

NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD
February 17, 2005

A meeting of the Nashua City Planning Board was held on Thursday, February 17, 2005 at 7:00 PM in the Auditorium at City Hall.

Bette Lasky, Chair conducted the meeting.

Members present were: Bette Lasky, Chair
 Ken Dufour, Vice Chair
 Ald. Richard Larose
 Mike Lowe, Mayor's Representative
 Steve Dookran (City Engineer)
 William Slivinski
 Steve Farkas
 Hugh Moran
 George Torosian
 Kelly Dowling

Also present: Roger Houston, Planning Director/Manager
 Mike Yeomans, Deputy Planning Manager

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 13, 2005 (Both the regular and annual meetings)

MOTION by Ald. Larose accept the minutes of both the annual meeting and regular meetings of January 13, 2005, waive the reading, and place them on file.

SECONDED by Mr. Lowe.

MOTION CARRIED 4-0-3, Mr. Dufour, Mr. Farkas 7 Mr. Moran abstaining.

February 3, 2005

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to accept the minutes of the February 3, 2005 meeting, waive the reading, and place on file.

SECONDED by Mr. Moran.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Houston said the following items should be in the Board's folders:
Preliminary Planning Board Agenda for the next meeting to determine regional impact

Letter dated February 17 to Mike Yeomans, Deputy Planning Manager from Wayne Husband, Supt. Of Traffic regarding Old Business Site Plan at 163 Main Dunstable Road

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE & LAISON

Mr. Dufour said the Capital Improvements Committee has had their final gathering and in the next packet they will receive the results and at the next meeting they hope they can approve the results and forward them to the Mayor. He said they found this year that the Department Directors were absolutely focused on what they needed.

Mrs. Lasky asked when the next ordinance meeting will be held.

Mr. Houston said it is next Tuesday. He said he is not sure that the land use code will be on the agenda. He said the Committee actually finished its page-by-page review at the last meeting so they are trying to bring Nashua Planning Commission on board. There are some last minute events that happened last week that they are still working on to prepare a matrix with all the comments from all the Aldermanic Planning Committee meetings that have been had since the beginning of July 2004. The Committee is going to start addressing some of the major issues that are on the matrix. He said it may not be until their first meeting in March.

Mrs. Lasky asked when the process was started with the consultant.

Mr. Houston said he believes it was March or April 2002.

Mrs. Lasky went into the procedure of the meeting as follows:

After the legal notice of each site plan or subdivision is read by the Chair, the applicant or his representative will be given time to present an overview and description of their project. The applicant shall speak as to whether or not they agree with the staff stipulations.

The Board will then have the opportunity to ask questions of the applicant or staff. The Chair will ask for testimony from the audience, first anyone wishing to speak in opposition or with concern to the plan may speak. Come forward to the microphone and state their name and address for the record. This would also be the time to ask questions they have regarding the plan.

Next follows testimony coming from anyone wishing to speak in favor of the plan before the Board. The Board asks that both sides keep their remarks to the subject at hand and try not to repeat what someone else may have said.

After the public testimony is given the Board will discuss the issue and render their decision.

OLD BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLANS

None

OLD BUSINESS - SITE PLANS

1. **Dunstable Road, LLC (Owner) Petroleum Wholesalers, Inc. (Applicant) - Proposed amendment to NR307 for the conversion of the existing 1,575 square foot service station into a convenience store with drive-thru and associated access, parking and site improvements, 163 Main Dunstable Road, Sheet E - Lot 27, Zoned "HB" - Highway Business. (Tabled from December 16, 2004 Meeting)**

MOTION by Ald. Larose to remove from the table.

SECONDED by Mr. Lowe.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Atty. Andy Prolman. Atty. Prolman said when this was before the Board a couple of weeks ago there was an outstanding issue of getting a blessing from the Traffic Department, which they now have.

He said Luke DeStefano from Bohler Engineering is present to advise the Board about his discussions with the Traffic Department. They have met a couple of times over the past two weeks, including some discussion on the phone today. Mr. Husband's memo indicates he is satisfied and has listed some conditions in his report.

