

NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD
October 20, 2005

A meeting of the Nashua City Planning Board was held on Thursday, October 20, 2005 at 7:00PM in the auditorium at City Hall.

Bette Lasky, Chair, conducted the Meeting.

Members Present: Mike Lowe, Mayor's Representative
 Bette Lasky, Chair
 Ken Dufour, Vice Chair
 Ald. Richard Larose
 William Slivinski
 Steve Farkas
 Hugh Moran

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

Approval of Minutes

October 6, 2005 (Special Meeting)

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to approve the minutes of the special meeting for October 6, 2005, waive the reading and place on file.

SECONDED by Mr. Moran.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of October 6, 2005, waive the reading and place on file.

SECONDED by Mr. Moran.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Communications

Mr. Houston said the following items were in the Board's folder tonight:

NCPB

October 20, 2005

Page 2

Memorandum to the Planning Board from Corporation Counsel, David Connell, on off-site improvement fees as requested by Ald. Larose.

Memorandum from Mike Yeomans, Deputy Planning Manager dated October 20th on blasting. He said they may wish to take this up later tonight under discussion to decide when they might want to have that presentation.

Letter from Pennichuck on the water pressure issue, letter dated October 17th to the Planning Board from some abutters, revised drainage report - all on Old Business - Theresa J. Buckley, Owner.

Preliminary Agenda dated October 20th for regional impact

Memorandum from Roger Houston, Planning Director with today's date listing four items that the Aldermanic Planning & Economic Development Committee made as amendments to what the Board has in their packet tonight. They recommended final passage.

Report of Chairman, Committee & Liaison

Mr. Slivinski asked if anyone had a chance yet to read his or her Emails with reference to the Commuter Rail. He said he thinks the B&O Railroad is going to run a commuter train from Lowell to Manchester either this coming Monday or next Monday. He said he believes it's going to make a stop in Nashua before it heads up to Manchester. He said the Mayor has asked as many people as possible to show up to help support the commuter rail service at its stop in Nashua.

Somebody asked where it's going to stop.

Mr. Houston said he's aware that there's going to be a train, but he doesn't have any of the details.

Mr. Lowe said O-04-19 is waiting on the Planning Board. It has been passed by the Planning & Economic Development Committee subject to the Board's recommendation.

He said R-05-299 is being held and will continue to be held.

Ald. Larose said this is the resolution concerning Gilson Road. He said the parties who wanted to purchase or lease the land are in talks with a private party and looking at purchasing sixteen acres in Nashua. Part of it is in Nashua and part is in

Dunstable. One of the reasons the committee wanted it held was to see if that was going to go through or not. If this isn't acted on by the end of the year, it dies.

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

OLD BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLAN

1. **Theresa J. Buckley, Revocable Trust (Owner) - Debbie Buxton & Nancy Ergmann (Applicants) - Proposed subdivision of one lot into four - 25 West Adelaide Ave. & Boylston Ave., Sheet 54 - Lot 51, Zoned "RA" - Urban Residence (Tabled from the October 6, 2005 Meeting)**

MOTION by Mr. Moran to remove from the table.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Richard Maynard. Mr. Maynard said when they were last before the Board there were two items that needed to be addressed further. One of them was the drainage. There was some confusion as to what was being proposed for drainage. He said the proposal is primarily roof leader leaching basins with each house. It is shown with a little line and a circle on the plan. Each of the houses will have at least two leaching basins.

He said Steve Dookran, the City Engineer, asked him to put a leaching catch basin in where the drainage has a tendency to go off the property. He showed the location on the plan and said they have added this to the plan. He said there are two other leaching catch basins on the site to take care of this.

Mr. Maynard said the other issue was water pressure in this area. He said the Board has the letter from Pennichuck dated October 19th where they've made actual measurements of 57psi. He said Don Ware uses a term of "rock solid". What he really means is the chart of the pressure readings, which is attached on a 24-hour basis never budged up and down. This means there is very little effect due to water usage on the street. You would normally see some peaks and valleys. The pressure and flow are so good in this area it does not reflect in the charts. Therefore, these new homes will have no impact. Also, the Pennichuck standard is between 40 to 80 psi. The State standard is a minimum of 20psi. The preferred standard (the utility people) is 30psi. They have 57psi.

He said prior to 2001 there was a problem in this area. It's been upgraded since then and these are the results. He said Mr. Ware also has told him that there have been no complaints since 2001 by anybody in this particular area.

Mr. Dufour asked Mr. Maynard to address the topography for the lot that is to the right of the existing house. He said it looks a little strange. He asked if all the trees would have to come down.

Mr. Maynard said a lot of the trees will have to come down. The driveway is shown 10' off the side lot line. It's drawn almost parallel to the contours. There are not a lot of cuts and fills so there's not a lot of side grading to the side. The trees along the property line will remain.

Mrs. Lasky said they have heard testimony from everyone who was here last time in regards to this subdivision. She said if there is anyone in opposition who had anything new to be said regarding the water pressure and/or the leaching system to come forward. She said it's not the time to air what has already been said.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION

Terry Kaiser, 19 Boylston Avenue. Mr. Kaiser said he did call and speak to a couple of people at Pennichuck. He said it's unfortunate that it's been reported that no one called. He's been playing telephone tag with David Levasseur. They haven't arranged anything to measure the water pressure at his house.

He said water comes up from West Adelaide and maybe that got measured as opposed to coming up from the back of Shawmut and Metropolitan. He said he knows water comes up that way. He's not sure what did get measured.

Mrs. Lasky said she can only assume Pennichuck knows where the houses are going and what the issues were and they know their job and they know how to test the water pressure.

Mr. Kaiser said there are some other new issues - new information that he has since the previous meeting that he thinks is important for the Board to hear.

He said the average square footage of the houses existing on Boylston Avenue is 2,304 square feet. He said based on the building envelope for the proposed houses as drawn on the plan,

the largest house is 1,700 square feet, not including any stairwells, not including any garages, or any other things. This is 25% smaller than the existing houses in the neighborhood. The driveways are 125'. He said there's nothing on Boylston Avenue that has a driveway anywhere near 125'. These long driveways aren't consistent with anything else that's in the neighborhood.

He said everything that comes off of Boylston Avenue and West Adelaide has to dump onto Hills Ferry and Hills Ferry has to dump onto Concord Street or to Manchester Street. It's the only way in or out of there. Now there will be more houses, more traffic, and more people.

