

**CITY OF CONCORD PLANNING BOARD
December 19, 2012 MEETING**

The regular monthly meeting of the City Planning Board was held on December 19, 2012, in City Council Chambers, in the Municipal Complex, at 37 Green Street, at 7:00 p.m.

Present at the meeting were Chair Drypolcher and Members Regan, Smith Meyer, Hicks, Swope, and Foss. City Planner McPherson, Mr. Henninger, Ms. Hebert, and Ms. Muir of the City's Planning Division were also present, as was Ms. Aibel, the City's Associate Engineer.

At 7:00 p.m., a quorum was present and the Chair called the meeting to order.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Architectural Design Review Applications

1. 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 City of Concord's Code of Ordinances:

The Chair opened the public hearings for all the sign applications.

- **Application by Roy Nails & Spa for Architectural Design Review approval of a replacement affixed sign located at 31A South Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger stated that this proposal is for a replacement affixed sign. He stated that the Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) tabled the application at their November meeting, allowing the applicant time to address the ADRC's concerns regarding the lack of border on the sign, the background façade that the sign would be installed upon, and the placement of the sign. The applicant met with the Planning staff to discuss the revisions, and the ADRC recommended approval of the revised application at their December meeting.

Jimmy Vu was present on behalf of the applicant to respond to questions from the Planning Board.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for a replacement affixed sign as revised by the applicant. Mr. Regan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Beaver Meadow Village Condominium Association requesting Architectural Design review approval of a replacement freestanding sign located at the intersection of Second Street and Piscataqua Road, within the Single Family Residential (RS) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the application is for a replacement freestanding sign. He explained that the ADRC recommended approval of the sign as submitted, with the recommendation that the height of the sign not exceed six feet, as per zoning regulations.

John Sokul was present on behalf of the applicant to respond to questions from the Planning Board.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for the replacement freestanding sign as submitted, with the condition that the height of the sign not exceed six feet. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Aaron's requesting Architectural Design Review approval of a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign and an affixed sign located at 163 Loudon Road, within the General Commercial (CG) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the application is for a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign and an affixed sign. He reported that the ADRC recommended approval of the signs as revised by the applicant.

Marc Hortie was present on behalf of the applicant to respond to questions from the Planning Board.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for the replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign and an affixed sign, as revised by the applicant. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by B&B Associates Realty requesting Architectural Design Review approval of replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign located at 89 Storrs Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the application is for replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign. He explained that the ADRC has a number of concerns with the sign and that the applicant made the revisions consistent with the recommendations of the ADRC.

Bob Dufour was present on behalf of the applicant to respond to questions from the Planning Board.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for the replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign with the revisions as presented by the applicant. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by George Georgopolis / Veano's Italian Kitchen requesting Architectural Design Review approval of replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign and an existing affixed sign located at 30 Manchester Street, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the application is for replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign and an existing affixed sign. He reported that the ADRC recommended approval of the signs as submitted, and requested that a graphic for the panel in the affixed sign be provided to the Planning Division to ensure the sign panel looks appropriate at scale for the affixed sign.

George Georgopolis was present to respond to questions from the Planning Board.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for the replacement panels in the existing freestanding and affixed signs, as submitted to the Planning Division. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Cheryl Brosnahan / Verizon Wireless requesting Architectural Design Review approval of a replacement panel in an existing building sign and a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign located at 215 Fisherville Road, within the General Commercial (CG) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the applicant is proposing replacement panels in an existing building and freestanding signs. He stated that the ADRC recommended that the panel in the freestanding sign match the panel in the affixed sign with the black background, and that the Committee suggested that the applicant consider increased spacing between the first and second line of text to allow for easier reading.

Cheryl Brosnahan was present to respond to questions from the Planning Board. She stated that the freestanding sign would blend in with the environment with black background.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for the replacement panels in the existing building and freestanding signs as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Swope seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Minor Subdivision Applications

2. Application by Frances Potter, for property located at 38 Little Pond Road, requesting Minor Subdivision approval to create three lots where one currently exists. (2012-0051)

Ms. Hebert stated that the application is complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Swope moved and Ms. Foss seconded that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and ready for public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Ms. Hebert explained that this proposal is to subdivide an existing parcel of land at 38 Little Pond Road, on which there is an existing single family residence, to create two additional residential building lots. The property is located primarily in the Single Family Residential (RS) with a small portion of land in the Open Space Residential District (RO), but the subdivision occurs completely within the RS District.

Ms. Hebert stated that the applicant was granted two variances by the Zoning Board of Adjustment, the first to permit the proposed subdivision where all three lots will not be connected to the municipal sanitary sewer utility, and the second to allow the proposed subdivision where the two new proposed lots will not be connected to the municipal water system. She also explained that the applicant has requested four waivers to permit the overhead utility line serving the existing house to remain above ground; to permit the use of the existing 14 foot to 18 foot wide driveway; to allow for the use of the existing turnaround at the end of the driveway and construction of a Y-shaped turnaround; and to permit the installation of onsite well and septic on proposed lots one and three where the parcel is located within 1,500 feet of the municipal water and sewer service.

Mark Sargent, from Richard D. Bartlett and Associates was present on behalf of the applicant. He explained that the lot is 12.81 acres and was purchased in 1995 with the intent to subdivide the lot. Mr. Sargent

reported that the private driveway and water lines were as required at the time of the lot purchase. He stated that all three lots would have frontage on Little Pond Road, as well as access to the common driveway. Mr. Sargent reported the variances regarding not extending the water and sewer lines was because the water lines would not meet the required psi. He also explained that the applicant has applied for the State of NH Subdivision approval, but has not yet received it.

