

The regular monthly meeting of the City Planning Board was held on September 15, 2010 in the City Council Chambers in the City Hall Annex at 7:00 PM.

Present at the meeting were Members Drypolcher, Swope, Foss, Gross, Meyer, and Alternate Member Kenison (who was seated for absent Member Hicks). Messrs. Woodward and Henninger, Ms. Hebert and Ms. Osgood of the City Planning Division were also present, as were Messrs. Roberge and Mack of the City Engineering Division.

At 7:00 PM a quorum was present, and the Chair called the meeting to order and seated Alternate Member Kenison for absent Member Hicks who was not expected.

APPLICATIONS

Minor Subdivisions

1. Application by **the City of Concord** for approval of a subdivision property located at **35 East Street in Penacook. (#2010-38)**

Determination of Completeness

Ms. Hebert explained this proposal to subdivide the land at 35 East Street into three parcels.

She reported this application was complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and open the public hearing. Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

Public Hearing

Ms. Hebert explained this proposal to subdivide the land at 35 East Street into three parcels. The property is located south of the Contoocook River, with frontage along Crescent Street and East Street in Penacook, and was the former site of the Allied Leather Tannery mill building.

She explained that the subdivision of the parcel will make the property eligible for additional grant funding for the environmental cleanup of the property. The City Administration is preparing grant applications for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Brownfields Cleanup grants. Funding will be sought for each of the parcels in the amount of \$200,000, or \$600,000 for the entire site. Without the subdivision the property would only be eligible for \$200,000.

She reported that the mill building has been demolished, but the former waterproofing building and office building remain onsite. If, following the environmental cleanup of the site the City should decide to sell the lots individually, easements may be required for

existing utilities serving these structures. An agreement to convey utility easements for the benefit of proposed lot 1 and 2 should be provided.

She reported that the applicant has requested a waiver to Section 8.01 (2)(a)(ii) of the Subdivision Regulations to allow the subdivision plan to be submitted at a scale of 1" = 40' instead of 1" = 50' as required.

Matthew Walsh, Assistant for Special Projects representing the City Manager's office, was present to answer questions from the Board. In answer to a question by Mr. Kenison he reported that the City is hopeful that the \$600,000 in EPA grant funds will cover the cost of cleaning up the site for redevelopment.

There was no one else present who wished to be heard for or against this application and the Chair declared the hearing closed at 7:05 PM.

Deliberations and Action on Application

Mr. Swope moved that the Planning Board grant a waiver to Section 8.04 (2)(a)(ii) of the City's Subdivision Regulations to allow the subdivision plat to be submitted at a scale of 1" = 40' instead of 1"=50'. Mr. Gross seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant conditional final subdivision approval for the "Minor Subdivision Plat of the City of Concord" as prepared by Richard D. Bartlett Associates subject to the following standard conditions:

1. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant shall revise the plat drawings to address the minor corrections and omissions noted by City Staff.
2. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the following easement document, in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor and suitable for recording in the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds, will be provided to the Planning Division:
 - a. An agreement to convey utility easements for the benefit of proposed lot 1 and proposed lot 2.

Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

Major Subdivision Application

2. Application by **Scott Bussiere** for approval of a modification to a previously approved major subdivision so as to convert it to a cluster development on **Julie Drive, easterly of Graham Road. (#2010-24)[ref: #03-37]**

Public Hearing

Ms. Hebert explained this proposed subdivision is located off Graham Road, south of the Graham Road/Hoit Road intersection. The applicant proposes to revise a subdivision application which was approved by the Planning Board on August 18, 2004. The original plan involved the subdivision of a 62.66 acre parcel into eight conventional, single-family residential lots located off a proposed cul-de-sac. The proposal also involved a lot line adjustment with the adjacent property to merge a two acre parcel from this lot with the abutting property.

She explained that the applicant recorded the subdivision plat and related easement documents on August 31, 2006, and began constructing the road. The owner anticipated the downfall in the residential housing market and stopped work on the road. The partially constructed road failed to satisfy the substantial completion requirement of RSA 674:39, which would have given the subdivision application vested status against changes to the zoning ordinance and land use regulations. On April 15, 2009, the Planning Board voted that the Emerald Abode Subdivision had failed to achieve the substantial completion status within four years of the date of approval and determined that the subdivision needed to comply with the mandatory cluster development standards which were adopted by the City Council on March 12, 2007. The Board agreed to set the public hearing for the revocation of the subdivision approval for May 20, 2009.

She reported that at the hearing on May 20, 2009, the applicant testified that he intended to submit a revised application to amend the existing subdivision plat so as to comply with the cluster development standards. The Board agreed to stay its action on the revocation for 90 days in order to allow the applicant time to submit a revised plan to meet the deadline for the August Planning Board meeting. The applicant also agreed to submit a document agreeing not to convey any lots within the 90-day period.

In August 2009, the applicant requested and the Board agreed to grant another extension of the stay of revocation of the plat, subject to the applicant submitting a new plan on or before December 18, 2009. The applicant stated that extension was necessary in order to revise the plans to comply with the new NH Department of Environmental Services Alteration of Terrain Permit requirements. The applicant failed to submit revised plans by the December deadline and the Clerk of the Board sent by certified mail a written notice that the plat revocation would be filed on or after January 25, 2010. The applicant contacted the Clerk and explained that he has been actively pursuing the new Alteration of Terrain Permit, and he asked for another extension. The Board granted another extension on January 20, 2010, subject to the revised plan being submitted on April 23, 2010. On April 21st the applicant requested another extension of the stay for the revocation of the plat, and the Board agreed to a one month extension. The applicant submitted the revised subdivision plans on May 21, 2010. The Board determined the application complete at the June 16, 2010 meeting and set the public hearing for July 21, 2010. The applicant requested postponement of the public hearing to the September Planning Board meeting.

