

**PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 22, 2011 at 7:30 PM  
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

In attendance:

**Members:** Bill Dietrich, Judith Esmay, Joan Garipay, Kate Connolly (Selectmen's Representative)

**Alternates:** Iain Sim

**Staff:** Vicki Smith, Jonathan Edwards

Others: See attached sheet

**1. MINUTES FEBRUARY 8, 2011**

Review of minutes was postponed to March 8, 2011.

[The following 2 cases were heard together.]

- 2. 11-02 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW BY DARTMOUTH COLLEGE TO INSTALL AN AUDIBLE EMERGENCY WARNING SYSTEM ON A POLE ADJACENT TO THE DARTMOUTH OBSERVATORY ON OBSERVATORY ROAD, TAX MAP 38, LOT 83, IN THE "I" ZONING DISTRICT.**
- 3. 11-03 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW BY DARTMOUTH COLLEGE TO INSTALL AN AUDIBLE EMERGENCY WARNING SYSTEM ON THE ROOF OF MURDOUGH HALL, 31 TUCK MALL, TAX MAP 33, LOT 83, IN THE "I" ZONING DISTRICT.**

Tim McNamara, of the Dartmouth College Real Estate Office, presented the applications. He said Dartmouth has an emergency warning system in place for students, faculty, and staff that transmits emails and text messages and is relatively effective for those that have access to the necessary technology. The proposed audible system would function more like an air raid siren but can also transmit live or pre-recorded messages. It is similar to that which has been installed at a number of colleges/universities throughout the U.S. in response to recent acts of violence on campus.

McNamara reported that Dartmouth has already obtained ZBA approval for use of the units and annual testing.

The two locations proposed include:

- On top of the mechanical penthouse at the Murdough Center at the end of Tuck Drive. This unit will consist of a short foundation frame with a speaker array on top and measure just below 60' in height.
- On Observatory Hill. This unit will consist of a 49' freestanding, steel tower, with an 11' speaker array on top.

The proposed locations were chosen by consultants due to their minimal visual/construction impacts and maximum campus coverage. Two units are needed due to the shape of the campus. The units will be virtually invisible, screened by trees of similar height.

Both units will be fed by electrical power from adjoining buildings. These are self-testing units that do not require routine maintenance. The alarms are activated via an encrypted, secure radio signal from the Safety & Security office. There are no lights proposed as part of the installations.

ESMAY asked whether there would be a public campaign regarding what to expect and how to react when the alarms are activated. McNamara said yes, Dartmouth will publicize annual testing schedules in the local newspaper. DIETRICH questioned what types of emergencies would qualify for their use. McNamara said the primary reason would be to alert of a violent situation on campus, but they would also be activated for events such as a chemical spill or extreme weather. Smith asked if the alarms would be heard from inside buildings. McNamara said yes, in most buildings; they may not be heard in deep basement areas.

There were no comments from the public.

ESMAY noted that there were 23 waivers requested for Case No. 11-02.

**It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by DIETRICH, to find the application complete with the following waivers:**

- a. Certification, dated within six (6) months, of a currently valid boundary survey by a land surveyor licensed to practice in New Hampshire. The perimeter boundaries of the lot or lots on which the project is located, including compass bearings, distances, and lot areas;**
- b. Existing and proposed grades, including topographic contours at intervals not exceeding five (5) feet;**
- c. The location of water resources, other significant natural features, and man-made features including, but not limited to, existing roads, structures, and man-made drainage features. The plan shall also indicate those natural and manmade features which are to be removed, retained or altered;**
- d. The 100-year flood elevation, floodway and floodplain limit shall be included where applicable;**
- e. The use of abutting properties within one hundred (100) feet of the site boundary; roads, streets, and driveways within two hundred (200) feet of the site boundary, and trail easements of abutting properties within five hundred (500) feet of the site boundary;**
- f. All legal rights of ways and easements;**
- g. The shape, size, and location of all existing and proposed structures, including typical elevations;**
- h. The use of all rooms and areas;**
- i. Proposed streets, driveways, parking spaces, and sidewalks, with indication of direction of travel, the inside radii of all curves, the width of the traveled way of all streets, driveways and sidewalks, and the total number of parking spaces and handicapped parking spaces;**
- j. A circulation plan of the interior of the lot showing provisions for both vehicle**

