EXPANDED DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY
THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TAPE RECORDED PROCEEDINGS
THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN HAS NOT BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE NCPB

NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD
June 18, 2020

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Nashua City Planning Board was held on June 18, 2020 at 7:00 PM via Webex virtual meeting.

Members Present: Scott LeClair, Chair
Adam Varley, Vice Chair
Mike Pederson, Mayor's Rep.
Ed Weber, Secretary
Dan Hudson, City Engineer
Ald. Jan Schmidt
Bob Bollinger
Larry Hirsch

Also Present: Linda McGhee, Deputy Planning Manager
Christine Webber, Department Coordinator

COVID-19 Address

Mr. LeClair addressed the COVID-19 pandemic as follows: Due to the State of Emergency declared by Governor Sununu as a result of COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12, pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically until further notice.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized to meet electronically pursuant to the Governor's order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are:

1. Access

The Board is providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic access means.

The Board is video conferencing utilizing Webex for this electronic meeting. All members of the Planning Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to listen to this meeting by dialing (978)-990-5298, with password 273974.

Public access to this meeting is also provided via Webex. The link to this meeting is contained in the meeting agenda, available on the city website. The meeting can be streamed thru the city's website on Nashua Community Link and also on Channel 16 on Comcast.

2. Public Notice

The Board previously gave public notice to the meeting and the necessary information for accessing the meeting through public postings, and where applicable notice to abutters. Instructions have also been posted to the city website, and publicly noticed at City Hall.

3. Public Alert

The Board is providing a mechanism for the public to alert the Board during the meeting if there are problems with access. If anybody has a problem accessing the meeting via phone or channel 16, please call (603)-589-3115, and they will help you connect.

4. Adjourning the Meeting

In the event that the public is unable to access the meeting via the methods above, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

5. Procedures

The Chair is in control of the meeting, and to the extent practicable and advisable the Board will follow the procedures identified in the Bylaws. The applicant will present the applicant’s case, followed by questions by the Board. The Chair will then allow testimony from persons wishing to speak in favor, or with questions or opposition, before the Board deliberates and determines an outcome.

Applicants and their representatives, and individuals required to appear before the Board are appearing remotely, and are not required to be physically present. These individuals may contact the Planning Department to arrange an alternative means of real time participation if they are unable to use Webex. Documentary exhibits and/or visual presentations must be submitted in advance of the meeting so that they may be displayed for remote public access viewing.

Real-time public comment can be addressed to the Board utilizing Webex virtual meeting software for remote access. Real-time public comments via audio will be addressed at the conclusion of the public hearing. This application will allow users to view the meeting, and submit questions or comments to the Board utilizing the Webex software.

The public is also encouraged to submit their comments via email to the Department email at planningdepartment@nashuanh.gov or by mail. Please be sure to include your name, address, and comments. Letters should be addressed to Planning Department, P.O. Box 2019, Nashua, NH 03061.

Please note that all votes taken during this meeting will be done by roll call. Planning Board meetings will be held electronically until further notice, when it is deemed safe to conduct meetings at City Hall.

The Planning Department and Board thank you for your understanding and patience during this difficult time.

Approval of Minutes

May 21, 2020

MOTION by Mr. Bollinger to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2020 meeting, as written.

SECONDED by Mr. Varley

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

May 28, 2020

MOTION by Mr. Bollinger to approve the minutes of the May 28, 2020 meeting, as written.

SECONDED by Mr. Varley

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

June 4, 2020

MOTION by Mr. Bollinger to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2020 meeting, as written.

SECONDED by Mr. Varley

MOTION CARRIED 7-0-1 (Bollinger abstained)

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. McGhee went over the following items that were received after the case packets were mailed:

- Email from Street Construction Engineer Joe Mendola re: Case #1
- Email between Traffic Engineer Wayne Husband and Austin Turner re: Case #1

REPORT OF CHAIR, COMMITTEE & LIAISON

Nashua Regional Planning Commission: Mr. Weber gave a report of the virtual meeting.

