PLANNING BOARD
July 3, 2018 at 7:30 PM
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET

In attendance:
Members: Judith Esmay (Chair), Nancy Carter (Selectboard Representative), Jon Criswell, Brian Edwards, Paul Simon, Michael Mayor, Jenna Musco, and Kelly Dent.
Staff: Rob Houseman and Vicki Smith
Others: Please see attendance sheet

1. **P2018-44 Submission of Application for Minor Lot Line Adjustment by SCST LLC to annex 2,045 sf from 22 School Street, Tax Map 23, Lot 21, to 22A School Street, Tax Map 23, Lot 20; both lots are located in the GR-2 and D-1 zoning districts.**

After taking attendance, ESMAY appointed SIMON to vote in place of SIM for tonight’s meeting. ESMAY called the first item on the agenda, a Minor Lot Line Adjustment for property located at 22 School Street. After reading the legal notice ESMAY stated the case would require a continuance due to abutter notification requirements. Ms. Smith stated the next scheduled meeting would be on August 28, 2018. ESMAY asked if that meeting would be work for the applicant. Ms. Smith stated the applicant would be in favor of meeting that date.

ESMAY called for vote. **MAYOR made a motion to continue the case until August 28, 2018.** EDWARDS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. **VOTE 7-0 with SIMON voting.**

2. **Review of the merger of 42 Lebanon Street Map 34, Lot 80 and 44 Lebanon Street Map 34, Lot 82; both lots are owned by the Town of Hanover.**

Meeting Date: July 3, 2018
ESMAY called the next item on the agenda and read the legal notice. ESMAY asked staff to address the item. Mr. Houseman stated that staff recommends the merger of the two lots with the condition that the site plan is approved. The Town Manager is favor of moving this project forward. The transfer of ownership to Twin Pine Housing Trust from the Town of Hanover will take place after the site plan approval.

ESMAY called for a motion to approve the merger. EDWARDS made a motion and it is seconded by DENT with the condition that the approval will not be effective until the site plan is approved. The motion passed unanimously. Vote 7-0 with Simon voting.

3. **P2018-48 Submission of application for Site Plan Review by Twin Pine Housing, as Agent for Town of Hanover, property owner of record, to construct a 3-story, 24 unit residential housing development at 42 Lebanon Street, Tax Map 34, Lot 80 and 44 Lebanon Street Map 34. Lot 82. Both lots are located in the “RO” zoning district.**

ESMAY called the next item on the agenda, P2018-48. ESMAY read the legal notice and asked the representatives to come forward. Representatives include Andrew Winter, Executive Director of the Twin Pines Housing Trust; Matt Giffen, architect; and Kevin Worden, Engineering Ventures.

Mr. Worden gave an overview of the engineering aspects of the proposed project. He went over the site design and construction process for the proposed project. Mr. Winter stated they were in the process of applying for tax credits. The approved site plan review application needed to be submitted with the tax credit application to the State in August. Mr. Worden stated the construction team’s goal was to make sure a much of the site as possible will be maintained and used through the entire construction process. Phase 1 shows how the site will look when the new building is being constructed. It will start with the demolition of the existing structures at 42 and 44 Lebanon Street. The completion of the Phase 1 will be the transfer of residents from the old
buildings to the new building. Then the existing residential buildings will be demolished. The 24 new units in the new building is all Twin Pines can propose at this time due to the funding process.

Phase 2 is a proposed future design that will allow for future development. An image of the full build out of Phase 2 was shown. It includes an addition to the new Phase 1 building, a path that is used for connectivity through the entire site, and additional parking to replace what is being displaced by the new building addition. The representatives have meet with the Department of Public Works and have worked together on the plans for Phase 2.

Lighting for the site include LED fixtures that meet the Town’s lighting requirements. There are several trees worth protecting that are labeled on the plans. New trees are proposed on the landscape plan to take the place of those that have to be removed during the construction process.

