

**Planning Board
Board Room, Municipal Building at 7:30 pm
October 16, 2007**

Members: Nancy Collier, Bill Dietrich, Judith Esmay, Charles Faulkner, Michael Mayor

Alternates: Peter Christie (Selectmen's Alternate), Mike Hingston

Staff: Vicki Smith, Jonathan Edwards

Others: See attached sheet

07-13 Continuation of submission of application for public hearing and request by Penfield Family LTD Partnership for site plan and subdivision review to create a 15-unit multi-family dwelling with associated parking on Curtiss Road, Tax Map 44, Lot 4, in the "GR-2" zoning district.

This was the Board's fifth review of this application. Previous hearings were held July 3, August 28, and September 18, 2007 and a site visit was conducted July 10, 2007. A two-lot subdivision application, submitted in concert with this application, was approved by the Board August 28, 2007.

COLLIER announced that the Board had not received any additional information since the September 18th public hearing.

Rod Finley, of Pathways Consulting, distributed copies of a new site plan dated June 5, 2007. He recapped the modifications discussed at the August hearing including:

1. Incorporation of a one-way access drive through the Hampshire House parking lot to Reservoir Road. This would reduce the number of on-site parking spaces, resulting in non-compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. The use of off-site parking was not an option for this project.
2. Researching the capacity of the existing storm drains on Curtiss Road and how they exit Curtiss Road. A soils evaluation confirmed the poor soils and very limited infiltration on the site. An existing drainage system heads west to a catch basin, discharges south of the roundabout in the Garipay Field area, and continues toward the old Hanover Country Club (HCC) Maintenance Facility.
3. A playground area was added between the Hampshire House and Curtiss Court. Its design and equipment have not yet been determined.
4. Rotate the building 180 degrees, facing the horseshoe toward the east. The building rotation was changed; the open court area would now face Curtiss Road; the parking lot would be between the building and 45 Lyme Road. The area between the building and Curtiss Road was cleaned up. LP tanks, transformers, and dumpster were relocated.
5. Clarify the affordability of the units. The building design was simplified (straightened out and made as easy and cost effective to build as possible). Every unit will have the same elevation. Dormers were added to soften the façade. A modular builder in Canada will construct and transport prefabricated boxes to the site. The applicant was seeking written support from the Upper Valley Housing Coalition for this project.

Mr. Finley said this would be a walk-to-work community. It is an in-fill project that meets the goals of the Lyme Road study recently conducted. The unit count was directly related to the affordability of the project and matched that which was envisioned in the Master Plan for this area.

COLLIER opened the floor for questions. Jonathan Edwards asked about the rental rates. Kent Penfield said he was reluctant to be specific but suggested the rate would be between \$1,200 and \$1,800 per month.

Mr. Edwards asked why the courtyard pathway did not connect to Curtiss Road. Mr. Finley said the connection was removed to contain the courtyard. A walkway connection was maintained around the north side of the building. An applicant representative explained that Curtiss Road residents had expressed concern for potential parking issues on Curtiss Road. A split-rail fence was proposed along Curtiss Road to discourage parking and access from that area. Vicki Smith suggested reconnecting the internal courtyard with a walkway to the north.

COLLIER asked to review the proposed surfaces of the different walking paths. Mr. Finley said black asphalt, crushed stone, hard pack, and colored pavement would be used. The paths would be plowed in the winter.

Ms. Smith asked of the proposed access to the playground. Mr. Finley said the playground access had not been considered. The playground design may dictate where the entrance and exits are located.

Ms. Smith said the parking lot design did not appear to meet the standards for internal or perimeter landscaping. Mr. Finley said the landscaping plan had not changed from the original submittal. A waiver was being sought for the internal landscaping. He said he intended to meet the perimeter requirements. Ms. Smith questioned the depth of the sidewalk along the parking lot relative to cars hanging over and blocking them. Mr. Finley agreed to increase the sidewalk width to seven feet. ESMAY asked if a sidewalk would be provided on the east end of the parking lot. Mr. Finley confirmed.

COLLIER asked how residents would access the parking lot. Elizabeth Church, architect for the project, said they would exit from the front of the units. Each unit would have a small patio area out of the rear exit with privacy fences and 4' deep pavers separating them. COLLIER asked that the plan package be updated to include the patios.

DIETRICH asked if the south entrance could be tied to the bottom of the parking lot rather than utilizing 45 Lyme Road. Mr. Finley said this would displace parking. The unit count or approved subdivision would need to be revised to accommodate that. Ms. Smith asked if slanting the spaces would increase the number. Mr. Finley said it would not. The plan was already designed to the minimum parking space width. Don Penfield said people from Hanover Terrace would also use this access.