OLD BUSINESS – CONDITIONAL/SPECIAL USE PERMITS

None

OLD BUSINESS – SUBDIVISION PLANS

None

OLD BUSINESS – SITE PLANS

None

NEW BUSINESS – CONDITIONAL/SPECIAL USE PERMITS

None

NEW BUSINESS - SUBDIVISIONS

None

NEW BUSINESS – SITE PLANS

1. Appletree Properties, LLC (Owner) BJ's Wholesale Club (Applicant) - Application and acceptance of proposed amendment to NR0113 to develop a 400-sf kiosk supporting a gasoline fueling facility with six dispenser islands and associated site improvements. Property is located at 210 Daniel Webster Highway and 101 Adventure Way. Sheet A - Lots 231 & 167. Zoned "HB" Highway Business. Ward 7.

MOTION by Mr. Weber that the application is complete and the Planning Board is ready to take jurisdiction.

SECONDED by Mr. Hirsch

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

Atty. Gerald Prunier, Prunier & Prolman PA, 20 Trafalgar Sq, Nashua NH

Atty. Prunier introduced himself to the Board as representative for the applicant. He also introduced Project Engineer Matthew Bombaci from Bohler Engineering, Traffic Engineer Giles Ham from Vanasse & Associates and Ronald Lawrence from Stantec.

Matt Bombaci, Project Engineer, Bohler Engineering

Mr. Bombaci presented the proposed site design to the Board. He described the current onsite conditions of both lots. He said the use of fuelling station is permitted by right in this zone. He described the layout of the proposed gas station. He said that traffic is proposed to be one-way only.

Mr. Bombaci said the hours of operation would be from 6:30AM-10PM. There will be no convenience store or goods sold at the 400-sqft kiosk. The only thing that will be sold there is BJ's membership cards. The project will have underground storage tanks along the north property line and will be permitted through the NHDES process. Fuel deliveries will be through a dedicated lane so as to not affect traffic flow through the site. Deliveries are scheduled and automated; there will be no surprise deliveries.

Mr. Bombaci said the facility is anticipated to be open to the public, although the expectation would be that the majority of customers would be BJ's members.

Mr. Bombaci described the access and circulation to the site. He described the elevation and grading in relation to Daniel Webster Hwy. He described parking, trash management, and other site amenities. He said they have addressed the Transit Oriented Development overlay with the submitted site plan report.

Mr. Bombaci said there is no formal drainage onsite currently. They propose a full drainage design for the site, and he described the different best management practices they propose. He said they received the comments from Engineering Dept. and

reviewed them before the meeting, and said they feel comfortable with addressing them on the plan. He described the onsite utilities, landscaping, lighting, and architectural design. He said during preliminary meetings with Planning staff, they did request additional parapet height to the canopy to screen fire suppression units.

Mr. Bombaci said they had a traffic analysis performed by Vanasse & Associates. He outlined some of the recommendations made in that report. He said they received comments from the city traffic engineer, and they asked for a $33,600 contribution to the future development of Daniel Webster Hwy. They are amenable to providing that if required. He said a second request was for a traffic counter on the signal, and they have agreed to compensate the city $4,000 for that fixture. Another request was for a left-turn study, performed by Vanasse & Associated and paid for by the applicant. The last request was regarding pedestrian connectivity, and they are amenable to working with the city for pedestrian improvements, and they would be amenable to this being a stipulation of approval.

Mr. Bombaci said they have received a copy of the staff report, and there is a paving moratorium until August 2021. He said as the project exists now, they are not proposing any trenching into Daniel Webster Hwy, so they suspect it will not be a great impact. They are happy to work with the Engineering Dept. on their requirements for a possible waiver.

Mr. Bombaci said Fire Dept. has had a chance to review the plans, and they addressed most of their concerns prior to submittal. They requested to use the current structure for training before its demolition, and they are amenable to that.

Mr. Bombaci said they are requesting three waivers with this proposal. The first is from NRO §190-26.1(H)(2), which requires a maximum front setback of 15 feet. The second is from NRO §190-89 (A), which requires light levels not exceed 0.2 foot-candles at property lines. The third is from NRO § 190-89(C), which requires any luminaire with a lamp rated more than 1800 should be mounted using a formula where D is the distance to property line with a pole height not to exceed 25 feet. He outlined each of the waiver requests.

Mr. LeClair said he thinks the parapet screening is an important item. He asked if the sightlines along Daniel Webster Hwy have been taken into account. This site is lower than the road, and he asked what accommodations have been made to clean that up.

Mr. Bombaci said the canopy is 14-ft high. The site is 3-ft lower than the road, so it would be 11-ft higher than the road, and the parapet would be 3-ft higher than that.

Mr. LeClair asked if this would be on both ends.

Mr. Bombaci said yes. At one end the top of the parapet will be 7-ft higher than the road.

