

**Planning Board
Board Room, Municipal Building 7:30 pm
January 9, 2007**

In Attendance:

Members: Nancy Collier, Michael Mayor, Charles Faulkner, Kate Connolly, Judith Esmay, Jim Hornig, Bill Dietrich

Alternates: Joan Garipay

Selectmen Alternate: Bill Baschnagel

Staff: Jonathan Edwards, Vicki Smith

Others: See attached sheet

1. 06-23 Submission of application and site plan review of proposal by Hypertherm, Inc. to create a pedestrian and small vehicle pathway to connect the principal buildings at Hypertherm and the former Spectra property, 21 and 25 Great Hollow Road, Map 1, Lots 18 and 21, in the "BM" zoning district.

COLLIER stepped down.

Representing Hypertherm and following informal hearing of November 7, 2006, Engineer Michael McCrory requested site plan review with waivers. Waiver of the requirement for a full boundary survey is reasonable, he said, because Hypertherm has used deed and tax map information and the two subject parcels are owned by Hypertherm.

Mr. McCrory also requested waiver of the requirement for a landscaping plan. He stated that the application proposes a low-impact pathway, and adding landscaping would be more visual improvement rather than maintaining a minimum footprint. Mr. McCrory stated the the path will be 8 to 10 feet wide, along the most direct route between the two buildings; the path will have a gravel surface and a split rail fence to keep people from shortcutting across wetlands. He stated Hypertherm has determined lighting is necessary for safety and that lighting would be used with timers.

MAYOR asked if the elevated portion of the walkway shown on the submission had been deleted. Mr. McCrory stated there is an elevated walkway, a wetlands crossing, that is about 150 feet long. MAYOR asked if the elevated portion would be supported by pylons drilled into the ground, and Mr. McCrory stated that was correct. MAYOR asked if the applicant had explored issues raised by the Conservation Commission about ice and snow conditions; Mr. McCrory stated that Hypertherm could not address them completely short of implementing an expensive ice removal system and some sort of rapid heat system. Mr. McCrory stated mechanical methods would be used to remove some of the ice.

ESMAY asked if the bollards would impede wheelchair access and if the surface of the parking area will also accommodate wheelchair use under the ADA. Mr. McCrory stated no, the bollards will not impede wheelchair use and the parking surface will accommodate wheelchair use. ESMAY also asked if the parking areas will be marked so that drivers are forewarned of pedestrian traffic. Mr. McCrory stated on the 21 Great Hollow Road side there is a crosswalk painted and at 15 Great Hollow Road there is frequent pedestrian crossing now, but there is not a cross walk.

FAULKNER asked what sort of small vehicles would use the path. Mr. McCrory stated it will be used by small off road vehicles such as golf carts and with the possibility of other small vehicles such as Gator

utility vehicles; Hypertherm does not want to limit itself to golf-cart use only.

COLLIER questioned the spacing of the lighting and asked if timing would be automatic or by sensors; she said she preferred the latter. Mr. McCrory pointed out the 15-foot lights; he stated there would be a split rail fence on the same side as the lights and that Hypertherm prefers low-impact downcast lighting with a full cutoff fixture along the elevated portion of the walkway. Understanding that Hanover is sensitive about lighting issues, Hypertherm intends to use the fewest number of lights consistent with provision of a safe path, and the present plan was designed with those criteria in mind. Mr. McCrory stated that he thought that the proposed lighting is efficient and reasonable for the use and reasonably safe for this proposal, but he will look into reducing it. He stated it was the intent not only meet to the regulations, but to exceed them where possible. Mr. McCrory stated sensors had been considered, but on a path of this size timers are the better choice. HORNIG suggested installing a push button that would activate the lights for five minutes.

MAYOR asked about the core sample log. Mr. McCrory stated this was an option open to the contractor.

Mr. Edwards asked how construction would be affected by the absence of a hard freeze; Mr. McCrory stated installation of the walkway in the wetlands would be more difficult and time consuming. Mr. McCrory explained the measures that would be taken, many of which are conditional.

MAYOR moved to approve the application as complete. DIETRICH seconded. All members voted in favor.

COLLIER asked whether the split-rail fence is important to the design. Mr. McCrory stated the fence is intended to keep people from shortcutting and on the path so they do not step into wetlands. There was discussion on this and on light pole spacing, the height of the light poles, and having bollard lighting only. Mr. McCrory stated Hypertherm could look at fewer lighting poles as a condition, but stated they would prefer not to change the proposal because the path is not limited to pedestrians use.

