots originally, lots 106 & 123. In order to build the

site as proposed, they want access in the rear. He pointed out on the map a portion of a lot they acquired. A portion of Lot 106 will remain as a separate lot by the owner. Lot 123 will then be combined with a majority of Lot 106 to make a new lot, Lot 123.

Mr. Dufour asked if once this plan is approved, it will be a new lot (Lot 106) with roughly 55 feet of frontage?

Mr. Keating said that is correct. He said that eventually the owner will combine the small lot with another lot he identified on the map, but it is out of their control.

Mr. Lowe asked to see where the wetlands are.

Mr. Keating identified the 100-year floodplain, and said the wetland is right at the edge of that.

Mrs. Lasky asked Mr. Keating to continue with the discussion of the site plan.

Mr. Keating described the proposed building as a 6,960 square foot, 6-bay garage, with a service area and for storing tires. The site is composed of 32 parking spaces in the front, side and rear of the building. Cars will come in off of Amherst Street, and either park in the front, side or rear, and exit onto Amherst Street.

He said there will be a cross access into Pizzeria Uno, which is now under construction adjacent to the site, and will maintain a gravel road in the back, which will be improved for car and truck traffic.

Mr. Lowe asked if the roadway is in the buffer.

Mr. Keating said it is within the buffer, but a roadway is allowed in the 150-foot buffer. All the drainage and structures are outside the buffer.

He said for the drainage plan, all the drainage facilities are outside of the 150 foot buffer, and since there is no room on site for a detention basin, all the drainage will be handled by underground storage and infiltration. A lot of precautions were made to protect the water. There is no gasoline or oil or any products that can spill, it is just changing tires. There is a deep sump catch basin, where the particles settle, and then into a second phase treatment with for two infiltration chambers, where there is a drainage manhole, which acts like an oil/water

separator.

He said there are four infiltration beds; two of them consist of 10 pipes, 20-foot lengths each, high density polyethylene perforated 18 inch in diameter. The two in the back consist of 14 pipes in each bed, and the reason why there is more in the back is because most of the runoff from the building is directed to the rear. He said if there is a big storm, they could overflow, and to prevent water from backing up into the parking lot, there is an overflow pipe, and an outlet into a drainage trench from the Pizzeria Uno's detention basin where they are constructing a drainage swale. He said they will connect to city sewer and city water.

Mr. Lowe asked about the back parking area, and if it slopes back towards the drainage.

Mr. Keating said it does slope back down into a catch basin.

Mr. Lowe asked if they planned on putting in boulders along the edge, and a road in there.

Mr. Keating said yes.

Mr. Lowe asked if the road is within the wetlands, and if the Conservation Commission had approved it.

Mr. Yeomans said the road is existing.

Mr. Lowe asked if instead of putting in the boulders, would they be willing to put up a small wall, maybe 18 inches high? He asked about snow being pushed up to the back, and running over the back, where water will run into the chambers.

Mr. Yeomans said the objective of the stones was to give a clear demarcation line that no snow storage is permitted in the 150 foot zone, and it will be placarded, too.

He said that what Mr. Lowe is talking about is that when they are clearing snow, and pushing it towards the curb line, some of the snow will be pushed over the back of it. He said a small wall will help prevent extra snow from being dumped as a result of clearing the parking lot; that is the intent. He said that something similar was done at Best Ford.

Mr. Lowe said since that was already done at Best Ford, he didn't see any reason why that couldn't be done here.

Mr. Bavaro said they no have problem putting in an 18 inch wall in the back.

Ald. Vitale said she recognizes the little gravel road is in the back, but she thought it was originally there to connect the earth materials over to the PK's Nursery area. She asked why the road is still being continued, and what correlation does PK's Nursery have with Pizzeria Uno's, and why is this access road is still there.

Mr. Keating said the road is for emergency vehicle access only, and is required.

Mr. Yeomans said the access road is connected to the materials site with the garden center, and was an integral part of that plan, and has been there for many years. He said the road has not been abandoned, and at some time in the future, the garden center will be redeveloped, and the road is important for circulation, cross access, and secondary emergency access. It also provides alternative access to the traffic light at the intersection where PK's main entrance is across from the gas station.

Ald. Vitale asked about the road, and is it wise to keep it open to be an access to the light.

Mr. Yeomans said yes.

Ald. Vitale didn't believe that a gravel access road is the best way to approve developments of this size and magnitude with back alley accesses that are currently gravel, and maintained as a driveway.