Mr. LeClair said that's close. There will be a lot of people coming down the hill looking down, and that grade keeps going up as you cross Daniel Webster Hwy. He asked if there could be some accommodations with the design to move the equipment towards the front and tighter to the parapet. He asked for an explanation of the suppression design below the canopy.

Mr. Bombaci gave a brief description of the fire suppression systems.

Ronald Lawrence, Fuel Systems Engineer, Stantec, 5 Dartmouth Dr Ste 200, Auburn, NH

Mr. Lawrence said fire suppression will only be provided here if required. He said the nozzles can be stuck below and covered as described.

Mr. LeClair asked for details on the tank venting.

Mr. Lawrence described the approximate locations of the vents, and said they will be about 12-ft high.

Mr. LeClair asked about the ingress and egress to the site from Adventure Way. It seems to be angled assuming that there will be infrequent left-turning traffic out of that curb cut. He thinks that is the case right now, but there are development plans for a site to the northeast that will change that over time. He asked if they believe this design is the right approach.

Mr. Bombaci said expectation is that the majority of traffic will be coming in and out this way, so they designed it with that and the turning radius of trucks in mind. That being said, they could straighten it out or extend the double yellow line so that left turns are easier. They anticipated most of the traffic from Daniel Webster Hwy, but the curb cut is wide enough that left turn maneuvers could be executed.

Mr. LeClair said he doesn't know what the timeframe is for development of the adjacent lot. He asked if they are confident that if that becomes a frequent maneuver, that it would simply be a restriping exercise.

Mr. Bombaci said yes, the driveway radius is fairly large to accommodate fuel delivery and fire vehicles. He feels comfortable that they could adjust the geometry of the curbing.

Mr. LeClair asked if they intend to dispense diesel fuel. He asked what kind of provisions they have to accommodate those vehicles.

Mr. Bombaci said there will be 4 dedicated gasoline dispensers, and 2 dispensers that have both gasoline and diesel fuel. He described the dimensions.

Mr. LeClair said he thinks the first island would be complicated to maneuver for a trailered vehicle, and the farthest two would be easier.

Mr. Bombaci agreed with Mr. LeClair, and said those two would be the most appropriate for diesel.

Mr. Bollinger asked if there was any consideration to siting this closer to the BJ's site for convenience of customers.

Mr. Bombaci said the zoning ordinance has a provision prohibiting gas stations from being sited within 750-ft of each other. This was an available site that was allowed under zoning.

Mr. Bollinger asked if customers do not need a BJ's membership to use.

Mr. Bombaci said correct. There is a 5-cent discount for card members.

Mr. Bollinger asked if the ingress/egress lane farther into the site is appropriately sized for two lanes of traffic.

Mr. Bombaci said they could increase the throat width. It is intended to be one-way traffic only.

Mr. Bollinger said it appears there is an intention to analyze the southbound left-turn queue on Daniel Webster Hwy. Is that something he can speak to on the adequacy of storage capacity, or is that an effort to be undertaken?

Mr. Bombaci said this is one of the conditions of approval from the Engineering Dept.

Mr. Bollinger referred to the correspondence mentioning the Amherst St corridor vs Daniel Webster Hwy. He asked what the contribution would be towards.

Atty. Gerald Prunier, Prunier & Prolman PA

Atty. Prunier said that was a typo, and it should be Daniel Webster Hwy. It has already been corrected by the Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Weber asked if the transformer is protected by bollards.

Mr. Bombaci said it will be. The generator will be as well.

Mr. Weber asked if they were planning on installing "Do Not Enter" and "Right Turn Only" signs on the egress onto Daniel Webster Hwy.

Matt Bombaci, Project Engineer

Mr. Bombaci said yes. He indicated other signage onsite.

Mr. Weber asked if the painted arrows would be high temperature paint, because of the high traffic loads.

Mr. Bombaci said yes.

Mr. Weber asked if there were any provisions on Adventure Way with regards to stormwater. The slope there will be a hazard in the wintertime with ice shed and sheet flow. Is there any provision to collect that?

Mr. Bombaci said there is a catch basin, and described surface drainage.

Mr. LeClair asked for clarification of hours of operation.

Mr. Bombaci said they would be open from 6:30AM-10:00PM

Mr. LeClair asked what kind of onsite signage there would be.