He said one issue did come up today. There was a field inspection and there was some concern about a survey. This is noted in the memo from the Traffic Department. He said there is an iron pin out there. He indicated the surveyor took a look at the plan and sent in a fax with his stamp on the plans. He said they are confident that the survey is accurate. Actually, if the survey is not accurate, it will better the situation because the concern that Mr. Husband is raising is that the boundary of the applicant's survey is off of Main Dunstable Road by three feet. What that would do would be to allow the applicant to widen the area where they could do some roadwork and some striping. He said he believes they have satisfied both the Traffic Department and the Planning Department concerns.

Mr. Lowe asked if the applicant was satisfied with the stipulations from both Traffic and Planning and Atty. Prolman said they were fine.

Mr. Lowe asked if they will have a problem with removing shrubs and Atty. Prolman they would not.

Mr. Dookran said that Mr. Husband told him that he had some discussion with either Atty. Prolman or someone else regarding some signage to be added to the project.

Atty. Prolman said that discussion was not with him. He said it may have been with Mr. DeStefano.

Luke DeStefano, Bohler Engineering. Mr. DeStefano said he and Mr. Husband did have a conversation relative to five additional highway marking or roadway-marking signs that they would like to see added both on the Route 3 off-ramp as well as a portion of Main Dunstable Road. Their client has no problems with the additional five signs. However, it is their understanding that any State permitting involved with those signs would be handled directly through the City and not by them. He said their client will pay for the signage as well as the installation of the signage. If acceptable, they have no problems with it at all.

Ald. Larose asked about the five signs.

Mr. DeStefano said it is his understanding that they are looking for two, 20 MPH signs on the off-ramp itself to help limit speeds coming off of the ramp onto Dunstable Road. He said he believes they are also looking for two sign indications that would indicate one land for left turns into the site and one thru lane and then he believes there is one other traffic marking sign. He doesn't believe it has been indicated what type it would be.

Mr. Dookran asked how the drainage on the site is being handled.

Mr. DeStefano said it is basically existing to remain. There is literally no increase in impervious coverage. Under existing conditions the site sheet flows from north to south right into Main Dunstable Road. They propose no changes to the drainage pattern whatsoever. Drainage from the landscaped areas will continue to infiltrate as it does.

He said under the existing conditions, even the landscaped areas are pretty degraded in some spots where they aren't getting the added infiltration. He referred to the plan that has been presented and said this rendering offers a design that should allow for additional infiltration above and beyond what they get under existing conditions. The over-all drainage pattern will remain unchanged. He said they are proposing a series of dry wells to help pick up some of the runoff as well to get additional infiltration, but there will be no added increase in runoff into Main Dunstable Road.

Mr. Dookran said he is more concerned about the drainage on the City's right-of-way. He said there will be some widening to accommodate the left turn into the site. He said he wanted to make sure there wouldn't be any puddles forming within the City street.

Mr. DeStefano said this shouldn't be a problem.

Mr. Dufour asked Mr. DeStefano if he had a graphic with the lane markings.

Mr. DeStefano said they did. He said right now the only plan they have is a sketch plan that was provided yesterday when they met with Mr. Husband. Mr. Husband took that plan for his meeting with the City

Engineer. He said he didn't have a copy of it. He said he does have some small sketch plans that were the basis of that particular design.

Mr. Dufour said it is his understanding that there will be one lane heading east and two lanes heading west. He asked if this is correct.

Mr. DeStefano said he believes it is the opposite - two lanes heading eastbound and one lane heading west. He said they have designed a left turn lane into the site which will help eliminate queuing problems that you would have if an individual looking to make a left into the site with someone stopped behind him waiting for through traffic heading westbound on Main Dunstable. It will help eliminate conflicts with traffic entering or exiting the turnpike.

Mr. Dufour said this is a question regarding the location of the signage.

Paul Minekel ???, Petroleum Wholesalers. Mr. Minekel said right now the high rise sign will have the donut name as well as on the building.

Mr. Slivinski asked if this is going to be visible from the highway.

Mr. Minekel said it will be.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN

No One.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

No One.