Ms. Hebert reported that the subdivision layout had been revised to comply with the mandatory cluster subdivision standards. The road layout and location of the right-of-way for Julie Drive remained the same. However the subdivision was modified to include

ten residential parcels and one open space parcel which is proposed to be conveyed to the City. The ten residential parcels are located off the proposed cul-de-sac (Julie Drive), which is 1000 feet in length. One parcel has legal frontage along Graham Road, but is accessed off Julie Drive through a driveway easement over one of the proposed lots.

She reported that the applicant in 2003 provided a traffic study for a 20-unit subdivision. The larger subdivision had no adverse impact on the nearby intersection of Hoit Road/Graham Road. This intersection is anticipated to continue to function at Level of Service A and B through 2014.

She reported that the new residential homes will be required to have residential sprinklers systems to satisfy the recent amendment to the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Hebert explained that the original approval did not include a landscape plan. Under the existing land use regulations, the landscape plan is not a requirement. However, Section 9.12 (2)a, of the Subdivision Regulations states that the Board may require additional tree planting and other landscaping appropriate to the area being developed. The revised application has been designed as a cluster subdivision with smaller lots, and staff has recommended that a landscape plan be provided, with a minimum of two street trees per house lot and the cul-de-sac island landscaped with low maintenance trees and shrubs.

She reported that there are no changes proposed to the previously approved roadway in terms of the typical cross section, slope, or layout. Julie Drive was designed as a minor street in low density districts with a 50-foot right-of-way, 26 feet of pavement, and sloped granite curbing with a closed drainage system. The roadway has a maximum grade of 8% and is approximately 1,000 feet long.

She reported that the drainage plan had changed slightly since the original approval in order to satisfy the new requirements of the NH Department of Environmental Services Alteration of Terrain Permit. Treatment swale #1 was replaced with an infiltration basin and treatment swale #3 was slightly reconfigured.

She reported that during the original approval, the applicant had requested a waiver from the subdivision regulations to have the side slopes on Julie Drive increased (steepened) from 3:1 to 2:1 at the proposed wetland crossing to minimize the wetland impacts. The side slopes at the wetland crossing have been constructed and the waiver is not necessary as part of the revised subdivision approval. The original subdivision plan also included the disturbance of approximately 3,185 square feet of wetlands for the construction of Julie Drive. The wetland permit was approved by NH Department of Environmental Services and the wetland was filled during the initial road construction activities.

Ms. Hebert reported that the original application included a request for a Conditional Use Permit for encroachments into the wetland buffers for the construction of Julie Drive and the proposed drainage treatment swale. The applicant does not need to reapply for the Conditional Use Permit.

She explained that a 16.75 acre conservation easement was conveyed to the City as a condition of the original approval. In order to comply with the cluster development regulations, the applicant now proposes to convey a 40.71 acre parcel of open space to the City. The new open space parcel includes most of the land within the existing conservation easement with the exception of a small area on proposed lot #9 and lot #10. A portion of treatment swale #3 encroaches into the conservation easement. The applicant will need to amend the existing conservation easement to allow for the proposed encroachment into the easement area. The amendment will need to be reviewed by the Conservation Commission and accepted by the City Council.

The Conservation Commission reviewed the revised subdivision layout and did not object to the proposal as submitted, but suggested that the applicant construct a trail through the open space for the benefit of the future residents.

She reported that a number of easement documents and agreements were recorded at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds as a condition of the original approval. The applicant will need to record a revised slope and drainage easement to take into consideration the proposed changes to the roadway design. The existing drainage and slope easements will need to be released by the City. The Conservation Commission as a condition of the support of the NHDES Wetland Permit requested that the applicant prohibit any further subdivision of the proposed lots. The applicant recorded an agreement stating that there would be no further subdivision of the property. A modified agreement will need to be recorded to acknowledge the new cluster subdivision layout. The location of the proposed hiking trail has been modified and a new easement will need to be recorded; the existing easement will need to be released by the City. Also, proposed lot #10 has road frontage along Graham Road. An agreement to convey a driveway easement will need to be provided for the benefit of proposed lot # 10 over lot #7.

Mr. Gross had questions relative to the proposed conservation parcel as well as the trail easement and whether the trail easement might better be located closer to the larger area of the conservation parcel.

Scott Bussiere was present as applicant to answer questions from the Board.

There was no one else present who wished to be heard for or against this application and the Chair declared the hearing closed at 7:34 PM.

Deliberations and Action on Application

Mr. Swope moved that the Planning Board grant conditional preliminary and final subdivision approval of the "Julie Drive Subdivision for Emerald Abode LLC, Concord, New Hampshire" as prepared by Northpoint Engineering, Inc., Duval Survey, Inc. and Nobis Engineering subject to the following standard and special conditions:

Standard Conditions:

1. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, approvals shall be obtained for the construction drawings and specifications for all proposed improvements from the Engineering Division and Planning Division. No construction activity may commence prior to the pre-construction conference.
2. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant will provide to the City Solicitor a financial guarantee for all public improvements in an amount approved by the City Engineer, and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor.
3. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant shall obtain City Council approval to release the following easements, which shall be substituted with new easements listed in condition #4.
 - a. Drainage and slope easement; and
 - b. Trail easement
4. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the following easement documents, in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor and suitable for recording in the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds, will be provided to the Planning Division:
 - a. Drainage and slope easements;
 - b. Amended conservation easement to allow the proposed construction of treatment swale #3;
 - c. Revised agreement not to further subdivide lots 1 through 10 in this subdivision;
 - d. Agreement to Convey a Driveway Easement for the benefit of proposed lot # 10;
 - e. Trail easement; and
 - f. Warranty deed for the conveyance of the 40.719 acres of open space to the City of Concord
5. No certificate of occupancy for any building or use shall be issued until all public improvements have been completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and accepted by the City Council.
6. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant shall obtain approval of private utility plans from Unitil, Fairpoint Communications, and National Grid.
7. Traffic, recreation and school impact fees shall be assessed for any construction on lots contained within this approved subdivision. The impact fees and procedures shall be those in effect at the time of the issuance of a building permit as set forth in the City of Concord Code of Ordinances, Title IV, Subdivision Code: Chapter 29.2, Public Capital Facilities Impact Fee Ordinance. The specific fees assessed are those contained in Section 29.2.1-1 Assessment and Collection; subsection (b)

Computation of the Amount of Impact Fees; Table 1, School Facilities Impact Fee per variable unit; and Table 2, Recreational Facilities Impact Fee per Variable Unit; and Table 3, Transportation Facilities Impact Fee per Variable Unit.