Mr. Bombaci described the proposed signage onsite. He said there would be nothing greater than what the ordinance allows.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR CONCERN

Rob Parsons, 11 Gilboa Ln, Nashua NH

Mr. Parsons said he is the owner of 2 East Spit Brook Rd, the adjacent northeast parcel to this site. Mr. Parsons said they fully intend to develop this site, and have been working on it. He said the major issue they have had with redeveloping the site has been drainage, and many of the abutters have been allowed to drain runoff onto their site. He said the past few years they have been working on a plan to mitigate the drainage issues and redevelop the site in the best possible fashion. He requests special concern to be paid to the drainage aspect of this site.

Mr. Parsons said this applicant has made reference to the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) overlay district, but in order to utilize the TOD, they would need to provide a study of how this would improve the district. He said he can't see how this will do such.

Mr. Parsons asked how the increased traffic will impact the future development of their land. He said they have been in discussions with the city for quite some time on the best way to develop the parcel, and the city has asked for something that looks at the entirety of the three parcels. He asked that they not be adversely impacted by this proposal.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL

Atty. Gerald Prunier, Prunier & Prolman PA

Atty. Prunier said they can't let any more water offsite than was present before redevelopment. He said they have submitted a traffic report, and he is sure that in its review the city would have wanted to make sure it complied with all surrounding properties. They are making contributions to help the surrounding properties and performing a traffic study.

Matt Bombaci, Project Engineer

Mr. Bombaci said they are required to analyze storm events to see how the site would function. They have well drained soils onsite that are well suited to provide infiltration, so they are able to decrease runoff for all storm events in comparison to existing conditions. There were some minor comments from Engineering Dept. that they would be happy to iron out, but in general the review was very thorough.

Mr. LeClair asked if all the stormwater generated onsite will be contained and infiltrated, with the exception of storms not required by guidelines.

Mr. Bombaci said yes. Up to a two-year storm they are completely holding and infiltrating. The larger storm events will have an overflow device to discharge into city infrastructure, but your typical storm will be contained.

Mr. LeClair asked if Adventure Way has a storm drain.

Mr. Bombaci said yes.

Mr. LeClair asked if it was combined or separated.

Mr. Bombaci said separated.

Mr. LeClair asked if he has an understanding of where the discharge from Adventure Way storm drain ends up.

Mr. Bombaci said it went in the direction down Adventure Way. Street Construction Engineer Joe Mendola was unable to locate where the pipe discharged. For their site the goal was to reduce the amount of flow coming offsite in comparison to current conditions, which is what they have done.

Mr. LeClair asked him to address the TOD district

Mr. Bombaci said they provided a site suitability report to Planning staff analyzing traffic, parking, economics, appearance, and aesthetics. If was reviewed by staff, and there were no comments. The facility is pretty similar to the uses around it. He said they don’t need any of the TOD provisions to allow the Planning Board to relax requirements. They are applying under the Highway Business district, but did supply the report at the request of Planning staff. They feel the project meets those standards.

Mr. LeClair asked if they are not using any of the TOD benefits.

Mr. Bombaci said correct.

Mr. LeClair asked if the additional traffic analysis they are funding is for a left turning lane on Daniel Webster Hwy.

Mr. Bombaci described the traffic improvements they are proposing. He said the traffic study is a $33,600 benefit to the

city from BJ's for future traffic improvements, and $4,000 traffic counter.

Mr. LeClair asked for clarification of the study from the City Engineer.

Mr. Hudson said they recognize that there is an issue in that left turn lane. The existing storage isn't sufficient currently, and BJ's isn't going to make it any better. They didn't see any queuing information in the analysis study the applicant provided, so they have asked them to provide that. They are planning to extend that left turning lane to accommodate future development, but the road is currently in a moratorium. It's a more extensive project than we felt was warranted to have BJ's do, so that is why we are asking for a contribution towards it. They already have an idea of what the results are, but they need documentation and that was the basis for the contribution.

Mr. LeClair asked if there was additional information on the storm drain system on Adventure Way.

Mr. Hudson said he knows it's downhill to the property in the back, and likely that way for a long time. The Engineering Dept. is working with their engineers collaboratively to mitigate the drainage issues. It is good that BJ's is not going to exacerbate any issue that exists today, and they will continue to work with all applicants going forward to address this issue.

Mr. LeClair asked if he believes this will improve the drainage issue.

Mr. Hudson said yes. It's a highly impervious site currently and will remain so when they are done, but there will be infiltration to a greater extent than what exists.