The Planning Board discussed the sizes of the lots in the RS District and the useable area superimposed on the well head radius.

Hearing no additional comments from the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a waiver to Section 26.02(1), Underground Utilities, to permit the overhead utility line serving the existing house to remain above ground. The new utilities to lots #1 and #3 shall be placed underground from the existing pole onsite. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a waiver to Table 20-1, Standards for Residential Common Private Drives, to permit the use of the existing 14' to 18' wide driveway, where a 22-foot wide driveway would typically be required. The existing driveway was constructed with two foot gravel shoulders and is of an adequate width to serve the proposed lots. Ms. Foss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a waiver to Section 20.14(2), Terminus of Residential Common Private Drives, to allow for the use of the existing turnaround at the end of the driveway and the construction of a "modified Y-shaped" turnaround. The modified Y-shaped turnaround will ensure that vehicles will be able to turnaround at the end of the common private drive. Ms. Foss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a waiver to Sections 24.02, Municipal Water Systems, to permit the installation of onsite well on proposed lots #1 and 3 where the parcel is located within 1,500 feet of the municipal water service and an extension of the water line would typically be required for property within the Single Family Residential District. It has been determined by the City's water consultant that the proposed homes cannot be served by municipal water. Mr. Regan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a waiver to Section 25.02, Municipal Sanitary Sewers, to permit the installation of onsite subsurface disposal system on proposed lots #1 and 3, and the continued use of the existing subsurface disposal system on proposed lot #2, where the parcel is located within 1,500 feet of the municipal water and sewer service and the extension of the utility line would typically be required in the Single Family Residential District. Ms. Foss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant final subdivision approval for the Minor Subdivision application of Frances Potter 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. No certificate of occupancy for any building or use on proposed lot #1 or #3 shall be issued until the turnaround for the common private driveway has been substantially completed to the satisfaction of the City Planner.
3. No certificate of occupancy for any building or use on proposed lot #3 shall be issued until the vegetation has been cleared along the common private driveway and Little Pond Road as noted on the plan.
4. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, digital information shall be provided to the City Engineer for incorporation into the City of Concord Geographic Information System (GIS) and tax maps. The information shall be submitted in accordance with Section 12.08 of the Subdivision Regulations.
5. Traffic, recreation, and school impact fees shall be assessed for any construction on the new 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. Transportation Facilities - Single Family Residence
6. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the following State permit shall be obtained and copies provided to the Planning Division:
 - a. NH Department of Environmental Services, Water Division, Subsurface Systems Bureau Subdivision Approval for subsurface disposal systems.
7. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the following 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. Access and Utility Easement
 - b. Agreement to Convey a Maintenance and Operation Agreement for the Driveway and Utilities

Mr. Hicks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Major Site Plan Applications

3. **Application by the New Hampshire Association of Realtors, for property located at 115A Airport Road, requesting Site Plan approval, Architectural Design Review approval, and a Conditional Use**

Permit pursuant to Article 28-7-11 (f), Driveway Separation Alternatives, of the Concord Zoning Ordinance, for the construction of a new three-story 23,832 square foot office building and related parking, access driveway, stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, and associated site improvements. (2012-0049)

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Ms. Hebert reported that the applicant is proposing to construct a new three-story 23,832 square foot multi-tenant office building at 115A Airport Road. She explained that the existing building will be demolished and replaced with the new office building. Ms. Hebert stated that the application also includes a Conditional Use Permit to allow for the construction of a driveway that is less than 200 feet from the existing driveway on the adjacent property to the north. She said that the site currently contains two driveways and the proposal involves removing one driveway and shifting the new driveway to the north.

Brian Pratt, from CLD Engineers, was present on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the existing conditions plan, the phasing plan, and the landscaping plan. Mr. Pratt explained that a portion of the building will be three stories and the other portion of the building will be two stories to conform to FAA height requirements. He said that the existing building will remain during the construction of the new building. He reported that a new storm water infiltration system will be constructed, so that there will be no storm water running off site.

Ms. Foss asked whether the applicant looked into incorporating the existing building into the new design. Mr. Pratt responded that the existing building is wood framed and there is no way to build up because of the FAA regulations.

Ms. Smith Meyer questioned the 24 trees that are proposed and asked whether the existing 24 foot evergreen tree was part of the landscape plan. Ms. Hebert responded that she is working with the applicant to revise the landscape plan and swap out some of the trees.

The Chair asked whether the north side driveway connection to allow access to the abutter was one way. Mr. Pratt explained that the abutter comes through the Realtors' property to exit and that this is an existing easement on the site.