He said every house that exists on Boylston Avenue either has a square, rectangular or trapezoidal shaped lot. These lots have nine different angles. He said the lots to be created aren't even consistent with the existing house. The building envelope for the existing house is two times + greater than the building envelope for the three houses on the three new lots.

He said something else the Board should consider is the risk for fire. He said he knows somebody said that there are longer driveways and that the Fire Department is able to get fire trucks up and down. He said there is one fire hydrant and it's on West Adelaide close to Boylston Avenue. It is 325' from the farthest house and it's 304' from the next farthest house. There's no other water supply in this specific area.

Mr. Kaiser said if they put an emergency vehicle down a small driveway to get to the house to put a fire out, they're not going to get an ambulance in behind it or a second vehicle in if you need to. Therefore the ability to address a fire in either of the rear two houses is going to be difficult. He said if they get a westerly wind it is going to drive the fire right down onto the houses that are on Birchwood.

He said there's a nice sidewalk on Hills Ferry. Everybody knows that there's a bridge that takes you over to Pennichuck. He said the kids are forced to walk down that sidewalk, through Shawmut, Metropolitan, down over the bridge to Pennichuck. He said this sidewalk doesn't get plowed in the wintertime and the kids are walking on the road. There are going to be more kids and more traffic.

He said he's had two realtors come to his house that tell him about what the impact would be on his house. He said they have said there would be a significant impact to the value of his

home if there are three significantly smaller houses next to his house. His property is directly adjacent to this proposed subdivision. The second realtor said it would have an impact on all the houses on Boylston Avenue.

He said it's very difficult to get someone that makes their livelihood selling houses that are built in this neighborhood to document something in writing and come in front of everybody and say that the value of the neighbor's homes are being impacted. He would have to get a professional from outside of the area to document this in writing. He hasn't had the opportunity to do that.

He said a few days after the Board meeting of October 6th the neighborhood had a meeting at his house and Mrs. Buckley showed up at the meeting. He said they asked her if they could reach an amicable solution to this outside of the Planning Board. She recommended that they call her daughter, Debbie Buxton. His wife did that and she was going to try to get back to her before this meeting, but she did not.

He said there are a few other people in the neighborhood who have also talked to realtors, not necessarily for value, but considering moving out of the neighborhood.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

Atty. Gerald Prunier. Atty. Prunier said Pennichuck doesn't go to one particular property to do their measuring test. He said they go to the area and they take the test. He said the circle will show the result of their test.

Mr. Lowe said the chart is one sided. He said there's a site somewhere where they did the pressure test.

Mrs. Lasky said the site is one place, but it measures what's going on in the area.

Richard Maynard. Mr. Maynard said the hydrant is located at the intersection of Boylston Ave. & West Adelaide, adjacent to his client's property. That's where the measurement is taken. The measurement is taken of the pressure in the public water main. Pennichuck, unless it's a very special circumstance, does not go into people's homes to measure pressure. Everybody's home is different. Everybody has different types of plumbing systems, some might be undersized, some may be servicing too many fixtures, they may be older or there may be other problems.

Pressure is measured in the street where everybody shares from it.

He said the minimum pressure for fire protection is 20 psi. They have 57 psi. Fire protection is more than well served in this area.

Mrs. Lasky asked Mr. Maynard to address what the Fire Department has said about this subdivision.

Mr. Maynard said he only hears from the Fire Department if they have a problem with a proposal. He said Mr. Yeomans has the information about any comments the Fire Department may have made about this proposal.

Mr. Yeomans said the Fire Department looked at this plan as it does all other plans. He said the only thing that they said was what was mentioned at the last meeting about having a turn-around because of the length of the driveway. This will have a turn-around.

Mr. Slivinski asked Mr. Maynard about the sizes of the proposed houses on the new lots.

Mr. Maynard said it's not really a legitimate concern. He said they can build anything they want - small or large. It's not relevant to a single-family development. They can't regulate what somebody can build on their property, no matter what the neighborhood is.

Mr. Moran asked if there is any creative landscaping around the perimeter that can be performed to isolate the site.

Mr. Maynard said other than some routine type landscaping there's nothing special proposed. Other than the unique shape of the lots, there's nothing unusual about this. Every homeowner will have his own plantings. It's rare that somebody doesn't have foundation plantings. It's likely that the perimeter trees will stay because there's no reason to take them down.

Atty. Gerald Prunier. Atty. Prunier said they can have large houses built on these lots. What's going to be built on them will be up to the person who purchases a lot and wants to build a house.

He said he understands Mr. Levasseur and some of the others who have lived in the neighborhood a long time. This is a big piece of property with a lot of trees on it that they have enjoyed these many years, but the Buckley's own the land. They are the ones who paid for it and they are the ones who paid the taxes on it.

He said he heard some of the Board members at the last meeting state that they didn't care too much for the subdivision, but that it met all the criteria and that's the law. He said the members can have their own opinions and they might differ, but when a subdivision or site plans comes to the Board and it meets all the requirements then the plan has to be approved.

Mrs. Lasky asked Mr. Maynard why Mr. Dookran asked him to do the leaching catch basin.

Mr. Maynard said the driveway to the right that goes off the right hand side off of West Adelaide tilts towards the abutter and Mr. Dookran asked him to add some more drainage there and that's what they've added to the plan.

MOTION by Ald. Larose to grant the subdivision plan of one lot into four at 25 West Adelaide Ave. & Boylston Ave., Sheet 54 - Lot 51 with the finding that it meets NRO 16-108 and with the following stipulations:

1. Prior to recording the plan bonding for work in the public right-of-way shall be approved by the Division of Public Works and Corporation Counsel.
2. Prior to recording the plan an easement for utilities on Lot 51 & Lot 123 shall be approved by the Division of Public Works and Corporation Counsel and recorded with the plan.
3. Prior to recording the plan any final drafting corrections shall be made.
4. 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.

5. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit the storm water operation and maintenance plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Department and recorded.
6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, if a revision to site grading is required for any house or driveway a revised grading plan shall be approved by the Division of Public Works.
7. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy the sidewalk contribution shall be paid to the Planning Department, unless the sidewalk is to be constructed.
8. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy all work within the public right-of-way shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Division of Public Works.
9. Sidewalk contribution of \$20,800 accepted in lieu of the construction of sidewalk.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

Mr. Dufour said he drove out to this site again tonight to take another look at the lot. He said Mr. Maynard & Atty. Prunier are probably technically correct, however, the Board does have some latitude. He referred to Section 16-108(d), which talks about evaluations of subdivisions to determine if it is compatible with the existing character of the neighborhood.