Mr. Weber asked if after the site is completed, the applicant could test the stormwater system of the inlet/outlet driveway to show that the water isn't going onto the abutter's property.

Mr. Bombaci said they are willing to confirm that the project was constructed as designed.

Mr. Weber asked if they could send a report of the test to Engineering Dept. and Planning staff.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR CONCERN - REBUTTAL

Rob Parsons, 11 Gilboa Ln, Nashua NH

Mr. Parsons said the second lot of this proposed development is a former house lot, and is currently a field. He knows that they are going to collect stormwater and head it down Adventure Way, where it will ultimately pass through his property. He said the statement made by Mr. Hudson that the site is mostly impervious is not correct. He said they have been impacted pretty heavily by all of the development nearby from Planning Boards of the past. They want to make sure that they will not be impacted further.

Mr. Parsons asked how the site suitability report addressed the modal development within the TOD.

Mr. LeClair asked the applicant to clarify further on drainage.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL

Matt Bombaci, Project Engineer

Mr. Bombaci said they performed a full hydrologic study. They considered the full condition of all surfaces onsite, and were very conservative. Their report shows that they are reducing flows, and if there are any remaining comments from the Engineering Dept. they would be happy to address them.

Mr. LeClair asked if the vacant lot was modeled as a pervious grass site.

Mr. Bombaci said yes. He said this proposal is not going to be using any of the benefits of the TOD district. He outlined their site plan suitability report, and said they provided a detailed narrative on all aspects of the overlay district they were required to address.

Mr. LeClair asked about modal development.

Mr. Bombaci addressed how the project fits in with the surrounding area. He said there is a significant improvement to landscaping, drainage, and traffic.

Mr. Varley said they used conservative calculations when determining what the runoff would be for different storm events. He asked if they are saying there will be less impact to abutting sites, but there will not be 'no impact' from developing this site.

Mr. Bombaci said he would define greater impact as making an increase or making it worse. Naturally the topography down Adventure Way goes southerly, so the drainage infrastructure heads that way. It sounds like the abutter has a complicated drainage situation, and their one-acre lot isn't going to fix that. They want to provide improvement to their own condition.

Mr. LeClair asked staff for clarification on the TOD site suitability report.

Ms. McGhee cited code section 190-26.1(D)(2), and said any site plan submitted to the Board within the TOD has to supply a site plan suitability report. She said the applicant is correct; they are not seeking any relief under the TOD district.

Mr. LeClair asked if the applicant had to do that to meet city requirements.

Ms. McGhee said correct.

Rob Parsons, 11 Gilboa Ln, Nashua NH

Mr. Parsons said he understands that they are not actually utilizing any relief from the TOD, but they are in the district. He asked the Board to look at this application with regard to how it will impact the development of the TOD. The intention of the district was to develop in a transit oriented development manner, and if this isn't contributing to that and in fact negates it, it could be impactful to the district. If it doesn't benefit the development of the TOD it may negatively impact his ability to develop his 40-acre parcel which gives consideration to transit oriented development.

Atty. Gerald Prunier, Prunier & Prolman PA

Atty. Prunier said the abutter could have absolved this before and made any comments before tonight's meeting. However, they have complied with the city's regulations regarding their site plan. The Board should not do anything outside of making sure that this site doesn't injure the abutting property through drainage. He doesn't feel that they are impacting the abutter's plan in any way.

Mr. Weber asked staff for clarification on dates contained in the staff report.

PUBLIC MEETING

Mr. LeClair closed the public hearing and moved into the public meeting.

Mr. LeClair thinks this is an improvement from what is there currently. The current entrance and exit to the site is a disaster. He is interested in the development of this corner, and he thinks the layout of the site seems to work. In regards to the TOD, he thinks a gas station close to where you might park for rail someday is a good idea.

Mr. Varley agreed with Mr. LeClair. The development is an improvement. He thinks at worst this is neutral to the TOD; he doesn't think it negatively impacts development in connection to the abutting site. The other main concern was drainage, which was discussed at length, and it is clear to him that the applicant has created an effective drainage plan with a net reduction in outflow to the site.

Mr. Bollinger agreed. His primary concern is the left turn lane queue issue. He asked if it is wise to vote on this before they see what the traffic study has to say. He described the surrounding conditions. If this site exacerbates the southbound queue issue, should the Board have some greater knowledge of the impact before they make a decision?