- and pedestrian circulation;**
- k. All areas designated or intended for loading and unloading passenger or freight deliveries;**
- l. Fire lanes, fire hydrants, and emergency access;**
- m. The size and location of all existing and proposed public and private utilities;**
- n. The location of any vents (intake or exhaust) and nature thereof (for example: emergency generator exhaust, lab waste pipe vent, etc., building ventilation supply air areaway, etc.);**
- o. Mechanical equipment located exterior to, or on top of, any structures such as air handlers, generators, chillers, etc;**
- p. A plan for exterior lighting and signs;**
- q. Landscaping plan indicating plantings to be installed and natural cover to be retained. The plan shall specify in detail the size and types of shrubs, plants, caliber of trees, etc. Such plan shall also show the proposed landscaping and natural cover of the perimeter of the site including all sizes and types of trees, screens, fences, and walls and natural cover to be retained (See Article IX.B.3);**
- r. The dimensional requirements applicable to the site under the Hanover Zoning Ordinance;**
- s. The following zoning information:**
  - (1) Area of lot;**
  - (2) Location and gross area of existing and proposed buildings;**
  - (3) Off-street parking spaces;**
  - (4) Handicap/Accessible spaces;**
  - (5) Loading spaces;**
  - (6) Height and number of stories of existing and proposed buildings, with indication of height from finished grade to highest elevation of building and height of any towers, spires, chimneys, penthouses, or other similar rooftop structures; and**
  - (7) Front, side and rear setbacks;**
- t. Plans for snow removal and storage;**
- u. Paving, grading and drainage plans including but not limited to walks, steps, curbing and drainage structures;**
- v. All surface and subsurface storm drainage facilities, including town storm drainage facilities located immediately adjacent to the site;**
- z. Contents specific to review phases:**
  - (1) The application for design review and, if deemed necessary by the Planning Board, the application for final plan review shall fully address all comments and recommendations made by town staff at the staff evaluation meeting;**
  - (2) The application for final plan review shall contain a road and utility plan acceptable to and signed by the Director of Public Works. This road and utility plan shall be developed by the applicant with input from the Director of Public Works;**
  - (3) The application for final plan review shall fully address, to the satisfaction of the Planning Board, all comments and recommendations that were made by the Board at the design review hearings and reflected in the Board's design review action.**

**THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

ESMAY questioned the landscaping waiver request. Smith said the request is to waive the whole landscape plan.

DIETRICH asked whether a child would be able to climb the poles. McNamara said no, the poles are similar to light poles and do not have rungs or lattice work. The first 10' is just smooth pole leading up to a tamper-proof control box. GARIPAY asked of the width of the poles. McNamara said they will be 8-12". GARIPAY suggested a college student would be able to climb them, as has proven to be the case on similar structures around campus.

**It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by DIETRICH, to approve Case No. 11-02 for an audible emergency warning system on Observatory Hill. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

[Case 11-03]

**It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by DIETRICH, to find the application complete with the following waivers:**

- a. **Certification, dated within six (6) months, of a currently valid boundary survey by a land surveyor licensed to practice in New Hampshire. The perimeter boundaries of the lot or lots on which the project is located, including compass bearings, distances, and lot areas;**
- b. **Existing and proposed grades, including topographic contours at intervals not exceeding five (5) feet;**
- c. **The location of water resources, other significant natural features, and man-made features including, but not limited to, existing roads, structures, and man-made drainage features. The plan shall also indicate those natural and manmade features which are to be removed, retained or altered;**
- d. **The 100-year flood elevation, floodway and floodplain limit shall be included where applicable;**
- e. **The use of abutting properties within one hundred (100) feet of the site boundary; roads, streets, and driveways within two hundred (200) feet of the site boundary, and trail easements of abutting properties within five hundred (500) feet of the site boundary;**
- f. **All legal rights of ways and easements;**
- g. **The shape, size, and location of all existing and proposed structures, including typical elevations;**
- h. **The use of all rooms and areas;**
- i. **Proposed streets, driveways, parking spaces, and sidewalks, with indication of direction of travel, the inside radii of all curves, the width of the traveled way of all streets, driveways and sidewalks, and the total number of parking spaces and handicapped parking spaces;**
- j. **A circulation plan of the interior of the lot showing provisions for both vehicle and pedestrian circulation;**
- k. **All areas designated or intended for loading and unloading passenger or freight deliveries;**
- l. **Fire lanes, fire hydrants, and emergency access;**
- m. **The size and location of all existing and proposed public and private utilities;**