Mr. Edwards asked if the width of the main road could be reduced to 22' or 20'. DIETRICH asked if the option to combine the driveway with the property to the north had been pursued. Mr. Finley said the neighbors were open to modifying their site plan. Approval for that piece would be a subsequent process.

Mr. Edwards asked about lighting mounted on the building. Mr. Finley said there would be one recessed, sharp cut-off fixture outside of each rear sliding doors. The applicant agreed to work with staff to choose the fixtures and provide cut sheets for Board review. COLLIER suggested the Legend for Sheet 4, *Landscape and Lighting Plan*, was incomplete. SP1, SP2, MF, AS and some lighting elements were not listed.

COLLIER asked if it was possible to provide community garden areas on the Hampshire House land. Susan Edwards, of 11 Woodmore Road, said there were some community gardens on the rugby field site.

Ms. Smith questioned the proposed drainage changes. The area the drainage was now directed toward was already significantly compromised. Ms. Smith said the project could not be approved until more was known of the receiving area. Mr. Finley said they were still seeking permit approval from the State. COLLIER asked about minimization attempts. Mr. Finley said attempts to infiltrate on site included constructing an infiltrating catch basin in the courtyard, a 4' diameter basin surrounded by 10' of crushed stone. Runoff would also be directed toward a small infiltrating ditch on the south side of the parking lot where it would be held before continuing to the catch basin. Mr. Finley said he expected the State

permits to be approved in the near future and the College to correct the erosion problem at the HCC site upon permit issuance. Ms. Smith said snow storage should not be located over a treatment swale.

COLLIER opened the floor for public comment. Bill Mlacak, of 16 Reservoir Road, asked for details of the property perimeter. Mr. Finley said a split-rail fence would run along the eastern boundary. A crushed-stone path would run along the northern boundary. A silt fence would be created along the southern boundary. At project completion this area would be grassed over. Another grass area would encompass the western boundary beyond the parking lot.

Alex Iskandar, co-owner of 45 Lyme Road, summarized his concerns communicated to the Board in a letter dated July 3, 2007. He said traffic and safety items were still outstanding. He requested access to the geotechnical report drafted before August 25, 2007. He said this project would make the drainage much worse than existing conditions.

Michael Herron, of 6 Bridgman Road, spoke in favor of the building rotation. He said this would help to integrate the building into the neighborhood. However, he characterized the revised building design as "institutional" and said it would not match the rest of the neighborhood given the lack of articulation of setbacks.

A male speaker said the Master Plan tried to integrate things that were visually related in a neighborhood setting. The long look the proposed building would not accomplish that and would change the character of the area. He suggested design elements and flexibility were sacrificed to accommodate the maximum unit count. Mr. Finley said the density/open space table in the Lyme Road Village Center rezoning plan called for 15 units at this lot. The result of the rezoning was to significantly reduce the developable area in the zone and to vastly increase the open space area. He said the project met almost all of the core principles of the Master Plan, excluding the ones relating to Dartmouth College.

CHRISTIE agreed that the elevations from the east and west were extremely sterile. He said he would prefer to have the developer decide the tradeoff between building design versus affordability. Ms. Smith agreed that tradeoffs were made under the guise of affordability without guarantee that the units would remain affordable. Kent Penfield said the goal from the beginning was to provide affordable apartments for people who want to walk to work in that area. They had been encouraged to do this to meet the need of affordable housing in Hanover. A tradeoff was necessary to make that happen.

An abutter said if the revised plan had been presented to the neighborhood, as was the original plan, they would not have supported it. The original design was acceptably aesthetic. He said since there was not a legally binding commitment to keep the units affordable the revised design seemed unjustified. It was noted that the revised plan, submitted at the start of the meeting, had not been made available to staff or abutters prior to the meeting. Mr. Finley said only five changes were made from what was originally proposed.

COLLIER recapped the unresolved issues for further review as:

- Landscaping impact from snow storage
- Lighting details, cut-sheets
- Staff review of the revised plan
- Proof of compliance with landscape plantings
- Construction timing of the erosion repairs at the HCC
- Lot coverage calculations
- Pathways to the northern courtyard
- Submission of the geotechnical report
- Storm water treatment
- Construction hours and access to the site
- Widening of the sidewalk
- Affordability versus design

It was moved by DIETRICH, seconded by ESMAY, to continue this public hearing to December 4, 2007. COLLIER asked that responses to the unresolved issues be provided in advance of the meeting in addition to a response from Peter Kulbacki, Public Works Director, relative to the storm water system redesign. **The MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Preliminary conceptual consultation to review plans to re-develop the Co-op Community Food Market, 43 Lyme Road, Tax Map 44, Lot 2, in the "B-1" zoning district.