Mr. Dufour said he isn't going to support this request. There is a very short distance from the off-ramp to the road. There was a gas station there years ago, but with a different highway configuration. He said it probably can be made to work as a service station, but with a Dunkin Donuts at that exit there isn't a stacking lane long enough where traffic won't be backing out onto the highway. They are seeing a less potentially dangerous situation on West Hollis Street where it is a nightmare at peak level and they have a long stacking lane at the West Hollis Street site.

Mr. Slivinski said he sort of concurs with what Mr. Dufour is saying. He said he brought up the West Hollis Street site at the Board's last meeting. He said he goes by it every day and he feels bad that as a member of this Board that he voted to approve it. He said two years ago Atty. Prunier was before the Board with experts that were telling the Board that there would be no problem.

He said people like their coffee and like to go through drive-thrus. If

NCPB

February 17, 2005

Page 6

you live in the western portion of the City and want to come east into Nashua this is going to be the drive-thru of choice because there is no other drive-thru. Any traffic study being done now is not going to be indicative of what the traffic is going to be once the donut place is open.

He said he wants the site to work. He said there's no doubt there will be queue lines here that need to be addressed. He said he would like to have some sort of recourse so they can go back in a year or so to review these sites without going through some legal process. The developer has to take the responsibility that the site is going to work as much as the Board takes the responsibility that the site is going to work.

Mrs. Lasky said with regard to the site on West Hollis Street, a letter is being sent to them and it mentions revoking the site plan.

Ald. Larose said he finds it difficult to try to compare this site with the Dunkin Donuts on West Hollis Street. He said he believes there is far more traffic on West Hollis Street than they are going to see at this intersection. He said they don't have a Howard Johnson's at the exit any more. It's a car dealership. He said he isn't sure that they are going to see the problems that some of the members see happening.

He asked how many cars can be stacked up on the property to go through the drive-thru window.

Atty. Prolman said he just wanted to point out that this isn't a Dunkin Donuts. He said they don't have a tenant yet. They are looking at a competitor of Dunkin Donuts.

Luke DeStefano. Mr. DeStefano said they have stacking for 12-15 cars on site with the configuration showing the drive-thru on the western side. He said the traffic westbound, which may be a limiting factor for vehicles making a left into what has become an entrance only driveway on the eastern portion of the site, is very limited due to the fact that it dead ends at the end of the road at that end. He said they felt there should be very limited turning movements into the site. He said they have added an extra-wide drive-thru lane to allow for a by-pass for anyone who happens to get caught in the drive-thru and wants to get out of it.

Mrs. Lasky said even if you are heading out more than likely you will be heading into town.

She asked Mr. Yeomans what the stacking lanes was on the site on West Hollis Street.

Mr. Yeomans said the restaurants they have done in the last few years have all maintained approximately 12-15 so what is proposed for this site is the standard.

Mr. Dufour said he agreed that there are fewer cars today that go in front of the station as compared to West Hollis. He said if there is a

NCPB

February 17, 2005

Page 7

sign there indicating there is coffee and/or donuts, regardless of what brand or company, people will drive off the highway as they come into the State. He said they don't know that they have anyplace to go after they get off the highway. They don't realize that this is a dead end until they are on. He said as far as the extra-wide lane so that people can by-pass and get out, they won't be able to get out because the stacking cars won't be able to let them out.

Ald. Larose asked what the stacking lane is on Dunstable Road to take a left turn.

Mr. DeStefano said it was originally designed for one car and one fuel delivery - 75'. He said after their discussions with Mr. Husband yesterday, they have extended that lane another 70' or so for a total in the vicinity of 130' - 160'. He said now they probably have the ability for somewhere in the vicinity of 4-6 cars looking to turn left at any one time before they would cause any stacking issue with cars exiting the off-ramp.

Mr. Torosian said there is the issue of getting into the site and the issue of getting out. He said he took that exit tonight at about 4:30PM. He said it already backs up a little bit at the stop sign. He as third in line at the stop sign. He thinks this could be a recipe for disaster. He said people will be coming off the exit and now there is the potential of an additional lane to take a left into a gas station/donut shop. When you combine that with the fact that there are going to be more cars trying to get out and take a left, where is the car supposed to go that is coming off the exit.