Mr. Yeomans said the Board is not approving anything to do with the PK's or Uno's plan, and is not part of this plan. It is existing.

Ald. Vitale asked why this roadway is even shown on the plan.

Mr. Yeomans said it is necessary due to cross-access easements between the property owners, and it gives the city emergency access. He said technically it is a driveway, not a road.

Ald. Vitale asked if it is only for the property owners, or is it going to be gated.

Mr. Yeomans said it is an incompatible use between the garden center and the retail and restaurant. He said all the properties will be connected with future development, and the point of these

access roads is to get traffic off of Amherst Street. Ald. Vitale said the Board should take note that the road goes in the buffer area, and it's planned for further development.

Mr. Yeomans said yes.

Mr. Lowe said this is being done consistently, on both Daniel Webster Highway and Amherst Street. He said it because of the high volume of traffic, it is an access road because the Fire Department asks for it, and the Board likes it because it provides cross access between properties. He said it lessens traffic problems, and the Fire Department wants it.

Mrs. Lasky said anything going in the Conservation zone, if it's not approved by Ordinance, is looked at by the appropriate agencies.

Mr. Yeomans said when the Board approved PK's plan, which included both the garden and materials center, Mr. Kerouac did some substantial improvements to the property, in concert with the Conservation Commission. Many hours were spent reviewing this plan with the Conservation Commission. He said a substantial grass treatment swale exists along the entire length of the property, which protects the adjacent wetlands.

He said photographs and elevation drawings have been submitted.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN:**

No one.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR:**

No one.

**MOTION** by Mr. Dufour to approve the proposed consolidation and lot line relocation, with the findings that it complies with Section 16-108, with no stipulations.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Lowe.

**MOTION CARRIED 6-0.**

**MOTION** by Mr. Dufour to approve the proposed site plan for Town Fair Tire dated in the package January 15<sup>th</sup>, with the findings that

it meets Section 16-123, with the following stipulations:

1. Prior to any work being conducted a pre-construction conference shall be held with City staff to review demolition, erosion control measures and other construction requirements. Erosion control shall be put in place prior to the start of construction.
2. Prior to a building permit being issued, bonding for any work required within the public right-of-way shall be submitted to and approved by the Division of Public Works and Corporation Counsel.
3. Prior to a building permit being issued, documents pertaining to the storm water operation and maintenance plan shall be recorded.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit a contribution in the amount of \$3,500 for traffic improvements for the Amherst Street Improvement Fund shall be submitted to the Planning Department as requested by the Division of Public Works.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit final project plans shall be submitted with any required drafting corrections.
6. 12" wide by 18" high retaining wall shall be placed at the rear of the parking lot in place of the proposed boulders.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Lowe.

**MOTION CARRIED 6-0.**

3. **White Family Ventures, LLC (Owner) - Proposed amendment to NR 1980 to show multi tenant, mixed use office and manufacturing, new 3,600 square foot loading/receiving area with overhead doors, increased open space and associated site improvements, 12 Murphy Drive, Sheet 140 - Lot 60, Zoned "PI" Park Industrial. POSTPONED FROM JANUARY 15, 2004.**

Richard Maynard, Professional Engineer, Maynard & Paquette. Mr. Maynard said the building is the partially completed former Teredyne property. He said the client would like to finish the building in two phases; the first would be to finish the first floor, put a roof on it and use it for a multi-tenant building with between five and seven tenants. The Teredyne building, under the

current approvals, is for a 197,000 square foot building, this is essentially for half of that.

He said there are some minor changes, since it is multi-tenant, there will be additional entrances and significant more landscaped areas around the building. He pointed out on a plan where there will be a common dumpster area. He said there is a common corridor to the central portion of the site for a loading dock area. The common corridor is approximately 9,000 to 9,800 square feet in size, which is not part of the multi-tenant building.

He said the number of parking spaces is slightly less, and the same storm water management program, which is principally the underground storage basins, and all portions of the existing approvals will continue to be in effect.

He said when this was originally approved, there was a \$10,000 contribution towards Northeastern Boulevard improvements, that has been paid and is in place.

He pointed out an architectural rendering, showing how the building will be treated, he identified the multiple entrances, and said that the green space is being increased by eliminating some of the parking spaces by the front of the building, and many more trees have been planted at the site.