- a. School Facilities – Single Family Residence
 - b. Recreational Facilities – Single Family Residence
 - c. Table 3: Transportation Facilities - Single Family Residence
8. Prior to the release of a financial guarantee for any public improvement, an as built plan shall be provided to the City Engineer in form and content acceptable to the City Engineer.
 9. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the following State and federal permits shall be obtained and copies provided to the Planning Division
 - a. NH Department of Environmental Services Alteration of Terrain Permit
 - b. NH Department of Environmental Services, Water Supply and Pollution Control Division, subdivision approval for on-site septic systems.

Special Conditions:

10. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the amendment to the terms of the existing conservation easement to allow for the minor grading for the construction of treatment swale #3 shall be approved by the Conservation Commission.
11. The wetland buffers shall be clearly and permanently marked before, during, and after construction of the sites. Building permits will not be issued until the buffers are marked.
12. A landscape plan shall be provided with a minimum of two street trees per house lot and the cul-de-sac island shall be landscaped with low maintenance trees and shrubs.
13. A trail shall be constructed to provide access to the open space, as recommended by the Conservation Commission.
14. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the plat shall be annotated to indicate that all new residential units to be constructed within the subdivision shall have automatic residential fire sprinklers systems installed in each unit, and that such automatic fire sprinkler systems shall be duly maintained.

Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

Major Site Plan Applications

3. Application of **Banks Chevrolet** for a site plan of property located at **137 Manchester Street**. Along with this application is a request for a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 28-7-11(f), Driveway Separation Alternatives, of the Zoning Ordinance. (#2010-31)

Public Hearing

(Mr. Kenison recused himself and left the table.)

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal to demolish six buildings containing a total of 55,600 square feet and to construct a new car dealership containing a total of 93,576 square feet in a single building. There is currently approximately 70,000 square feet of outside motor vehicle display area on the existing site, and the applicant proposes to retain approximately 53,000 square feet of display area on the reconstructed site. All existing site improvements will be removed and the site will be completely reconstructed.

He reported that the applicant had requested a Conditional Use Permit to allow a driveway separation of 33 feet where 100 feet is required on the east end of the property on Old Suncook Road. City staff is of the opinion that the location for the second drive on Old Suncook Road is the optimal location for truck and emergency access around the east side of the building. At this location, the proposed driveway aligns with the driveway on the opposite side of Old Suncook Road used for vehicle storage by the dealership. The abutting driveway to the west is less than three feet from the proposed driveway.

He reported that a three-phase demolition plan has been submitted, as well as an interim or temporary parking plan which will be used during the first and second phases of the demolition and construction process.

He reported that the Architectural Design Review Committee reviewed the site and building plans and found the site plan, building elevations and proposed affixed signs to be appropriate for the use and location. The applicant expressed concern about the amount of landscaping in front of the vehicle display area and tree droppings tarnishing the finish of vehicles and the Committee recommended that the applicant work with Planning Division staff to substitute alternative trees and shrubs to address their concerns. The Committee expressed the strong desire to retain a green edge along both Manchester Street and Old Suncook Road. The proposed signage for the property has not yet been submitted for consideration.

Mr. Henninger reported that the lighting plan does not conform to the Zoning Ordinance for the wall mounted lights on the east side of the site. The wall mounted units are sending light out beyond the property line in excess of the 0.2 footcandle limit. The wall mount units will have to be redesigned or replaced with ground mounted light fixtures. These lights face second story residential units to the east.

He reported that the landscape plan in general meets the City's requirements for parking lot landscaping. The City's landscape architect has provided the applicant with

recommendations in regard to specie substitution and to avoiding utility and planting conflicts. City staff has recommended that the landscape plan be prepared, or reviewed, by a landscape architect in order to maximize the benefits and appearance of the foundation and ornamental plantings proposed along Manchester Street and in front of the building.

He reported that the existing traffic circulation is characterized by a 510 foot continuous curb cut on Old Suncook Road and a 420 foot continuous curb cut along Manchester Street. The new site plan has one driveway on Manchester Street and two driveways on Old Suncook Road. Manchester Street is classified as a major arterial street, while Old Suncook Road is classified as a local street.

He reported that the building frontage along Manchester Street will be disturbed by construction as part of Phase 1B of the City's Manchester Street project. Phase 1A is already funded and is scheduled to commence in the summer of 2011. Phase 1B is proposed for funding in fiscal years 2016 & 2017 in the City's adopted Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Phase 1A and Phase 1B of the City's Manchester Street project involves the acquisition of right-of-way for the entire length of Manchester Street, utility and sign relocations, the realignment of Integra Drive and Airport Road, the signalization of the new Airport Road/Integra Drive intersection, the widening of Manchester Street from the intersection of Airport Road southeasterly to the existing five lane section, and the widening of Manchester Street as a three lane cross section from Airport Road to the existing five lane cross section just west of Garvins Falls Road. The full phase includes sidewalks on both sides and street tree plantings.