He said it goes on to talk about ensuring that it preserves the natural character features of the area or neighborhood. He said they are going to see a lot more of these proposals in the coming years because the City is approaching build out. He said at some point they have to ask themselves what the City is going to look like ten or fifteen years out when they start approving configurations like this one. He said at the last meeting he called it an ugly subdivision and it still is.

Ald. Larose said there are times when the Board has things that come before them that they don't particularly care for, but it meets all the criteria of the City. Some people feel that it's not in character with the neighborhood. He said it's not when it comes to being a square or rectangular lot, but there's nothing that he could find in the ordinance that said this was grounds for a denial.

He said at the last meeting there was a woman who said that when she looks out her window now she is going to see a house. He said when somebody lives in the new house that's built there they are also going to be seeing a house.

He said as far as people saying that this is going to devalue their property, he finds this not to be true. He said he believes that the homes that will be built there will probably be more expensive than what their properties are assessed. If you're building houses that are more expensive than what you're assessed at he can't see how the property is going to go down in value.

Ald. Larose said he understands that this is an emotional issue. The people in the neighborhood have lived here for a long time and have seen a large piece of land with trees and some of it's going to disappear. He thinks as time goes on the animosity that the neighbors feel now will disappear.

MOTION CARRIES - 4 - 3, Mr. Dufour, Mr. Lowe, Mrs. Lasky opposed.

OLD BUSINESS - SITE PLAN

None

NEW BUSINESS - SUBDIVISION PLAN

2. **Richard Schwind (Owners) - Proposed lot line relocation, 63 & 65 Manchester Street, Sheet 65 - Lots 15 & 238, Zoned "RA" - Urban Residence.**

Richard Maynard, Professional Engineer, Maynard & Paquette. Mr. Maynard said in September they came to the Board with this particular site and they subdivided off a long and narrow lot. Since that time they have had a person interested in buying and they want a larger lot - 11,000 square feet versus the 9,000 square feet that they had come for in September. He showed the Board how the land would be configured. Everything is the same as before, except that the lot is bigger.

Mr. Slivinski asked if there is still going to be only a single-family home on the lot.

Mr. Maynard said at this time a single-family is proposed, but that doesn't preclude anybody at any time asking for a second unit. It calls for Zoning Board action.

Mr. Farkas said that he notices that the Traffic Department is asking for a nebulous contribution even when there is no impact. It doesn't feel right to ask for money for no real reason. He said he's trying to understand what this would be used for and how it's going to be tracked.

Mr. Maynard said it's also erratic because sometimes they ask for it and sometimes they don't. When you are doing a lot line relocation, you're not creating any new impacts.

Mr. Dufour asked if the applicant agrees to make the voluntary contribution.

Mr. Maynard said they did not because the sidewalk contribution is substantial.

Mr. Sawyer said his understanding is that the Traffic Department looks at each project based on the number of trips it generates. The number of trips in the peak hour from a single-family house is typically one and they have the rationale of asking for \$200 per trip in the peak hour.

Mrs. Lasky said in the time she has been on the Board she has not seen this type of request on a lot line relocation.

Mr. Sawyer said he thinks it was missed on the subdivision that came to the Board a couple of months ago. They didn't ask for a contribution at that time. They were more concerned about site distance at the time.

Mr. Maynard said the peak hour trip from a single-family house is less than one.

Ald. Larose said they don't have an impact fee for traffic. The Planning Board has no procedures to accept this money so every time something like this comes in they need to introduce a resolution to create a trust fund. This doesn't say what this is going to be used for. He said he has a problem with something like this.

He said if this was a large development he wouldn't have a problem with asking for monies because the four corners can certainly use a traffic signal even now.

Mr. Lowe asked a question about the driveway, which Mr. Maynard explained. He said there is no new driveways and the pavement that runs across the lines will be removed.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERN

No One.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

No One.

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to approve the lot line relocation for 63 & 65 Manchester Street with the finding that it meets NRO 16-108 and with the following stipulations:

1. The previously required stipulation from the August 11, 2005 approval shall remain in effect.
2. Prior to the plan being recorded, the sewer easement document shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Department and Corporation Counsel and recorded with the plan. The cost associated with recording the documents shall be submitted to the Planning Department.

No contribution as requested by the Engineering Department.

Mr. Dufour said the next time this happens the Board should have a better explanation on the requested donation and there's nobody here to give them that explanation.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **Regency Centers, Jeffrey M. Hirsch (Owner - Proposed 2,780 square foot right-of-way dedication, 550 Amherst Street & Cellu Drive, Sheet H - Lot 646, Zoned "GB" - General Business.**

NEW BUSINESS - SITE PLAN

4. **Regency Centers (Applicant) Jeffrey M. Hirsch (Owner) - Proposed amendment to NR1107 for the addition of an exit only access way onto Amherst Street with associated site improvements, 550 Amherst Street, Sheet H - Lots 181, 184, & 646, Zoned "GB" - General Business.**

Jim Petropulos. Mr. Petropulos said many of the facts about the project are in the staff report. He said on April 14th he appeared before the Board for this project at the corner of

Amherst Street & Cellu Drive for a retail complex and a three lot subdivision. That project is currently under construction.

He said Condition #7 on the site plan required that prior to a certificate of occupancy for these buildings that they formally dedicate a wedge of land along 101A to the Amherst Street right-of-way so that there's proper room for the future 101A corridor improvement. He referred the Board to the plan of land that is on display. He said there is an area on the easternmost part of this retail complex to be dedicated. He said it is shaded in yellow. In the northern part of the lot there is an 8' donation and to the southern part of the lot there is a 3' donation.

Mr. Petropulos said the site was designed in anticipation of this dedication so that moving the property line in an average of 5' does not put them into any setbacks.

He then proceeded to talk about the previously approved site plan and their amendment to it. He referred the Board to the plan that was on display. He said the amendment is to allow an exit only from the project. He said he circled the area of discussion in red. The remaining site plan does not change. The previous site plan had parking in that corner and they are proposing an exit only out of this project. He said it's at a sixty-degree angle. It is 24' in width. There's a crosswalk that will be properly signed. The acute angle on the inside of the curb is to prevent people from making the right turn in. It's really to allow the right turns out of the project.