He said that the enterprise is speculative, and currently only one tenant is proposed for 10,000 square feet. The others will be small business, low density, and approximately 51% office uses are proposed, very similar to what Teredyne proposed.

Mr. Lowe asked if a handicap parking space can be placed at each one of the new entrances, and eliminate some of the others.

Mr. Maynard said they can add four or five standard handicap spaces, not the van sized ones.

Mr. Lowe said a standard sized one at the end of each entrance.

Mr. Maynard said they will add four standard spaces, for a total of seven. He said they will be the 12 foot wide ones, not the 16 foot wide spaces.

Mr. Farkas stated that the architectural rendering was for one side, and asked what the other sides would look like.

Mr. Maynard said they will all be very similar. He said they will

all be very similar in character.

Mr. Dufour asked if they were approving the architectural design.

Mr. Maynard said the design as shown will be built. He said it will be a little more attractive, and a little more upscale from what was proposed before.

Mr. Dookran said he spoke with the Traffic Engineer, and she had not received the traffic evaluation sheet.

Mr. Maynard said the plan is only for minor amendments, and the traffic evaluation sheet is not relevant.

Mr. Dookran said the procedure is for the applicant to provide a worksheet to see if a traffic report is required or not.

Mr. Maynard said it is an approved plan already, Teredyne was an intense development, with high traffic levels; we are less than one-half the level here, we are only building half the building. He said this is a current approval, we are just amending it in the middle of the process, to make it a better project. To start at square one with the traffic is not relevant, this is not a new plan and not a new approval, it's just strictly improvements to a current approval.

Mr. Yeomans said it's a case where the Traffic Department and the applicant disagree. He said they are looking for some guidance from the Board to come to a resolution, both sides are correct, with fair issues. He said they are working off a pre-existing approved plan, and they are building half of what is there, perhaps the applicant should speak to the issue of use, it would be very helpful to really understand what the questions are.

Mr. Dufour stated that they are only building half of the building, and asked if they have to come back to the Board if they are building the other half.

Mr. Yeomans said he has a stipulation that it would have to return to the Board for further review if they come in for the second floor.

Mr. Dufour asked if at that time, can the Board can request a traffic study to satisfy the Engineering Department?

Mr. Yeomans said they have suggested several times, perhaps coming

NCPB

February 5, 2004

Page 11

up with a formula, either by square footage or conversion of use, or some other kind of threshold. He said the real question is use of the land, for example, a mixed use industrial use vs. a heavy office use. The question of threshold, at some point, should be reviewed.

Mrs. Lasky asked Mr. Dookran if that would represent their concerns.

Mr. Dookran said they got approved in 2000. He said they are not sure if the correct decision was made at that time, it is irrelevant. Today we have some improvements for review, and those improvements are in the form of change of use. That change of use needs to be validated for traffic impact. He said that they are not asking for a traffic report, all that is asked of the applicant is to fill out the worksheet that shows the new trips generated based on the new use, so the numbers can be compared with the thresholds we have to see if a traffic report is needed.

Mrs. Lasky asked if the Department of Public Works is working blind.

Mr. Dookran said yes.

Mr. Maynard said it is not a change of use, it is the same use as before, a combination of office, manufacturing and storage. The only difference is multi-tenant, which is not a change of use.

Attorney Jeffrey Zall, 221 Main Street. Atty. Zall said his client purchased the building last fall from Teredyne, Inc. He said they went over the approvals with Planning staff, to go over the approvals and what the plans of the structure were, which was for a mixed use office, manufacturing and warehousing facility.

He said they determined that the plan approvals were still valid, enough construction had already been done on the structure, and that a traffic study was not needed. The traffic impacts were determined in 2000 that based on the traffic impacts, a \$10,000 contribution was made for that purpose. After the building was bought, they met with Planning staff to go over a more detailed design of what was planned, and it was to scale the building down from a two-story to a one-story building, with the potential in the future to go to a two-story, but highly unlikely. He said the building is primarily a one story mixed use office with light manufacturing and warehouse.

He said their hopes were that this was a minor amendment that did not require a public hearing. He said they were bringing more flexibility into the office use, to go from 25% to up to 51% of the premises for office use, depending on what the market bears.

He said because of those factors, and the change in landscaping and the loading dock area, Planning staff believed it should go back to the Board.

He said he believes it is clear in the Planning staff's recommendation that what happened in 2000 that the traffic impact has already been determined, and a contribution was made to take care of that. No traffic study was deemed necessary. What they are proposing now has an overall intensity of use that has been reduced, and that no traffic issue is anticipated.