He reported that, due to funding limitations and drainage redesigns being required by the NH Alteration of Terrain Permit, Phase 1A will only include the realignment of the Airport Road/Integra Drive intersection, the widening of Manchester Street from the intersection of Airport Road southeasterly to beyond Broken Bridge Road, and the relocation of Broken Bridge Road to connect with Integra Drive. The installation of sidewalks and landscaping is being deferred to Phase 1B, since the sidewalk that would be constructed in this phase would be isolated from the rest of the system and the landscaping installed would be disturbed by subsequent construction.

Normally, the Planning Board would require the installation of street trees and curbing along a project's frontage for a site being redeveloped. This project's frontage along Manchester Street will be completely reconstructed this decade and any improvements made by the applicants would have to be replaced. A complete landscape package is proposed within the landscaped strip on the project site. City staff has not recommended the installation of curbing or landscaping within the Manchester Street right-of-way due to the pending construction.

He reported that the City's Traffic Engineer estimated an increase in total weekday traffic generation of 1,266 from the expanded dealership using ITE Trip Generation rates. The City's Traffic Engineer notes that the existing traffic generation is in line with the ITE trip

generation rates and finds that there is substantial and convincing evidence that the ITE rates are appropriate. The existing traffic generation submitted by the applicant is consistent with the ITE published rates for Automobile Dealerships. The existing traffic counts were performed in July of 2010 during a significant recession. The Transportation Impact Fee has been calculated at \$136,123. The applicant's engineer has responded that the facility is being reconstructed as a requirement of retaining their franchises and the applicant does not anticipate any increased business activity.

The site driveway is projected to operate at Level of Service E in the AM peak hour and level of Service F in the PM peak hour. The property has access to by way of Old Suncook Road to Airport Road. The difficult left turn movement from the site onto Manchester Street during the peak hours can be avoided once the traffic signal is installed at the intersection of Airport Road and Manchester Street. The additional traffic to be generated by this facility will result in continued poor level of service for left turning traffic into and out of the site from Manchester Street during the peak hour. This is normal for a driveway along this corridor. The City's Traffic Engineer has recommended that a bypass shoulder be constructed on the south side of Manchester Street to facilitate vehicles traveling eastbound to bypass left turning vehicles into the site.

Peter Holden from Holden Engineering & Surveying, Inc. was present on behalf of the applicant and discussed the suggested traffic impact fee. He explained this building is being constructed because they are being required to do so by General Motors. They sell a lot of cars out of a very modest facility currently and do not feel they will benefit with a huge increase in sales as a result of this construction. They propose to pay the impact fee after the building is constructed based on the difference between current traffic counts and traffic counts after the building is constructed and the novelty has worn off. They will have the same number of sales people and the same number of service technicians.

Mr. Woodward responded that the current counts and the ITE trip generation rates were pretty close. The Impact Fee Ordinance empowers the Clerk of the Board to negotiate an agreement with the applicant under which security is provided for the basic impact fee. Pre-development and post-development traffic counts can then be reviewed at an agreed upon point in time after construction and the impact fee adjusted accordingly. There is then an appeal process to the Planning Board which is available to the applicant if they disagree with the Clerk's determination.

There was no one else present who wished to be heard for or against this application and the Chair declared the hearing closed at 8:07 PM.

Deliberations and Action on Application
Deliberations and Action on Architectural Design Review

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant Architectural Design Review approval of the site and building elevations for new automobile dealership at 137 Manchester Street for Banks Chevrolet-Cadillac, Inc. as submitted by the applicant. This approval does not include any of the site signage. Mr. Swope seconded. Motion carried with Mr. Kenison abstaining from discussion and vote.

Mr. Swope moved that the Planning Board grant a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 28-7-11 (f) Driveway Separation Alternatives for a driveway with only 33 feet of separation along Old Suncook Road for Banks Chevrolet-Cadillac, Inc. The Board finds that this driveway is best situated for emergency and truck access and recognizes that the abutting existing drive is only three feet removed from the eastern property line. Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried with Mr. Kenison abstaining from discussion and vote.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant conditional site plan approval of the site and building elevations for new automobile dealership at 137 Manchester Street for Banks Chevrolet-Cadillac, Inc., subject to the following standard and special conditions:

Standard Conditions

1. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), approvals of construction drawings for on-site improvements shall be obtained from the Engineering and Planning Divisions. No construction activity may commence prior to the preconstruction conference.
2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the applicant will provide to the City Solicitor a financial guarantee for all public improvements in an amount approved by the City Engineer and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor.
3. Prior to the release of a financial guarantee for any public improvement, an as-built plan shall be provided to the City Engineer in a form and content acceptable to the City Engineer.
4. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the following local approvals and permits shall be obtained and copies provided to the Planning Division:
 - a. Driveway Alteration Permit from the Engineering Division
5. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the following State and Federal permits shall be obtained and copies provided to the Planning Division:
 - a. NH Department of Environmental Services Alteration of Terrain Permit (RSA 485-A:17)
 - b. NH Department of Environmental Services Water Quality and Sewer Discharge Permits

6. Traffic impact fees shall be assessed for any construction contained within the limits of the approved site plan. The impact fees and procedures shall be those in effect at the time of the issuance of a building permit as set forth in the City of Concord Code of Ordinances, Title IV, Subdivision Code: Chapter 29.2, Public Capital Facilities Impact Fee Ordinance. The specific fees assessed are those contained in Section 29.2.1-1 Assessment and Collection; subsection (b) Computation of the Amount of Impact Fees; Table 3, Transportation Facilities Impact Fee per Variable Unit.
 - a. Transportation Facilities - New Car Sales & Auto Service
7. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the applicant shall obtain approval of private utility plans from Unitil, Fairpoint, and National Grid.

Special Conditions

8. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the applicant shall revise the landscape plan to the satisfaction of the City Planner.
9. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the applicant shall revise the lighting plan to bring the lighting standards into conformity with the Zoning Ordinance.
10. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the applicant shall revise the electrical service plan to conform to the Site Plan Review Regulations.

Mr. Swope seconded. Motion carried with Mr. Kenison abstaining from discussion and vote.