Ms. Smith said an alternative construction sequence, to be used in the event the ground is not frozen, should be specified and included in a bid package. She asked Mr. McCrory if a contractor had been selected. Mr. McCrory stated it was in the latest bid package and read what would be done and how. Ms. Smith stated it needed to be more specific. Mr. McCrory stated updates would be made to the latest bid package with more details on all Ms. Smith's concerns. Mr. Edwards asked if the engineer would regularly supervise and oversee the construction to make sure specs and sequencing are followed. Mr. McCrory stated a construction management firm had been hired to oversee installation.

ESMAY moved to approve the plan with 2 conditions:

- 1. Working out a new lighting plan acceptable to Staff that brings the lighting as close as possible to the existing lighting and no more lighting than provided in the present plans.**
- 2. Preparation of a construction sequence acceptable to the Staff.**

The motion was seconded, and all members voted in favor.

COLLIER rejoined the Board.

2. Discussion of possible zoning amendments:

COLLIER stated this was last done on December 12, 2006.

PRD Parking deferral (Twin Pines Housing Trust)

Mr. Rod Finley, representing the proponent, stated the intention is to build initially only the parking spaces minimally required for the site and install more later only if they are required by residents; overall, to limit the number of parking spaces. DIETRICH asked why affordable housing would need fewer

parking spaces. Mr. Finley stated one reason is residents in this particular project are more likely to walk or ride bikes to work. CONNOLLY replied that they are more likely to require two cars as both spouses are likely to work.

The consensus of the Board was that this matter will be referred back in Twin Pines for consultation with Staff before the Board hears it again.

"I" district on-campus parking requirements (Dartmouth College)

Steve Campbell of Dartmouth College, the proponent, stated this amendment came out of a College planning effort to review parking and transportation. He stated under the current ordinance the College or any institution in the "I" district is required to provide on-site parking. He stated the committee foresaw a point at which college growth would require greater paved area at every building or the construction of larger parking structures within the "I" zone. He stated an alternative to that would be to create satellite lots serviced by Advanced Transit or another shuttle service. There was discussion on "I" district parking and parking in other districts for the "I" zone and on special exceptions through the ZBA for different types of parking.

Mr. Edwards stated that the proposal could be revised to say that the Planning Board may approve private off-lot parking proposed to be located in the "I" district or other districts during the site plan review process. ESMAY stated an easier way might be to change section "C" of the proposal to say the Planning Board may permit all or part of the required spaces to be provided elsewhere. Mr. Edwards stated then it would be opening the Board up to proposals that may come in any district or off site parking. Baschnagel spoke of his parking concerns and of his concerns about fraternities and sororities renting parking spaces that do not meet any parking requirements.

Sandra Hoeh of Dartmouth College suggested revisiting this next month when the college could have more information together. COLLIER stated if the Board did go along with this it should be kept within the current language, not in new sections, and as a special exception, so that credit can be gotten for parking provided outside the college's zoning district. Ms. Smith suggested that, rather than opening up all the other districts to remote parking, just rezone whatever parking that is being looked for into the "I" zone.

The college will come back next month to discuss this further.

Height in "F" zone (Dartmouth College)

Sandra Hoeh spoke to the proposed zoning change; she had offered to check on the height requirement in the "F" zone, presently 35 feet. Ms. Hoeh stated Dartmouth Outdoor Recreation supports an increase in the height limitation to 40 feet. She stated the College is proposing a rope course that would also be open to the High School. Ms. Smith stated the change would also be applicable to barns and other structures in the "F" zone.

The consensus of the Board was that this will be discussed more next month when more data is available.

PRD Open Space Requirements in GR-2 (Kent Penfield)

CONNOLLY stated there is a much larger "GR-2" zone that might be adversely effected by this change and suggested making this "GR-2" zone a "GR-4" zone and in the end the same result will be obtained without effecting the rest of the "GR-2" zone. There was much discussion on this and on the open space requirements of the zones.

COLLIER stated the "GR-3" zone might be a better option than "GR-4". Collier also stated that when the Board was considering the Lime Road Village District rezoning there was discussion on whether or not to allow offsite open space which the Board did not support at that time. There was discussion on "GR"

zones and density.