Atty. Zall said what Mr. Dufour makes perfect sense, if they propose a second floor, and go up to 180,000 or 190,000 square feet; then a traffic study would make a lot of sense. It is half of what it was in 2000.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN:**

No one.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR:**

No one.

Mrs. Lasky asked staff if at this point, if their recommendations stay the same, as far as the intensity of the use.

Mr. Yeomans said that from conversations staff has had with the applicant, the use is an industrial use, the same as previously approved by the Board, with the exception that it is multi-tenant. The manufacturing, storage, office use is there to support the businesses that are there. The office use is there to support the other uses, which is the manufacturing and storage. He said he thinks the Traffic Department has legitimate concerns.

Mrs. Lasky's concern is that if this is approved, is there a scenario that could happen before it is looked at for phase two, there could be a problem that cannot be corrected?

Mr. Yeomans said it is potential, but not likely.

Mr. Farkas said if the previous calculations were incorrect, Mrs. Lasky's concern would be valid, but since the proposal is for a less intensive use, the logical answer is to look at the second phase and review all findings at that time.

Mr. Dookran said he has indication from the Traffic Engineer, Mr. Bibbo in 2000, that he was provided with additional information, that 200 employees would be working in two shifts, in 24-hour operation, and wouldn't impact the peak hour traffic. He said the second point is that there was going to be a transfer of 50-75 employees from a facility nearby, thereby not having the additional traffic. He said those two points may have influenced the decision back then that a traffic report wasn't necessary. He said that all they are asking for today, is that we have a plan in front of us, that the Engineering staff must evaluate it and send a recommendation to Planning staff and ultimately the Planning Board. All they are asking for is for the worksheet to be done, to see what the numbers indicate.

Mrs. Lasky asked when this worksheet was requested.

Mr. Dookran said December 22<sup>nd</sup>, a letter from the Traffic Department states that a traffic impact threshold worksheet report is required. It is anticipated based on the information then, that a traffic impact report will be required.

Mrs. Lasky asked if a traffic impact report was requested subsequent to that.

Mr. Dookran said on January 7, 2004, Susan Klasen requested additional information.

Mrs. Lasky said it was suggested Ms. Klasen call Maynard & Paquette.

Mr. Dookran said they had a meeting, and told them the same thing, to fill out the sheet, as they are concerned about the traffic corridor, just to see what this development will do.

Mr. Farkas said the concern with the corridor is separate, they are looking at an already approved plan, and are reducing by 50% from what was previously approved, and they may be a shift with employees, so there may be a reason to keep an eye on the property.

He said that the reasonable compromise that has been put on the table that makes sense, is that the Traffic Department is asking

NCPB

February 5, 2004

Page 14

that the Board not approve this plan until a traffic worksheet is submitted. He said that the Traffic Department is basically asking the Board to revoke the plan, without a significant, substantial, demonstrative different use.

He said a reasonable compromise is on the table, which is when and if they come in for a building permit for the second floor, they will update it. He said he is not prepared to support any approval that does not include this stipulation.

Mr. Dookran said the December 22, 2003 request to fill out a worksheet was based on the applicant asking for a different composition of use. After meeting with them, they have changed that composition, so that they could impact the worksheet. All that needs to be done is to perform the worksheet.

Mr. Dufour said in his tenure on the Board, it is hard for him to overcome Fire, Police and DPW. He realizes it is only one story instead of two, but the building is going from 25% to 51% office, and the traffic generation is unknown, and he is going to support DPW's request.

Ald. Vitale said she is also supporting the recommendation that the Board gets this information. She said the number one thing that they hear about is traffic problems, and it only makes sense to have that information, even if the case is tabled to get this information.

Mrs. Lasky said tabling the case is an option.

Mr. Lowe said he is supporting it. They have already paid \$10,000, and they are coming in with half of the development that was shown last time, and to delay this project is costing them more money when it was already approved.

Mr. Dufour said he doesn't think they have already approved this project. He said they came before the Board with a two-story building with a whole different mix of use. That use folded. Someone else bought the building, and they are recommending a change of use. He said it looks like a new plan to him.

Mr. Farkas said whether the original approval to the Teredyne building is what we're talking about or not, they did come before the Board and it was approved. He said the Board asked them to come back with a rendering, which is what they've done. He said if the Board does not vote for it tonight, what they are doing in

effect is revoking an approval without any basis.