Mr. LeClair said they have seen several site plans come up along this corridor, and this is the first one he's seen that is investing into looking at traffic. He thinks the city's intent is to do something with that information in the future, and any future development would implement that. If this development needs more car space in the queue, he doesn't think it would be addressed until the city knows what the abutting property is going to do. They shouldn't have to do it twice.

Mr. Hudson agreed. He says there is an issue in this area, and the rear property would exacerbate the issue. They have decided to take a contribution toward a future project in lieu of changes to the intersection, which would be much more expansive.

Mr. Weber asked if stipulation #7 could address it.

Mr. LeClair said in this arrangement, they are taking a contribution in lieu of a change to the street and a study, which will help them down the road in the future. He's not sure what waiting for a study would do if they're not asking the applicant to implement the changes needed.

Mr. Weber asked what the study would accomplish.

Mr. Hudson said he can't say because they don't have the information. He cited some statistics they currently know. They don't have a study to indicate how bad it would be.

Mr. Varley agreed that this is not something they should do twice, and the issue with the left turning lane is more a question of when and to what extent. The contribution is made with the understanding that it will go to a more significant improvement. Even if they had a study in front of them he doesn't think they would ask the applicant to make improvements right now; this is a long term, large scale project.

Mr. Bollinger referred to the contribution, and asked if it is sufficient given the relative impact of the development.

Mr. Hudson said he believes it is. He cited how the contribution was calculated.

Mr. Pedersen said many times heading south on Daniel Webster the traffic can get up a long way. If they can improve the left turn here, it would improve the neighborhood at large.

MOTION by Mr. Weber to approve New Business – Site Plan #1. It conforms to § 190-146(D) with the following stipulations or waivers:

1. The request for a waiver of NRO § 190-26.1(H)(2), which requires a maximum front setback of 15 feet, is granted, finding that the waiver will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulation.
2. The request for a waiver of NRO § 190-89 (A), which requires light levels not exceed 0.2 foot-candles at property lines, is granted, finding that the waiver will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulation.
3. The request for a waiver of NRO § 190-89(C), which requires any luminaire with a lamp rated more than 1800 should be mounted using a formula where D is the distance to property line with a pole height not to exceed 25 feet, is granted, finding that the waiver will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulation.
4. Prior to the Chair signing the plan, all conditions from the Planning Board approval letter will be added to the cover page of the final plans.

5. Prior to the Chair signing the plan, minor drafting corrections will be made.
6. Prior to the Chair signing the plan, all comments in an e-mail from Joe Mendola, Street Construction Engineer, dated June 12, 2020 shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Department.
7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, all comments in an e-mail from Wayne Husband, P.E. dated June 18, 2020 shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Department.
8. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, stormwater documents shall be submitted to Planning Staff for review and recorded at the applicant's expense.
9. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the lots shall be merged.
10. Prior to any work on site, a pre-construction meeting shall be held and a financial guarantee shall be approved.
11. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, all off-site and on-site improvements will be completed.
12. The applicant will do a visual stormwater drainage test.

SECONDED by Mr. Bollinger

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

OTHER BUSINESS

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

MOTION by Mr. Bollinger that there are no items of regional impact

SECONDED by Mr. Varley

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

2. Referral from the Board of Aldermen on proposed O-20-023, relative to advertising signage on umbrellas, awnings, and canopies in connection with outdoor dining.

Ms. McGhee gave a brief overview of the proposed ordinance. She said currently umbrellas and canopies cannot have signage on it.

This allows for signage, but will not allow them to block pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

MOTION by Mr. Weber to make a favorable recommendation of Other Business #2 to the Board of Aldermen, as written

SECONDED by Mr. Bollinger

MOTION CARRIED 8-0

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Mr. Weber said the Nashua Regional Planning Commission is seeking applicants to serve on the Board.

MOTION to adjourn by Mr. Hirsch at 8:51 PM.

MOTION CARRIED 7-0

APPROVED:

_____
Mr. LeClair, Chair, Nashua Planning Board

DIGITAL RECORDING OF THIS MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING DURING REGULAR OFFICE HOURS OR CAN BE ACCESSED ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE. DIGITAL COPY OF AUDIO OF THE MEETING MAY BE MADE AVAILABLE UPON 48 HOURS ADVANCED NOTICE AND PAYMENT OF THE FEE.

_____
Prepared by: Kate Poirier

Taped Meeting