DIETRICH suggested a citizens group to get input. Mr. Edwards suggested asking the Village Center Group if they could take this up and deferring Planning Board action pending that committee's response.

Mr. Finley stated the density differences between "GR-2" and "GR-4". CONNOLLY stated she didn't realize when she spoke the density would more than double.

Mr. Edwards will confer with the Village Center Group.

Rural environmental districts (Rural Group)

Ms. Smith stated there is no proposal as yet; the Rural Group is working to complete its analysis. She stated the most important thing for the Board to do is establish a zoning calendar so the group knows when the deadline is. COLLIER stated this will be done at the end of the discussions.

Revision of Section 803 to remove requirement for a special exception when a proposed addition to a non-conforming structure is no farther into the setback than the existing structure. (Judith Brotman)

COLLIER stated the Zoning Board needed to handle all of these right now. Arthur Gardner of the ZBA stated that the Zoning Board was trying to get these out of the Board's purview and refer them to the Zoning Administrator. COLLIER suggested adding "lot line in front of setback" in two places. The Planning Board agreed with the proposal.

ESMAY stated that, although it is sensible for the Zoning Administrator to make decisions that need not go to the ZBA, there are administrative decisions that might profit by the comments of neighbors, who can offer them only if they have notice that a decision affecting them is about to be made. Mr. Gardiner stated that was a major issue for a Zoning Board member. He said the problem with notification to neighbors of decisions that do not require ZBA approval may be considered inappropriate. COLLIER observed that in this case the extension into the setback would be no closer than the existing structure to a structure on adjacent property. Mr. Edwards asked if the Board would like to see a draft that would incorporate a provision similar to the abutter notice for administrative permits. Mr. Edwards explained that in the case of administrative permits such a notice is basically for the purpose of notifying abutters of impending action. COLLIER asked Mr. Gardiner if the comments of neighbors at ZBA meetings has ever changed the Zoning Board's thinking. Mr. Gardiner replied no. He also stated there may have been eight of these in the last five years and it is hard for the Zoning Board to understand why they need to look at them.

Mr. Edwards will redraft the proposal with notification provisions similar to those of the administrative permit.

DIETRICH noticed that the language in the second paragraph differs from the special exception language in that it applies when the proposed addition extends the existing structure no closer to a structure on an adjacent property in the proposed language, but to the lot line in the existing language. Mr. Gardiner stated controversy is more likely to follow when structures are closer.

Clarify the definition of front setback- to mandate the area of the front setback be the same as the frontage requirement (Judith Brotman)

The purpose of this amendment is to avoid "L" or "triangle" shape frontages that skirt the issue of adequate frontage for subdivisions. The area of frontage required should continue through the whole setback area.

The Board's consensus was to defer this matter to next year.

The following pending proposals were not discussed:

Variance Update

1006.1 variance clarifications (Arthur Gardiner with assistance from Town Counsel)

Wetland & Flood Plain

Clarify 702.5 language... (Judith Brotman, Arthur Gardiner) Remove seasonal dwelling from first 25 feet of setback

Eliminate the need for WSE for docks (Section 701 and 702 require a wetland special exception). (Judith Brotman)

Include intermittent stream in 702.5C

Add walkways/paths as permitted uses (Hypertherm)

New definitions

FEMA requirements

Non-zoning work

By-Laws

Incorporate right to know and meeting process suggestions

Capital Improvement Plan

Define in-town rural boundary and define infrastructure limitations and uses accordingly

Site Plan Review

Lots of housekeeping, new procedures, road, storm water management, erosion and sedimentation control standards, invasive species, etc.

Subdivision Regulations

Road, storm water management, erosion and sedimentation control standards

For Town Meeting 2008

Growth Management

Rural Cluster

3. Other business:

The Board briefly discussed content of upcoming meetings:

January 23: the rest of the possible zoning changes.

February 6: another Grasse III meeting, minor lot line adjacent, and the high school.

February 13

February 20

CONNOLLY stated the Board of Selectmen would like to thank the Planning Board for its Reservoir Road recommendations. The Select Board's plan is to build a two-lane, unpaved, safe road with some shoulders.

Mr. Edwards stated a meeting of the Route 120 Corridor Study Steering Committee will take place January 10 at 4:30 pm in the Lebanon Library.

4. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned 10:12 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Erin Hammond, Recording Secretary

Judith Esmay, Clerk