

NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD
March 17, 2005

A meeting of the Nashua City Planning Board was held on Thursday, March 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
 Steve Dookran (City Engineer)
 William Slivinski
 Steve Farkas
 Hugh Moran
 George Torosian
 Kelly Dowling

Also present: Roger Houston, Director, Planning Dept.
 Mike Yeomans, Deputy Planning Manager
 Rick Sawyer, Deputy Planning Manager

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 17, 2005

Mr. Dookran said on Page 13 in the last paragraph Mr. Dookran's name should be substituted for Mr. Dufour's name.

MOTION by Ald. Larose to accept the minutes of 2/17/05 with corrections and place them on file.

SECONDED by Mr. Moran.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Houston said the following item should be in the Board's folders:

Memorandum received at 4:52PM today from Susan Klasen pertaining to the Maplewood subdivision A/K/A Carriage House Common.

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE & LAISON

Ald. Larose said last night at the Personnel Classification Meeting Mr. Dufour and Mr. Moran were nominated for re-nomination to the Planning Board. It should come to the next Board of Alderman

NCPB
March 17, 2005
Page 2

meeting and there should be no problems.
Mrs. Lasky asked if there have been any meetings on the ordinance.

Ald. Larose said there hasn't been a meeting in the last couple of weeks. His understanding is that the two April meetings have been cancelled. He said the Chairman had a heart attack and is home recuperating.

Mr. Farkas said there was a Regional Planning Meeting last night and they passed the 2004 Regional Housing Needs Assessment. A copy of that report will be made available to the Board.

He said they also considered the Nashua Regional Planning Commission's Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan. He said it was the first time a lot of people had seen it and no one had much chance to go through it in much detail so it was tabled until their June meeting. A letter will be going out to all Planning Boards through staff. A presentation will be offered so the Boards can get more involved in it.

He said there is a two-page fact sheet that the Dept. of Safety provided to Regional Planning yesterday with questions and answers referring to "On Board Diagnostics" for the new vehicle testing. He said their position is that there is no way this should cause your vehicle inspections to double or triple like some of the vehicle inspection stations are saying. He will make this available to the Board members as well.

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

None

NEW BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLANS

1. **John T. Jackson (Owner) - Proposed lot line relocation, 50 Wellington Street & Stark Street, Sheet 65 - Lots 29 & 30, Zoned "RA" - Urban Residence.**

Atty. Ernest Jette, 187 Main Street, Nashua. Atty. Jette said this is a simple lot line relocation plan. He said Mr. Jackson owns the property at 50 Wellington Street, which is a single-family home and he wants to construct a sunroom addition of 276 square feet, but by doing so he would violate the setback requirement. He also owns the lot adjacent to it and proposes to move the lot line 10' to allow for the proper setback. The resulting Lot 29, on which the house exists, will increase from 7500 square feet to 8250 square feet and the adjacent lot (Lot 30) will be reduced in size from 12500 square feet to 11750 square feet, which still exceeds the minimum of 7500 square feet needed in this zone. He said the addition increases the maximum buildable area by 1%, for which a variance has been granted.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN

No One.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

No One.

MOTION by Ald. Larose to approve the lot line relocation plan, 50 Wellington Street & Stark Street with the finding that it meets Section 16-108.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 2. Carriage House Common At Maplewood, SSJ,LLC (Owner) - Proposed final subdivision approval of Phase 6, for 37 building lots, Cherrywood Drive, Searles & Buck Meadow Roads, Sheet C - Lot 2793, Zoned "FUOD" - Flexible Use Overlay District.**

Scott Murphy, Hayner/Swanson, Inc., Nashua. Mr. Murphy said Atty. Prunier is also present for this case. He said that Phase 6 of this project was given preliminary approval by the Planning Board on September 13, 2001.

He said Phase 6 creates thirty-seven new single-family residential lots and four open space lots. The plans include the completion of Cherrywood Drive from Buckmeadow Road throughout to the Gagnon Farm portion of the project. There will be lots off of Cherrywood Drive as well as two cul-de-sacs - Chokeberry Lane and Hydrangea Drive. Most of the lots are around 1/4 acre in size, with the largest being just over one acre.

