

**Planning Board
Board Room, Municipal Building 7:30 pm
November 13, 2007**

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

Alternates: Michael Hingston

Selectman Alternate: Bill Baschnagel

Staff: Vicki Smith, Jonathan Edwards

Others: Susie Nagy, Margaret Bragg, Scott Williams, John Joline, Paul Max, Barbara McIlroy, Doug McIlroy, Bob Norman, Perry Williamson

Agenda:

1. Discussion about the Route 120 Corridor Report

The September 5, 2007 draft of the Route 120 Corridor Study was identified as the latest version of the study. The latest version of the goals and vision statement is dated September 26, 2007. Mr. Edwards was confident that Phase 2 of the study would be funded in the not too distant future. COLLIER said that she wanted the Planning Board to have a role in the release of the final product. She hoped that the Planning Board would provide the Regional Planning Commission with feedback on the statement of vision and goals. BASCHNAGEL thought the Steering Committee was too distanced from the clients, the Town of Hanover and City of Lebanon, and that the Board should review the work.

CONNOLLY asked about the status of the Lebanon zoning amendments. Mr. Edwards thought that the City Council was still working on a draft, but that it would be ready for the voters soon. CONNOLLY summarized her understanding of the zoning amendments from less industrially zoned land to more residentially zoned land. HINGSTON confirmed that Hanover had no plans for zoning amendments in the Route 120 corridor for 2008 Town Meeting.

MAYOR commented that the latest vision statement considers natural resource protection, not just development. BASCHNAGEL agreed that the vision statement was heading in the right direction, but that in his opinion, it had not crystallized enough to give people a vision. He hoped for more clarity in the vision statement that could then serve as a basis for zoning. CONNOLLY said that the point of the report was to figure out how much development pressure the municipalities will face. HORNIG understood the report was a build out analysis and that the vision was not part of the report. The vision and goals are a work in progress.

Bob Norman summarized his understanding of the report: an exploration of four future build-out scenarios, including ones based on current zoning and the expected future modified to reflect a realistic build-out. COLLIER hoped everyone had an opportunity to experience Route 120 at 7:45 am. She wanted to be sure that there was a statement about not expanding the corridor infrastructure. She hoped that the corridor would not be expanded.

MAYOR thought that Hanover did not have a lot of leverage regarding the future of the corridor since most of it lies in Lebanon. It appeared to him that Hanover would just be an observer and not a participant in determining the future of the corridor. COLLIER thought there was a lot in Hanover to talk

about including the Buck Road and Greensboro Road intersections and the proposed Centerra North village center.

Mr. Edwards thought that the Planning Board could have a much better informed discussion about the Route 120 corridor because of the Study. CONNOLLY thought that the two Planning Boards would be in a much better place for cooperating and understanding each other. COLLIER suggested reviewing goals #1- #11. She asked Board members to comment on how well each applies to Hanover.

Bob Norman thought that Hanover could have quite a bit of influence especially since Phase 2 of the Study would catch the attention of the public. He suggested that a traffic analysis be part of Phase 2 and that a computer terminal be made available to produce reports so that the community could use the traffic model. He thought that in talking about the impact of cars that the amount of time it takes to travel from Ledyard Bridge to Centerra should be used as a measure instead of car counts. COLLIER added that the time spent waiting to get onto a road was also a good measure. Bill Baschnagel was confident that if there was no increase in through traffic in downtown Hanover that the future would be better. He hoped to get people from home to work without traveling through downtown Hanover.

Margaret Bragg said she has lived on Greensboro Road for 25 years. She wanted the Town to take over the road so that speed and truck traffic would be better controlled. Bill Baschnagel said that only speed can be controlled. Mr. Edwards thought that a bike path or sidewalk would be difficult to site due to the proximity of houses to the travel way. Bob Norman wanted the management of Greensboro Road to be included in the Phase 2 portion of the Study. He thought the side roads are already overburdened.

Doug McIlroy noted that Phase 1 focused on jobs and traffic. In Phase 2 he wanted the analysis to include the wild lands. He wanted an answer to the questions: how many fewer animals will there be if the corridor is built out? How much less biodiversity will there be? Will there be bears on Rix Ledges? How much environmental change will there be with more traffic?

The Board turned attention to the goals. HINGSTON wondered if the first was strictly an engineer's statement. BASCHNAGEL responded that some engineering is needed. The consensus was that the second sentence needed revision and should not be passive. COLLIER thought that the first goal should be at least two goals. The second could be to identify ways to avoid, mitigate or alter the impacts of development. BASCHNAGEL thought the first sentence start with *Capacity must be determined*. HORNIG thought Hanover should list its own visions and not tell Lebanon what to do. There should also be a separate section listing what the Regional Planning Commission should do. CONNOLLY wanted to send the signal that Hanover wants to work with the Lebanon Planning Board. Bob Norman wanted to see the document owned by both Hanover and Lebanon. He remembered what people at the first hearing said. He wanted to see the goals be suggestions that both boards can endorse. He wanted a "we project", not an "us/them" project. ESMAY agreed.