- n. The location of any vents (intake or exhaust) and nature thereof (for example: emergency generator exhaust, lab waste pipe vent, etc., building ventilation supply air areaway, etc.);
- o. Mechanical equipment located exterior to, or on top of, any structures such as air handlers, generators, chillers, etc;
- p. A plan for exterior lighting and signs;
- q. Landscaping plan indicating plantings to be installed and natural cover to be retained. The plan shall specify in detail the size and types of shrubs, plants, caliber of trees, etc. Such plan shall also show the proposed landscaping and natural cover of the perimeter of the site including all sizes and types of trees, screens, fences, and walls and natural cover to be retained (See Article IX.B.3);
- r. The dimensional requirements applicable to the site under the Hanover Zoning Ordinance;
- s. The following zoning information:
  - (1) Area of lot;
  - (2) Location and gross area of existing and proposed buildings;
  - (3) Off-street parking spaces;
  - (4) Handicap/Accessible spaces;
  - (5) Loading spaces;
  - (6) Height and number of stories of existing and proposed buildings, with indication of height from finished grade to highest elevation of building and height of any towers, spires, chimneys, penthouses, or other similar rooftop structures; and
  - (7) Front, side and rear setbacks;
- t. Plans for snow removal and storage;
- u. Paving, grading and drainage plans including but not limited to walks, steps, curbing and drainage structures;
- v. All surface and subsurface storm drainage facilities, including town storm drainage facilities located immediately adjacent to the site;
- z. Contents specific to review phases:
  - (1) The application for design review and, if deemed necessary by the Planning Board, the application for final plan review shall fully address all comments and recommendations made by town staff at the staff evaluation meeting;
  - (2) The application for final plan review shall contain a road and utility plan acceptable to and signed by the Director of Public Works. This road and utility plan shall be developed by the applicant with input from the Director of Public Works;
  - (3) The application for final plan review shall fully address, to the satisfaction of the Planning Board, all comments and recommendations that were made by the Board at the design review hearings and reflected in the Board's design review action.

**THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

Edwards questioned if a functional location, not as close to the access of Tuck Mall, might be a better spot for this unit. McNamara said in speaking with the consultants, he was unaware of a better location in that area where it would be less visible. The roof-top location is also

beneficial for electrical feed purposes. McNamara reiterated that the Murdough unit would be innocuous most of the year. SIM questioned if a screen could be installed around it. McNamara said no.

**It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by DIETRICH, to approve Case No. 11-03 for an audible emergency warning system on Murdough Hall. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

#### **4. PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS FOR TOWN MEETING 2011**

The public hearing was opened.

Eliminate Student Residence as a Special Exception use in the “GR” zoning district - by amending Section 204.5, eliminating “*Student Residence*” from the Special Exception listing.

ESMAY noted that the proposed amendment was submitted by petition. Edwards confirmed that both petitioned amendments have been certified as having the requisite signatures. Copies of the Zoning Ordinance’s definition of ‘student residence’ were distributed.

CONNOLLY said the rationale for proposing this amendment is to try to avoid a ‘Paragon moment’, whereby a permitted use in a particular zoning district went ignored for many years and suddenly became a real problem. In the Paragon case it was the matter of allowing a CCRC in the “RR” zone. In this case it is allowing a student residence in the “GR” zone. ‘Student residence’ was left in the “GR” zone and separated out from the “I” zone in 1976. It does not exist in any other residential zone and should be removed from the “GR” zone. CONNOLLY said having a student residence in the “GR” zone would affect the character of the neighborhood. The “GR” zone is very small, densely populated, and very diverse. There is more than enough room in the “I” zone to accommodate student residences. CONNOLLY said this would not affect people’s ability to rent to students in the “GR” zone.

DIETRICH questioned whether it was premature to make this change and expressed concern for unintended consequences. He said such a change should be done on a broad-based approach, similar to that which the Residential Project Committee (RPC) is working toward. DIETRICH questioned Dartmouth’s plans for the Rivercrest area, currently zoned “GR-4”, and suggested it may not be problematic to have a graduate facility there. He said under the current Zoning regulations, if someone proposed a student residence in the “GR” zone, they would need to prove the use would not have an adverse affect on the character of the neighborhood in order to obtain a Special Exception.