Hearing no additional comments from the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a waiver from Section 15.03(3) of the Site Plan Regulations which requires that site plans be prepared using North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88), to permit the site plan to be prepared using the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD29) so the vertical datum can match the datum also used for the FAA permitting. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a waiver from Section 27.07(4) of the Site Plan Regulations which requires that 25% or less of the trees proposed to be planted within the parking lot area to be ornamental trees. Due to the FAA height restrictions, a comparable number of ornamental trees have been used in locations where larger shade trees could not be planted. Mr. Regan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a waiver from Section 21.02 of the Site Plan Regulations which requires the construction of sidewalk along the frontage of all collector streets in Concord. Airport Road is classified as a collector street, but the city does not intend to construct a sidewalk along this side of the road. Mr. Regan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to Article 28-7-11 (f) Driveway Separation Alternatives to allow a driveway entrance on Airport Road that is less than 200 feet from the driveway on the adjacent property to the north. The site currently contains two driveways and the proposed improvements will be removing one of the driveway. A traffic assessment memo was prepared by the applicant and reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer. The assessment indicated that the proposed driveway location would not adversely affect the Terrill Park Drive/Airport Road intersection. Mr. Hicks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for the site and building plans for New Hampshire Association of Realtors for the construction of a 23,832 square foot office building at 115 Airport Road, as prepared by CLD Consulting Engineers, Inc. and Bruce Ronayne Hamilton Architects. Mr. Hicks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to grant conditional site plan approval for the site and building plans for New Hampshire Association of Realtors to construct a 23,832 square foot office building and the related site improvements, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, approvals of construction drawings and specifications for all private improvements shall be obtained from the Planning Division and plans shall be revised to address minor omissions and corrections noted by staff.
2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the applicant shall obtain approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for the proposed improvements within the approach and transitional slopes for the Concord Municipal Airport.
3. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, 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:
 - i) Aviation Easement for Concord Airport for the Transitional and Approach Slopes for Runway
4. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the applicant will provide to the City Solicitor a financial guarantee for site stabilization in an amount approved by the City Engineer, and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor.

5. A pre-construction meeting shall be required prior to the start any construction activities onsite. Prior to the pre-construction meeting seven copies of the final approved site plan shall be provided to the Planning Division for endorsement by the City Engineer as “approved for construction.”
6. No construction activity may commence prior to the payment of inspection fees in an amount approved by the City Engineer.
7. No certificate of occupancy for any building or use shall be issued until all public and private improvements have been substantially completed to the satisfaction of the City Planner and City Engineer.
8. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval, digital information shall be provided to the City Engineer for incorporation into the City of Concord Geographic Information System (GIS) and tax maps. The information shall be submitted in accordance with Section 12.08 of the Site Plan Review Regulations and all information shall be converted to a vertical datum of NAVD88.
9. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, as-built drawings shall be provided to the City Engineer in accordance with Section 12.09 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.
10. 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 – *General Office*

Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- 4. Application by D’Angelo / Papa Gino’s, Inc., for property located at 87 South Main Street, requesting Site Plan approval, Architectural Design Review approval, and a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 28-7-11 (f), Driveway Separation Alternatives, of the Concord Zoning Ordinance, for façade renovations, an expanded parking lot, and related driveway, access, landscaping, and site improvements (2012-0055)**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Henninger reported that the application involves the conversion of an existing office building to a high turnover restaurant at 87 South Main Street. He stated that the first floor consists of 1,813 square feet and is intended as the primary restaurant space and the walk-out basement or lower floor consists of 1,798 square feet and is intended to be used for storage purposes and as an access from the rear parking lot to the restaurant space. Mr. Henninger explained that the applicant is proposing to make only minor changes to the five-space parking lot in the front of the building abutting South Main Street, while at the rear of the site facing Storrs Street, the applicant is proposing to expand and reconfigure the existing parking lot to create 17 spaces and to provide a screened dumpster location.

Mr. Henninger reported that a Conditional Use Permit is being requested to maintain an existing second driveway onsite as an exit-only driveway. He stated that the southern driveway will be reduced from 28 feet to 24 feet to allow two-way movement over Turner Avenue and the northern driveway is being reduced from 26 feet to 14 feet in width and signed for exiting traffic only.

Mr. Henninger explained that the landscape, lighting, and drainage plans have been submitted and are under review.

Chris Nadeau, from Nobis Engineering, John Arnold, from Hinckley Allen & Snyder, and Mike Rodelle, from D'Angelo, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Arnold explained that D'Angelo is moving north on Main Street and will be renovating an existing building and reconfiguring the parking in the back of the building. He stated that this renovation is consistent with the City's plans for redeveloping Main Street.

Mr. Nadeau reviewed the site plan explaining that the front parking would remain the same, the driveways would be made smaller, and more trees would be added to the site and landscaping provided. He stated that the building façades would be refaced with vinyl shakes with a brick shelf on the bottom and the front façade of the building is being converted to a retail storefront.

Konstandinos Luzis, owner of 89 South Main Street, was present. He stated that he would like clarification of the property lines within Turner Avenue. The Chair responded that this is not something that can be answered by the Planning Board and that he isn't sure that City Hall has the answers. Mr. Arnold responded that Richard D. Bartlett & Associates has done some title research and found that Turner Avenue belongs to 87 South Main Street. He stated that Turner Avenue, a private way, extends from South Main Street to nearly the bottom of the 87 South Main Street lot. The Chair suggested that Mr. Luzis should get together with Mr. Arnold to discuss this.

Mr. Swope asked whether the prominence of the rear entrance been addressed satisfactorily. Mr. Henninger responded that he continues to work with the applicant regarding the rear entrance.

Ms. Hebert suggested that the freestanding sign on South Main Street have a dark background on the changeable copy portion of the sign. She stated that the ADRC has had concerns in the past about changeable copy signs with a white background. She suggested that the applicant should either remove the changeable copy or require a dark background with white lettering.

Ms. Smith Meyer asked about the additional landscaping that was suggested by Ms. Hebert on the back slope between the parking lot and Storrs Street. Mr. Henninger explained that most of the slope is grass and on the top of the slope trees will be removed and replanted. Ms. Smith Meyer stated that native shrubs should be on the slope.

