

**Planning Board  
Board Room, Municipal Building 7:30 pm  
January 2, 2007**

In Attendance:

**Members:** Mayor, Esmay, Collier, Hornig, Dietrich, Connolly, Faulkner

**Alternates:** Garipay

**Selectman Alternate:** Baschnagel

**Staff:** Vicki Smith and Jonathan Edwards

Others: see attached sheet

**1. 06-27 Submission of application by Dartmouth College for minor subdivision review to create a**

**.096 acre lot with existing house at 5 Currier Place, Map 34, Lot 24, in the "D2" zoning district.**

John Caulo stated what was being proposed was to subdivide the lot known as South Block, which contains multiple buildings with one of the buildings being a residential duplex. He stated based on the demand for For Sale housing in other parts of downtown by Dartmouth employees the College felt that a more appropriate use of that residential duplex would be to be able to offer that to Dartmouth employees as For Sale condominiums. Mr. Caulo stated in order to be able to do that the land would have to be subdivided. Mr. Caulo stated there is no change in the use, the design, or anything related to this project.

CONNOLLY asked about the number of bedrooms. Mr. Caulo stated the structure contains two, two bedroom units, which is exactly how it was approved by the Planning Board. CONNOLLY asked if this was for Dartmouth employees only. Mr. Caulo stated yes. CONNOLLY stated what worried her was that this sounds like an attractive dormitory for another buyer and asked if this would be going out on the market. Mr. Caulo stated it would only be sold to a Dartmouth employee as a primary residence. There was discussion on this.

Esmay asked if there would be any barriers on the proposed lot line between the house and the tanks. Mr. Caulo stated they are tanks like any other all around the Upper Valley that provide propane not just for this residential duplex, but also for the other properties on South Block. CONNOLLY spoke of her concerns of someone trying to park in that spot. There was discussion on this and Mr. Caulo stated Dartmouth could put a couple of bollards up if it was a concern.

COLLIER stated Judith Brotman and the Zoning Board had some questions about parking. Mr. Edwards stated it has to do with the mechanism by which the parking credits would be transferred from what will now be a separate property containing a garage to the separate property containing the two duplex units. He stated the mechanism would be formally to transfer the parking garage spaces to the new lot. It essentially amounts to being a mechanism that can be legally binding. There was much discussion on this.

**ESMAY made a motion to approve the application as complete.  
CONNOLLY seconded.**

**All voted unanimously in favor of this.**

Winifred Stearns stated she wanted to make sure this remained under the South Block's aegis because this is a non conforming lot on the part of "D2". Ms. Stearns stated her concerns on parking and also stated she did not want to see any commercial use out of the duplexes on Currier Street. There was much discussion on all this and also discussion if there should be conditions added to it. There was discussion on what conditions should be added.

**ESMAY made a motion to approve the application with the condition that 1 parking space be assigned to each unit in the adjoining parking garage according to zoning.**

**MAYOR seconded.**

Baschnagel spoke of his concerns for adding more conditions now and to preserve the conditions that were made for South Block. ESMAY stated she didn't see any reason why the planning office couldn't keep track of any conditions so that in 30 years they are not forgotten. There was discussion on this.

**All voted unanimously in favor of this.**

**2. 06-05 Submission of application and public hearing on request by Twin Pines Housing Trust for**

**subdivision and site plan review to create a multi-family residential community of approximately**

**120 units with both affordable and market value rental and town houses, off Route 120, Tax Map**

**21, Lot 2, in the "OL" zoning district.**

ESMAY and DIETRICH stepped down.

Miro Weinberger stated he would be talking about the larger of the two documents, which is the fourth version of the memo that Twin Pines has been bringing forward since June 2006. He stated the fuchsia color is new and has been added since October 2006. Mr. Weinberger stated the first two pages are completely revised since the last hearing. Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pines received a wetlands special exception from the ZBA on December 14, 2006. Mr. Weinberger stated there is a need to go to Lebanon for a permit specifically for the intersection coming off Medical Center Drive. He stated there will be a planning meeting next Wednesday for this in Lebanon.

Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pines has proposed pedestrian access using Buck Road with the existing bridge that Twin Pines believes is still viable. Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pine thought this was still a viable solution to get pedestrians toward downtown. He stated Twin Pines has just learned that the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission has recently obtained funding for the broader Route 120 corridor management plan. He stated Twin Pines wanted to put before the board the possibility of how Twin Pines might integrate the pedestrian issue regarding Gile that might be the same pedestrian issues Hanover Woods would have to address at some point and integrate that into the broader Route 120 conversation. Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pines is suggesting they would commit a certain amount of money to the plan but not fix on a particular pedestrian access plan right now. Mr. Weinberger stated if this wasn't possible Twin Pines is ready to build the pedestrian access that was first discussed. Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pines would like to see more of what the UVLSRPC is doing.

Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pines has an agreement, in great detail, with the DPW and the water company to upgrade the Greensboro Road water pump station to make a number of improvements that Pathways can review with the Board.

Mr. Weinberger stated not much has changed in the way of scheduling since the last hearing. He wanted

to remind the Board, because of costs, that it is very important for Twin Pines to start construction on May 1, 2007. He also stated that some of the site work would be better done in the winter particularly some of the logging that needs to be done with less impact to the site if done in the winter.

Mr. Weinberger stated they had an issue with the lengthy document called Construction Controls and Practice Requirements. He stated that is a document that is a considerable excerpt of what is either a proposed ordinance or amendment to the subdivision regulations. He stated the reason he wanted to call the Boards attention to this is Twin Pines feels there are many of the construction standards in that draft that Twin Pines do not have a problem with however the recommendation is that the permit attach basically these CCOPR to the document as a whole document as a broad condition of permitting. He stated Twin Pines does have issues there. He stated that many things that are in that document are not appropriate to have attached to a specific project. He gave examples of some discrepancies Twin Pines has found in the document and spoke of his concerns.

HORNIG stated the Board has had many thoughtful letters from the public that really go back to step one and two of the four step process. Mainly what are the areas of high resource and moderate resource value and how have the buildings been sited taking that into account. He asked Mr. Finley to address this at some point during his presentation.

Rod Finley gave a presentation explaining all the slides he was showing. He stated this presentation was going back to the building. Mr. Finley showed a slide and stated it was about HORNIG's question and stated it was a slide of the composite of the existing site resources and analysis plan. Mr. Finley pointed out the wetlands and explained each one of them and stated the wetlands are of high resource value. He also pointed out the steep slopes and stated they are also of high resource value. Mr. Finley also pointed out rock outcroppings, boulder fields, ledges, roads, where the buildings with would be including the changes, and things of moderate resource values. Mr. Finley continued with his slide presentation pointing out utility plans, landscape and lighting plans, wetlands, constructed wetlands, and the storm water treatment facilities.

HORNIG asked Mr. Finley to point out where all the buildings are and which are low cost and which are market value. Mr. Weinberger pointed these out along with the affordable rental and market value rentals.

It was asked about what looked like parking spaces. Mr. Weinberger explained these were covered parking spaces and stated there are 252 spaces for 120 units.

Mr. Edwards asked if Twin Pines was able to determine what percentage of runoff would be able to be infiltrated back into the ground rather than discharging it offsite. Mr. Finley stated no, but there was a system on site that promotes as much infiltration as possible and it also promotes as much evaporation as possible. Mr. Finley stated this plan is not proposing a storm water system that meets The State of NH Regulations. It is proposing to meet the future state regulations. Mr. Finley explained what these regulations will be. Mr. Finley stated there are moderately well drained soils on this site and when Twin Pines did 40 test pits on the site and there was no groundwater encountered in the test sites. There was discussion on groundwater treatment and the planned maintenance and how the plan would be written up, how the discharge would be handled when it leaves the site, and how the water would get across the road. Mr. Finley stated the sewer is a gravity sewer that eventually ties into the main interceptor at Buck Road.