Mr. Petropulos said at the April meeting he stated that they would more than likely be back before the Board. They were working with the State of New Hampshire on this curb cut at the time. He said 101A is a controlled access right-of-way. They determine where curb cuts go. He said they have appeared before New Hampshire Department of Transportation. They have sent a letter that preliminarily approves the exit only, subject to making sure that it didn't impact wetlands, which it doesn't and that an appraisal is done to determine the value so that they could compensate the State for this exit onto 101A. He said he thought Mr. Sawyer had indicated a condition of approval to get the final Department of Transportation letter, which is fine.

He said this really doesn't impact parking to the project. There are benefits to the curb cut. He said the exit only reduces circulation around the proposed pharmacy. As people come through the drive-through for the pharmacy they will be able to

come out and exit the property if they want to head back to Nashua.

He said on April 14th there was concern about stacking back from the 101A intersection. This exit out of the property will provide relief and it should ultimately translate to relief to that intersection.

Ald. Larose asked if the exit is going to be done now or if it is contingent on when the State widens the road.

Mr. Petropulos said it's going to be done now.

Mr. Slivinski said as he remembers it when they came to the Board the first time there was an exit there.

Mr. Petropulos said it wasn't formally in the plan. It was dashed in as a proposed curb cut.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERNS

No One.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

No One.

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to grant the proposed 2,780 square foot right-of-way dedication, 550 Amherst Street & Cellu Drive, Sheet H Lot 646 with the finding that it meets Section NRO 16-108.

SECONDED by Ald. Larose.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to approve the site plan for the proposed amendment to NR 1107 for the addition of an exit only access way onto Amherst Street with associated site improvements, 550 Amherst Street & Cellu Drive, Sheet H Lots 181, 184, & 646 with the finding that it meets Section 16-123 and with the following stipulation:

1. Prior to the installation of the exit driveway onto Amherst Street final approval of NHDOT shall be obtained.
2. All previously required stipulations from the April 14, 2005 approval shall remain in effect.

SECONDED by Ald. Larose.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS - SITE PLAN

5. Lake Street Place, Lita Lane, LLC (Owner) - Proposed site plan for the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a 3-story, 5-unit multi-family building with associated access, parking and site improvements, 60 Lake Street, Sheet 101 - Lots 61 & 152, Zoned "RC" Urban Residence.

Mr. Lowe said the building is already demolished.

Mrs. Lasky said they don't need the Board's approval to demolish the building.

Stephan Toth, Granite State Surveying. Mr. Toth said that he is representing the applicant for their project on 60 Lake Street, which comprises two parcels, Lot 61 & 152. These will be consolidated as part of this project.

He said the existing building has been razed. The proposal calls for five townhouse style units of three stories. The first story will have a garage. The remaining two stories will be living space. There are a total of thirteen parking spaces. He showed where the parking spaces were located on the plan that was on display. There are five garages, one in each unit and eight exterior parking spaces and one handicapped space.

He said there is a sidewalk and other site improvements as part of the project.

He said his client has read the stipulations and doesn't have any problems with them.

Mr. Moran asked what they are going to do for a family with two vehicles.

Mr. Toth said the calculation for parking spaces is 1.75 per unit. According to the ordinance there are nine spaces required and they are providing thirteen. They are exceeding what the ordinance requires.

Ald. Larose asked how far from the street does the building start at. He also asked about the rear.

NCPB

October 20, 2005

Page 16

Mr. Toth said approximately 85'. He said they've tried to center it from both the front and back to give it nice green space on either side.

Mr. Dufour asked if there is going to be any fencing here or if there is any fencing proposed.

Mr. Toth said there's fencing on all sides. He said his client has approached the abutters about possibly upgrading and changing the fence. He said when his company surveyed the property, the fencing wavered in and out of the property line between the client's property and the abutting property. Right now the proposal is to have it remain.

Ald. Larose said as far as the fencing goes, some of it needs to be upgraded. Some of it is leaning.

Mr. Toth said he added a note to the plan with reference to the fencing. It is the applicant's desire to replace the fencing. At this time there hasn't been an agreement between his client and the abutters.

Ald. Larose said if the abutters agree to have the fencing moved, would it be chain link fencing or stockade fencing.

Mr. Toth said it would be a stockade fence.

Mr. Slivinski asked about snow removal and trash removal.

Mr. Toth said when they plow the driveway there is a swale and leaching basin that can catch it and handle it on the site. There's also swales in the rear and adequate area in the front to push the snow.

He said he looked at different arrangements for any exterior dumpsters. He said it seemed like this would be more of a nuisance and an eyesore so they are proposing that people bring their trash to the end of the street and have the City pick it up.

Mr. Dufour asked if these are rental units or condominiums.

Mr. Toth said they are condominiums.

Mr. Dufour said that a stockade fence doesn't last as long as a chain link fence and down the line the stockade fence may need some work done to it. There would be five people that would

have to agree to contribute to have the fence repaired. He said he would prefer to see something that would be a little longer lasting.

Ald. Larose asked if there are rules or regulations about units like this. He asked if the City is responsible for picking up their trash or if they would have to get private trash pick up.

Mr. Yeomans said he didn't know the answer to this.

Mr. Toth said it seemed likely that in that area with the different duplexes and single-family homes that it would be acceptable.

Mr. Dufour said he does not see a pad for a compactor on the site plan.

Mr. Toth said this was correct. He said each unit would be responsible for bringing their trash containers out to the street in the proper containers.

Mr. Dufour said this is assuming that the City is the one responsible for picking it up. Otherwise, it will have to be a private company.

Mr. Toth said the association would have to set up something for trash removal if the City does not pick it up. He said he would rather not take up additional green space for a dumpster outside.

Mr. Dufour asked Mr. Toth if they had held a neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Toth said the applicant did meet with abutters if they were available.

Mr. Farkas said there is another one of these voluntary requests for a donation from the Traffic Department without a finding that it has an impact on the traffic. He asked for Mr. Toth's response.

Mr. Toth said the applicant has paid the \$400 that was requested.

Mr. Farkas said everybody should read Dave Connell's memo, particularly the people in the Traffic Department, because they

need to have some reasonable relationship between the money they ask for and what it's going to be used for.

Mr. Dufour said he was sure that if Mr. Dookran were present he would have a logical explanation.