Mr. Murphy said Cherrywood Drive has been under construction for the last couple of years and will be completed in early spring. Chokeberry and Hydrangea will follow later on this year or the beginning of next year.

He said previously there was a restriction on the four lots in Phase 6 with regard to the New Hampshire DES Wetlands Permit issued for the entire project. Recently DES has amended the Wetlands Permit, releasing those four lots for development.

Mr. Murphy said they have read Mr. Sawyer's staff report and have no problem with the stipulations that he has recommended. The comments made in Susan Klasen's memo are fine.

He said they have been in discussion with Mr. Dookran regarding Note #23 with regard to inflow and infiltration. He will answer any questions about this that the Board may have.

Mr. Dookran said Susan Klasen sent an E Mail. She is asking that all signs and pavement markings be installed per specification. He said he wanted to make it clear that some signs installed already in previous phases don't meet these specifications and those will have to be re-installed. The condition is that prior to a building permit being issued in Phase 6, all the previous signs and pavement markings are to be brought up to standards.

He said the second condition recommended by Susan Klasen is that prior to the last ten certificates of occupancy being issued in Phase 6, all signs and pavement markings throughout the entire project must be installed.

He said with regard to Note #23 there isn't a lot of history about how this came about. He said there must have been some discussions with the City Engineer at the time with SSJ that mitigation for adding 200+ homes to the sewer (Salmon Brook Interceptor) would be to remove infiltration and inflow from the system downstream. At the time the Lund Road/Bishop Guertin High School area was identified as an area where work could be done in the form of installing new drains, new sewers, etc. to remove the excess inflow and allow more capacity, especially during storms. He said looking at this stipulation today, it is sort of vague and he'd like to have it revised somewhat. He said he discussed this earlier today with Atty. Prunier to get language.

He said this is a question now because it may not be necessary to complete the work based on their approach to solving combined sewer overflows in the City. He said they have just started a new inflow/infiltration study throughout the City to determine where the excess flow is coming into the system. The Bishop Guertin area happens to be in the study area. He said it might be a year from now before they know for sure whether this work will be done or not. He is hopeful they can make that determination within the coming months, before a number of certificates of occupancy are issued. In discussions with Atty. Prunier, the last fifteen would be the cut-off.

Mr. Dookran said if the work were not necessary, the City would like to have a monetary contribution in lieu of the work. He doesn't want them to be in a position where that number is questionable so he wants to make sure the language protects the City.

Mr. Dookran said the wording of Note #23 on the plan states: "The issue on inflow and infiltration in the area of Bishop Guertin High School and Lund Road shall be coordinated and approved by the Engineering Department. Work associated with this issue shall be completed prior to the completion of Phase 6."

The suggested wording is: "If it is determined by the City Engineering Department that this work is not necessary, a monetary contribution shall be made in an amount to be agreed upon between

SSJ, LLC and the City of Nashua Engineering Department prior to the issuance of the last fifteen certificates of occupancy." Mrs. Lasky asked why it would be tied to the last fifteen certificates of occupancy.

Atty. Gerry Prunier. Atty. Prunier said the idea is that they would like the project to move on, but at the same time Mr. Dookran wants to make sure that this is accomplished before the project is done. By tying it to the certificates of occupancy, there is an urgency upon the developer to work with the City to get it done. No one wants to spend money on something that may not be necessary. If they don't do the work there, a monetary contribution may be better for the City to get something done in another location. He said as Mr. Dookran has stated, they are conducting a study and hopeful in a month or two the City will be in a position to make a decision as to which is better.

Mr. Dufour asked Mr. Dookran if he is comfortable leaving the amount vague at this time.

Mr. Dookran said in the study that they are doing, they wouldn't have final results until nine months to a year from now, but he wants to have the opportunity to evaluate the commitment that was made by the applicant some years ago. He said he believes he can evaluate that commitment in the coming months.

