

NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD  
June 2, 2005

A meeting of the Nashua City Planning Board was held on Thursday, June 2, 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

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**May 5, 2005**

**MOTION** by Mr. Lowe to accept the minutes of the May 5, 2005 meeting with a change to Page 11 for Stipulation #3 to read: "The stairway will remain in the plan."

**SECONDED** by Mr. Farkas.

**MOTION CARRIED 8-0-1, Mrs. Lasky abstaining.**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

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

Preliminary Planning Board agenda to help with determination of regional impact

Memo from Fred & Barbara Medeiros, 7 Dawn Street, concerning the Exxon Station/Cumberland Farms, Item #3 on the Board's agenda.

Revised report dated June 2, 2005 providing supplemental information from Mr. Yeomans on the Exxon Station - Item #3 on the agenda.

**REPORT OF CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE & LAISON**

Mr. Dufour said that the CIC has a special meeting scheduled for Monday night at 6:00PM.

Mr. Houston said the Committee has been asked to make a recommendation, which will come to the Planning Board at their next meeting for forwarding to the Mayor and Board of Alderman. One of the items is in regard to re-activating the School Capital Reserve Fund. There is nothing in writing yet, but somebody is going to be there from the Administration to elaborate to the Committee. He said the other item is the Pennichuck Acquisition Capital Account.

He said there is a meeting about Rotary Park at the Adult Learning Center on Lake Street on June 7, 2005 at 6:30PM.

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. **Daniel & Jennifer Abel & Maria Rowe, Ricardo Mantos & Filade O. Silva (Owners) - Proposed lot line relocation and consolidation, 25 Stevens Street & 34 Park Avenue, Sheet 124 - Lots 48, 48,49,51,53,54,55,56 & 57 Zoned "RB", Urban Residence.**

Richard Maynard, Professional Engineer, Maynard & Paquette. Mr. Maynard said this proposal consists of a request for a lot line relocation and consolidation along Park Avenue, Lawndale Avenue & Stevens Street, which is off of Main Street. Salmon Brook is a couple of lots to the west.

He said essentially there are three lots of record right now. He pointed two of the lots that had houses on them and the vacant lot. He said each of the individual lots was a series of strip lots, all 25' wide and has never been officially consolidated. He indicated where the lot line was going to be moved. He said no construction or other work is being proposed at this time.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN**

No One.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

No One.

**MOTION** by Mr. Dufour to approve the lot line relocation and consolidation plan, 25 Stevens Street & 34 Park Avenue with the finding that it meets NRO Section 16-108.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Farkas.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**NEW BUSINESS - SITE PLANS**

2. **Jackson Falls, The Residences at Jackson Falls, LLC (Owner) - Proposed 1-year extension for the construction of a 5-story, 22-unit multi-family apartment building with associated access, parking and site improvements, 52 Main Street, Sheet 43 - Lot 103, Zoned "CB/MU" Central Business/Mixed Use Overlay.**

Atty. Gerald Prunier. Atty. Prunier said he is representing Jackson Falls. He said they are asking for a 1-year extension for the

construction of this building. He said when this came to the Board they were uncertain about the City's part with reference to the river walk and now they know a little more certain. The City had to go through certain steps for TIFs and finally got approval. They went out to bid and the bids came in close to or a little under what the City had allocated for the work. He said they are assuming that when the Finance Committee meets next week that they will approve the money to be spent to develop the walkway. He said it appears that they will be under construction within 30 - 60 days.

Mr. Lowe asked if the pylons to hold up the walkway have been installed on the Peddler's Daughter.

Atty. Prunier said he's sure whatever arrangements for the walkway with the Peddler's Daughter have been taken care of. There is an easement for the walkway.

Mr. Dufour asked if the public would be allowed to go in the back and park when the restaurant opens.

Atty. Prunier said "no." He said that wasn't in the approval.

Mr. Farkas asked what would happen if the Finance Committee said "no" to the funding.

Atty. Prunier said they would probably go ahead and build the site anyway because they have invested a lot of money already, but they would have to come back to the Board because the plan approval was with the walkway.

Mr. Dufour said the applicant came to the Board recently to talk about possibly eliminating the gate system. He asked for an update on this.

Atty. Prunier said they are still working on this to make sure that the system they proposed to the Board is going to work. Someone has come up with a new idea/a better idea that they think would work. If it does they probably will be back in front of the Board to approve it. They can't change it without the Board's approval.

Mr. Dookran said he is tempted to appear before the Finance Committee to demand some payment that the project owes Public Works for doing some paving over the utilities. He asked if Atty. Prunier knows the status of this payment or if someone else knows.