Ms. McPherson stated that there appears on the landscape plan to be a lot of grading that goes onto the abutting property. Mr. Henninger responded that there is slight encroachment on the other property. Mr. Nadeau stated that there is a note on Plan C-3, that stated the applicant will obtain a slope easement in order to grade the slope, and if not, the applicant will build a short retaining wall.

Ms. Foss asked whether the informal pedestrian access from Storrs Street be more formalized. Ms. Hebert responded that this is something that the applicant could consider, but they would have to work an agreement out with Mr. Duprey, the abutting landowner. Mr. Hicks stated that the slope is fairly steep and may be difficult to maintain a formalized pedestrian access. Mr. Henninger stated that the most defined path comes from the Duprey property on the north and that the applicant would need to acquire legal rights to access the property from Storrs Street. Ms. Smith Meyer suggested that the applicant explore the possibility with Mr. Duprey.

Hearing no additional comments from the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 28-7-11(f), Driveway Separation Alternatives, to allow a second exit only driveway on South Main Street and to allow the two existing driveways to have less than the minimum 200' separation from driveways on and off site. The applicant has improved compliance with the driveway standards and cannot comply with the driveway spacing requirements due to the location of existing driveways immediately abutting this property and the narrow width of the property. Mr. Regan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for the site and building plans, including a new affixed sign and replacement panels in an existing free-standing sign, for the conversion of an existing office building to a high turnover restaurant for D'Angelo at 87 South Main Street subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the rear entrance shall be made more prominent and inviting for patrons and that (1) a more substantial canopy be provided to better key the entrance and to provide better coverage beyond the entry vestibule and (2) a sign be added at the entrance, either on the canopy or on the door glass, to better identify this entrance. Revised plans shall be approved by the Clerk of the Planning Board.
- 2) A black or matching maroon background with white lettering be used on the changeable copy portion of the freestanding sign.

Ms. Foss seconded the motion. Mr. Rodelle stated that the white background is less intrusive and that with a black or maroon color the sign will be one big dark square and more prominent. Ms. Hebert asked whether the sign was internally lit. Mr. Rodelle stated that it is internally lit. He stated that he is confused about what the sign will look like and how it would work. Mr. Henninger tried to explain the way the new sign on Loudon Road is designed. Mr. Rodelle said that he would look into this. Mr. Swope said that this is not consistent with other signs. The Chair explained that the motion has been made with Condition 2 added, and if it is unacceptable, the applicant should speak with the Planning Division staff. Mr. Hicks stated that he is uncomfortable with the sign background being listed as a condition of the Planning Board approval, because as a condition, it cannot be easily changed.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 4-2, with Mr. Hicks and Mr. Regan voting against the motion.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant conditional site plan approval for the site and building plans, including the conversion of an existing office building to a high turnover restaurant, for D'Angelo at 87 South Main Street subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, approvals of construction drawings and specifications for all public and private improvements shall be obtained from the Planning Division.
2. 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, as set forth in the attached Impact Fee Worksheet.
3. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, a copy of the following easement document recorded in the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds, shall be provided to the Clerk:
 - a) A deed of easement for the existing sewer line across parcel 35-4-1 owned by Duprey Center LLC.
4. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the Turner Avenue parcel shall be merged with the main project parcel.
5. No construction activity may commence prior to the payment of inspection fees in an amount approved by the City Engineer.
6. No certificate of occupancy for any building or use shall be issued until all public and private improvements have been substantially completed to the satisfaction of the City Planner and City Engineer.
7. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval, digital information shall be provided to the City Engineer for incorporation into the City of Concord Geographic Information System (GIS) and tax maps. The information shall be submitted in accordance with Section 12.08 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.
8. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, as-built drawings shall be provided to the City Engineer in accordance with Section 12.09 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.
9. The applicant will obtain approval for grading on abutting property to be obtained and a copy of the approval be submitted to the Planning Division.
10. It is recommended that the applicant explore with the abutting landowner a pedestrian connection from Storrs Street to the back parking lot.

11. Additional landscaping to be added to the slope to the rear of the parking lot in the back of the building.

Mr. Swope seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Amendments to the Official Map of the City of Concord

5. Consideration of the following proposed amendments to the Official Map of the City of Concord:

- a) Proposed amendment to establish the mapped lines of a future street for the extension of Whitney Road from its current terminus southerly to Sewalls Falls Road.
- b) Proposed amendment to establish the mapped lines of future streets for the extension of Old Suncook Road from Manchester Street southerly to Garvins Falls Road and the extension of Integra Drive westerly to the future intersection with Old Suncook Road extension.
- c) Proposed amendment to establish the mapped lines of a future street for the extension of Storrs Street from Theatre Street southerly to Gas Street and Langdon Avenue.
- d) Proposed amendment to abandon the mapped lines of future streets in the area between Loudon Road, Christian Avenue, Ormond Street and East Side Drive.
- e) Proposed amendment to abandon the mapped lines of future streets in the area between Manchester Street, Terrill Park Drive, Old Turnpike Road and Airport Road.
- f) Proposed amendment to abandon the mapped lines of future streets of the extension of Brookside Drive from its current terminus to South Street and the extension of Bow Street from Joffre Street to Nivelles Street.

The Chair opened the public hearing on all the amendments to the Official Map of the City of Concord.