Mrs. Lasky does not know if the traffic issue was or was not brought up, or if the report had not been submitted.

Mr. Dufour asked exactly what was approved.

Mr. Farkas said they came before the Board, and it was conditionally approved, but the Board asked them to come back with a rendering.

Mrs. Lasky asked what the traffic issue was at that point.

Mr. Farkas said there was no traffic issue. He said that something is placed on the agenda only when it has the approval of all relevant reviewing agencies.

Mr. Dufour asked if it was actually voted on and approved in December subject to seeing the rendering.

Mr. Yeomans said they came in December to ask if the project could be done on an administrative approval basis, and to explain that the applicant wanted to change the ratio of use, and that it is an amended site plan.

**MOTION** to approve by Mr. Lowe, White Family Ventures LLC (Owner) to amend site plan NR1980, 12 Murphy Drive, Park Industrial, that it does meet the requirements of NRO 16-123, with the following stipulations:

1. All stipulations of approval from September 14, 2000 are incorporated into this approval and shall remain in full force and effect unless otherwise determined by the Planning Board.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the second story the applicant shall return to the Planning Board to review existing conditions.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit final drafting corrections shall be made to the plan.
4. Add seven handicap spaces, one to each entrance.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Farkas.

Mr. Dookran said any project coming before the city, staff must

evaluate properly. We want to evaluate the impacts properly, and follow the standard procedures. He said he is not going to vote against the project, and will abstain. He said he is going to reserve that right for voting for the permanent city engineer.

Mrs. Lasky thanked Mr. Dookran for his expertise and comments.

Mr. Dufour said he still is going to vote against it, and thinks that maybe this was missed in December, but two wrongs don't make a right.

**MOTION CARRIED 3-2-1 (Ald. Vitale and Mr. Dufour against; Mr. Dookran abstained).**

**NEW BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLANS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS - SITE PLANS**

- 4. Fletcher's Appliance, David Pastor (Owner) - Proposed demolition of the existing structure and the development of a 1-story, 8,200 square foot retail building with associated access, parking and site improvements, 531 Amherst Street, Sheet H - Lot 139, Zoned "HB" Highway Business. Previously approved by the Planning Board on February 20, 2003.**

Steven Auger, Project Manager, Hayner Swanson, 3 Congress Street. Mr. Auger said with him is Mr. Loren DuBois and Mr. Bill Francour of Maple Leaf Construction. He said Mr. David Pastor is not here this evening. He said on February 20, 2003, the Planning Board approved an 8,200 square foot one-story retail building with associated access, parking and site improvements. He said they are here tonight seeking a one year extension to that approval. He said the plan is the same one that was originally approved. The reason for the delay to the start of the project is financial, they are trying to obtain financing. They are anticipating breaking ground in late May of this year.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN**

No one.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

No one.

**MOTION** by Mr. Lowe to approve the 8,200 square foot retail building at 531 Amherst Street, and that it meets NRO Section 16-123, with the following six staff stipulations:

1. Prior to ANY work being conducted, a pre-construction conference shall be set up with the Planning Department to review the overall details of the plan, phasing and site circulation & safety during construction.
2. Prior to a building permit being issued, bonding for all public improvements, shall be submitted to and approved by the Engineering Department and Corporation Counsel.
3. Prior to a building permit being issued, final approval of the necessary covenants and easements for the storm water management system shall be obtained from the Planning Department and Corporation Counsel. The cost associated with recording the document shall be submitted to the Planning Department and the document shall be recorded.
4. Prior to a building permit being issued, a cross-access easement shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Department, and recorded.
5. Retail space "B" shall not be occupied until all site work is completed and a final certificate of occupancy is issued.
6. All construction vehicles and employees will park within the fenced area.

**SECONDED** by Ald. Vitale.

**MOTION CARRIED 6-0.**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **Review of tentative agenda to determine proposals of regional impact.**

**MOTION** by Mr. Dufour finding that there are no proposals of regional impact on the tentative agenda.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Lowe.

**MOTION CARRIED 6-0.**

**2. Referral from the Board of Alderman on proposed R-04-06, waiving or reimbursing certain land use application and permit fees in exchange for pavement of an off-site emergency access road by the developer.**

Mr. Lowe pointed out on a map a yellow highlighted area, said he would like to make a motion to approve it. He said it is an emergency access road.