SIM questioned the problem of having student residences in the residential district. Arthur Gardiner, of 8 Sargent Street, said student-occupied houses have proven to be a serious impairment on the character of the neighborhood. Noise and traffic issues are prevalent and continuing problems. Gardiner said there may be parts of the “GR-1” district that are different from others. His neighborhood is now predominantly single-family residential. Gardiner questioned the definition of ‘*student residence*’ and whether the wording ‘*in conjunction with another institutional use*’ is sufficient to deter student residences in the “GR” district. He said the ZBA’s review of the Special Exception criteria is relative to what

the Ordinance permits, not what is there at that point in time. Gardiner said if a student residence were placed in his neighborhood, it would not be consistent with the expectation of the neighbors.

Peter Williamson, of 5 Lewin Road, spoke in favor of the amendment stating that facilities in the area are threatened by this very wide ranging Special Exception.

Sarah Buckley, of 1 Sargent Street, spoke in favor of the amendment relative to the value of the character of the neighborhood. She said she would prefer to see the burden of proof placed upon an organization that wishes to put a student institution in the area rather than vice versa.

Edwards said Dartmouth is not the only institution that may wish to develop a student residence in the "GR" district. A national fraternal organization could come forward in which case there might be less of a connection with local interests that might tend to mitigate adverse affects.

GARIPAY questioned what affect this will have on the RPC's work to address some of these same issues if this amendment is passed. DIETRICH suggested the RPC would continue to study this in a broader context, looking beyond the Sargent Street neighborhood. The Ordinance could then be further refined based upon their findings.

SIM said the public comments point to a failure or inadequacy of enforcement of the Noise Ordinance and traffic controls. The elimination of this Special Exception requirement would not address those issues. He said if a student residence is undesirable in the "GR" district, then trying to restrict them by limiting their use by Special Exceptions is not the way to go. The RPC should continue with its review of each of the Town's neighborhoods and determine what zoning is appropriate.

**It was moved by DIETRICH, seconded by CONNOLLY, to recommend to Town Meeting to pass the proposal, with the understanding that the Residential Project Committee will nonetheless pursue coming up with a more detailed recommendation as to where student residences and other kinds of student housing may well be located. ESMAY said this serves notice that the entire Ordinance is under review. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

Edwards asked the petitioners to provide him with a short statement of the problem so that it may be expressed to Town Meeting.

ESMAY announced that the Planning Board will recommend to the Selectboard the adoption of an ordinance that would require the regular inspection of all rental properties. She encouraged the public to attend the Selectboard meeting when the issue will be discussed. CONNOLLY reported that the State legislature passed a bill whereby all rental properties above four units have to be registered with the towns and cities in which they are located. Gardiner said enforcement is the issue. The Town does not have the money or staff to do this, so when passing a Rental Housing Ordinance it must be understood that at least the nuances will not be picked up.

Goose Pond Zoning District - add a new Section 204.10 as follows:

**TABLE 204.10**

**"GP" Goose Pond Zoning District**

**Objective:**

*The Goose Pond zoning district is established to distinguish the unique neighborhood around Goose Pond from surrounding areas. The Goose Pond District is an area of traditional seasonal summer camps and cottages that surround and front on Goose Pond. The primary land use is seasonal residences whose inhabitants use Goose Pond and the surrounding area recreationally. Therefore, reliable water quality, Class B or better, in Goose Pond is critical to the continued recreational use of the Pond and to the wildlife which lives in and around the pond.*

*The residential use of Goose Pond was established and developed prior to town-wide zoning. Upon adoption of the first town-wide zoning, the Goose Pond area was classified with the Forestry District. The Goose Pond area is sufficiently distinct from the Forestry District with respect to use, building size and configuration, lot size, residential density and proximity to the waterfront of Goose Pond that a new zoning district is appropriate. The geographical boundaries of the Goose Pond District reflect these distinctions.*

*The Goose Pond District is fully subdivided and increases in either the density of residences or additional uses are prohibited. District regulations have been established to ensure these restrictions will be enforced.*