Mr. Henninger provided an overview of how the mapped lines of future streets are created, amended, and abandoned. He explained that the Planning Board would be making recommendations on the six proposed amendments to the City Council.

Mr. Henninger provided information on the three proposed amendments to establish the mapped lines of future streets.

- a) Proposed amendment to establish the mapped lines of a future street for the extension of Whitney Road from its current terminus southerly to Sewalls Falls Road.

Mr. Henninger stated that in the current Master Plan, the Planning Board reaffirmed Whitney Road as a planned highway improvement and continued to classify Whitney Road as an urban collector road. He stated that the mapped line follows the existing municipal water line and water line easement from the current terminus of the Whitney Road layout to Sewalls Falls Road. Mr. Henninger explained that a significant portion of this future road was proposed to be constructed in 2012 to provide access to the planned Resource Recovery Facility; however, this project was subsequently abandoned after final design for the roadway and permitting was obtained, including improvements to the existing Burnham Brook culvert. He reported that the proposed route for Whitney Road was designed to open up the remainder of the industrially zoned area for development while maximizing the size of the future lots. Mr. Henninger said that four properties would be affected by the proposed mapped line of future streets.

- b) Proposed amendment to establish the mapped lines of future streets for the extension of Old Suncook Road from Manchester Street southerly to Garvins Falls Road and the extension of Integra Drive westerly to the future intersection with Old Suncook Road extension.

Mr. Henninger reported that the Planning Board in 1993, as part of the Year 2010 Master Plan Update, adopted a Future Transportation Plan showing the southerly extension of Old Suncook Road and the westerly extension of Integra Drive as a major collector roadway. He stated that the corridor for the southerly extension of Old Suncook Road has been preserved in the approved site plan for Freedom Cycle over the northern portion of parcel 110D-3-13, and the proposed new mapped street has been referred for decades as the southerly extension of old Suncook Road. He explained that the layout for both Old Suncook Road and Integra Drive has been shown on the subdivision for B & D Houston over parcel 109-6-17. Mr. Henninger reported that the transportation modeling undertaken for the Master Plan 2030 indicate that Phase 1 of the Garvins Falls area, and part of Phase 2, can be accommodated with the construction of Old Suncook Road and Integra Drive along with improvements to Manchester Street.

According to Mr. Henninger, six properties would be affected by the proposed mapped line of future streets. The impacts to the two residential lots at 109 and 115 Garvins Falls Road are minimal in nature. The existing buildings and structures would not be impacted, nor would the mapped lines of future streets interfere with any addition additional development on these lots.

- c) Proposed amendment to establish the mapped lines of a future street for the extension of Storrs Street from Theatre Street southerly to Gas Street and Langdon Avenue.

Mr. Henninger reported that the Planning Board in 1993, as part of the Year 2010 Master Plan Update, adopted a Future Transportation Plan showing the southerly extension of Storrs Street from Theatre Street (Chandler Street) to the vicinity of Allison Street and South Main Street. He stated that in the "The South Concord Redevelopment Area Study – A Small Area Master Plan" which was adopted by the Planning Board in 1997, shows the current alignment that was developed. Mr. Henninger said that the Concord Opportunity Corridor Master Plan, prepared in April of 2005, reaffirmed the location and alignment of the southerly extension of Storrs Street and the recommendations of the South Concord Redevelopment Area Study. He explained that in the current Master Plan 2030, the Planning Board reaffirmed the location and purpose of the southerly extension of Storrs Street to facilitate the redevelopment within the southern segment of the Opportunity Corridor. Mr. Henninger reported that full access at Gas Street will be a design consideration given the available right-of-way for Gas Street, grade of Gas Street at South Main Street, and site distance at the South Main Street/Gas Street intersection. He explained that the underpass designed specifically for the future road under the Water Street Bridge is the only feasible location for the street between South Main Street and the NH Main Line Railroad and that this section of the NH Main Line Railroad has been designated as one of five high speed rail corridors in the country with service proposed from Boston to Montreal.

Mr. Henninger stated that six properties would be affected by this proposed mapped line of future streets, and that for the extension of Storrs Street to be completed south of Gas Street, a complete take would be required for parcel 26-1-5 owned by Cohen Properties of Concord, LLC,; this 0.65 acre parcel has a total assessed value of \$87,600.

Ms. Foss said that the northern portion of the alignment of Whitney Road concerns her. She stated that it appears that the road will cross a wide area of delta of Burnham Brook and as it continues south it is fairly

near to an outside bluff that is actively eroding. Ms. Foss said that the road is on a fairly narrow peninsula and if there were periods of high precipitation it would cause issues. Ms. Hebert stated that the slopes are reinforced with rip-rap. Ms. Foss suggested that a more direct route coming from behind the incinerator be used to avoid areas of erosion. Mr. Henninger stated that the proposed route is shorter, has less impact, and already has a water line and road across it. He explained that it would be difficult to reconstruct and modify it. He explained that the NH Department of Environmental Services has permitted the design.

Arnold Cohen, property owner of 5 Gas Street was present. He stated that if this is done he would be the only property owner that would be affected. He said that he has a little building on the property that he is very happy with and if this goes through, it would decrease the value of his property. He was concerned because he doesn't know when this would happen and he feels that he would lose out because of it. He stated that he would be taken out completely, building and land, while other property owners would only be losing small pieces of land. Mr. Cohen was concerned that he would not be able to sell or improve the land prior to the taking. The Chair stated that this has been in the news for a long time and the hindrance already exists. Mr. Cohen responded that now something is going to be done, before it was just talk. The Chair said that his property value has already been decreased because this has been planned for quite some time. Mr. Arnold asked whether there is a chance that the street could be moved to avoid his building. Mr. Henninger responded in the negative.