Mr. DeStefano said that is the reason behind the addition of a left turn lane and the expansion of eastbound traffic widths to allow for that by-pass lane. The way they are proposing to stripe the off-ramp it will better delineate traffic so that there's a more controlled turn from the ramp into the through traffic lane. The traffic exiting the turnpike has a straight shot both visually to come off the ramp and head straight. To make the left turn it's going to be a lot more gradual than it was under some of the earlier iterations. They have pulled the width from where they are looking to expand the roadway further west, expanding the stacking lane for those cars turning left. He said they have gone through several iterations of traffic improvements to that area. He said right now they have a plan that they feel will work.

Mrs. Lasky said that she would feel more comfortable if she know how long a transaction was going to take and she understands that they don't have a tenant and can't tell the Board what kind of a donut place it's going to be.

Mr. DeStefano said that they only have a small area of the convenience store dedicated to donut sales. It's about 400 square feet, maybe not even that much, dedicated to donuts and coffee sales. Without a Dunkin

NCPB

February 17, 2005

Page 8

Donuts brand name and without a large full fledged Dunkin Donuts they are comparing apples and oranges to some extent. This is a gas station first and foremost with a small donut shop second.

Mr. Farkas said Mr. Dufour raises a valid point on the cars trying to get out. Once there are cars stacked in the front waiting to get in, people trying to get out won't be able to get out. He asked if they have looked at trying to obtain a cross access easement with the adjacent properties so people can exit somewhere other than back into the traffic.

Atty. Prolman said not that he knows of. He said it is something they could look into.

Mr. DeStefano said his concern with the office building site is that there would be interior conflicts with vehicles using that entrance only. Now you are forcing vehicles do a loop throughout the entire site to cross that major traffic pattern which they designed to help facilitate traffic out.

Mr. Farkas said it would be a place to go because right now everybody could be hemmed in. Nobody could get in, no-one could get out and no-one can get off the ramp because of the back-up.

Mr. Moran asked what corner of the building is proposed for the donut shop.

Mr. DeStefano said the southwest corner.

Mr. Dufour said he has no problem with the site succeeding as a service station and working within its confines. He said the minute you put up a sign that people can see advertising there are donuts off the highway, he doesn't care how many feet they have inside, they have a drive-up situation. The issue here is not walk-in, sit down and eat. The issue is servicing vehicles. The small stacking lane that they have is not enough. When you get off the highway you basically have one lane until you get in front of their establishment. As soon as the stacking lane gets filled, they are going to block the through lane. He said he does not believe it's a small part of their business. They are going to be enticing people off of the highway.

Mr. Lowe said the more he looks at it, the more he dislikes it. He doesn't think the convenience store is a problem; putting in the donut shop is the problem.

Mrs. Dowling asked if it would make any difference if there weren't a sign drawing people in.

Mr. Dufour said people will know at some point that it's there.

Mr. Dookran said on West Hollis Street people are heading toward the turnpike and people know it's the last stop before getting on. There are

NCPB

February 17, 2005

Page 9

other donut shops around the City and if you are heading downtown you know there is another place not too far away for donuts/coffee and you might not wait in line at this proposed site. The main concern that Public Works was the backing up on the ramp and that is one of the reasons they asked for a speed limit of 20 MPH.

He said providing additional stacking, not just on site, but in the roadway helps a lot. It's not the ideal situation, but if he was heading downtown and saw cars waiting to get in, he would go by. If you are in line at the West Hollis Street site, there are two lanes to the left for thru traffic. He said he doesn't like it. West Hollis Street has a lot of problems, a lot of it being the way the service is operated. Another may be the design itself. The drive-thru lane impedes the parking and no one can park. It needs to be re-designed to help the site. The proposed on-site design for this project is much better because the drive-thru is long and there is a by-pass lane and if you don't want to wait in line you can go around.

He said there was talk about exiting the site. He said if there is a car in front of you he believes that people will make room for you to go through. He said it is rather safe here because you can see the cars coming off of the highway so you know when to exit. The through traffic towards the west at this time is very low. Most of the through traffic is going to the Porsche dealership. The other building is a house that is being used for home sales.

He said another reason he has some comfort with this design is that the City took the design to the Department of Transportation and asked for their comments. They thought it was pretty much a local issue.