Ms. Smith pointed out that the goals were not really goals, but instead strategies. COLLIER agreed that many were strategies for the Phase 2 study. HINGSTON pointed out that some were overriding concepts and others were things to do. Ms. Smith suggested grouping goals 2, 4 and 10 into a natural resource section. Other sections could be topical, neighbors, jobs and housing, for example. HORNIG, MAYOR and CONNOLLY will work as a subcommittee on re-writing the vision and goals. Hornig thought it would be pretty easy to organize the goals into goals with related strategies. He found that the Board thought that the Route 120 Tomorrow paragraph contained statements with which they could agree.

Comments will be emailed to staff and the subcommittee will revise the September 26 draft. Mr. Edwards will get a digital version so editing will be easier.

Barbara McIlroy thought that a mistake was made by not including Cuttings Corner with its huge

employers in the study area. Bill Baschnagel said that a considered decision had been made not to include Great Hollow/Etna Road.

2. Discussion about Storm Water Regulations

COLLIER reviewed the history of the storm water regulations. At the meeting between College officials--Tim McNamara and Joanna Whitcomb, consultant Jim Spaulding--and Town staff--Mr. Edwards, Ms. Smith and Peter Kulbacki--not many of the College's suggested changes were agreed to by the Town. Mr. Edwards said that he did not think the Town should go as far as meeting LEED standards or the State standards. While the College thought that limiting the contractor's choice of means and methods was not a good idea, Mr. Edwards disagreed. He noted that means and methods are often estimated at the lowest possible costs in order to win the bid and that interest is in opposition to the interest of the environment and the Town.

Mr. Edwards said that the Town did agree with the suggestion about 16.02B3a and the categorical volume control was loosened. There is a difference between flow and volume.

HINGSTON had some practical questions. He was concerned that the Board's proposed standards would be too rigid. The field change and modification of approval avenues to follow in that situation were explained.

Scott Williams thought that good plans would be implemented correctly with the guidance from the new regulations. He thought the regulations did a good job of defining and assigning responsibilities.

CONNOLLY reviewed Section C4c and thought that too much information was being requested. HINGSTON wondered why down gradient water features needed to be considered. Mr. Edwards said that the regulations attempted to protect down gradient features by controlling what is up gradient. Scott Williams noted that the Town and applicant had no ability to control what happens downstream. The goal is to maintain existing conditions down gradient. HINGSTON noted that rates were being controlled because volumes were increasing. Doug McIlroy thought that omitting volume from consideration would result in a recipe for Girl Brook everywhere. COLLIER wondered if volume regulations should be added back in. Mr. Edwards said that it was deleted at the request of Peter Kulbacki. Barbara McIlroy noted that items 3c, 4 and 5 were omitted in the current draft.

Mr. Edwards read a memo from Peter Kulbacki, dated October 24, which responded to Barbara's McIlroy's concern. Mr. Edwards said that he could find no scientific consensus and that he agreed that no other brooks should end up like Girl Brook. He did not think that volume regulations would prevent other streams from going dry part of the year. Mr. Edwards agreed to ask Peter about volume considerations. Barbara McIlroy wondered what happened to the cut and fill standards and the rules that amounted to no disturbance in the setback. A required vegetated buffer clause was added back in. Sections 11.16B2 4 and 5 will be added back in. BASCHNAGEL thought that 4 and 5 were too extreme and should be added back in with strikethrough so members could see the wording but that they would not be reconsidered but definitely back in the proposal.

HINGSTON will meet with Mr. Edwards to discuss his questions about the storm water regulations. He noted that with Section 16.02B2 requiring larger culverts there could be conflict with the minimization criteria in Section 702.

3. Other Business

The Route 120 Study review committee will arrange to meet.

Mr. Edwards mentioned that a development of regional impact for a project at Etna Road and Route 120 was coming to the Board for review.

On November 20th, the Rural Committee will report and the proposed zoning amendments will be reviewed. On December 4th, the Curtiss Court project will be reviewed. On December 10th, the Rivercrest staff review will be held at 1:30 PM. On December 11th, the Board will consider the wetlands proposal, the revised Route 120 vision and goals, and the next storm water draft.

4. Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at 9:45 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Vicki Smith, Scribe Pro-temps
Judith Esmay, Clerk