SIMON asked about the pedestrian connection between the Black Center and Lebanon Street through the site. Mr. Worden showed the ADA accessible pedestrian path on the plans. There would be some disruption because the path would go through the parking lot. Mr. Winter stated that they will know about approved financing in October and would be able to start construction next summer. While Phase 1 is under construction, the representatives would be submitting applications for Phase 2 with the Town and New Hampshire Housing Authority. Ideally, they would be able to move smoothly into Phase 2 in 2020 with completion in 2021. CARTER asked where the closest Advance Transit stop was located. The closest stop was on Lebanon Street close to CO-OP and it was accessed by the Blue Line. ESMAY asked if there was going to be a presentation of the landscaping plan. Mr. Giffen stated he wished to address a few items concerning the landscaping. He stated the residents have done a wonderful job doing their own landscaping and take a lot of pride in it. The plan calls for digging up and saving many of the bushes and smaller trees and using them for the new design. DENT asked where the gardens would be located. The gardens would be in the green areas by the path and on the north side of the building. DENT wished to see the Town parking plan on the south side of the building and
see how it connected to the Black Center. Staff stated the Town parking plans are in a concept phase and there is nothing to show at this time. The Public Works Department knows there is a demand for parking for the Black Center and trying to fit in as many spaces as possible. DENT expressed concerns over the site not being planned as an entire campus. Mr. Houseman stated the Town would not own the senior housing portion but still own the Black Center portion of the site. Mr. Worden added that they are planning on using Summer Street for the main vehicle route from the site.

ESMAY asked the Board if they had any more questions before they move to determine the completeness of the application. SIMON asked about outdoor seating and other hardscape components of the landscaping. Mr. Giffen stated it would be described in Phase 2. There were currently a lot of outdoor benches on the site that can be reused but exact locations would be determined after construction and utility work is complete. The Board suggested adding small recreational spaces as well. MAYOR asked about the elevator and the decks. Mr. Giffen stated it would be a large elevator that was designed to fit a full sized stretcher.

Mr. Giffen gave a presentation regarding the architectural plans. Mr. Giffen showed images from a bird’s eye view and the view from the high school. He stated they added the decks, columns, cornices and porches to the front face of the building to help break up the overall scale and bring a more residential feel to the building. During Phase 2 an additional porch will be added. ESMAY asked about street trees to screen the front porch. Mr. Giffen stated there would be street trees as well as a garden with flowers and shrubs. There would also be an ADA accessible path. Materials for the new building include a combination of lap board and board and batten siding. The color scheme will be shades of tans, whites, and grays. The studio and one-bedroom apartments were arranged in order to pull the top floor back 5 feet to reduce the scale of building from the street. Mr. Giffen felt that the size of the building fit in well in this area of Town because of its proximity to the high school, the Black Center, and a church. CARTER asked about the use of studio apartments. Laura Beliveau stated the nature of the vouchers made it impossible for all residents to have a one bedroom apartment. The representatives stated the
studio apartments will be larger than what is on the site currently and they are placed in more desirable locations in order to make them more enticing to the residents.

ESMAY opened the floor to the public to comment on the completeness of the application. No one came forward.

ESMAY called for a motion to determine the completeness of the application. **MAYOR made a motion to find the application complete and it was seconded by EDWARDS with the following waivers:**

**Submission:**
Survey map dated within 6 months showing perimeter boundaries of the lot
Not applicable:
Location of 100 year floodplain **Standards:**
IXB2 A sign package is being worked on. Signs will be evaluated by the Zoning Administrator for conformance with the Ordinance and can be added as a field change.
Parking landscaping depth along the NW property line to accommodate the driveway and stormwater management features; the depth matches what exists today.

**The motion passed unanimously. VOTE 7-0 with SIMON voting.**

ESMAY asked if any member of the public wished to speak for or against the application. A member of the public wished the building had a more residential look. Mr. Giffen explained why certain elements were not being used in the design, such as knee walls. Another public suggestion was to add screening to the decks and have a slanted roof. Mr. Giffen stated the purpose of the flat roof was to hold solar panels.

DENT asked about the height of the Black Center. Mr. Giffen stated the Black Center was about 35 feet to the roof ridge and the proposed building is 34 feet. CRISWELL asked if the Phase 2 units were a mirror image of Phase 1. Mr. Giffen stated Phase 2 would be all one bedroom.
apartments. MUSCO asked for clarification on the use of the decks. Mr. Giffen stated they were public area and not associated with particular units. SIMON asked if the Lebanon Street ADA access path was less than a 5% grade so handrails would not have to be used. The representatives confirmed it would be less than a 5% grade. SIMON asked about using the “passive house” approach. Mr. Giffen stated that a passive house uses about a 90% less energy than a traditionally constructed house. Mr. Giffen stated they were hoping to accomplish something similar with this building by using triple pane windows, insulation, and solar panels. DENT stated she wished the building looked more residential and changing the roofline could help. The representatives talked about the heating and cooling systems and trying to work within the funding restraints. CARTER asked Mr. Winter if the residents would be able to control their own heating cooling. Mr. Winter stated they would.

ESMAY asked for staff to talk about the sign package. Mr. Houseman stated the applicant could apply and the zoning administrator would review it and then the Boards would approve or deny the application.