He said getting to this point with the design has been very frustrating for the Traffic Department. They (City Engineers) had to do a lot of the design themselves to try to make this work. He said Bohler Engineering has another project coming up and he said they make sure they (Bohler Engineering) do the ground work.

Mr. Dookran said he thinks that this is going to work, although it may not be the ideal situation. He said when the turnpike was widened a few years ago the ramp became shorter and worse than it was before. He said when the signs are added, hopefully they will see more safety on this particular ramp.

Atty. Prolman said again that this is not going to be a Dunkin Donuts. He said his client has talked with the local Dunkin Donut franchisees and they have all passed, for whatever reason.

He said there is a positive recommendation from the City's Traffic Department. He said since the last meeting they have had two on-site meetings with the Traffic Department and they are satisfied that the traffic flow is going to work. He said they have to ask themselves how heavy the traffic flow is coming off the highway. He's not sure this is

a high traffic flow area.

He said the applicant agrees to a stipulation that they will come back to the Board in one year and if the site isn't working they will have to make some modifications.

Mr. Dufour said if the traffic flow remains the same and the applicant infers, they would not be opening up at this location. He said they are expecting traffic flow to increase because they want to survive in this location. He said they should be very careful in accepting the offer of the stipulation by Atty. Prolman. He finds it hard to believe that a year from now the Planning Board will be able to tell them that the drive-thru has got to go. He doesn't think legally that they will be able to do that.

Mr. Yeomans said he thinks Mr. Dufour is correct. The removal of the drive-thru would be a pretty substantial change to the site plan. If the applicant is willing to agree to that, they would definitely want to have it as part of the record. He said he didn't think the Board would be entitled to remove a financial element of a site because it's not working correctly. He said the discussion they had at the end of the last meeting is really a site management and enforcement item that is really the problem, not a design issue. He said they can bring the applicant in for discussion. They did it with one of the cluster subdivision projects several times.

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to approve the site plan for Dunstable Road, LLC (Owner) Petroleum Wholesalers, Inc. (Applicant) at 163 Main Dunstable Road for the conversion of the existing service station into a convenience store with drive-thru and associated access, parking and site improvements with the finding that it meets NRO 16-123 and with the following stipulations:

1. Prior to any work being started, the applicant and their contractors shall hold a pre-construction conference with Planning staff to review scheduling, erosion and traffic control. All erosion control shall be installed prior to the start of construction.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit documents pertaining to the storm water operation and maintenance plan shall be recorded.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit the applicant shall resolve any outstanding traffic issues to the satisfaction of the Traffic Department.
4. The Traffic Department recommends the applicant review this design control. If the location allows a wider travel lane and a greater taper rate, the concept should be revised accordingly.
5. Using GIS information for detailed design work could have associated

risks. Traffic Department recommends using more detailed field survey for detailed design work.

6. The Traffic Department reserves the right to review and approve Final Pavement Marking and Signage Plan prior to construction.
7. The first 40' of shrubs on the front left corner of the property are to be removed to increase visibility - to be approved by staff.
8. One year after issuance of C/O, applicant to return to Planning Board to review site conditions.
9. Applicant shall purchase up to five additional signs as determined by Traffic Department. City will install the signage.
10. Final plan to be reviewed by City Engineer.

SECONDED by Mr. Moran.

MOTION CARRIED - Mr. Dufour & Mr. Torosian.

NEW BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLANS

2. **John C. & Margaret M. Jameson, Paul & Marianne Lipari & the Mary Jo Cannarella Revocable Trust (Owners) - Proposed lot line relocation, 3 Bennington Road & 25 & 27 Monza Road, Sheet G - Lots 236, 237 & 570, Zoned "R18", Suburban Residence.**

Steve Auger, Project Manager, Hayner/Swanson, 3 Congress Street, Nashua.
Mr. Auger said Mr. Jameson and Mr. & Mrs. Lipari are also present tonight.

He said the request is for a lot line relocation. The three properties involved in the plan are on Map G Lots 236, 237, and 570. All of the lots are zoned R18. He said the purpose of the plan is to take the area shaded in orange on the plan, currently part of the larger lot and relocating it and dividing it in half and giving it to each of the smaller lots. The purpose is to increase the back yards of the two smaller lots.