He said he has asked the applicant's engineer to submit whatever plans they've worked on for the Lund Road area. He wants to see those plans and use them to evaluate how much work they had intended to do. In the meantime they will continue the study and if the indications are that this area really isn't showing inflow and infiltration than there is no need to waste resources. At the same time he will have an estimate of what their work would have cost. If the Board allows him to negotiate with the applicant he will do that.

Mr. Slivinski said this means that the contractor is being penalized if the work isn't necessary.

Atty. Prunier said a commitment was made in the past and he doesn't remember exactly why, except that it had something to do with infiltration. Instead of doing the work in the Maplewood area the agreement was to do the work around Bishop Guertin High School. It was acceptable to the developer and the developer isn't going to back away from that. The issue now is whether that work needs to be done either. If it doesn't have to be done the City and developer will agree on some monetary consideration and the City

can use it in another place.

Mr. Dookran said the City isn't trying to extort money from the developer because they made a commitment or promise. He said he thinks the City Engineer at the time was thinking forward because there were going to be 200+ units coming in and placing stress on the sewer. At the same time the City was dealing with the CSO order from the EPA. This is the way the City Engineer at the time dealt with it.

He said you can spend a lot of money to remove the excess inflow and infiltration, but the benefit may not be there. You can spend less money doing something different and that is the CSO approach they are taking. He said they are using storage tanks and building a new plant at the current wastewater plant to bring in the excess and create capacity upstream.

Ms. Dowling asked if this is the Salmon Brook or Cold Brook sewer interceptor.

Mr. Dookran said the Cold Brook sewer interceptor runs into Salmon Brook.

Ms. Dowling asked if Pennichuck Water Works is still servicing the project.

No answer could be heard.

Mr. Dufour referred back to Susan Klasen's memo and the reference to the street signs. He said he knows the issue is wood versus the standard sign. He asked if the developer is going to remove the existing signs or just install new conforming signs and leaving the wooden ones.

Mr. Murphy said he believes they will be removing the existing signs that don't meet the City's specs.

Mr. Farkas referred back to the amount of the contribution they addressed earlier. He said if they wanted to have clarity it seemed like they would want to define what that is now. They signed up to do certain work, which is worth something. He said they can probably tell the City what they estimated that to be right now. He said if this is done down the road and the City and developer can't agree they might be back before the Board again.

Mr. Dookran said he wished he knew the amount right now, but they haven't had the opportunity to do the assessment. He said the

issue really came up a couple of weeks ago and he asked for someone to do that evaluation and it hasn't been done because of the lack of information. He is hoping that within the next couple of months this can be done. It takes time to get that number right. If the applicant is willing to hold off until that's done, he is okay with it.

Atty. Prunier said they've committed to do some work and if they want them to do it, they will do it. They agree with Mr. Dookran that it's silly to do that. At the same time they want to move ahead because spring is coming.

Mrs. Lasky said she thinks the stipulation is clear enough.

Mr. Farkas said he thought it just kicks it down the road and doesn't change it. It leaves the amount of the contribution to be figured out later. He said he'd like to have a number so that it is decided upon and then it doesn't have to be determined at a later time.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN

Jay Leatherman, 6 Cherrywood Drive. Mr. Leatherman said he has lived in his home for about two years. They are in Phase 3. He said he would like to add one minor phrase to one of the recommendations. He referred to Recommendation #4. He would like to see a sign or some type of way to make sure that the construction trucks would use Ridge Street rather than Cherrywood Drive going to Buckmeadow. Phase IV & V have been done and the trucks have been using this route and it has been causing major problems with bus routes and bus traffic.

Mr. Dufour said he understands the situation and he's sure that the residents are sick of looking at these trucks, although they are coming to an end. He said he thinks Mr. Leatherman is asking the developer re-route the traffic through another development that's yet to be developed. He said he isn't sure that can be done. In other words, Mr. Leatherman is asking that the trucks enter through Ridge Road and go through the Ashwood Homes to Gagnon Farm parcel to access this Maplewood subdivision. First of all, it's not an approved street. They haven't even started building in there yet.