Mr. Finley stated there are also buried electricity, telephone, and fire alarm systems. He stated in certain areas around the site there will be propane tanks for the heat that will also be buried. CONNOLLY asked if Twin Pines had segregated the utilities as Mr. Kulbacki had complained that the utilities were on top of each other. Mr. Finley stated that after Staff review, when the comment was made, he had a meeting with Mr. Kulbacki and things were rerouted.

Mr. Finley stated the Lebanon Planning Board wanted a boulevard, which like the one at Centerra, so Twin Pines pulled the application since Twin Pines did not like the idea of a boulevard. Mr. Finley stated there was a transformer and a main power feed from a substation, and pointed out where this is and where it goes. He pointed out where the proposed boulevard would be and pointed out where a secondary access would be. Mr. Finley stated the Lebanon Fire Department bought into that concept so Twin Pines could leave just 24 feet of paved access as the look for the entrance instead of a boulevard. Mr. Finley stated Twin Pines would be talking more about this with the Lebanon Planning Board.

Mr. Weinberger stated the last four slides are what the ZBA granted the special exception on. Mr. Finley pointed out the different things on the slides.

Mr. Finley spoke more on the wetlands. He also spoke about a drip strip on the building's front that will be planted with ferns.

Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pines has had a considerable amount of work done by a forester that was hired to do two things. One is to advise what trees can stay and what trees need to be removed because of construction. The other thing is working on transplanting some of the smaller trees to a temporary nursery so we can keep them and bring them back after construction.

GARIPAY asked if anything had been done to see what can be seen from Buck Road and Route 120 on this project. Mr. Finley stated yes there was a photo study on the memo Mr. Weinberger handed out earlier looking from the Hanover East property. There was discussion on how high the buildings and trees are.

A member asked about the road design and what the design speed would be to keep the traffic moving as slow as possible. Mr. Finley stated it is a very slow design speed. He stated the way it is laid out for the access road it is about 20 mph based on vertical and horizontal curves. He explained what these curves meant. Mr. Finley stated Mr. Kulbacki would like to see the access road speed limit at 25 mph and Mr. Finley stated that is what he is working on now.

COLLIER asked who said there had to guardrails and why the guardrails had to be metal. Mr. Finley stated the guardrails had to be metal to meet the state standard for design speed and safety. COLLIER asked if this was according to Mr. Kulbacki. Mr. Finley stated yes. There was discussion on this and where guardrails might be placed. Mr. Finley stated there wasn't a lot of guardrails proposed. He pointed out where the guardrails might be.

FAULKNER asked for an explanation why Mr. Kulbacki wants a 25 mph speed zone instead of the 20 mph that was designed for that area. Mr. Finley stated he couldn't explain that. COLLIER asked if the roads would be maintained by the development or by Mr. Kulbacki. Mr. Finley stated (inaudible).

COLLIER asked for the Staff's assistance in dealing with Mr. Kulbacki on design speed on the entrance and guardrail treatment since it is not always clear on how to deal with the differences between Mr. Kulbacki and the Board. Mr. Edwards stated the Board can override engineering issues if they need to be overridden because of larger values the Board should do it. He also stated some of the things are engineering preferences rather than things that have to be done. Mr. Edwards stated design speed would be a preference, but a 20 mph speed would be safer. There is no logic in requiring a higher design speed. COLLIER stated the Board is trying very hard to make this attractive for the pedestrians and it seems this is going the wrong way. There was discussion on guardrails, grades, and pedestrian access. Mr. Edwards stated, so that there can be public pedestrian access, it should be specified in a condition so that the Residence Association can't later say they do not want it to be public pedestrian access. COLLIER asked if there was going to a road project sign at the beginning and a road sign as all this has to do with how private or welcoming it looks. Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pines wanted identity, but it

will not be a suburban subdivision sign.

COLLIER asked about trash, recycling, and mail. Mr. Finley pointed out where the dumpsters and recycling spot would be. Mr. Finley pointed out where the mail kiosk would be. He also pointed out where the school bus would pick the kids up and how it would leave the area.

HORNIG asked about snow removal. Mr. Finley stated that the snow would remain on site unless for some reason it would need to be removed offsite, which he didn't see happening. He pointed out where the areas for snow storage will be.