Atty. Prunier said he didn't know.

Mark Maynard, 7 Burgundy Drive, Nashua. Mr. Maynard said he has every intention of paying for these services. He said they were supposed to be in the ground in June. There was a holdup on the City's part (the River walk) and that held the project up. They couldn't get financing until they have an approved stamped plan.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN**

No One.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

No One.

**MOTION** by Mr. Lowe to approve the site plan for Jackson Falls, the Residences at Jackson Falls, LLC, 52 Main Street for a proposed 1-year extension for 22-unit multi-family apartment building with the finding that it meets Section 16-123 & Section 16-557 (Mixed Use) and with the following stipulations:

1. With approval of the plan Section 16-557(2)(e) is modified to allow the encroachment of the 60-foot setback from the Nashua River.
2. With approval of the plan Section 16-557(2)(f) is modified to allow the encroachment of the 30-degree plane setback from the Nashua River.
3. 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, erosion control measures and tree protection.
4. Prior to a building permit being issued, a development agreement shall be executed between the applicant and the City in regards to the construction of the proposed river walk.
5. Prior to a building permit being issued, the final river walk lighting, railing and retaining wall details shall be approved by the Community Development Division.
6. Prior to a building permit being issued, final approval of the storm water management system shall be obtained from the Engineering Department and the necessary covenants and easements for the 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.
7. Prior to a building permit being issued, final approval of the emergency access easement on Lot 96 shall be obtained from the Fire and Planning Departments and Corporation Counsel and recorded. The cost associated with recording the document shall be submitted to the Planning Department.
  8. Prior to a building permit being issued, approval of the NHDES Wetland Dredge and Fill Permit and Shoreline Protection impacts shall be obtained.
  9. Prior to a building permit being issued, final approval of the one-way gate system details and access signage shall be obtained from the Engineering and Planning Departments.
  10. 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.
  11. Written agreement that the gate system shall be maintained by the association and fixed within 48 hours of failure or city will have the right to repair it and charge owner full cost.
  12. The association maintenance fund shall be started by developer.
  13. Developer will review the color of the balcony ceiling with staff.
  14. Emergency access must be maintained from Canal Street to the railroad and clearly posted. The building shall contain fire related compartments, sprinklers/wet standpipes, and a master box.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Dufour.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. **Exxon, Cumberland Farms, Inc. (Owner) - Proposed amendment of NR1616 to show the demolition of the existing facility and the construction of a 3,240 square foot convenience store, 10 fuel pumping stations and a 1,380 square foot car wash with associated access, parking and site improvements, 103-105 Broad Street & Spar Ave., Sheet E - Lots 186 & 205, Zoned "HB" Highway Business and "RA" Urban Residence.**

Scott Borcier, Dubois & King. He said the existing site consists of a convenience store, an automatic car wash, twelve fuel dispensing

stations and three site accesses - two on Broad Street and one on Spar Avenue. You may enter and exit from all three of them. The proposal is to demolish all existing structures. They would like to take the finish floors of the car wash, fuel stations and convenience store and raise them up anywhere from 1' - 2' relative to the existing station.

He said the next thing they would like to do is to move the existing convenience store slightly more northerly and away from Broad Street and build associated parking on the easterly and southerly side of the proposed building.

He said the fuel stations would be going from twelve stations down to ten stations. Instead of located on both the north and south side of the existing convenience store it will be centrally located to just the south side of the proposed building.

He said the car wash currently located on the north side of the site would be relocated to the westerly side. An additional 12' paved by-pass travel lane will be located on that westerly side.

Mr. Borcier said access to the site has been improved and has been increased from three to four. There is an additional access of a dual directional on Spar Avenue. He said the plan that is before the Board has changed slightly since this past week. He said they received some comments from the Traffic Department and they have addressed those comments. Based on those comments they have made the easterly side on Broad Street an entrance only and the westerly side an exit only and have channelized the driveway.

Mr. Yeomans referred the Board to the supplemental information he provided on this site. He said it has a site plan that shows these proposed improvements and a description of what Mr. Borcier was describing to the Board.

Mr. Borcier said they have looked into the storm drainage and just like the existing site, the proposed site will consist of catch basins, manholes, and storm drainage pipes. However, the proposed site will also include two oil/water separators that will treat the collected storm water prior to discharging to the existing retention pond. They are able to manage the runoff to either meet or be lower than the pre-development conditions.