Mr. Leatherman said on the corner of Hollyhock & Conant, which is another entrance into the area. He said there's been a sign there for the past 2-3 years that asks that all construction trucks use the Buckmeadow entrance.

Mr. Dufour said Mr. Leatherman is asking that they enter through Ridge Road, but they would have to go through a development that hasn't been built yet. That is the Gagnon Farm subdivision.

Mr. Leatherman said they were one of the first homes in Phase III to be built at that end of Cherrywood. At that time it was not a completed phase. All of the construction trucks were moving up and down the road at that time because they were in the construction phase. Since then they continue to have construction trucks. He is asking for the construction trucks to be re-directed off the Ridge Road entrance rather than coming through Cherrywood off of the Buckmeadow & Cherrywood entrance.

Mr. Dufour said the developer is finalizing the last phase, which abuts Gagnon Farms. What Mr. Leatherman is asking is that the trucks cut through Gagnon Farms to work the last phase. They have done very little work at Gagnon Farms and he isn't sure that the roads are in a condition where they even have the right to direct that traffic through someone else's property.

Mr. Farkas said if he is understanding what Mr. Leatherman is talking about, he is making a reference to Stipulation #6 that states before you get a building permit, if you are going to connect Cherrywood Drive all the way to Ridge Road so there is going to be a completion and it should at least be suitable for construction vehicles.

Mr. Dufour asked if it becomes a City street at that point. He said he doesn't think it does.

Mr. Farkas said it might not be a City street, but it will be a street that has been constructed by the people who are building the homes. He asked why they couldn't use it.

Mr. Dufour said he didn't see how that could be stipulated if the land is owned right now by someone else.

Mr. Sawyer said he understands that the base pavement at Gagnon Farms was put in before winter came. The part of Cherrywood that's missing is at Phase VI. They are still working on it. He said he assumes they are going to have an easement across that until the subdivision at Gagnon Farms is actually recorded. This is going to be on the Board's next agenda so they are talking about something that's almost here. At this point it would be a private easement or agreement between the two parties. He said the Board could ask

the applicant if there is an agreement in place now or if they are willing to work that way.

Atty. Prunier said the reason the stipulation was put in was because the Board was concerned about the safety of the connection. He said in one of the earlier phases they had to get an easement on a dirt road and it allowed other phases in Maplewood to continue. In Phase VI they want to have an easy emergency access through. He said it becomes a problem because there is no bond put up by the contractors in Maplewood to use Gagnon Farms. If they dig up the road, Gagnon Farms has to replace it.

He said probably very soon it will be difficult to tell which trucks are going where, but that's a policing matter that will have to be taken care of by the owner of Gagnon Farms.

Further discussion ensued.

Mrs. Lasky asked if Cherrywood is an approved street now.

Mr. Sawyer said he doesn't know that they've accepted any parts of it. It meets street compliance, which allows for houses to have occupancies. He said there is no other way to access Phase VI of this project without going through the existing phases of the project. He said the signs were put up on the earlier roads because there was a way to get away from the parts that were built.

He said they are nearer the end. They needed to move a lot of material - something like 50,000 cubic yards out of Phase VI. That is the reason they are seeing so many trucks coming out of there right now.

There was a discussion about the speeding trucks and the fact that the police have been called because of them. When the police presence is there the trucks slow down.

Mr. Sawyer said there are signs out here that read "Caution, Children at Play, Contractors Beware" and all those kinds of things. He said the developer's representative is in the audience tonight and has heard what has been said. He said this is the first he has heard about this. He said they can discuss this with the contractors to see what they can do about schedules around bus stops, etc.

Anand Kalyanavarathan, 5 Cherrywood Drive. Mr. Kalyanavarathan asked if the Board could at least add a phrase about a target date by which the City and SSJ come to an agreement in the amount of contribution that has not yet been decoded. Right now it is open-ended. He said the City is conducting studies and after three or

four months they may end up needing more time because of other priority items that need to be assessed.

Mr. Slivinski said that generally developers want to get this done as fast as they can. They have a lot of money tied up and the one factor they don't know is how fast they are going to be able to sell the homes. If the real estate market slowed down appreciably it will take longer for the developer to finish the project versus if the market is still very hot.