*Uses permitted in the area shall be consistent with the dominant seasonal residential use and strong orientation to Goose Pond. Recognizing that residents are concerned with the quiet enjoyment of their property and the Pond, commercial uses and other uses that are acceptable in the surrounding Forestry District are not compatible with this concept. Of paramount importance is the maintaining the water quality in Goose Pond so that it is safe for swimming and other water based recreational activities and can support a healthy aquatic ecosystem. Therefore, the use of NH DES approved advanced septic technology in lieu of traditional leach fields is encouraged.*

**Uses:**

<b>Permitted Uses:</b>	<b>Allowed by Special Exception:</b>
1. Seasonal Dwelling	1. Essential Service
2. Use accessory to permitted use	2. Use accessory to Special Exception

**Area and Dimensions:**

*(all measurements in feet & inches unless otherwise stated)*

*Different area and dimension standards apply depending upon whether the lot includes water frontage.*

**Waterfront Lots**

**Minimum**

<u>Lot Size</u>	<u>Frontage*</u>	<u>Minimum Setbacks</u>				<u>Maximum Building</u>		<u>Lot</u>
<u>Area</u>	<u>Frontage*</u>	<u>Front</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>Rear</u>	<u>Top of Bank</u>	<u>Height</u>	<u>Footprint</u>	<u>Coverage</u>
21,570 sf	75	20	10	10	50	24**	5.5% or 1200 sf***	8%

**Lots with No Water Frontage**

**Minimum**

<u>Lot Size</u>	<u>Frontage*</u>	<u>Minimum Setbacks</u>			<u>Maximum Building</u>		<u>Lot</u>
<u>Area</u>	<u>Frontage*</u>	<u>Front</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>Rear</u>	<u>Height</u>	<u>Footprint</u>	<u>Coverage</u>
21,570 sf	100	30	10	10	24	5.5% or 1200 sf***	8%

*\*Frontage is measured along the edge of the right-of-way providing access to the lot.*

*\*\*Height is measured from the Goose Pond waterfront side of structure.*

*\*\*\* The maximum aggregate building foot print shall not exceed the smaller area: 5.5% of the lot area or 1200 square feet.*



**Other Restrictions:**

1. *No new lots may be created in the Goose Pond District, except that lot mergers and boundary line adjustments which do not make a lot more non-conforming are permitted.*
2. *In recognition of the fact that many waterfront lots cannot reasonably accommodate development respecting the 75 foot water resource buffer set forth in Section 702, waterfront lots in the Goose Pond District may be developed as follows:*
  - a) *Excepting water dependent structures, new structures on waterfront lots shall be 50 feet from the top of the bank of Goose Pond.*
  - b) *On a waterfront lot, any addition to an existing building or replacement structure shall be either:*
    - (i) *no closer than 50 ft. from the edge of Goose Pond;*
    - (ii) *located on the existing footprint; or*
    - (iii) *located no closer to Goose Pond than the closest point of the existing building edge that is farthest from and most nearly parallel to Goose Pond.*
  - c) *In addition to NH DES review and approval, all new and replacement septic systems shall also be reviewed pursuant to Section 702.7.*
  - d) *No decks or porches may be enclosed unless they are a minimum of 50 ft. from the top of the bank of Goose Pond.*

ESMAY advised that the Board had reviewed this amendment at length previously.

SIM noted that one of the emails submitted to staff regarding this amendment suggested that one particular individual would benefit from this more than others. He said he assumed that was because that individual had a larger plot of land, not because he was being singled out for preferential treatment.

**It was moved by SIM, seconded by DIETRICH, to send this amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to add a new Section 204.10 to create the “GP” Goose Pond zoning district and amend the Hanover, NH Zoning Map Town-Wide referred to in Section 202 to include this district forward to Town Meeting. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

Downtown Parking Reduction – to amend Section 403.2 to read,

“Subject to Section 405, all expanded portions of existing buildings and changed land uses occurring after the effective date of this ordinance must conform to off-street parking requirements set forth in Section 404.

*Small additions of less than 1,000 gross square feet of structure which do not expand the use of the building but serve solely to accommodate enhanced function of the building are exempt from the parking requirements. Typical additions would be exterior construction of utility enclosures, stair towers or elevator towers. Similar utility spaces contained within the structure are not exempt from the gross square foot parking calculation. Not more than one such exempt addition may be constructed in any 5-year period.”*

CONNOLLY said the proposed amendment allows people to put in or adjust utility spaces without generating a parking requirement within a given time frame and for projects within a certain size restriction. Qualifying projects would fall under the purview of the Planning Board Minor Project Review Committee (MPRC).