ESMAY called for a motion to approve or deny the application. MAYOR made a motion to approve the application and it was seconded by EDWARDS with the following conditions:

Prior to the Issuance of a Building Permit  Preconstruction

1. At the time the application for a building permit is submitted, the applicant will submit for review by the Department of Public Works “for construction” set of site utility plans stamped by the design engineer. Approval of the site utility plans must be given prior to the building permit being issued.

2. A preconstruction meeting shall be scheduled and held with Town Planning, Police, Fire and Public Works staff prior to the construction start.

3. At the discretion of the building inspector, independent code review of building plans may be required at the applicant’s expense.

During construction
1. On-site inspection of utilities and other site features may be required at the applicant’s expense.

Prior to the Certificate of Occupancy being issued

1. A stormwater maintenance plan (SWMP) shall be submitted for approval by Planning and Zoning staff that addresses routine maintenance and repairs for all permanent erosion control, stormwater conveyance and stormwater control systems.
2. A CAD file of the building footprint satisfactory to the Director of Public Works along with $1000 (for as-builts to be completed by the Town), will be submitted to the Town.

The motion was unanimously approved. Vote 7-0 with SIMON voting.


ESMAY called the next item on the agenda, P2018-48. DENT recused herself from the two Dartmouth College applications. ESMAY appointed MUSCO to vote in place of DENT.

Mr. Scherding came forward to address the Board. He gave an overview presentation and explained how this project fit into the larger plans for the west side of Dartmouth College. The purpose of reopening Old Tuck Drive is to ease traffic on Wheelock Street. The realignment and reconstruction of Old Tuck Drive is the first project because while construction takes place on other projects on the West End, the construction vehicles will be using Old Tuck Drive. Mr. Scherding stated they may be able to start as early as next week and would like to get asphalt down before November. Thayer Drive will be closed once Old Tuck Drive is open. All the projects on the West Side of campus will take about two and a half years to complete.

Kevin Worden addressed the engineering aspects of the project. The road is about half a mile long. He stated they will be working within the existing asphalt and drainage swales in order to
maintain the existing stone walls. Lighting along the road will be minimal. Fixtures will be spaced 80-120 feet apart. Better access to the loading dock at Murdough will be provided. From Wheelock Street, Old Tuck Drive will be a two way street and give access to the Ledyard Parking Lot. After the turn off to the parking lot, the drive becomes a one way access. There is a pedestrian crossing point marked by a raised speed table. Guardrails will be installed along Old Tuck Drive. There is a bike lane separated from vehicle traffic by a double yellow line. Close to Tuck Drive there will be sidewalks on both sides of the drive. Mr. Worden explained they have asked for a waiver to increase the light pole height from 15 feet to 20 feet. The existing lights are 15-17 feet. The representatives felt the 20” height provides a more uniform light. The light surface would cover the sidewalk, bike lane, and road. The foot candles would be 1 - 1.8.

Erica Wygonik spoke to the Board regarding the completed traffic study. Ms. Wygonik stated they looked at the situation that would generate the most traffic on Old Tuck Drive. The most traffic would be created when Old Tuck Drive is fully open and other drives through the West End of campus are closed to make it more pedestrian friendly. There will be fewer cars backing up traffic on Wheelock Street because there is a left turn lane at the entrance to Old Tuck Drive. There will be some vehicle rerouting through town. Overall, there will be a lot of change in traffic flows but not an increase in traffic. In staff review, it was asked what the impact of construction vehicles would be. Ms. Wygonik spoke with the construction company and they thought there would be about 5 trucks an hour, mostly in the morning. There would not be any vehicle delay.

ESMAY asked the Board if they had any comments or questions. MAYOR asked about truck routes once they made deliveries at the Murdough loading dock. Mr. Scherding stated the trucks will have to exit through campus. CRISWELL asked who the primary users of Old Tuck Drive would be. Ms. Wygonik stated that the main users would be drivers headed north. CRISWELL asked if a signal was need to turn on to Old Tuck Drive from the bridge. Ms. Wygonik stated there was not the volume of traffic to need a signal. SIMON asked about speeds and signage on
Old Tuck Drive. Ms. Wygonik stated that the travel times will not be much different than the current routes but the design features will make it feel faster because pedestrians, bikes, and vehicles will be separated. MUSCO asked about bike racks at the pedestrian stairs. There is currently not a rack there but there are plans for one. CARTER asked if there was enough signage to show pedestrian walkways and make it clear this is not a fast vehicle cut through. Ms. Wygonik thought there were enough elements to make it clear Old Tuck Drive was a shared roadway. Mr. Scherding stated the campus was open with busy streets and students were used to crossing streets and sharing roads. He stated the Director of Public Works suggested narrowing the road at pedestrian crossings to make it safer. Mr. Scherding said they talked about having a physical barrier between the vehicles and the bike lanes but currently it is not on the plans. ESMAY asked what the guardrail would look like. Mr. Scherding stated it would look like the existing granite bollards. EDWARDS asked if there were counts of bicycle traffic. Ms. Wygonik stated they did count bikes but she did not bring the data with her. EDWARDS asked if the current speed limit of 15 mph would be continued. He also asked if the road would be swept to clear leaves and pine needles.