4. Application by **Prolerized New England Company LLC** for a site plan of property located at **25 Sandquist Street. (#2010-36)**

Public Hearing

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal to pave and to improve storm drainage at an existing recycling yard located east of Hall Street next to the Merrimack River. The proposal will reduce the amount of impervious surface on the site by 0.516 acres and provide for storm water quality treatment for the site drainage. The metal recycling facility is an existing non-conforming use in the OCP District. The applicant proposes to add a water quality treatment facility to treat storm water leaving the site and to reduce sediment runoff from the site by paving 40,598 square feet of the existing storage yard.

The area to be paved has been used for generations for metal storage and consists of reclaimed asphalt and gravel material, which has been heavily compacted.

He reported that a Conditional Use Permit for Disturbance to the Shoreland Protection District of the Merrimack River is not being required for this work. The reasons for this decision were threefold: the area being used for the storage of material within the Shoreland Protection District would be reduced by the proposed site improvements; the area to be paved is largely, if not completely, impervious; and the amount of impervious area within the Shoreland Protection District would be reduced by the proposed improvements.

He reported that the proposed use is located within the Flood Plain of the Merrimack River. The applicant has advised staff that they have a flood management program that will be implemented if flooding is imminent on the property.

He reported that the applicant proposes to reorient one of the double stacked shipping containers which provides a visual and noise screen for the manufactured home park to the south. About three years ago, material was relocated from the boundary of the manufactured park and the barrier installed. The re-orientation of the barrier section is to allow access to the new storm water facility. The barrier will have to be temporarily relocated during the drainage construction.

Mr. Henninger reported that Planning staff has recommended that the applicant add tree plantings along the west property line in the newly created landscape strip. It was recommended that one tree be provided for each 50 lineal feet of green space. The applicants for operational reasons and for access to existing monitoring wells have indicated that they do not wish to add any plantings in this location.

Planning staff has also recommended that the applicant add both native shrub and tree plantings in the 75-foot vegetative buffer south of the visual barrier on both sides of the 20-foot wide storm drainage easement. The applicant has revised the plans accordingly.

Keri Fitzpatrick from ProLerized, Tim Reed from Sanborn Head, and John Nicolala, the general manager from ProLerized, were present to answer questions from the Board.

Ms. Meyer asked the reasons for not wanting to landscape at the rear of the building and Ms. Fitzpatrick responded that there is still a monitoring well for which they need to keep clear access. The monitoring is done by a drill rig that needs a 12-foot span when it is placed on site.

Ms. Meyer felt that adding a couple of trees would provide shade to the property as well as improve its appearance.

There was no one else who wished to be heard for or against this application and the Chair declared the hearing closed at 8:24 PM.

Deliberations and Action on Application

Deliberations and Action on Architectural Design Review

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant Architectural Design Review approval for site modifications for Prolerized New England Company subject to the condition that four additional shade trees be planted along the western property line. Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant conditional site plan approval for site modifications for Prolerized New England Company subject to the following standard and special conditions:

Standard Condition

1. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), approvals of construction drawings for on-site improvements shall be obtained from the Engineering and Planning Divisions. No construction activity may commence prior to the preconstruction conference.

Special Condition

2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the applicant shall revise the landscape plan to the satisfaction of the City Planner.

Mr. Swope seconded. Motion carried.

5. Application by **Franklin Pierce Law Center Corporation** for a site plan of property located at **2 White Street. (#2010-35)**

The Chair reported that the applicant's agent had requested that this application be withdrawn from this evening's agenda.

Mr. Woodward reported that the Planning Board had received a communication from Attorney Richard Uchida on behalf of the applicant requesting that the Board set a special meeting to discuss this application, preferable before October 15th. The matter has been tabled by the Zoning Board of Adjustment which has set a special meeting on September 29, 2010, to further deliberate on the application for the parking variance application. There was also a neighborhood meeting scheduled for this evening between the Law Center and its neighbors.

He reported that members of the Planning Board had been polled to determine their availability to attend a special meeting of the Board to consider the Major Site Plan application inclusive of a Determination of Completeness; a public hearing on a request for a waiver to hold the hearing immediately and not wait until the next regular meeting as required by the Site Plan Review Regulations; and then if the waiver is granted, to actually open the public hearing on the Site Plan application. The options provided to the

Board were Wednesday October 6th, Thursday October 7th, and Wednesday October 14th. The results of the polling indicate that a quorum is available on October 6th and October 14th. If the Board is willing to schedule the special meeting, it is suggested that it be scheduled for October 6th so that the application can be determined complete (if the ZBA has granted the variance), and then if the Board does not find grounds to grant the waiver, the public hearing on the site plan application can be set for the regular meeting on October 20th. If the waiver is granted, then the Board can proceed immediately with the public hearing on the site plan application.

Mr. Gross did not understand what possible purpose could be achieved by scheduling a special meeting, having people attend and the possibility of not being able to determine the application complete because their application before the Zoning Board of Adjustment is denied or because the Planning Board sees no reason to hold a public hearing the same evening.

Mr. Woodward explained the process and reported there would be an opportunity for public input on the waiver request if the abutters chose to protest.

Mr. Drypolcher felt rushing to hold the public hearing seemed excessive.

Ms. Foss asked if the regulations required a 30-day notice from the time of determination of completeness, which would then mean that even if completion is agreed upon, the regular meeting would be too early for public hearing. Review of the Site Plan Review Regulations indicated that the Board was required to set an application for hearing no sooner than the next regular meeting of the Board after determination of completeness.

Mr. Gross asked if the Planning Board could conditionally schedule a hearing on this application for October 20th conditioned on the Zoning Board of Adjustment granting the necessary variance. Mr. Woodward responded that the Planning Board could not schedule a hearing until it had a complete application.