COLLIER asked what the tallest light pole would be. Carol Williams stated the tallest is 12 feet.

COLLIER asked about the right of way to Hanover East and if enough width and land could be reserved in case some future Planning Board thinks it is necessary. Mr. Finley stated there was no deeded right of way, but it would be possible to do. There was discussion on this.

Mrs. McIlroy stated she sent the Board many questions in July 2006 and one of the main ones was about runoff and spoke of her concerns about this. She stated this was not addressed by either the Planning Board or the ZBA. She spoke of her other concerns from her July memo also. Mr. Finley stated the concerns have been considered and Twin Pines is trying to implement Low Impact Development concepts in Hanover on any project that is possible. Mr. Finley stated there is no question that the volume of runoff is going to increase as soon as the cover type is changed on a site. Mr. Finley stated the idea is can you infiltrate that volume or not. He stated there are elevated ground water levels in town and the state is going to have to, in the new regulations, account for soil types and infiltration rates. Mr. Finley went on to speak about infiltration in different areas of the state. Mr. Finley stated Twin Pines has been trying to take pieces of the LID system and implement them on site, infiltrate water whenever possible, and then design the state system to handle the larger storm event.

HORNIG asked what total volume means and where the water would go otherwise. Mrs. McIlroy stated it would go into the ground or evaporate. Mrs. McIlroy stated there is the before and after volume. There was discussion on this, where the water goes, aquifers, and where the water went before this project.

GARIPAY asked what the difference is between impervious and non impervious runoff. Mr. Finley stated there is not a huge amount of difference between the two. He stated a gravel or hard packed road is relatively impervious and a blacktop road is almost completely impervious. COLLIER asked if pervious pavement has any place in the developments parking lots. Mr. Finley stated he hasn't been convinced that it is a viable product. Mrs. McIlroy stated there is a lot of research to dispute that.

COLLIER stated there are some things that haven't been talked about yet, but need to be. Ms. Smith asked a lot about some specs, soil erosion, storm water retention, silt stabilization and stated she may not have seen the ZBA write up. COLLIER stated Twin Pines may want to meet with Ms. Smith and get some of this taken care of before the Board meets again.

Mr. Weinberger stated Twin Pines can work with the staff to create what will be reasonable conditions to a permit to address the storm water and erosion concerns.

CONNOLLY stated all of the water line upgrades come to \$421,000 and needs more clarification on who will pay for it and in what order because even without all Twin Pines work it would still need upgrading. CONNOLLY stated Twin Pines should figure out a mechanism working with the Staff and the Town to pay for it or ensure it is paid somehow. Mr. Edwards stated Staff discussions have already been started on workable and equitable ways to handle that.

COLLIER stated one of Ms. Smith's questions was how much of the site would be open at one time. Mr.

Date of Hearing: 01/02/07

Approved: 02/06/07

Weinberger stated Twin Pines came to terms with that without much difficulty. COLLIER stated Ms. Smith's work will be the best guidance before the Board hears more.

There was discussion on school impacts and if further study was needed.

COLLIER stated things for further discussion are Ms. Smith's memo, roads and guardrails, would the bridge be useable and viable with DOT, and pedestrians and bikes.

**HORNIG made a motion to continue this hearing until January 23, 2007.**

**FAULKNER seconded.**

**All voted in favor of this.**

### **3. Minutes November 21, 2006:**

DIETRICH rejoined the Board.

**MAYOR made a motion to approve as amended.**

**FAULKNER seconded.**

**4 voted in favor of this.**

**HORNIG, CONNOLLY, and GARIPAY abstained.**

### **4. Other Business:**

The Board will be meeting next Tuesday, January 9th.

COLLIER stated she spoke on the Board's behalf and told Ms. Smith the Board would be willing to hear Hypertherm, which is weather sensitive even though it is a planning night. COLLIER stated it should be straightforward.

Zoning will be discussed on January 9th.

Wednesday, January 10<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 pm will be the Route 120 Study at the Lebanon library.

### **5. Adjournment:** Meeting Adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Erin Hammond, Recording Secretary