Mr. Toth said when they arrive at the amount there is some negotiation with the applicant. It is voluntary. The department comes up with the number and there is some discussion with the applicant with what is reasonable.

Mrs. Lasky said the Planning Board needs to understand where it's coming from. If they want to put it in the staff report they should do that and say what it's for and why it's being requested.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH CONCERNS

No One.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR

Steven Vallier, Sequel Management/Lita Lane LLC. Mr. Vallier said they are the developers of the project. He said he has met with most of the neighbors and they aren't exactly sure who owns all of the fencing. Based on his discussions with some of the abutting neighbors they would like to see the stockade fence.

Mrs. Lasky asked about whether there had been a meeting with the neighbors.

Mr. Vallier said he has met with most of the neighbors individually, not in a meeting type form. There was no negative feedback.

Mr. Farkas said he tends to agree with Mr. Dufour about the maintenance issue with the fence. He said it doesn't have to be a chain link fence. It can be stockade with some of the newer materials that aren't wood and won't rot and fall down. He said they might want to consider this.

Mr. Vallier agreed.

MOTION by Mr. Lowe to approve the site plan for the construction of a 3-story, 5-unit multi-family building with associated access, parking and site improvements, 60 Lake Street, Sheet 101

- Lots 61 & 152 with the finding that it meets NRO 16-123 and with the following stipulations:

1. Prior to this plan being signed any final drafting corrections shall be made and revised plans submitted. Drafting corrections requiring approval by the Division of Public Works or the Nashua Fire Department shall be obtained prior to submittal.
2. Prior to any work being conducted a pre-construction conference shall be held with the Planning Department to review erosion control measures and related site development issues. The maple tree shall be protected from cutting, or other disturbance with temporary fencing.
3. Prior to the issuance of the building permit the Planning Department shall review the storm water operation and maintenance plan. The plan shall be recorded prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy.
4. Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy the applicant shall install unit numbers.
5. Prior to the final certificate of occupancy being issued all required site improvements shall be completed according to the approved plan, and all work conducted in the Lake Street right-of-way completed to the satisfaction of the Division of Public Works.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Other Business

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

MOTION by Mr. Dufour that there are no issues of regional impact on the preliminary 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 Meeting)

MOTION by Ald. Larose to remove from the table.

SECONDED by Mr. Lowe.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mark Fougere, Fougere Planning. Mr. Fougere passed around some handouts. He said they should have some others that were given to them by the Staff.

Mr. Fougere said this has been a long process and when they were before the Planning & Economic Development Committee a couple of nights ago Ald. McCarthy said that this actually goes back almost ten years when he was with the City and they tried to scan the old ordinance into the computer and tried to do it in-house and actually did a round of interviews with some outside professionals that unfortunately didn't proceed.

He said as the Board knows last summer there was an extensive period of public comment that went well into the fall. The Planning & Economic Develop Committee received a significant amount of comments from various individuals, groups, the Chamber, etc. At the conclusion of that the decision was made to try to incorporate and respond to those. He said that's what they've been doing for the past four or five months.

He said Kerrie Diers from Nashua Regional Planning and he have been working on the project since July and Kerrie did some of the heavy lifting, having gone through hundreds of pages of public testimony and pages of written comments that were submitted. He said they were summarized in a matrix on 11"X17" sheets, 21 pages long, double sided with comments.

He said basically what the subcommittee did was start on Page 1 and went through each comment. Many of them were typos or clarification issues. Some were more significant. They made periodic updates to the Planning & Economic Development Committee throughout the summer and into the fall. Their last appearance was two days ago.

He said in the Board's packets tonight they will see some additional comments that add a little bit to the book with the strikeouts. Some of these are minor. There were some clarifications on the sign issues that they felt were necessary.

There was a letter from Rivier College relative to the special district for colleges that addressed some issues that they had that were incorporated into the document. There is a memo from the Planning Director relative to some additional changes that were made Tuesday night on electronic message centers. There's also an addition to the site plan requirements relative to capturing and treating runoff prior to exiting the site.

He said the City Clerk had an issue with the manufactured housing section in the ordinance, which actually goes back to the 60s. In that section there's a requirement for a yearly license which the City Clerk found was outdated and almost irrelevant. The committee voted to strike that entire licensing section. If there are any issues with mobile home parks the various departments within the City can handle it if its public health or housing.

He said that if the ordinance is passed, they anticipate it would become effective January 2, 2006. He said the most significant and biggest zone change is shown on the wall. There were three downtown districts - D1, D2, and D3. After considerable discussion the D2 district was absorbed into the D1 district so there will be two new downtown districts.

He said the executive summary and Appendix A & B are also going to be a part of the ordinance. He said if this passes they intend to go through the text again. The strikeouts will be removed. They'll re-read the text and try to catch any other problems or issues and then it will go to the full Board.

Mr. Lowe said he wants to make sure the index is done. He said when he first started to look at the ordinance there was no cross-reference to anything and it was hard to find things.

Mr. Fougere said this is one of the things they are going to pay particular attention to, especially with the formatting.

Mr. Dufour said this was something that has been looked at over a long period of time and everybody was invited to show up at the table. Some people didn't chose not to. After that group was done they had their public meeting and at that point people who hadn't shown up at the meeting now wanted a voice. They went into Phase II and some more work was done to "tweak" what had already been discussed and things that had been brought up.

He said now, all of a sudden, the year's end has approached and there's a rush to get this approved. He understands that it has

to be done because they'll have a new batch of Aldermen and they will have to start all over. He said they have a product that the second phase has created and now it's here before them tonight and this Board has to give it a favorable or unfavorable recommendation so the Aldermen can vote on it by the year's end.

He said he didn't see how the Planning Board can give a favorable or unfavorable recommendation to what's in the document when he's sure the vast majority of them don't know what's in it. He has read some of it, but not all of it and he's not comfortable giving it a favorable or unfavorable recommendation. He said he overheard people tonight discussing language in the new proposed ordinance that was up for interpretation.

Mr. Lowe said the language hasn't changed. There are a lot of things that haven't changed.

Mr. Moran said it's poorly written.

Mr. Dufour said he's not looking to nix this. He understands that it's a work in progress. Once it gets passed, they can rest assure that the movement will be on to "tweak it" as it comes to light. He said he doesn't know how to vote against it. Besides the City Charter this is the most important document that they have in this building. He just has a problem saying that he's for it because he doesn't know what's in it.