Mrs. Lasky asked Mr. Borcier to go through the pattern of the drive-thru. She asked if it is going to be for a Dunkin Donuts.

Mr. Borcier said from what he understands it will be a Dunkin Donuts. People will enter from the northerly Spar Avenue. The menu

board will be on the northerly side of the building (not located or shown on the plan). The pick-up window is on the westerly side.

Mr. Lasky asked if the pumps are going to be in the front and if there are ten instead of twelve.

Mr. Borcier said right now they are located on north and south side of the convenience store. They are proposing to just do them on the front of the building and the number of pumps has been reduced by two.

Mr. Lowe asked the applicant to address the issue brought up in the letter from the abutters. He read the letter. It is dated 6/2/05 and is from the abutters, Frederick & Barbara Medeiros, 7 Dawn Street. This letter indicated that the existing 6' fence of approximately 200 linear feet which abuts their property is old and in need of repair. It went on to say that since the new building is moving closer to their home they are asking for a new 8' fence to give both parties some privacy.

Atty. Gerald Prunier. Atty. Prunier said they became aware of this letter just this evening. He said they don't even know if the fence is their fence, but assuming it is theirs they would repair it. If it isn't theirs they will ask the owner of the fence if they will be allowed to repair it. An 8' fence is not permitted due to the zoning district. It may be cheaper to replace the fence, but they would like to keep this open right now because they don't know anything about the fence.

Mr. Lowe asked Atty. Prunier if they would mind a stipulation indicating that the applicant would work with staff to determine what's to be done with the fence.

Atty. Prunier agreed to this.

Mr. Slivinski said this reminds him of the West Hollis Street site. It's the same scenario. It's a main route going to Route 3. There's no other drive-thru. He believes this site is going to be busier than the one on West Hollis Street. It will be extremely successful if the traffic pattern works and they don't get traffic backed up onto the street.

He said the plan shows that there is room for seven cars in the queue. He said this isn't going to happen. There's going to be many more than seven cars in the queue. He said after the problem they have had at West Hollis Street he said he would never vote to

approve something like this again. There are parking places that people are going to pull into and then when they want to get out they are going to back up into the queue lines.

He said Exit 6 is a major access exit. He's in this area all the time and he knows what the problems are. When people try to exit that site, the exit of choice is to try to get all the way across Broad Street so they can go south on Route 3.

Atty. Prunier said he understands what Mr. Slivinski is saying about cutting across. This happens now - he doesn't know that there is anything that can be done about it.

Mr. Slivinski said he didn't think there was either, but if a drive-thru is put into the site it's going to get a lot busier.

Mrs. Lasky said there's also a car wash.

Atty. Prunier said the car wash is already there. It will be moved away from the residential area.

Mrs. Lasky said it's in the same traffic pattern as the drive-thru window.

Atty. Prunier said there are three lanes - one for the car wash, one by-pass lane, and one going to the drive-thru window.

Mrs. Lasky asked what the hours of operation are for the car wash.

Ald. Larose said he thinks it's 6:00AM - 10:00PM.

Mr. Dufour said he sees a thru lane that is 17' wide to the left of Dawn Lane. He also sees a sign that says "vacuum & trash". He asked where people are parking and how much of the 17' is that taking.

Mr. Borcier said they are parking right in the 17' road.

Mr. Dookran said they usually use 8' for parallel parking spaces.

Mr. Dufour said this means they are down to a 9' thru lane.

Mr. Dookran said this isn't meant to be a by-pass lane. The by-pass lane is the outside of the car wash. It was meant to be a vacuum lane.

Mr. Farkas said it is the by-pass for the drive-thru if it gets backed up and you want to get out.

Mrs. Lasky said if you want to by-pass the Dunkin Donuts and want to go to the car wash or use the vacuums, that's the lane you have to use.

Atty. Prunier said they could eliminate the vacuums.

Mr. Dufour agreed with Mr. Slivinski's concerns with the stacking for the drive-thru. He said they have discussed the issue on West Hollis Street more than once and he believes this will have a similar scenario. People are going to come in off of Broad Street and back up onto Broad Street trying to get into the parking lot or they will have dueling entrances - off Long Avenue, off Spar Avenue, and then off the on-site queuing that is already designed for that. There's too much happening.

Mrs. Lasky said she could see people coming in on both cuts on Spar Avenue and waiting to get into the Dunkin Donuts.

She asked how many parking spaces there are for the convenience store.

Mr. Borcier said thirteen.

Mrs. Lasky asked the reason for the floors being raised.

Mr. Borcier said so that drainage can move away and there won't be any icing on the concrete pads and to shed water away from the convenience store.