Mr. Gross then asked what would be wrong with making a determination of completeness at a special meeting and then setting it for public hearing at the regular October meeting. Mr. Woodward responded that the applicant had asked the Planning Board to consider a waiver and that he believed that the Board had to consider the request for a waiver on its merits, and allow the applicant to present his arguments for the same, as well as receive testimony from any abutters thereon.

Ms. Foss noted that the constraint would still remain regarding the time necessary to notice the hearing. Mr. Woodward responded that there would have to be ten clear days for notice, and there would be just enough time to get out a notice if the Board made the decision to hold the hearing at its regular meeting on October 20, 2010. On October 6th, there would be a public hearing on the waiver request and then the Board would deliberate on the testimony it received. If the waiver were to be denied, then the Site Plan hearing would be scheduled to October 20th. If the waiver were to be granted, then the hearing would be opened immediately following the vote on the waiver.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board authorize the Chair to call a special meeting on October 6, 2010 contingent on the Zoning Board of Adjustment's authorization of a variance sufficient to make the application potentially complete. Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried.

The meeting will be cancelled in the absence of affirmative action by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Architectural Design Review

6. Applications by the following for approval of signs at the following locations under the provisions of Section 28-9-4(f), Architectural Design Review, of the Code of Ordinances.

- **Dress Barn** for one affixed replacement sign in the **Ft. Eddy Plaza at 24 Fort Eddy Road**
- **Eastern Mountain Sports** for one affixed replacement sign in the **Ft. Eddy Plaza at 24 Fort Eddy Road**
- **Holiday Inn** for one replacement freestanding sign at **172 North Main Street**
- **Penacook Village Laundromat** for one freestanding sign and one affixed sign at **285 Village Street in Penacook.**

The Chair opened the hearings on all of the above signs.

- **Dress Barn** for one affixed replacement sign in the **Ft. Eddy Plaza at 24 Fort Eddy Road**

Mr. Henninger explained this application for a replacement sign as part of the façade renovations taking place at the shopping plaza. There is no significant change from the existing sign to the proposed.

He reported that the Design Review Committee found the proposed design and placement of the sign to be appropriate for the location and use, and recommended approval as submitted.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant

Mr. Gross moved approval as submitted. Mr. Swope seconded. Motion carried.

- **Eastern Mountain Sports** for one affixed replacement sign in the **Ft. Eddy Plaza at 24 Fort Eddy Road**

Mr. Henninger explained this application for a replacement sign as part of the façade renovations taking place at the shopping place. This will not be a box sign. It will be white individual letters on a blue background. This is similar in design to the other signs in this shopping center.

He reported that the Design Review Committee found the proposed design and placement of the sign to be appropriate for the location and use, and recommended approval as submitted.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant

Mr. Gross moved approval as submitted. Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried.

- **Holiday Inn** for one replacement freestanding sign at **172 North Main Street**

Mr. Henninger reported that the applicant had resubmitted a design with a narrow pole in a light beige color instead of the wide base originally proposed. He reported that the Design Review Committee does not usually recommend the use of a narrow pole for freestanding signs, but the Committee was of the opinion that it was appropriate to use in this location with the base of the sign being well below street level.

He reported that the Design Review Committee recommended approval provided the sign is on a light beige pole matching the color of the building.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant

Mr. Gross moved approval provided the sign is on a light beige pole matching the color of the building. Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

- **Penacook Village Laundromat** for one freestanding sign and one affixed sign at **285 Village Street in Penacook.**

Mr. Henninger explained this application for a sign using individual black letters affixed to the building and not illuminated. The freestanding sign will have black lettering on a white background. This is a replacement sign using the existing posts.

He reported that the Design Review Committee felt the proposed signage was not inspiring but accomplished the purpose of identifying the business, found the proposed design and placement of the signage to be appropriate for the location and use, and recommended approval as submitted.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant

Mr. Gross moved approval as submitted. Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried.

REGULAR MEETING

Minutes

Mr. Gross moved approval of the minutes of the meetings of August 18, 2010 and August 25, 2010 as submitted. Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

8. Further consideration of applications for approval of developments on which public hearings have previously been held:
 - a. Application by **Tropic Star Development on behalf of Burger King Corporation, the Hall 2001 Family Revocable Trust, and Jean B. Chase** for approval of revisions to a previously approved site plan of property located at **155 and 157 Loudon Road**. Along with this application is a request for a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 28-7-11(c), Driveway Separation Alternatives, of the Zoning Ordinance. (#2009-04)

Mr. Henninger explained that the Planning Board, at its regular meeting on July 21, 2010, held a hearing on a revised site plan application for this project, accepted testimony from City staff and the applicant's representatives, closed the hearing and tabled action on this application to the August 18, 2010, regular meeting of the Board to allow the applicant to work with City staff to address the following issues:

- The Board was concerned with the width of the proposed driveway on East Side Drive as it bears on pedestrian safety, and asked if a refuge island could be created in the center of the driveway. The Board also asked the applicant to address geometric changes that could reduce the potential for illegal left turns into the site from East Side Drive.
- The Board was also concerned with the experimental nature of the left turn access from the site onto East Side Drive. The Board asked for additional information and analysis of the impacts of immediately installing a median in East Side Drive to prohibit exiting traffic from turning left from the site. The Board asked the applicant to evaluate the potential for diverting northbound traffic from the site through either Burns Avenue, Christian Avenue or Hazen Drive, methods for controlling cut-through traffic on Burns Avenue as well as looking at the possibility of a reduction in site-related trips from the overall project due to the installation of a median in East Side Drive.

He reported that the applicant has revised the site plan to show a gore in the East Side Drive access drive which will act to discourage illegal left turns into the site and provide a refuge island for pedestrians crossing the driveway on the west side of East Side Drive. The off-site improvement plan has been revised to address staff comments.