Mr. Farkas said he echoes Mr. Dufour's sentiments. He said he personally feels reluctant to vote in favor of the new ordinances without having read it all. It's a big document and he hasn't read it all. He said he would like not to see a recommendation go forward from this Board with a lot of abstentions.

He said he knows there's been a lot of hard work done on this and he would like to give a favorable recommendation on it, but he can't until he's read it.

He asked how soon the recommendation has to get to the Board of Aldermen to be able to pass it in time. If they table it for one more meeting, would everybody read it.

Mr. Dufour said in the timetable they have to work with from now to the next meeting, if there are any issues, it can't be changed because the Aldermen have to vote on it at the next meeting.

Mr. Farkas said the Planning Board can cite the issues and send it forward with their recommendation. They would at least be able to weigh in with some intelligent commentary.

Mrs. Lasky said the bigger question is whether they are given one, two, or however many number of weeks, would they fall asleep after an additional 27 pages. This isn't a novel.

Mr. Slivinski said you could put him in a room for a year with that book and he's not sure he would understand it or really grasp everything. He said on a document like this he trusts the people who have worked on it and recognize that there are going to be some flaws. Two years or four years from now they are going to work as they get into some of these things, the same way they've worked through some of the problems with the current ordinance. He said he wouldn't mind a couple of more weeks with it.

Ald. Larose said at last Tuesday's meeting of the Planning & Economic Committee they voted in the affirmative for final passage subject to a recommendation from the Planning Board. When he said recommendation it didn't say positive or negative. As far as the Board of Aldermen goes, the fourth Tuesday of December is their last meeting. As far as he knows whenever the Board gives their recommendation, it will go to the Aldermanic Legislative Secretary and she will put it on the calendar. He said if there are going to be some questions on changing they don't want to wait until the last minute to send it to the Board. He said he's ready to vote for it, but if other members are reluctant he has no problem with holding it until another meeting.

Mrs. Lasky said she's been involved in the process from the first. She said Mr. Dufour, Mr. Slivinski as well as she put in a lot of time in that first stage. She said they felt that with the consultant at that point it was a good product, but it did go to public hearing. There were some very good comments made from people, whether they chose not to participate in the original meetings or didn't, it needed to come to light.

She said she thinks it really began to gel at the second stage. It became a more "Nashua" product - a product she feels comfortable about bringing forth and being a part of. She said she feels like she knows this book. She said it's not going to be perfect and she hopes that when things need to be changed they will be changed and that it won't take another thirty years before a re-write.

She said that she didn't see any point in holding it. She said if there are enough of the members who don't feel comfortable with it this evening, so be it. She said those of them who have worked closely with it feel pretty good about the finished product and feel comfortable in passing it on. She hopes that the Board of Aldermen will approve it at this stage.

She thanked all the people who participated in helping to get this product to this point.

MOTION by Mr. Slivinski for favorable recommendation to the Board of Alderman on O-14-19 amending the Planning and Zoning Ordinances of the City of Nashua in their entirety as amended.

SECONDED by Mr. Lowe.

MOTION CARRIED - 5-0-2, Mr. Dufour & Mr. Farkas abstaining.

Mr. Houston said many individuals put a lot of time into this ordinance and thanked all of them for their time and effort.

3. Referral from the Board of Alderman on proposed R-05-299, accepting and adopting the recommendations of the report by Mt. Auburn Associates entitled "Beyond the Crossroad: Positioning Nashua to Compete in the Global Economy" dated July 2005. (Tabled from the October 6, 2005 Meeting)

MOTION by Ald. Larose to remove from the table.

SECONDED by Mr. Moran.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Jay Minkarah, 13 Mt. Pleasant Street, Nashua - Community Development Director, City of Nashua. Mr. Minkarah said he hoped everyone had received a black and white paper copy and a disc version of the plan. He presented a slide program covering the report from Mt. Auburn Associates.

Mr. Minkarah said this plan has been in the works for about a year. He said Mt. Auburn Associates, Economic Development Consulting Firm, prepared the report. He said they came to the City back in 1991 and did a similar plan for the City called "Nashua at the Crossroads". He said in some ways this is a follow up to that. This report is called "Beyond the Crossroads".

He said the prior report was a little more regional in nature. There were some significant recommendations that came out of it that they did implement, including creating a regional economic development entity that existed for about five years - a center for economic development.

He said Mt. Auburn foresaw the boom of the software industry in Nashua.

He said the revolving loan fund that the City has now was also a recommendation that came out of the 1991 plan.

He said Mt. Auburn Associates was very struck by the things they saw had happened in the City during the interim period. One of the biggest differences was the downtown.

In 1991 Nashua was very much in a recession and the downtown made it obvious.

He said they saw the investment that Nashua had made in the schools was something else that really jumped out at them.

Mr. Minkarah said there is a lot of information in the report, including data on the City's economy. He said he wouldn't go into a lot of the detail, but if anyone had any questions to feel free to interrupt him.

He said the project's goals are to improve the economic well being of all the residents of the City, improve the competitiveness of the City and address the needs of the business community, and insure a stable physical environment (Municipal budget).

He said the overall project was divided into three phases. Phase I was what they called the Economic Resource Space Analysis and essentially that is the data gathering and analysis portion of the project. Phase II is the Strategies to Build a Competitive City. Phase III is actually three parts. It's the implementation plan that is in the material the Board has. There's also a separate marketing piece that the City has now received. He said it's actually a separate document

Mr. Minkarah said in September 2004 the more formal process began initially with the meeting of various City officials and Department Heads to scope out the plan. The Planning & Economic Development Committee was really the committee that Mt. Auburn Associates worked with as they went through the process.

Initially that was goal setting and to determine the scope of the project, and which cities they should use in the comparative cities analysis. A lot of that groundwork was established then.

He said they went on to the fall and early winter doing a series of interviews with various city officials and business officials. He said over fifty individuals were interviewed - all the larger employers and developers. He said the staff did not participate in any of these interviews.

He said during that period Mt. Auburn was also doing a basic data analysis - gathering economic statistics, looking at comparable cities, and doing what they referred to as an industry cluster analysis looking at where there were particular concentration of industries within the city that might be something they could capitalize on. They reviewed those findings with the Planning & Economic Development Committee in February 2005.