Mr. Torosian asked about the two left-hand fueling stations. He asked if they are supposed to make a hard right or a hard left to get out.

Mr. Borcier said this is correct.

Mr. Torosian asked what would happen if there was on-coming traffic out of the drive-thru lane or out of the car wash. He asked if there was a potential for back up.

Mr. Borcier said he doesn't believe there would be a back up potential from the car wash. Those people will be coming out and moving steadily along to the exit.

He said with regard to the drive-thru he believes there will be time between when the person in the vehicle is going to be receiving their order. That will give the opportunity for the other vehicle at the pump to continue on, either left or right.

Mr. Torosian asked if it is safe to assume that because this is changing from an Exxon Station to a Cumberland Farms that there is going to be less fuel business.

Mr. Borcier said this is the reason that there is a reduction in the number of fueling pumps.

Mr. Dufour said the only thing he can compare this to is the Cumberland Farms across from Costco and they are very busy. They are usually very competitive with their gas. He said he doesn't see it as having less volume than Exxon. He said he would anticipate a similar intensity in the traffic flow. He said he thinks the reason they have eliminated the pumps is so they can get everything else on the site.

Atty. Prunier interrupted to say this is going to be an Exxon Station. He said it's owned by Cumberland Farms.

Mr. Farkas asked about taking the end cap where the parking spaces are and moving it all the way over so they can take out a couple of the conflicts. If you want to come in off of Broad Street you can go straight down the lane where there is parking on the side and you can come in off Spar and cut over.

Mr. Borcier said anyone who comes in on Spar has to go around the site to get to the fuel station.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Dookran said he knows of a site in Nashua that has a similar layout. It's on Amherst Street going west and is opposite Southern New Hampshire University. He asked if anyone knows if there are any issues with queuing for the Dunkin Donuts on that site. He said he hasn't heard of any problems.

Mr. Yeomans said from his observations the only place that comes close is the Texaco Station on Amherst Street adjacent to Exit 7. He said he has seen those cars back out to the street line.

Mr. Dufour said the parking at the Texaco Station doesn't back into the queue line.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR CONCERN**

No One.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

No One.

Mr. Slivinski said he would like to have the applicant go back and re-work the queue lines and maybe spend time at West Hollis Street in the mornings to see how many cars are in the queues, etc. He said he didn't think the problem of cars cutting across to go south on Route 3 could be solved.

Mr. Dookran asked how someone determines that they will institute a "Dunkin Donuts" at a particular site. He is assuming that they study the demand, etc.

Atty. Prunier said there already is a Dunkin Donuts at the site, but it is not a drive-thru. People have to go inside. He said there is more than enough demand for this type of service. Most "C" stores these days have a drive-thru establishment.

Mr. Dookran asked what the demand is - in other words, how many cars so they expect to show up.

Atty. Prunier said he thinks his client believes that seven is sufficient to take care of the demand. He said he would appreciate it if the Board tables this until their next meeting so they can see what they can do about eliminating some parking spaces to add to the queue line and compare it to other comparable gasoline stations. He doesn't believe the Texaco on Amherst Street is one that is comparable because their queue line doesn't have any traffic backing into it. They will come back with more information to help the Board make their decision.

Mr. Dufour said that he would like to know prior to the meeting which stations the applicant has checked so that he could see for himself how they worked (or did not work).

Ald. Larose asked if there was any thought given to moving the proposed main retail building further west and finding some other way of putting the car wash somewhere else. If you go further west with the main building there will be a longer stack-up lane.

Mr. Slivinski said he would like them to look at ideas to speed the service. At certain time periods (usually AM) they may want a two-station area - one where you pay and the other where you pick up your items.

Mrs. Lasky asked if this would be a limited menu Dunkin Donuts like it is inside.

Atty. Prunier said he doesn't believe that's the case. It's one of the answers they will bring to the Board at the next meeting.

Mr. Dookran said the drive-thru lane for coffee/donuts is 12' wide. It's bordered by curb against the building. He asked how comfortable they are that a large vehicle can make that.

Mr. Borcier pointed out the turning radius. There's 12' plus another 17' lane - a total of 29' of area. They have agreed to eliminate the vacuums so he doesn't think there is going to be an issue for the larger vehicles. There is no curbing except for the car wash side and the building.

Mrs. Lasky asked about delivery hours, how many trucks, etc.

Atty. Prunier said most of the deliveries are done on off hours so it doesn't interfere with the business.