Richard George was present. He asked whether not allowing Mr. Cohen the use and enjoyment of his property was condemnation and shouldn't Mr. Cohen be receiving compensation. Mr. Henninger stated that Mr. Cohen would need to apply for a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment to do anything on his property because he doesn't have any frontage. Mr. George asked how the lot became illegal when it was subdivided years ago legally.

The Chair explained that if Mr. Cohen or Mr. George needed more clarification, they should visit the Planning Division and talk with the staff. He stated that the Planning Board only makes recommendation to the City Council. The Chair stated that the City Council may hold a public hearing where Mr. Cohen and/or Mr. George would be able to talk with City Council about their issues.

Mr. George reiterated that this was condemnation without compensation. Mr. Swope explained that this was merely notification and not condemnation.

Jim Presher, of the Concord Regional Solid Waste Cooperative, was present. Mr. Presher stated that the Cooperative is excited about the extension of Whitney Road. He explained that the area has premium land and the Cooperative has City approvals for some work on the street. Mr. Presher stated that he had one concern, which is if someone came into request a building permit would it be issued. Mr. Henninger reported that a building permit would not be issued within the area of the mapped line, but could be if the work was for an unaffected area.

Roger Sanborn was present. He asked whether his land would be affected by the proposed changes to the Garvins Falls area. Mr. Henninger explained where the proposed mapped line would be and that it may or may not affect his property. Mr. Sanborn wanted to know when the work on the street was planned for. Mr. Henninger stated that it wouldn't be until at least 2020.

David Rauseo, of Interchange Development LLC and Concord Crossing, was present. He stated that he is currently marketing property on Whitney Road off of Route 4 and is proposing to have natural gas service. He stated that Liberty Utilities would like to know where the road will be so they can design the natural gas lines.

Richard Uchida, from Hinckley Allen & Snyder, was present. Mr. Uchida stated that his client is 15 Integra Drive, LLC, and in regards to the mapped line of future streets in the Garvins Falls area, he echoes the support of his client that this is a logical place for the road over the bluff. Mr. Uchida said that this makes perfect sense for his client.

Hearing no additional comments from the public, the Chair closed the public hearing regarding the proposed amendments to establish mapped lines of future streets and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to recommend that City Council approve the proposed amendments to establish the mapped lines of future streets for the extension of Whitney Road from its current terminus southerly to Sewalls Falls Road. Mr. Hicks seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed 5-1, with Ms. Foss voting against the motion.

Mr. Swope moved to recommend that City Council approve the proposed amendments to establish the mapped lines of future streets for the extension of Old Suncook Road from Manchester Street southerly to Garvins Falls Road and the extension of Integra Drive westerly to the future intersection with Old Suncook Road extension. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to recommend that City Council approve the proposed amendments to establish the mapped lines of future streets for the extension of Storrs Street from Theatre Street southerly to Gas Street and Langdon Avenue. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Henninger provided information on the three proposed amendments to abandon the mapped lines of future streets.

- d) Proposed amendment to abandon the mapped lines of future streets in the area between Loudon Road, Christian Avenue, Ormond Street and East Side Drive.

Mr. Henninger explained that these mapped lines were created in 1953 and 1963, and were amended in 1973 and 1993. He reported that the remaining mapped lines are those segments left after the construction and development of the majority of this area from the 1960's to the present day and are no longer necessary. Mr. Henninger stated that the mapped lines are located on a fully developed housing area known as Concord Gardens and Royal Gardens, which are the only properties affected by the proposed abandonment of the mapped lines. He explained that the private internal circulation system exists on both properties and follows the general east-west layout of the mapped streets and meets the circulation needs of the properties. He said that none of the existing mapped lines of future streets in this area are specifically shown or noted in the Land Use Section, the Transportation Section, the Economic Development Section, nor the Housing Section of the adopted Master Plan 2030.

- e) Proposed amendment to abandon the mapped lines of future streets in the area between Manchester Street, Terrill Park Drive, Old Turnpike Road and Airport Road.

Mr. Henninger explained that the mapped lines between Old Turnpike Road, Manchester Street, Airport Road, and Terrill Park Drive were created in 1963 and 1968 and were amended in 1971, 1974, 1979, 1980, and 1989. He reported that the remaining mapped lines are those segments left after the construction and development of the majority of this area from the 1970's to the present day and the continuation of the mapped lines are no longer feasible given restrictions on development including wetlands, steep slopes and the Old Suncook Road landfill, or are over existing developed parcels where the proposed road layout is either unlikely or unfeasible. Mr. Henninger reported that the other section of mapped lines to be abandoned falls primarily across the City's Old Suncook Road landfill site and the reuse of this property is limited at best to recreation field development. He explained that the mapped line passes through recently completed drainage retention swales around the landfill and also lie across the rear of six single family residential lots along Airport Road and through the side of a single family residential lot on Marion Street. Mr. Henninger stated that a commercial lot developed as a vehicle storage area for Banks Chevrolet-Cadillac is split by the mapped line adjacent to Old Suncook Road and that the abandonment would allow for additional subdivision of the Marion Street residential lot and the construction of a building on the commercial property along Old Suncook Road. He explained that the abandonment of the existing map line would not alter the development possibilities of the six residential lots on Airport Road and the two existing 50 foot wide connecting stubs leading from Airport Road to the bulk of the Old Suncook Road landfill site would remain in City ownership and could be used to provide future access to the planned recreational fields.