He said some of the things they found were that the City was relatively prosperous, although there is what they term "underemployment", meaning that unemployment in Nashua is actually relatively high compared to the rest of the State, not compared to the Greater Boston area. They saw greater growing strengthening links to Greater Boston.

He said they found that overall there is a relatively young and relatively skilled labor force, particularly strong concentrations in engineering and software.

He said they found that the investments that the City made in the schools and in the downtown were major assets.

He said there are also some challenges. In the research & development area there is a lack of incentives. This is really a State issue. He said Mt. Auburn also noted that the City lacks a university-based research facility in Nashua.

Mr. Farkas asked a question - unintelligible.

Mr. Minkarah said that what they were alluding to more is that New Hampshire is the only New England State, and he thought the only northeastern State, that provides no tax credits or incentives for research and development. The State also provides little or no grant funding.

He alluded to Massachusetts, which has invested in research facilities to focus on nanotechnology. Also, Nashua doesn't have a research university linked facility and increasingly that's become an important component of economic development. That's why they see so much happening in Cambridge because MIT is there, in particular and that leads to a spin off - a commercialization of the technology that comes out of those centers.

Mrs. Lasky asked if it's happening in the seacoast area where UNH is located.

Mr. Minkarah said it's happening in the seacoast area, although to a lesser extent. He said it's not as strong there as it could be. He said it's also happening, to an extent, in the Dartmouth area because that's in the medical technology. It's not happening on a major level in New Hampshire at all. He said Daniel Webster College now has an undergraduate engineering program. It's the first year so there is some progress.

Mr. Minkarah said the City had a very prosperous 1990s, mostly tech related. There was a significant downturn, more in 2001. He showed the slide representing the job loss during that period (5.4%). The State of New Hampshire average was .4%. The job losses in the City were at a much higher rate than the rest of the State and the U.S. as a whole.

He said in 1991, 29% of the City's employment was in manufacturing. That has dropped to 19.5%. Retail increased slightly. The drop in the manufacturing rate has a few implications.

Mr. Slivinski said it was hard for him to believe that between 1991 and the present time that retailing employment has gone up so little. In relationship to all of the things that the Planning Board has approved over the last fifteen years, the expansion in Nashua has been in retailing.

Mr. Minkarah said it appears to be much greater than it really is. He said even in this year, the last he saw, they probably have lost jobs (net) in retail. He said a lot of the development that they have seen has been redevelopment, for example, the Nashua Mall. He said that they may find that there are fewer people employed in some of the larger stores. The density of employment is lower.

NCPB

October 20, 2005

Page 28

He said from 2001 to 2003 the City lost a new of almost 3,000 jobs.

Mr. Farkas asked what the population did.

Mr. Minkarah said the population did little or nothing. He said in the last OSP estimate that he saw there was an estimate of a drop in the population.

Mrs. Lasky said this is for the City. She asked if the region is a different story.

Mr. Minkarah said the region is a different story. The region also lost jobs, but the total region lost about 3,800 jobs - 3,000 of which were in Nashua. It's significant and he doesn't think that too many people appreciate how much the City has been impacted by the recession that they have had.

He said the vacancy rates, particularly in office and industrial soared to over 25%.

Mrs. Lasky asked if there is any way of tracking retail dollars spent.

Mr. Minkarah said he believes that this can be done.

He referred to the slide that showed the changes in unemployment in the City. He said basically they closely track the unemployment rate of Boston. He referred them to the lines for Nashua and Boston on the slide and how closely they run together versus the rest of New Hampshire and the U.S. average.

Mr. Minkarah said they have seen a real decline in middle-income people in the City. He said this is on Page 7 of the report. He referred to the changes in household income between 1990 and 2000. He said there was an increase of 790 households below the \$25,000 category and a drop of 1,697 households in the \$25,000 - \$75,000 category. There was an increase in the over \$75,000 households of 2,530. The very low-income households are growing. The higher income households grew at a higher rate, but the middle-income households have dropped. He said the rate of decrease for households between \$25,000 and \$75,000 in that period dropped 10.2%. He said it's more than double the decrease for the State of New Hampshire as a whole and far more than the nation.

He said the land use changes that they've seen in the City have impacted that figure, and obviously the employment changes that they've seen too.

Mr. Lowe asked if there is any way to figure out what percentage of the middle income households were seniors.

He said their income is static and the tax rate is increasing. The answer is to sell your house and go to some other State where it's cheaper.

Mr. Minkarah said he didn't think that this was really mostly seniors, but it's something that could be tracked if you went into detailed census data.

Mr. Farkas said there is a change in the way that you measure both what a middle-income house is and looking at manufacturing as being good high-paying jobs. He said manufacturing jobs aren't really all that high-paying any more. In order to stay competitive they have to keep their cost down. That's why a lot of them leave.

He referred to another slide that showed the concentration of people in certain industries. He said on the left hand side there are various numbers running up. He said at the bottom is #1. If you are at this number you are at the U.S. average for employment in the category. The dotted line going from top to bottom represents average wages for all occupations (\$19.20). If you are on the right of the dotted line it's an occupation that pays more than the average wage and if you're above #1 it means that there are more than the U.S. average concentration in one of these businesses. He said the City has more than 1,000 people employed in electrical engineering and the concentration is more than four times the U.S. average. He said their chemical and biological engineers are more than three times the concentration of the U.S. average and industrial engineers are the same thing. He said the farther you are to the right, the higher the wage. He said computer software engineers in the City are more than six times the concentration of the U.S. average.

Mr. Minkarah said there are a few principals that guide the overall plan. He said they're looking for sustained economic growth that is comprehensive, meaning it's overall benefit to the City and its people.

He said it's important to recognize that there are no quick solutions and that it's a long-term process. It requires a sustained commitment by the City leaders if they want to make the City successful economically. It is important that they reflect the diversity of the population. It's important for the City to build on their competitive advantages and try not to be what they can't be. He said they have very little open space left in the City - very little vacant developable land. Most of what they are going to focus on is redevelopment. They don't have sites to attract large new industries. They don't have a lot of the advantages that some of the other parts of the country have.

He said the City does have a location relative to the Boston Metropolitan area, which is an advantage. They have a quality of life within the region and the State is also an advantage. They also have a pool of highly skilled workers in their labor force.

Mr. Minkarah said he mentioned earlier that Mt. Auburn Associates placed a value on the investment that Nashua made in their schools, in their infrastructure and in their downtown. He said it is critical that they understand that there are some expenditures that the City makes that are investments in the long-term future and they have to maintain that even when it looks like it may not be the most prudent thing to do.