He reported that the applicant's agents had not been able to provide a definitive answer to the question of the amount of diverted traffic onto Burns Avenue or the number of trips which might be forgone if the median is installed in East Side Drive. The range of diverted trips to Burns Avenue ranges from zero to up to approximately 200 average daily trips (20 peak hour trips) using the information provided by the traffic consultant. The applicant's consultant and City staff agree that the impacts will not be zero nor will all the left turn traffic divert to Burns Avenue. Left turns from Burns Avenue are as difficult during peak hours as it will be from the proposed site driveway due to the long queues on East Drive. This is not expected to change significantly, based on the City Traffic Engineer's analysis. Diversion of traffic would be minimal during the peak hours,

but may be more likely during off-peak times.

Ms. Meyer asked if the proposed traffic island at the entry from East Side Drive would have any landscaping. She felt landscaping would make it more visible and suggested using low-growing plant material.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant Architectural Design Review approval for the site and buildings for a proposed development by Tropic Star Development, LLC at 155 and 157 Loudon Road. The approval does not include any affixed signs for Burger King or CVS or the two free standing signs shown on the site plan. Mr. Swope seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Swope moved that the Planning Board grant a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 28-7-11 (f) Driveway Separation Alternatives for the proposed Tropic Star Development, LLC at 155 and 157 Loudon Road, as set forth in the revised July 1st plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The East Side Drive driveway access shall be restricted to right in only with left turns into the site from East Side Drive being prohibited.
2. The project's driveway intersection with East Side Drive shall be monitored beginning six months after both the Burger King and CVS proposed for the site are open for business and then annually for three years thereafter. The monitoring plan shall be approved by the Clerk of the Board and the City Engineer prior to the start of demolition and shall, at a minimum, consist of turning movement counts during the weekday PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour, accident data along with an evaluation of each accident, and the length of the queue during peak hours on East Side Drive. A pre-build baseline survey shall be completed with the same parameters.
3. If, in the opinion of the City Engineer and the Clerk of the Board, a safety problem exists at the project's driveway on East Side Drive, or the increased turning movements at this driveway adversely impact traffic at the intersection of East Side Drive and Loudon Road, or adversely impact traffic flow on East Side Drive, improvements shall be installed along East Side Drive from Loudon Road extending approximately 200 feet north of the intersection of Loudon Road.
4. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), a design for the improvements to East Side Drive, an engineer's construction cost estimate, and a financial guarantee acceptable to the City Engineer shall be provided. The financial guarantee shall remain in place for a four year period after both the Burger King and CVS proposed for the site are open for business.
5. The traffic island in the East Side Drive entryway shall be raised and suitably landscaped appropriate to maintain sight distance to the north along East Side Drive.

Mr. Gross seconded. Motion carried, 5-1, with Mr. Kenison voting against.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 28-7-11 (b) Construction of Fewer Parking Spaces to construct 89 parking spaces where 101 spaces are required for Tropic Star Development, LLC at 155 and 157 Loudon Road. The CUP site plan shows the location of the twelve spaces to be constructed if the Zoning Administrator determines that parking demand warrants the additional spaces. Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried, 5-1, with Mr. Kenison voting against.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant conditional Site Plan approval for the proposal by Tropic Star Development, LLC at 155 and 157 Loudon Road, as set forth in the revised July 1st plan, subject to the following standard and special conditions:

Standard Conditions

1. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), approvals of construction drawings for on-site improvements shall be obtained from the Engineering and Planning Divisions. No construction activity may commence prior to the preconstruction conference.
2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the applicant shall obtain approval of private utility plans from Unitil, Fairpoint Communications and National Grid.
3. Traffic impact fees shall be assessed for any non-residential construction contained within the limits of the approved site plan. The impact fees and procedures shall be those in effect at the time of the issuance of a building permit as set forth in the City of Concord Code of Ordinances, Title IV, Subdivision Code: Chapter 29.2, Public Capital Facilities Impact Fee Ordinance. The specific fees assessed are those contained in Section 29.2.1-1 Assessment and Collection; subsection (b) Computation of the Amount of Impact Fees; Table 3, Transportation Facilities Impact Fee per Variable Unit.
 - a. Transportation Facilities - Retail (5,001 SF to 100,000 SF)
 - b. Transportation Facilities - Fast Food Restaurant w/drive-thru
4. The following improvements to be constructed are deemed to be eligible for credits against the assessed traffic impact fees. The procedures for determining the eligibility and the calculation of the credit shall be those in effect at the time of the issuance of a building permit as set forth in the City of Concord Code of Ordinances, Title IV, Subdivision Code: Chapter 29.2, Public Capital Facilities Impact Fee Ordinance:

- a. The double left turn on East Side Drive and associated improvements at the intersection of East Side Drive and Loudon Road.
5. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the applicant will provide to the City Solicitor a financial guarantee for all public improvements in an amount approved by the City Engineer and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor.
6. No certificate of occupancy for any building or use shall be issued until all public improvements have been substantially completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
7. Prior to the release of a financial guarantee for any public improvement, an as-built plan shall be provided to the City Engineer in a form and content acceptable to the City Engineer.
8. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the following easement document, in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor and suitable for recording in the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds, will be provided to the Planning Division:
 - a. A deed of easement to bring the right-of-way along East Side Drive from Loudon Road to Burns Avenue to a minimum width of 60 feet.

Special Conditions

9. The East Side Drive driveway access shall be restricted to right in only with left turns into the site from East Side Drive being prohibited.
10. The project driveway on East Side Drive shall be monitored beginning six months after both the Burger King and CVS proposed for the site are open for business and then annually for three years thereafter. The monitoring plan shall be approved by the Clerk of the Board and the City Engineer prior to the start of demolition and shall, at a minimum, consist of turning movement counts during the weekday PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour, accident data along with an evaluation of each accident, and the length of the queue during peak hours on East Side Drive. A pre-build baseline survey shall be completed with the same parameters.
11. If, in the opinion of the City Engineer and the Clerk of the Board, a safety problem exists at the project's driveway on East Side Drive or the increased turning movements at this driveway adversely impact traffic at the intersection of East Side Drive and Loudon Road, or adversely impact traffic flow on East Side Drive, improvements shall be installed along East Side Drive from Loudon Road extending approximately 200 feet north of the intersection of Loudon Road.

12. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), a design for the improvements to East Side Drive, an engineer's construction cost estimate, and a financial guarantee acceptable to the City Engineer shall be provided.
13. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), an agreement to allow for the interconnection of the Tropic Star Development parking lot with the abutters to the west (parcel 114D-3-11) shall be submitted acceptable to the Clerk of the Board. The agreement needs the flexibility to locate the interconnection where all parties can agree including the tenants, the landowners and the City Planning Board.
14. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair (and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site), the companion subdivision creating this development parcel shall be recorded in the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds.
15. The applicant has agreed to provide additional funding to be used at the City's discretion to improve either East Side Drive or Loudon Road in the vicinity of the project to help mitigate the project's off-site impacts on these roadways. The applicant has voluntarily agreed to contribute an additional \$15,000 dollars at the time the project begins construction. The agreement is incorporated as part of the approved site plan application.
16. The traffic island in the East Side Drive entryway shall be raised and suitably landscaped appropriate to maintain sight distance to the north along East Side Drive.

Mr. Swope seconded.

Mr. Kenison indicated that while he has not been in attendance at all of the meetings relative to this application, he has read all of the minutes and reports submitted. He felt this project would create traffic problems and did not feel those problems had been adequately addressed.

Motion carried, 4-2, with Mr. Drypolcher and Mr. Kenison voting against.

INFORMATION

- Communication from Attorney Morgan A. Hollis to the Board's Clerk relative to the **application of Continental Paving** to the Town of Pembroke, New Hampshire for an **Asphalt Manufacturing Facility**

Mr. Woodward provided a copy of the record of decision of the Pembroke Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) and reported that the Pembroke ZBA denied the special exception

request on Monday night. At the hearing there was a question as to whether they had applied under the correct section of the ordinance. The Zoning Board concluded that this was not an allowed use in the zoning district. Secondly, the Pembroke ZBA indicated in their decision that fuel should not be stored on Concord's wellhead protection area.

He reported that, prior to the Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting, the attorney for the applicant had offered to meet with the Concord Planning Board to present their plans. The Board concluded that given the denial by the Pembroke ZBA, that this matter is moot and that a presentation by the applicant would not seem to be relevant at this time.

Planning Board members expressed appreciation for Pembroke's actions regarding wellhead protection. Ms. Foss suggested that the Clerk send a communication to the Pembroke Zoning Board of Adjustment expressing its appreciation for the careful consideration of Concord's concerns. The Board agreed and directed the Clerk to communicate its appreciation to the Pembroke Zoning Board of Adjustment.

- Communication from Kassandra S. Ardinger of the **Concord School Board** to the Concord Planning Board relative to consideration of recommendations by the Planning Board concerning construction of **three new schools**

Mr. Henninger reported that he had attended a meeting of the Concord School District's Building Committee where it was reported that the School District staff and their consultants took each of the Planning Board's recommendations and made cost estimates and recommendation for each one. The Building Committee then reviewed those recommendations and estimates and took action on each.

He reported that regarding the Broken Ground School project, the School Board had agreed to improvements to Curtisville Road and extension of the sidewalk along Curtisville Road. They also directed district staff to meet with the City to discuss and design the looping of the water line. They don't know yet if they will construct the wood chip plant. The City has suggested exploring stimulus grants for the wood chip plant. The School Board directed their Director of Facilities and Planning to work with the abutting property owner regarding appropriate fencing. They also acknowledged that they need to do some landscaping at the project entrance but did not change the plan at this time.

At Conant School, the School Board felt the original access design was the best situation and elected to continue with that design. They also dramatically increased the landscaping around the dumpster and along the access road, and added a lot of landscaping for screening.

At Kimball School, the School Board agreed to request from the State Department of Education approval to remove a portion of the proposed parking lot on site in favor of a larger play area. They hope to acquire the last remaining house and that will also increase the play area. The 80 employees currently on site will be reduced to 70 with the relocation of the District's administrative employees. There will be fewer parking on-site spaces but the net effect will be a wash with the existing conditions relative to on-street parking.

They would rather see the playground than parking. He reported that the architect had come up with a novel plan for the building elevation for the Pleasant Street façade. It will be a much more interesting façade than in the plans the Planning Board saw at its public hearing. The School Board agreed to substitute some of the landscape materials with more child-friendly species.

Mr. Gross mentioned that there was a substantial concern from Planning Board members that the odd sign on the Pleasant Street side was not well advised in that environment. He asked what became of it. Mr. Henninger responded that there is still a small band shown on the façade but no sign has been proposed at this time.

He reported that the School Board felt that since hundreds of people had been involved in this project for a very long time leading up to this particular plan and so much had gone into it, that it would not be good to change that direction now.

Mr. Henninger reported that the School District will submit their revised plans to the City.

Mr. Woodward also reported that the Planning Board had received a request from the School District that a parking restriction be implemented along Pleasant Street in the location of the proposed new driveway that will exit the new school, including a parking restriction on both sides of the new proposed driveway, beginning in July of 2012.

Mr. Gross suggested that the School District should communicate to the City Council with this request based on the recommendations of the Planning Board. He suggested that the Board's Clerk communicate to the School Superintendent that they make that request directly to the City Council.

- Invitation from **Concord Housing and Redevelopment** to the opening of **Parmenter Place** on Thursday, September 16, 2010 at 4:00 PM.

The Clerk noted the invitation by Concord Housing and Redevelopment to the opening of Parmenter Place on Thursday, September 16, 2010.

There was no further business to come before the Board and the meeting adjourned at 9:56 PM.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Douglas G. Woodward
Clerk

o