- f) Proposed amendment to abandon the mapped lines of future streets of the extension of Brookside Drive from its current terminus to South Street and the extension of Bow Street from Joffre Street to Nivelles Street.

Mr. Henninger reported that a mapped line for the future extension of Brookside Drive was established in 1952 and was shown on the City's paper tax maps for decades. He stated that the purpose of this mapped line and others adopted in the South End of Concord was to provide for an orderly layout of residential streets which largely developed since the end of the Second World War. Mr. Henninger explained that the Brookside Drive mapped line affects five properties, each with an existing single family residence, and it appears that a garage was constructed over a portion of the mapped line at 181 South Street. He went on to say that if the road was constructed as envisioned several additional lots could be created from the existing lots; however, this would require the cooperation of all five property owners and the construction of more than 600 feet of new City street. Mr. Henninger reported that the elimination of the mapped line would release any existing restrictions on the five lots including the lot at 181 South Street. Mr. Henninger added that the extension of Bow Street was established long before environmental protections for wetlands were established. He stated that this extension would not create any new lots and would adversely affect three of the four single family residences and that the continuation of this existing mapped street serves no private or public purpose.

With no member of the public in the audience, the Chair closed the public hearing regarding the proposed amendments to abandon mapped lines of future streets and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to recommend that City Council approve the proposed amendments to abandon the mapped lines of future streets in the area between Loudon Road, Christian Avenue, Ormond Street and East Side Drive; in the area between Manchester Street, Terrill Park Drive, Old Turnpike Road and Airport Road;

and the extension of Brookside Drive from its current terminus to South Street and the extension of Bow Street from Joffre Street to Nivelles Street. Mr. Hicks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance

- 6. Consideration of proposed amendments to Article 28-4, Development Design Standards, which would add a new development type, Continuing Care Retirement Community, and design and performance standards, and corollary amendments to Section 28-8-4 (j), Table of Principal Uses, Section 28-9-4 (f), Decision by the Planning Board, Architectural Design Review and Section 28-7-2 (e) (A), Table of Off-Street Parking Requirements, Principal Uses, Residential.**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Ms. McPherson stated that the Havenwood and Heritage Heights campuses represent a development type known as a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC), which is a place where individuals can live independently as a resident and where they may, over time, access a continuum of services ranging from fully independent living cottages, homes, and or apartments, to assisted living residences and skilled nursing services, to end-of-life care, all on an as needed basis. She explained that the Havenwood and Heritage Heights campuses have undergone a significant amount of redevelopment over the past several years, including the renovation of existing independent living units, construction of six new duplex units off of Ormond Street, and the renovation of shared common facilities. Ms. McPherson reported that the campuses have also been expanded as adjacent properties have become available, including the purchase of the house at 175 East Side Drive, and its reuse as a community center.

Ms. McPherson explained that as each Havenwood and Heritage Heights project is brought before the City for permitting, there have been difficulties in classifying the uses under the existing zoning ordinance, resulting in multiple interpretations of how a proposed project should be permitted, including as a planned unit development, a residential social service center, and as attached and multi-family dwellings for the elderly, none of which fully or accurately describe the use. She stated that it makes sense to add an appropriate zoning classification, CCRC, to the City's Zoning Ordinance, which is a use classification that is used throughout the country, as well as in other New Hampshire cities and towns. Ms. McPherson added that having a CCRC classification acknowledges this existing use in Concord and addresses the range of options and services provided on a single site by this type of development, which would allow Havenwood and Heritage Heights to continue to upgrade and redevelop to better serve the needs of their residents. She explained that this zoning development type would also allow for the possibility of other CCRC campuses being developed within the City.

Ms. Hebert stated that the Planning Board would be able to have detailed development design standards in the Site Plan Regulations.

Ms. Smith Meyer asked whether applicants would be able to get variances to such requirements as setbacks. Ms. McPherson stated that variances could be applied for and received. She also stated that site plan approval would be required for any CCRCs.

Ms. Smith Meyer asked whether the applicant would need to apply for a Conditional Use Permit. Ms. McPherson responded that proposed section 28-4-9(e) (4) (b) would require a Conditional Use Permit to allow a density between six and 14 dwelling units per acre of usable site area.

Mr. Swope stated that for this to work, the property would need to be much more than ten acres, in order to create first class development.

John Arnold, of Hinckley Allen & Snyder, was present. He said that another idea is to have the CCRCs require at least two services.

Mr. Swope said he thinks this is a good idea and the Planning Board should adopt it, but he wanted to ensure that the change would not harm existing retirement communities, while allowing for better development. Ms. McPherson suggested that exceptions could be made or existing retirement communities could be grandfathered in.

The Chair stated that he is concerned about the potential for creep northward on East Side Drive by Havenwood and Heritage Heights. Ms. McPherson responded that the current zoning doesn't prohibit that and the proposed zoning for CCRCs doesn't prohibit or allow that. Mr. Swope stated that CCRCs are a residential use and not comparable with businesses on Pleasant Street creeping westward.

Ms. Smith Meyer stated that she would like to see the vision for Havenwood and Heritage Heights.