Ald. Vitale asked how we came to be in a partnership with this?

Kathy Hersh said that Westwood Park is the area at the end of Northwest Boulevard. When the City bought the 250 acres, plus a 41 acre conservation easement, the City became a major owner of Westwood Park, and we therefore ended up with other responsibilities, including the completion of this emergency access road, which wasn't completed at the time.

Ald. Vitale said it was because we bought the land, and each of the owners were responsible.

Mrs. Hersh said there is an agreement on what the responsibilities are for everyone in the park, and this ended up with the city.

**MOTION** by Mr. Lowe for a favorable recommendation.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Farkas.

**MOTION CARRIED 6-0.**

**DISCUSSION ITEM:**

**1. Southern New Hampshire Medical Center, Presentation of Updated Master Plan.**

Jim Petropulos, Hayner Swanson, Inc., 3 Congress Street. Mr. Petropulos said with him tonight is Scott Cote, Facilities Director of Southern New Hampshire Medical Center, Rick Duguay, Vice President of Southern New Hampshire Medical Center and Bob Strickland, Architect, JSA, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Mr. Petropulos said they are here for two purposes. The first is that in two weeks, the hospital will be before the Board for an approximately 39,000 square foot expansion to the Southern New Hampshire Medical Center, and we would like to introduce the project tonight.

He said the other, and perhaps main reason is that Southern New Hampshire Medical Center has been working towards a Master Plan of

NCPB

February 5, 2004

Page 19

their own. It is preliminary. He said he would like to introduce it to the Board, to show how the pieces fit together, and where the hospital is headed.

He pointed out to a plan on the left, which is an overall plan of the properties that the hospital owns, or has under lease agreement. It comprises about twenty parcels, totaling about fifteen and one-half acres, located prominently on Main Street with other public streets weaving their way through the parcels, such as Dearborn Street, Prospect Street and Tyler Street, to name a few. He said the main elements of the campus is the large hospital building, surrounded by Main Street, Spring Street, Prospect Street and Dearborn Street. It is an approximate 275,000 square foot multi-story building, licensed for 188 beds. The number of beds is not changing. He said that as cities grow, hospitals do as well.

He said the 550-space parking garage structure is located across the hospital serves visitors and hospital staff. Along Dearborn Street are two medical office buildings, which helps to create a synergy between the doctor's offices and the hospital. He said there is the recently re-developed 38 Tyler Street building with a dialysis facility operation. Also along Main Street are two smaller office buildings. He said interspersed along the campus area 1,060 parking spaces for the campus.

He said the property is located partially in the CB/MU zone. The mixed use overlay zone is over portions of the downtown area, and is there to promote the goals of the Master Plan, and gives the Planning Board broader powers under dimensional regulations and design standards. He said the basic elements of the Master Plan on the left, is that it includes the first phase of the emergency department expansion, located near the corner of Main Street and Spring Street.

He said that along with this expansion, is that the hospital recently has been under agreement with the former Texaco station site, which was a contaminated site. It will be reclaimed, and it will take about four or five years. This will become a parking lot. The reclamation will allow re-use of the site for future development.

He said the Master Plan represents behind the hospital two small wings, which is for medical and surgery procedure expansions. These are options in the future that will be based on many factors, such as cost and timing and needs. He said that on Dearborn Street, it shows three brown buildings, which are options on medical office buildings.

He said the main piece behind that building, is that the hospital has under agreement certain properties that would allow for a parking expansion, on the easternmost portion of the site. He identified it as a lightly shaded area.

Mr. Petropulos said one of the key, most visual pieces for the hospital is the re-use of the former Texaco site, it is hoped that it could support a future building.

He pointed out a drawing on the right. He said it is the proposal they are presenting to the Planning Board in two weeks for the emergency department expansion. It is a three-story expansion, with a proposed basement. The current emergency department sits down low, and as the building expands towards Spring Street, there isn't enough site left for ambulances and emergency vehicles. He said they are proposing an atrium-type entrance, which will be slightly higher, and a ramp will be installed to make up the grade difference. He said there will be a new ambulance loading bay.

He pointed out the entry, where ambulances will backload under a canopy and patients will be brought in directly through the building. He pointed out a drop-off, an emergency vehicle parking area, and a one-way drive aisle system. He said the curb-cut at the intersection will be removed.