ESMAY called for a motion to find the application complete. MAYOR made a motion to find the application complete with the following waivers:

**Submission:**
Survey map dated within 6 months showing perimeter boundaries of the lot
Height and number of stories of existing buildings
Shape, size and location of all proposed structures **Not applicable:**
Location and gross area of proposed buildings
Use of all rooms and areas
Elevation plan
Location of vents Mechanical equipment **Standards:**

Meeting Date: July 3, 2018
Height of exterior lighting. To allow the light poles to exceed the 15 foot limit and extend as high as 20 feet.

**CRISWELL seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. VOTE 7-0 with MUSCO voting.**

ESMAY asked if any member of the public wished to speak. Steve Fowler addressed the Board. He stated that this area is one of the last quiet natural areas of campus and it needs to be protected. He also raised concerns about light pollution and noise pollution. He stated the trucks backing up have loud beeping sounds and they idle. These noises impact the quiet natural area and the neighboring residential areas. Martha Hennessy addressed the Board. Ms. Hennessy raised concerns about increased traffic and how it will impact their neighborhood. Mr. Worden stated the vehicle lane would be 11 feet and the bike lane would be about 5 feet and those widths would keep traffic speed down. Linda Fowler addressed the Board. Ms. Fowler had concerns about the existing sewer system. She agreed with Mr. Fowler about disrupting one of the last natural areas on campus.

CARTER asked if it was possible to have a signal at Boat House Road that would tell other tucks that a truck is in the loading dock, or have set delivery times so there is not a backup of idling trucks. Ms. Scherding stated there would be room for the trucks to pull to the side and let cars go around and the truck could then back into the loading dock. There is room for two box trucks in that area. If there is a tractor trailer, the box trucks would have to wait on the side of the road. There are not enough deliveries during the day to set up a signal system. Mr. Scherding stated he had talked to residents about lighting concerns and believes this plan would not contribute to light pollution. They are proposing full cutoff fixtures. He stated that trucks backing up at 5:30 AM is in violation of the Town Noise Ordinance and can be changed. Linda Fowler spoke about truck traffic.
ESMAY asked staff what was the height of conventional street lights in Town. The ones on Main Street are about 17 feet in height. The ones at Tuck now are about 15-17 feet in height. There was no standard across the Town. Mr. Houseman observed that the poles are owned and installed by utility companies, historically without reference to Town height standards.

Mr. Scherding stated he wanted to go over the stormwater engineering plans. Mr. Worden stated most stormwater in this area is surface water. The inlets do get clogged with leaves and debris. The solution is to bring a storm line up the road and have domed inlets at more frequent intervals. The water will be brought down to the riverside parking lot and be treated at that location. The water will be discharged to the Connecticut River once treated. The sewer will be replaced to meet modern day standards. Mr. Houseman stated the plans have been reviewed at staff review and the permits will be reviewed by the state.

ESMAY asked the Board if they had any comments or questions. SIMON asked about the lighting waiver and wanted clarification on the requested height. Ms. Smith stated the waiver should be extended from 15 feet to 20 feet.

ESMAY called for a motion to approve or deny the application. MAYOR made a motion to approve the application and seconded by CRISWELL with the following conditions:

Prior to the Issuance of a Building Permit Preconstruction

1. At the time the application for a building permit is submitted, the applicant will submit for review by the Department of Public Works “for construction” set of site utility plans stamped by the design engineer. Approval of the site utility plans must be given prior to the building permit being issued.

2. A preconstruction meeting shall be scheduled and held with Town Planning, Police, Fire and Public Works staff prior to the construction start.

3. Receipt of an approved permit for Alteration of Terrain issued by NH DES. During construction

Meeting Date: July 3, 2018
1. On-site inspection of utilities and other site features may be required at the applicant’s expense.

