Final Minutes

Planning Board Meeting

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

41 South Main Street, Hanover, NH

Board Members Present: Iain Sim; Brian Edwards; Kelly Dent; Nancy Cater; and Chair, Judith Esmay.

Alternate Board Members Present: Paul Simon and Jenna Musco.

Staff Present: Robert Houseman and Vicki Smith.

1. P2019-20 Submission of Application for Site Plan Review by Hesham Abdunnasir, as Agent for the Trustees of Dartmouth College, property owner of record, to demolish a stairway and construct a raised metal stairway from Old Tuck Drive to West campus, with associated lighting and landscaping, Tax Map 33, Lot 83, in the “I” zoning district.

Patrick Ohearn, Dartmouth College Facilities and Management, and Kevin Warden were present to speak to this application. Warden advised work on Old Tuck drive is nearly finished. There is a wooden staircase halfway up needing to be removed and that they propose to locate a new metal slat staircase in a different location. He showed a map to the Board indicating the new location and that the staircase would connect with the sidewalk. Warden advised that they were asking for a waiver from the standard lighting pole height due to the elevation of the stairs. Discussion took place that neighbors in this area may see some of the light from the path. Ohearn advised that Dartmouth has reached out to the neighbors to discuss lighting issues.

CARTER asked for details of the sidewalk at the bottom of the hill, questioning if drivers would be able to see pedestrians sufficiently. Ohearn advised that the stairway will be up higher on the hill which is a change from where the wooden staircase now ends at the existing sidewalk.

DENT moved to find this application complete and EDWARDS seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with SIMON voted for MAYOR.

SIMON asked about slip resistant surface materials for the new staircase. Warden advised that it will be a metal slat stair surface and that they are looking at manufacturers that design stairs specifically for the conditions present for the staircase. He advised that the wooden staircase will be removed and that they will seed the ground.
afterwards. Discussion about a stone wall with seating as well as paths that will be created through this area took place.

Smith asked where the utility poles or power feeds would come from and if there would be plantings installed over any underground installation. Warden stated that the lines may be buried but that they don’t have this finalized.

ESMAY asked if a site visit was needed. Discussion took place indicating that the Board felt they had already conducted informal site visits.

ESMAY advised that she would not be calling for public comment as no public member was present for the meeting.

The waivers requested in this case were discussed. (Sara Jane needs to see what the waivers are for the minutes). Smith advised that a condition on what kind of mulch could be used would be an added. SIMON asked that a condition that they address the pedestrian drop under C be added. Houseman advised that code may address this issue. ESMAY advised that if something doesn’t meet code it will not be allowed to be built, so this condition is not needed.

SIM moved APPROVE to the request by Hesham Abdunnasir, as Agent for the Trustees of Dartmouth College, property owner of record, to demolish a stairway and construct a raised metal stairway from Old Tuck Drive to West campus, with associated lighting and landscaping, Tax Map 33, Lot 83, in the “I” zoning district, as shown on a plan set entitled Tuck Drive Stair Project, prepared by Engineering Ventures, Project #18518, dated 03/05/2019. The project was approved with the condition that prior to the start of construction, an erosion and sedimentation control plan for both stairways and a re-vegetation plan for the disturbed areas be submitted to Planning and Zoning staff. CRISWELL seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with SIMON voting in favor as the alternate.

2. Discussion about outreach to voters regarding proposed zoning amendments

CARTER advised that she and DENT do not feel that it would be appropriate to bring the petition amendment subject up in public as it would be disrespectful to the resident who brought the matter forward. ESMAY expressed concern that residents will wonder why the Board disapproved this matter and acknowledged that Planning Board Members cannot even appear to be persuading voters. Discussion took place about what would be provided in the town report that explain the request and action taken by the Board and Smith advised that staff has already created what will be presented. SIM questioned what would happen if the warrant was approved, but the Planning Board felt it is illegal, what would happen next. Houseman explained that the property owners’ neighbors who oppose the petition would have the opportunity
to speak up, and then also the opportunity to file a protest petition. Discussion continued to take place regarding the petition as the center of this conversation.

3. Discussion about amendments to Site Plan Review regulations

Discussion took place regarding the changes suggested to the landscaping regulations by SIM, as well as comparing how these changes would have affected past projects.

Smith asked if there were comments on lighting regulation. SIM asked for a rational for why the changes were made to 7(B)(5)(b)-3. Smith advised that this concerns conditional approvals, which the Town does not do. Approving with conditions is different than active conditional approvals. SIM asked if this item would be clearer if the language being removed were kept in the document. Smith said she could add it back into the document.

SIM asked about 7(C)(2), stating he did not see any changes to this item. Smith advised that no changes were made, but that she would check to make sure. Discussion took place about what kind of projects need to come before the Planning Board and how the Town determines which should be brought to the Board. Houseman suggested that the word buildings or structures need to be added. Discussion took place about using 90 degrees versus horizontal plane. Smith stated that the 90 degrees could be removed. EDWARDS asking about the definition of a foot candle and if the light put out from every candle is the same. Smith advised that this is a scientific definition that is used.

SIM asked for clarification of 6(B)(2)(g) the wording.

Smith suggested talking about the test standards for parking lots. She reported having reviewed the Hypertherm project and doesn’t know if that project can be what is used as their test case. She stated that the none living material piece as well as plantings and maturing of the plantings causes her to question using this site. Smith went on to discuss other projects that might be able to be their sample parking lot and why they do not provide enough variables to fully meet their needs as an example. In some sites the current standards would require more landscaping than what exists. She asked what number of parking spaces they should allow before landscaping is required and asked if 15 spaces would be appropriate. Discussion took place regarding this standard.

Discussion took place about including drawings to explain regulations within the regulations. SIMON has provided some and will work on others. It was determined that this visual representation was beneficial, providing more understanding of what is required.

Smith stated that the Planning Board should have a hearing on these items. May has several items on the agenda that may cause additional meetings during the month as well as a possible site visit. The meeting on May 7, 2019 has a full agenda. The Planning Board agreed to schedule this hearing on May 28, 2019 agenda, making an additional meeting for the month. The meeting for June is on June 4, 2019. The July
2, 2019 meeting is being rescheduled to July 9, 2019. Summer vacation for the Planning Board starts on July 10, 2019 and ends on August 27, 2019.

4. Minutes February 26 and March 5, 2019

Discussion took place regarding changes needed on the February 26, 2019 minutes.

DENT moved to approve the amended minutes and SIM seconded the motion. ESMAY, DENT, SIM, EDWARDS, and alternate SIMON voted in favor. CARTER abstained.

Discussion took place regarding changes needed on the March 5, 2019 minutes.

DENT moved to approve the amended minutes and EDWARDS seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with DENT, SIM, EDWARDS, ESMAY, CARTER, and SIMON voting in favor. CRISWELL abstained as he was not present for the March 5, 2019 meeting.

5. Other Business

Discussion took place regarding the need to rework the master plan and that the budget being proposed at Town Meeting includes funding to revisit the master plan.

6. Adjourn

ESMAY adjourned the meeting at 9:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sara Jane Murphy
Recording Secretary