Smith expressed concern that the MPRC’s review does not cover use of the space. An unintended consequence is that the use could generate the need for additional parking. Smith said she would support this in the “OL” or “BM” districts, but not the “D” district, where

space is at such a premium. SIM said he does not see this as a role for Smith or the MPRC to determine whether something can go ahead.

ESMAY said she was troubled by the wording, “*which do not expand the use of the building but serve solely to accommodate enhanced function of the building*”. DIETRICH suggested the ZBA might have a difficult time determining the difference between “use” and “function”.

Edwards said the Board does not have the time to deal with downtown parking right now and the means belong to more than just the Planning Board. There is clearly a financial element that needs to be interjected into this. Smith said the business community must also be involved. If they are going to fill their buildings with restaurants, they need to be realistic about what those restaurants will require for parking.

ESMAY suggested postponing action on both amendments related to downtown parking so that both may be considered together. SIM said he sensed there was not a strong majority in favor of this going forward. The Board has heard from the proponent and Mr. Campion at previous meetings.

**It was moved by SIM, seconded by GARIPAY, to withdraw this article to amend Section 403.2 by adding a paragraph which exempts additions to accommodate and enhance the building function from parking requirements from consideration for this Town Meeting. THE BOARD VOTED FOUR IN FAVOR, ONE OPPOSED (CONNOLLY). THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**It was moved by DIETRICH, seconded by SIM, to continue the public hearing on the amendment to Section 404.1 to March 8, 2011. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

Right-of-Way Signs - Amend Section 317.1 A to read, “No sign other than official street signs or traffic directions shall be erected or maintained within the street right-of-way *without approval of the Board of Selectmen or the New Hampshire Department of Transportation as appropriate.*”

CONNOLLY said she was informed by the Town Manager that this was requested because signs are all over the place.

**It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by DIETRICH, to put this on the Warrant without change.** Edwards said this has been percolating in staff discussions for many years. It was a confused jurisdiction. It seemed appropriate to consolidate the decision making with the Board of Selectmen. **THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

## **5. PROGRESS REPORT ON CENTERRA NORTH VILLAGE CENTER PROJECT**

Edwards provided copies of email communications from Gail Dahlstrom, DHMC Facilities Director, and Paul Olsen, DCRE Director, in which both state this is not the time for them to devote time or financial resources to this project given more pressing institutional needs. SIM asked where this left the applicant who had agreed to defer his request for rezoning pending the outcome of this village center project. Edwards said the applicant is still without

the practical prerequisites to move forward. Access, sewer, and water service will be large hurdles for this development.

DIETRICH suggested putting this project on hold for one year given the problems with this proposal and all of the other priorities before the Board. Smith said the rezoning should be done in a way that is planned for, not because an applicant wants it. She said the Board has already discussed taking this on at the conclusion of the residential project. ESMAY, DIETRICH, and SIM agreed stating that this will seem much more clear if done at the end of the residential project and after the CIP is completed, that the focus should remain as the appropriateness of residential housing in the area rather than planning for a specific project, and that this should be planned rather than done in response to something put in front of them. Edwards said if the applicant could come forward with the prerequisites within a period of time then it would make sense to work more actively on this.

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

Affordable Housing Bill: The Board discussed Edwards' handout from the AHC about a bill introduced to the State legislature that would undo the State's legal commitment to affordable housing.

NH 2013-2022 Ten-Year Transportation Improvement Plan (TYP): The Board discussed the UVLSRPC's February 10, 2011 letter to Brian Walsh concerning the TYP. Edwards said it was suggested to him by Nate Miller, UVLSRPC Senior Planner, to nominate the installation of a sidewalk and bike lane on Greensboro Road and the reconstruction of the Greensboro/Etna/Great Hollow Rds intersection for inclusion in the TYP. SIM suggested including additional park-and-ride facilities throughout town.

Sustainability Committee Workshop: Edwards announced that the Sustainability Committee is sponsoring another workshop on Saturday at the Richard W Black Community/Senior Center at 8:30.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 9:57 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Rivard, P&Z Administrative Assistant