Robert White, of ORW Landscape Architects and Planners, appeared on behalf of the Co-op. He said the program and building size were not yet finalized. A formal application would be submitted to the Town in November. The numbers presented in the traffic study submission for this preliminary consultation reflect the Penfield project and Rivercrest build-out.

Mr. White walked the Board through the proposed site plan which involved removal of the existing store, relocation of the fuel storage tanks and pump station, construction of a new 6,000 square foot market, and a complete rebuilding of the public streetscape along Lyme Road. The building, offering convenient retail items and office space, would include a deli, prepared foods section, and café with seating. It will be surrounded by a green zone of landscaping. Vehicular access will be provided from Lyme Road and Reservoir Road at the farthest points possible from the roundabout. Sidewalks will run continuously along Lyme and Reservoir Roads and footpaths will lead to the front door.

MAYOR spoke in support of the project. He said maintaining a connectedness with people on the street would be vital to the design of the façade. He suggested abandoning the "convenient store" terminology and hoped the food resource would satisfy and encourage a walkable community. Mr. White said the building would quadruple in size providing a variety of retail opportunities. DIETRICH asked about the building entrances. Mr. White said there would be two entrances, one from Lyme Road and another through a plaza area located in the middle section of the building.

FAULKNER asked if 31 parking spaces were required. Mr. White said the parking requirement would be recalculated when the building size and seating plans were finalized. He hoped neighborhood customers would walk or travel to the store by bicycle. Mr. Edwards suggested adding more on-street parking spaces to the Reservoir Road frontage. CHRISTIE questioned the need for the on-street parking. Mr. White said on-street parking provided the convenience of a main street, storefront relationship.

CHRISTIE asked if the traffic study indicated any issues crossing traffic to enter/exit the site. He suggested limiting exists to right-hand turns only. Mr. White said he did not believe this would work relative to delivery trucks. COLLIER suggested sharing the entrance to 45 Lyme Road rather than creating another curb cut next to it. Mr. White said that was considered and found not to be a valid option.

ESMAY spoke in support of the design. She asked if outdoor seating would be provided. Mr. White said seating would be provided inside and out.

ESMAY asked where snow storage would occur. Mr. White said adjacent to the pumps and in the area where the parking abuts the bank drive-through. Drainage calculations were not ready for review.

MAYOR asked if the issue of signs had matured. Mr. White said no.

Mr. Edwards asked if the Public Works Department had approved locating the dumpster, fuel storage tanks, and pump canopy over a sewer easement. Mr. White said it would be possible to abandon the portion of the sewer in that easement that currently serves the existing store. The new building would connect to the Reservoir Road lines.

MAYOR encouraged the applicant to seek a Leed Rating or perhaps a Platinum Rating. Mr. White said the Co-op members requested a green building at this site but having to complete the paperwork alone for

those ratings would add significantly to its cost. A management decision was made to do all the right things without seeking the ratings. Ms. Smith spoke in opposition to the proposed wall along Lyme Road, intended to block the sun. She said there were other creative ways to accomplish this. MAYOR agreed external screening could be utilized without ruining the façade.

COLLIER asked why a double sidewalk was proposed along Reservoir Road. Mr. White said he would have liked to use that space for outdoor seating or a farmer's market area but those uses and structures are restricted within the setback, which this area encompasses.

COLLIER opened the floor to public comment. An abutter spoke in support of the project. He asked how bike paths would connect to the site. Mr. White said bike paths ran along Lyme Road. The abutter suggested providing spaces for child pick-up/drop-offs. COLLIER asked that bike racks be provided and suggested adding a walk-up window to serve pedestrians/bikers.

Alex Iskandar, co-owner of 45 Lyme Road, spoke in support of the project with the exception of the proposed café. He suggested people would loiter at the café for hours, thereby occupying parking spaces for extended periods of time. Mr. Iskandar also expressed concern for the poor soils on the site and the width of the loading area which he thought was too narrow.

Bill Mlacak, of 16 Reservoir Road, spoke in support of the proposal and commended the applicant for incorporating the principals of the village center.

It was noted that the Town would commence streetscape construction in that area in July, 2007. The applicant will contact Peter Kulbacki, Public Works Director, and indicate on a future site plan the limits of work the applicant is committed to doing off their property.

FAULKNER suggested the Board go on record as being in support of this project.

Other business: The next Planning Board meeting will be held November 6th.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 9:59 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Beth Rivard, Administrative Assistant
Judith Esmay, Clerk