**MOTION** by Mr. Slivinski to table to June 16, 2005 to give the applicant the opportunity to re-work the site.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Moran.

Mr. Dufour said the applicant may want to consider what they are going to do with the trash and the vacuum cleaners. He said they have indicated they would eliminate the vacuums, but they did say something about coming back if they found a better location.

Mr. Farkas said he'd like them to identify the movements on the site and the conflict points.

Mr. Lowe said maybe there should be a little more detail on the off-site flow of traffic such as on Long Avenue.

Mr. Dufour said there's going to be vehicles on Long Avenue because people come up Pine Hill Road from Hollis and will want to pick up their coffee before they jump on the highway.

**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 proposals of regional impact on the technical review agenda.

**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 R-05-204, Authorizing the conveyance of a 12-acre parcel on Gilson Road (Tax Map D Lot 521) to Deborah A. Gleeson for \$100,000 for use as a private school. (Tabled from May 5, 2005 Meeting)

No motion to remove from the table.

#### **Discussion Items**

Mr. Dufour said at their last meeting they were asking for a favorable or unfavorable recommendation on an action the Board of Alderman were taking as it concerned a 55+ development. It was to waive school impact fees. He doesn't know if the Alderman have done anything with this yet. The provision is excellent if you take it at face value, this is housing for older people (55+) and the assumption is that there aren't going to be school impacts because of their age.

He said a couple of things have happened since the provision first started. Now 20% of a development is exempt from the 55+ rule. Also, the assumption is being made that none of those people over 55 have school age children. This is a wrong assumption. They could have their grandchildren. There might be second marriages and have kids in high school. This has to be re-visited. The automatic assumption that it's 55+ and that the exemption should be given is no longer valid.

Mr. Slivinski agreed. He said times have changed. At one time age 55 was old, but it's not any more.

Ald. Larose said his understanding is that the Federal Fair Housing Act stipulates that in this type of housing, 20% of it can be non-elderly, at the discretion of the developer.

He said Atty. Westgate brought out a point that the ordinance states that whatever the specific building is they are talking about impacts the school system. If the answer is "no" they can waive the whole thing. If the answer is, depending where it is and in the future they may have to build a school, the answer is "yes".

The Board asked how they could make this assumption and how the schools are at capacity now.

Mr. Dufour said the units aren't marketed before the impact fee is waived.

Ald. Larose said it's his understanding that when the impact fees are received, they go into a fund and if they aren't used up within a certain amount of time, the money goes back to whoever paid it. He asked if this is correct.

Mr. Houston said this is correct. It is what the State Law says. He said the City has had enough schools to use the funds on in the City. He said he doesn't think this is an issue.

Mr. Farkas said this is a narrow view expressed by someone who is advocating for a certain outcome. It's not that individual school because school impact is not elementary school or junior high or high school. He said they just built two new high schools to accommodate rampant development and it wasn't any one development or any one building. It was all of them put together.

Discussion ensued.

Ald. Larose said he understood what everyone was saying. He said that perhaps they should get some kind of letter together from the Planning Board to send to the Planning & Economic Development Committee so they can understand the issue.

Mr. Houston said some of the Planning Board members sat on the Land Use Committee and they visited this situation and discussed it. He said some communities define what elderly housing is. Nashua's ordinance refers to the HUD statutes, not necessarily the Fair Housing Act. He said his understanding of the Fair Housing Act is that the project has to meet the definition if you want to bring an action under the Fair Housing Act or if you want to get special financing assistance you have to have at least those minimum criteria.

He said he does think this bears some discussion by the Aldermanic Planning & Committee. He said they can also have the consultant

look at it. The Alderman may want to look at 62+. Also, if the Board feels strongly enough they might get a workshop together and have Corporation Counsel there as well as others to discuss the issue and forward the information on.

Mr. Dufour said he's not sure this conversation has to be taking place at this level. He said he gets the sense that the Alderman don't understand that there could very well be school impact in a 55+ development. He thinks it has to be clarified for them. They are the ones that should be clarifying the issue with Corporation Counsel. Ultimately it is the Alderman who have the final say.

Mrs. Lasky asked Ald. Larose if a joint meeting might be arranged with the Planning & Economic Committee and Ald. Larose said he would present it to them.

Mr. Larose said he tried to get the point across at the Planning & Economic Development Committee meeting. Ald. Larose and Ald. Vitale understood, but he didn't think the other three did. They listened to the lawyer and they believed the lawyer.

**ADJOURN**

Mrs. Lasky declared the meeting closed at 8:20PM.

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

**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.**

lt  
Taped Hearing