Mr. Slivinski asked if any blasting will be required.

Mr. Auger said they will try to keep it to a minimum.

Mr. Moran asked about the landscaping buffer.

Mr. Auger said way back the project next to it was called "Bennington Woods." He said there's a landscape buffer through a bunch of the lots and it currently extends through the area shown in orange. There are covenants given to the association that designed the original project and all of the other owners that the whole buffer fell over their property to

give them control over landscaping, mowing, etc. In order to do anything in those areas the current landowners will need to remove the landscape buffer legally by contacting all the other owners who have anything to do with the whole buffer.

Mr. Moran asked if there is anything the Board needs to do pending that legal question.

Mr. Auger said it is the attorney's opinion that regardless of whether the buffer is there or not, the only question is whether they can move the lot lines because the buffer, whether it's on the big lot now or whether it goes to the smaller lots, it's still there.

Tapes (both) become barely intelligible at this point.

Mr. Lowe asked a question about a conservation easement and Mr. Auger said it's a very small portion, but they are aware of it.

Mr. Lowe asked a question about one of the lots being a buildable lot.

Mr. Auger said if he is talking about the biggest lot - Lot 570 - half of the area that falls under the conservation easement has a bunch of wetlands. The left half meets the zoning requirements for a buildable lot.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN

No One.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

No One.

MOTION by Mr. Dufour to grant the lot line relocation at 3 Bennington Road & 25 & 27 Monza Road with the finding that it meets Section 16-108.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS - SITE PLANS

None

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 technical review agenda.

There was some discussion on whether Wal-Mart was going to come to the Board and when. Mr. Yeomans indicated it probably would not be coming to them until April.

SECONDED by Mr. Moran

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **Referral from the Board of Alderman on proposed O-04-19, amending the Planning and Zoning Ordinances of the City of Nashua in their entirety. (Tabled from June 3, 2004)**

No motion to remove from the table.

3. **Referral from the Board of Alderman on Proposed Street Discontinuance for a portion of Havelin Avenue (N/F Haven Avenue).**

Ald. Larose said Havelin Avenue is not a recognized street. Somewhere/somehow it became Havelin Avenue. It's really Haven.

Mr. Farkas said that in any event this has to be referred to the City Engineer for his recommendation. It can be sorted out when they know what the name of the street is.

Ald. Larose said they haven't discontinued the street. He said they have named the street. He said if they renamed the street, what are they discontinuing - a street that has a different name.

Mr. Farkas said there is a statement that says pursuant to NRO 19-37 the Planning Board, before reaching its decision, shall refer the matter to the City Engineer for his recommendations. He said reading this he doesn't think this is ready for the Planning Board's decision.

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to refer this item to City Engineer for a recommendation.

Mr. Yeomans said the definition of N/F means now or former.

Mr. Dookran said that his engineering staff looked at this in detail and recommended to him that this portion of Haven Avenue (renamed to Eckler Drive) be discontinued.

Ald. Larose said it is named after a person who is a WWII Veteran and his son owns a lot of the properties in that area and his business is on that street and he asked that it be named after his father.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION by Ald. Larose to send a favorable recommendation to the Board of Alderman to discontinue a portion of Haven Avenue now called Eckler subject to solving the zoning problem.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Other

Mrs. Lasky said there is a memorandum in the board member's packets regarding the spring planning conference. She said these have always been very informative. There are topics on every level of knowledge on Planning.

Mr. Houston said any Planning Board member who attends this conference will be reimbursed as if attending a Planning Board meeting.

Mrs. Lasky said the forms have to be in by Friday, April 1.

There was a discussion about the name "Poisson Avenue" because there had been a request to change the name. The Board of Alderman felt it should remain "Poisson" because of its' history.

Ald. Larose said that it probably was a footpath at one time for the people to go to the river to fish. He suspects that a "Poisson" family probably owned the land at some time. A lot of times that is what happens.

ADJOURN

Mrs. Lasky declared the meeting closed at 8:35PM.

APPROVED: _____
Bette Lasky, Chair Nashua City Planning Board

lt
Taped Hearing

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