Atty. Prunier said they are trying to accommodate the City Engineering Department because they are doing some studies and Mr. Dookran wants to make sure before saying it's needed or not needed. He thinks the flexibility should be with the City. He said they have a desire to get it done as quickly as possible and they will be talking to Mr. Dookran about it.

James Palmieri, 7 Cherrywood Drive. Mr. Palmieri said he wanted to agree with Mr. Leatherman's comments about the construction traffic. He said there is a lot of traffic going through there, especially at night and there are a lot of kids in that area.

He asked the Board if there are any plans to make improvements or widen Ridge Road or change the blinking light that is on the corner of Spit Brook Road and East Dunstable Road where it goes into Ridge. He is asking this because of the increased population in this area.

Mr. Sawyer said he is not aware of any plans like this.

Mrs. Lasky said there are plans to widen Lamb Road.

Mr. Dookran said over the last few years the City has looked at this intersection, even before he started with the City. He said it meets warrants for a traffic signal. It wasn't implemented because people at that time felt that putting a signal there would change the whole neighborhood look that they want to preserve in that area. He agreed that the road has seen traffic grow phenomenally over the last few years. Right now it sees between 11,000 - 12,000 vehicles a day and continues to grow.

He said they went from the blinking condition of yellow and red to a three way stop in order to give the people coming out of East Dunstable Road the opportunity to get out. To a lot of people yellow means right-of-way; it doesn't mean caution. He thinks it works better today. He understands there is a long back up in the evening peak hour as far down as Roby Park, although he hasn't seen that himself.

Mr. Palmieri said it does.

Mr. Dookran said they will look to see what can be done to make the traffic move a little faster. He said they had considered putting in a roundabout. It would give everyone the opportunity to get in and out. He said that idea was shot down, although he supports it. Roundabouts can support up to 15,000 vehicles a day and beyond that you are talking about a traffic signal, widening, or a two-lane roundabout. He doesn't believe the area would support a two-lane roundabout.

He said in terms of Lamb Road, they are going to be entering construction in a couple of months. They are going to be adding sidewalk on the south side to connect to the sidewalk that's down on Middle Dunstable Road further down to the sidewalk that goes to Roby Park. The road will be shifted somewhat to the north and widened a little bit to 24'. The neighbors didn't want a wide road. A wide road encourages speeding and they don't want people speeding up and down that roadway.

Mrs. Lasky mentioned that there have been neighborhood meetings at New Searles School on the Lamb Road Extension. When the Southwest Quadrant Master Plan was developed there was a strong cry to keep the rural character of the neighborhood in this area.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

No One.

Mr. Dufour said the developer's representative is in the audience. He said when you move into a subdivision like this, whether you like it or not you are going to have to put up with dust and noise - both early and late, but he doesn't think that people at any time have to worry about the safety of their children on the street. He thinks it would be wise to start controlling that.

MOTION by Mr. Dufour to approve the subdivision plan for Carriage House Common At Maplewood, Phase VI with the finding that it meets Section 16-108 and with the following stipulations:

1. Prior to a final subdivision plan being recorded, all required easement and dedication documents shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Department and Corporation Counsel and recorded with the plan, the cost associated with recording the easements, deeds shall be submitted to the Planning

- Department.
2. Prior to the final subdivision plan being recorded, bonding for all public improvements shall be submitted to and approved by the Engineering Department and Corporation Counsel.
 3. Prior to building permit being issued in Phase 6, improvements in the previous phase must be installed to the satisfaction of the Planning Department and Division of Public Works.
 4. Prior to a building permit being issued in Phase 6, Cherrywood Drive shall be completed to Ridge Road to the satisfaction of the Fire Department, Planning Department and Division of Public Works.
 5. Prior to the last 10 certificate of occupancy being issued, all on site improvements shall be completed.
 6. Prior to a building permit being issued in Phase VI, all signs and pavement markings included in previous phases must be installed to the specification and satisfaction of the Division of Public Works.
 7. Prior to the last 10 certificates of occupancy being issued in Phase VI, all signs and pavement markings throughout the entire project must be installed to the specification and satisfaction of the Division of Public Works.
 8. Note #23 on the plan shall be amended as follows: In the event that the City Engineering Department determines that the work not be necessary, developer agrees to make monetary contribution in lieu of completing the work in an amount to be determined between the Engineering Department and the applicant and made prior to the issuance of the last fifteen certificates of occupancy.