He also pointed out a portable MRI trailer unit. It gets tractor-trailer in during off-peak hours, about once per month. He said they want to ensure that the MRI loading is done during the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m., and done under the supervision of a security officer to control traffic.

He said the parking they are displacing for the emergency department is going to direct those 35 to 40 spaces to where the outpatient parking currently is. Signage will be installed to help direct drivers.

Discussion ensued about the short term loading and unloading of patients.

Mr. Petropulos said the second component is the redevelopment of the former Texaco site. He pointed out the relocation of the current entrance into the Spring Street lot, which will be relocated closer towards Main Street. He said it is on the inside of a curb, and it is difficult to see now, and with a pedestrian crossing there, it is a concern. He explained that they will take

NCPB

February 5, 2004

Page 21

the pedestrian crossing away and relocate it. He said that when it is done, it will be timed so that pedestrians can only cross when there is a red light at Kinsley Street.

He said there are seven curb-cuts out there now in various locations, and they are eliminating three existing curb-cuts. It will be safer than what currently exists.

Mr. Farkas asked about the entrance into the emergency room and parking lots from Spring Street, and if vehicles can make both a right and left turn.

Mr. Petropulos said vehicles cannot go right, it is a one-way street, and it is more simplified.

He said the drawing on the right indicates new lighting and landscaping. He said that in the mixed use zone, architectural elevations are part of the plan. He pointed out the Spring and Main Street elevations, with its windows, glass elements, flat roof, and brick. He said the key element is the atrium entrance. It is consistent with the Dearborn Street office. Also, the structured parking garage as part of the Master Plan does contemplate an overhead walkway over Spring Street in the future. It would tie in by the atrium entrance, and gives a free flow for pedestrians.

Mr. Dufour said the employee parking as it exists today, will now be emergency parking, will those employees be directed across the street?

Mr. Petropulos said yes.

Mr. Dufour pointed out a proposed crosswalk, and asked if it were to be the only one. It seems out of place.

Mr. Petropulos said they were concerned about someone unloading an emergency department patient, and crossing over parking the car, and not thinking, wanting to make a bee-line to an entrance he pointed out on a map.

Mr. Dufour asked if the employees would come in through the atrium.

Scott Cote, Property Management Director, Southern New Hampshire Health System. Mr. Cote said they are trying to make a shift in where the employees will park. He said the employees currently park in the Spring Street parking lot now. He pointed out the

NCPB

February 5, 2004

Page 22

easterly portion of the main Master Plan drawing. He said the medical center has secured some additional lots off of Prospect Street, with the intent of developing it into roughly 130 spaces. The intention is to have employees park there, to allow outpatient activity have better access to the outpatient entrance where the rotunda is. He said the Spring Street lot will dedicated to additional emergency department parking required, and outpatient and visitors.

Mr. Lowe asked how employees will get from the parking areas to the front of the hospital.

Mr. Cote explained where the employees park, and how they gain access to the building.

Mr. Petropulos said this will be a complex construction project in terms of phasing. He pointed out where ambulances will park and drop off patients into the emergency department entrance.

Mrs. Lasky asked what will be on the second and third floors.

Mr. Cote said the floor directly above the emergency department will be cardiologist's services. The third level will be an eventual expansion of surgical services. It will be constructed in a "shell" fashion, and it will be ready for expansion in the future.

Mr. Dookran said they have the traffic worksheet. However, the Traffic Department thinks that it is more than what is indicated on the worksheet. He said the emergency department is pushing out into a major intersection, and impacting parking. There are a lot of issues to be worked out, and a traffic engineer has been retained to look at these issues. Also, the Broad Street Parkway will be nearby, bringing in additional cars.

Mr. Cote said in all fairness, it wasn't until the day before that they knew of all the concerns of the Traffic Department. It is the hospital's intention to go over all the information with the Traffic Department so all specifics can be responded to. The hospital is looking forward to this plan, it resolves a lot of issues, and the redevelopment of the Texaco site is going to be appealing, too.

**ADJOURN**

NCPB  
February 5, 2004  
Page 23

Mr. Lowe declared the meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING:**

February 19, 2004.

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Bette Lasky, Chair, Nashua City Planning Board

**TAPES OF THIS MEETING ARE AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING DURING REGULAR OFFICE HOURS.  
COPIES OF TAPES MAY BE MADE AVAILABLE UPON 48 HOURS ADVANCED NOTICE AND PAYMENT OF THE FEE.**