Ms. Foss asked what other municipalities have on the books to deal with this issue. Ms. McPherson stated that what she used for the draft zoning amendment is standard in the state, and that she looked at Hanover's and Plymouth's zoning ordinances. Ms. Hebert explained that the Planning staff started with text from the State of New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning's website, and then added some standards to make them consistent with the City's current zoning ordinance.

Mr. Regan stated that he agrees with Mr. Swope that the time has come to address CCRCs, and he understands that this is something new for Concord, but CCRCs are out there and he supports moving forward with this change.

Ms. Hebert emphasized that this amendment only established the category and that the Planning Board will review the design standards as they are created.

Mr. Arnold said that his client is Havenwood and Heritage Heights and that he echoes Ms. McPherson and Ms. Hebert, in that this is important for Concord and that it is simply a housekeeping item, as many of these places exist now, but there is no specific category for them.

The Chair asked Mr. Arnold whether a variance would be needed for what Havenwood and Heritage Heights is planning on doing if the redevelopment was listed as a planned unit development. Mr. Arnold responded that yes, variances would be needed for this use in a RM District and for parking relief. Mr. Hebert stated that the planned unit development category is used more for initial development not for redevelopment. Ms. McPherson stated that it doesn't make sense from a planning perspective for Havenwood and Heritage Heights to be classified as a planned unit development.

Ms. Smith Meyer asked whether only a nursing home could be designated as a CCRC. Ms. McPherson responded no, that in order for a development to be classified as a CCRC, there would need to be at least two of the following – independent living units, assisted living residences, nursing home, skilled nursing facilities and other medical facilities.

Mr. Arnold suggested that the definition of CCRC be changes by striking “for the elderly,” stating that continuing care and life care is ambiguous in the law.

Ms. Foss stated that continuing care could also include care for spinal care injuries for any age individual.

Mr. Arnold suggested that Section E provide a grandfather clause to allow the continuation of one use on each tract of property, if it met the requirements at the time of original development. He suggested that this could be covered with a Conditional Use Permit option.

The Planning Board discussed that this perhaps needs more time for review and clarification and requested that the Planning staff create models of what they envision a development of a CCRC would look like. Ms. Hebert responded that the Planning staff could apply the proposed standards to a ten-acre site in Concord. She stated that items such as setbacks, density, and parking already exist in the Site Plan Regulations. Ms. McPherson explained that there could be a million variations and reiterated that the Site Plan Regulations cover some of the items already.

The Chair stated that the discussion would continue at the next meeting and requested the Planning staff provide a list of cities and towns that have model CCRC development regulations and to apply the minimal proposed CCRCs standards to a new site so that the Planning Board could review a sample proposed development.

REGULAR MEETING

7. Impact Fee Annual Update

Ms. McPherson reported that the impact fee tables are to be reviewed periodically by the Planning Board and revised by the City Council when appropriate. She stated that the Impact Fee Ordinance was amended in February 2012. Ms. McPherson explained that the Planning Board in the past has recommended that the fees be increased annually to keep pace with inflation rather than increasing the fees less frequently to reflect larger cumulative changes. She reported that the recommendation for 2013 is to adjust the Impact Fee Tables by the rate of inflation from 2011 to 2012, which for school and recreation construction cost is 4.79 percent and for highway construction is 2.46 percent.

Mr. Swope moved to recommend that City Council approve a 4.79 percent increase for school and recreation impact fees and a 2.46 percent increase for highway construction impact fees. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Consideration of proposed amendments to Chapter 29.2, Pubic Capital Facilities Impact Fees Ordinance, which would provide exemptions in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District for change of use and development of market rate housing.

Ms. McPherson reported that the current ordinance was adopted in June 2001 and requires that any change of use which generates additional traffic shall be subject to an impact fee assessment. She stated that with the high turnover and mixed uses found in the CBP in both Concord and Penacook, especially on the ground floor where residential development is not permitted, there is a potential for repeated assessment of fees every time there is a new use. She explained that the proposed exemptions would only apply to existing buildings and not to new construction or building additions in the CBP. Ms. McPherson stated that this proposed amendment would encourage redevelopment and increase traffic.

Mr. Swope moved to recommend that City Council approve the proposed amendments to Chapter 29.2, Public Capital Facilities Impact Fees Ordinance, providing exemption in the CBP for change of use and development of market rate housing. Ms. Foss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

9. Consideration of proposed amendments to Section 28-4-7, Cluster Development, which would add exemptions to the cluster development requirement in the Open Space Residential (RO) Zoning District, density standards and other performance standards, and corollary amendments to Section 28-5-46, Single Family Dwellings in a Standard (Non-Cluster) Subdivision, Section 28-3-5, Penacook Lake Watershed Protection (WS) District, and Section 28-9-4 (f), Decisions by the Planning Board, Architectural Design Review.

The Chair decided to table this item until the next Planning Board meeting, due to the late hour.

10. Consideration of proposed amendments to Chapter 4, Design Standards, which would add a new section on Open Space Residential Development Design Standards and corollary amendments to renumber the Site Plan Regulations as necessary.

The Chair decided to table this item until the next Planning Board meeting, due to the late hour.

11. Consideration of the Minutes of the November 28, 2012, Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Swope moved to approve the minutes of the November 28, 2012, Planning Board meeting as written. Ms. Foss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

INFORMATION

- The Chair reminded the Planning Board that the next regular monthly meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 16, 2013, at 7:00 p.m., in City Council Chambers.

There was no further business to come before the Planning Board, and the meeting adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Gloria McPherson
Clerk

djm