Mr. Dookran asked if the Board wanted to give some consideration into a time frame as had been suggested by Mr. Slivinski.

Mr. Farkas said he didn't know how they could do that. He said they could say by April or May, but he didn't think that buys a lot.

SECONDED by Ald. Larose.

MOTION CARRIED - Mr. Farkas opposed.

NEW BUSINESS - SITE PLANS

3. **White Family Ventures, LLC (Owner) - Proposed amendment of NR1980 for a change of use of 3,980 square feet from industrial/warehousing to personal service, 12 Murphy Drive, Sheet 140 - Lot 60, Zoned "PI" - Park Industrial.**

Richard Maynard, Professional Engineer, Maynard & Paquette, Nashua. Mr. Maynard said this building was once industrial and was converted into a multi-tenant use. It's located at the end of Murphy Drive adjacent to the F.E. Everett. He said the Board approved a site plan about 1-½ years ago. It's a 97,120 square foot building. About half the use is for business and about half is used for industrial. Most recently they received a variance for a change of use to allow a personal services operation. It is going to be a 3,980 square foot holistic care center, which preaches various techniques such as massage, acupuncture, Rikki, yoga, etc. He said the building will still be roughly 50% office and a little less industrial and 3900 square feet of a personal service center.

He said there are 309 parking spaces where 255 are required. The holistic center is estimated to required sixteen per the ordinance.

He said the two suggested stipulations are fine. With regard to the second one, there is a traffic study under review. There seems to be a demand for more office and business type uses than industrial. At some point they will be back before the Board for a little bit different mix of uses - more business than industrial - possibly as much as 80% - 85% business.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERNS

No One.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

No One.

MOTION by Mr. Slivinski to approve amendment of NR1980 for 12 Murphy Drive for a change of use of 3,980 square feet from industrial/warehousing to personal services with the finding that it meets Section 16-123 and with the following stipulation:

1. All stipulations of approval from September 14, 2000 and February 5, 2004 are incorporated into this approval and shall

remain in full force and effect, unless otherwise determined by the Planning Board.

2. Unless otherwise determined by the Traffic Department, any additional change of use, or increase of office use greater than previously approved by the Planning Board, the applicant shall prepare a traffic study as specified by the Traffic Department.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

OTHER BUSINESS

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

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

SECONDED by Ald. Larose.

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.

Discussion Items

None

Other

Mrs. Lasky said Ms. Dowling is going to work in the Mayor's Office and will not be able to serve on the Planning Board as she will be a City employee. She thanked Ms. Dowling for her service to the Board.

Mr. Moran asked if the City has heard anything from the State DES regarding the Wal-Mart hearing.

Mr. Sawyer said the applicant has requested that DES not pursue the

NCPB
March 17, 2005
Page 16

application at this point. He said there was a public hearing scheduled for the end of March, but it is not going to be held. It's on hold until the applicant notifies them again that they are either coming in with a new plan or they are ready to proceed with the original one. He said the Zoning Board denied their application and the rehearing period is still open. It closes sometime next week.

Mrs. Lasky reminded the Board to let Chris (Planning Dept. Administrative Assistant) know if you are going to be attending the meetings they have. Even if they aren't sure if they can make it they should tell her. Also, she asked the Board to let her know if they know anyone who might be interested in serving as an alternate to the Board.

Mr. Slivinski asked if there is any news on the Dunkin Donuts on West Hollis Street.

Mr. Yeomans said they haven't heard anything.

Mrs. Lasky said a letter was sent out just prior to the last meeting.

ADJOURN

Mrs. Lasky declared the meeting closed at 8:10PM.

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**