Prior to the Certificate of Occupancy being issued
1. A stormwater maintenance plan (SWMP) shall be submitted for approval by Planning and Zoning staff that addresses routine maintenance and repairs for all permanent erosion control, stormwater conveyance and stormwater control systems.
2. A CAD file of the improvements satisfactory to the Director of Public Works along with $1000 (for as-builts to be completed by the Town), will be submitted to the Town.

The motion passed unanimously. Vote 7-0 with SIMON and MUSCO voting.

5. P2018-45 Submission of Application for Site Plan Review by John Scherding, Agent for the Trustees of Dartmouth College, property owner of record, to construct a scoreboard at the tennis courts located at 4 Summer Court, Tax Map 34, Lot 32, in the “I” zoning district.

ESMAY called the next item on the agenda, P2018-45, and read the legal notice. Mr. Scherding, Nik Fiore, Engineer Ventures; and Jason Rouillard, Project Manager; addressed the Board. Mr. Scherding went over the location and the design of the proposed scoreboard. There was a slight modification in the location, the scoreboard will be installed outside the fence instead of inside the fence. The scoreboard will use LED lights. The application has been presented to the Zoning Board of Appeals and will receive a decision the following week. Dartmouth owns much of the abutting properties. There is a really dense tree buffer between the tennis area and the residential area. The residential neighbors have been contacted and Dartmouth has worked with them to come to an agreement. Jeff Doyle has requested two trees be planted in place of one that is being removed. Dartmouth representatives agreed with this request. Rob Ceplikas stated that about half the tennis matches are held outside and the scoreboard will be used on those occasions.

EDWARDS asked if they considered other locations. They had looked at another location but it was determined that if they moved to the other sides of the court lighting would impact the...
residential neighborhoods more than the proposed location. ESMAY asked if the illumination lit the entire area. Mr. Scherding stated it was just enough light to be able to read the scoreboard.

ESMAY called for a motion regarding the completeness of the application. **MAYOR made a motion to find the application complete and it was seconded by EDWARDS with the following waivers:**

**Submission:**

Vicinity Sketch
Survey map dated within 6 months showing perimeter boundaries of the lot
Site Context Map
  Uses of abutting properties
Shape, size and location of existing and proposed structures including typical elevations; Height and number of stories of existing buildings
Site Plan with buildings, streets, driveways, parking, accessible spaces
Vehicular and pedestrian circulation plan
Utility Plan showing location of vents and mechanical equipment
Landscaping plan
Paving, Grading and Drainage Plan
Construction Staging Plan showing location of construction trailer and displaced parking plan

**Not applicable:**

Location and gross area of proposed buildings
Proposed streets, driveways, parking spaces and sidewalks, off street regular and accessible parking
Areas for loading and unloading
Front, side and rear setbacks
Height and number of stories of proposed buildings
Proposed grades
Location of water resources and man made drainage features
100 yr. flood information
All rights of ways and easements
Use of all rooms and areas
Elevation plan
Utility Plan showing location of vents and mechanical equipment
Construction staging plan showing location of trailers, displaced parking plan
Plans for snow removal

**Standards:**
IX A1 Site Characteristics
IXB3 Landscaping and Screening
IXB5 Stormwater Management
IXB6 Groundwater Protection
IXB7 Snow Storage and Removal

*The motion was approved unanimously. Vote 7-0 with SIMON and MUSCO voting.*

ESMAY asked if any member of the public wished to speak for or against the application. No one came forward.

SIMON asked if the abutters request needed to be added to the conditions. Ms. Smith stated the new tree locations and a note about the request needed to be shown on the plans.

ESMAY called for a motion to approve or deny the application. **MAYOR made a motion to approve the application and CRISWELL seconded it with the following conditions:** Prior to the Issuance of a Building Permit and Preconstruction

1. At the discretion of the building inspector, independent code review of building plans may be required at the applicant’s expense.
2. Receipt of an approved permit from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
3. Submission of a plan acceptable to Planning and Zoning staff showing the proposed landscaping. **During construction**

Meeting Date: July 3, 2018
1. On-site inspection of utilities and other site features may be required at the applicant’s expense.

The motion passed unanimously. Vote 7-0 with SIMON and MUSCO voting.

6. Minutes June 5, 2018
DENT rejoined the Board. ESMAY appointed MUSCO to vote in place of SIM. ESMAY called for the next item on the agenda. The minutes from the June 5, 2018 meeting. After review, DENT made a motion to approve the minutes. EDWARDS seconded the motion and the item passed unanimously. Vote 7-0 with MUSCO voting.

7. Other Business
There was no other business.

8. Adjourn
There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:20 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Catheryn Hembree