He said the five key strategic areas identified by Mt. Auburn Associates are:

- Investing in the Future
- Maintaining the Quality of Life
- Accelerating Enterprise Development
- Marketing & Promoting the City
- Identify Regional Housing Issue
- Increase Improvement Investment in Downtown

He said the City of Nashua can't solve the housing issue by itself. The housing affordability is something that has to be addressed regionally.

He said Mt. Auburn Associates also looked at the Commuter Rail Project as something particularly important to support. He said that's one of those links to the Boston Metropolitan area. It can change the desirability of the community.

He said Nashua is a regional retail center and it is an important part of their economy. As long as they are property

tax based it's going to be a critical piece of their economy. It's important that they maintain this status. Pheasant Lane Mall is their largest taxpayer.

He said the enterprise and development item is also viewed as very important. He said he mentioned earlier their lack of a research facility that is university based. He said this is one of the key strategies that they've identified that they would like to create here. It's generally higher educational opportunities for the labor force.

He said there's talk about helping to support immigrant entrepreneurs and using a revolving loan fund to that end.

Mr. Minkarah said the marketing plan is to market the City as a technology center. "Shop Nashua" is an allusion to maintaining the retail base as strong as possible. "Team Nashua" is an allusion to reaching out to strengthen their ties between City government and the business community primarily by working more with other State agencies, the Chamber and trying to have a more coordinated effort.

He said the concept of positioning Nashua in the area as a family haven was interesting as opposed to say a City that was going to focus on trying to attract a very young population. Mt. Auburn saw this as a strength - schools, the neighborhoods, and the homes. It's something that the City can build on.

He said the enterprise hatchery is another concept that they mention in the report. He said in many ways the City is acting as a business incubator. He mentioned the Millyard and 101A where, as the businesses grow and succeed they aren't going to stay here. They don't have the physical room necessarily to stay here. They go to a neighboring community and still provide employment for Nashua's citizens and still providing opportunities for business growth. That's the role that Nashua plays within the regional economy.

He said he mentioned the concept of higher education. It's one that the City is pushing for very heavily now. It's going to be one of the top priorities.

Mr. Minkarah said Mt. Auburn Associates completed most of the base work on this report last spring. There was another round of meetings with local leaders. They held an economic summit last April where the plan was unveiled to the larger community.

There was also another regional forum that they conducted in April. The final document was completed in July.

Mrs. Lasky asked where they go from here.

Mr. Minkarah said although there was no legal requirement, legislation was introduced to approve the plan and it has been referred to the Board. He believes the Planning & Economic Development Committee voted on it at their last meeting.

He said in the global sense, they've already jumped on some of these things because they felt they were so important. They are actively working on the higher education link. He said they would like to strengthen the City's ties with the State University system. They would, if possible, like to attract some out of state entity that would maybe be a branch facility from Carnegie, Mellon or other institution. He said building on what Nashua has is also absolutely critical. He said they will be seeing more on the higher education in the very near future.

He said they haven't created any newer type marketing materials, but they will be doing this - more targeted to the types of businesses that make sense to the City.

He said if Nashua wants to position itself in the high tech world, they need to improve their web site. He said the City is making some progress, but needs some priority.

He said recently they held a high tech expo in the Millyard. They wanted to bring a spotlight to the types of businesses and industries that the City has, not just in the Millyard - in the City generally. He said they need to get people who are involved in technology and innovation speaking to each other and realizing whom else is out there. There are a lot of people who are doing their own thing and they're a one-person office. Many people living in the City are working out of their home.

He mentioned some of the ongoing things that they are doing - such as the Riverwalk.

Mrs. Lasky asked if Mr. Minkarah was pleased with the report and how long before another one is done.

Mr. Minkarah said he is very pleased. He said it's hard to tell when another would be done. He said economic cycles can change so dramatically and things that they think now are where it's happening, might not be. Technology is changing so rapidly now.

He said he thinks the current report will serve the City well for at least the next five years. There's a lot of change happening in the economy right now and it's difficult to pin where it's going to go.

Mr. Slivinski said the City should be concentrating on the things that they have control over. Whether they like it or not, Nashua and the United States is in a global economy. Software engineering in Nashua is going to compete with software engineering in China; software engineering in India. He said the City has to concentrate on those areas where they don't have to face worldwide competition. He said Nashua doesn't have any control over what's going to happen with software engineering or high tech.

MOTION by Ald. Larose to send a favorable recommendation to the Board of Aldermen on the report by Mt. Auburn Associates entitled "Beyond the Crossroad: Positioning Nashua to Compete in the Global Economy" (R-06-299).

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Adoption of the "2006 Meeting and Deadlines Dates" for the Nashua City Planning Board.

MOTION by Ald. Larose to adopt the meeting dates in 2006 for the Nashua Planning Board.

SECONDED by Mr. Farkas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Other

Mrs. Lasky said she spoke with the President of the Board of Education. She advised her that the Board is interested in enrollment figures. She said that she would make a presentation or try to get the Superintendent to make a presentation.

Mr. Dufour said they should put them ahead of the agenda.

Mr. Slivinski said the traffic continues to back up on West Hollis Street at the Dunkin Donuts. He said whatever they are trying it isn't working.

He said he had occasion where he had to make a visit to the Southern New Hampshire Hospital. He said there isn't any parking. He said when they come to the Board again in the future they really need to get more questions in concerning the parking.

Mrs. Lasky asked if it's because of the work that's going on.

Mr. Slivinski said he doesn't believe so. He said the garage is filled at 7:00AM. He reminded the Board about the project that was presented for a medical office across the street and there was going to be parking in the garage. He said there isn't any parking there.

Mrs. Lasky asked staff is there's anything further they can do about the Dunkin Donuts site on West Hollis Street.

Mr. Yeomans said one is active police enforcement. It's their responsibility to take care of traffic and to take care of issues that are causing traffic backup.

He said the other tool is the site plan revocation process, which they've talked about before. Short of doing something dramatic like that, they could get them in to have a meeting with the Board. He said he thought it would be the best thing they could do and that way the Board could address their concerns to them.

Mrs. Lasky asked if they should send a letter to the person who previously wrote them to the Board's meeting in December and it was agreed that this should be done.

ADJOURNMENT at 9:45PM.

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 Meeting