

**PLANNING BOARD  
APRIL 5, 2011 at 7:30 PM  
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

In attendance:

**Members:** Bill Dietrich, Judith Esmay, Charles Faulkner, Joan Garipay, Jim Hornig, Michael Mayor, Kate Connolly (Selectmen's Representative)

**Alternate:** Iain Sim

**Staff:** Vicki Smith, Jonathan Edwards

Others: See attached sheet

1. **MINUTES:** The minutes of March 22, 2011 were approved.
  
2. **11-09 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW BY DARTMOUTH COLLEGE TO RELOCATE THE STUDENT SWIM DOCK AND CREATE AN ADA-ACCESSIBLE PATH TO THE CONNECTICUT RIVER AT 33 TUCK MALL, TAX MAP 33, LOT 83, IN THE "I" ZONING DISTRICT.**

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

Joanna Whitcomb and Ellen Arnold of Dartmouth College and Roy Schiff of Milone & MacBroom Engineering, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Science presented the application and made the following assertions:

The plan is to relocate the swim dock to a safer location for swimming and to create an ADA-accessible path to the river's edge. The project also includes introducing stormwater management to the riverfront, removal of invasive species along the bank, and re-vegetating the bank. All of the edits from Staff Review and the Conservation Commission have been incorporated into the plans. The College has already obtained a wetland and shoreland permits from NH DES and applications are pending with the NH Dept. of Safety and Hanover ZBA. The College will also be conducting an initial archeological review of the area over the next week or so.

**Board Comments/Questions:**

- Is the river current different at the proposed site than it is at the present site?
  - Applicant said the College has heard from riverfront users that the proposed site is more sheltered. Another part of the project involves monitoring the velocity of the current and developing a rating curve for swimming conditions.
- Is there a plan to remediate the area of the existing dock after the dock is taken away?
  - Applicant said no, not at the moment.
- What is the intent of the entrance kiosk?

- Applicant said it will house new signage about safety, conditions of the river, and a display for the monitoring equipment.
- Stormwater discharge coming down the bank will be better than it is now?
  - Applicant said the goal is to capture as much as possible and try to boost the vegetation to filter it. There will be a series of stormwater detention ponds added to capture water coming down the ADA-accessible ramp.
- Are there any detention ponds there now?
  - Applicant said no.

**Staff Comments/Questions:**

- How will the gangplank and lower platform slab be surrounded?
  - Applicant confirmed the dock landing will be surrounded by a combination of wooden bench or railing. The back of the bench will be of the same height as the railing.
- When the dock and gangplank are removed, will there be a gate across there?
  - Applicant said that had been suggested. There will be gates and closure signs at the top of the bank when the docks are closed.
- The approval should include a condition for daily oversight by the design engineer including weekends and until the area is vegetated to prevent erosion.

**Public Comments/Questions:** None

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

**Waivers Requested:**

Procedural:

1. Design Review

Submissions:

1. Certification, dated within six (6) months, of a currently valid boundary survey by a land surveyor licensed to practice in New Hampshire.
2. Off street parking spaces, loading and handicapped spaces.
3. Heights and stories of existing and proposed buildings.
4. Abutting land uses shown on plan.
5. Vehicle and pedestrian circulation plan.
6. Snow storage plans.
7. Existing and proposed contour intervals are not shown. Spot elevations are noted.

Defense of each of these waivers is included in the submission materials.

**It was moved by DIETRICH, seconded by CONNOLLY, to grant the waivers listed above. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

**It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by MAYOR, to find the application complete with the above listed waivers. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

There being no further discussion, **it was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by HORNIG, to approve this request with the following conditions:**

1. **During construction, there shall be general oversight of the project by the design engineer and daily inspection of the project site for conditions that could cause erosion.**

**2. Prior to the beginning of construction, the appropriate zoning approvals shall have been granted.**

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

**3. 11-10 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW BY THE TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE TO INSTALL SEVEN NEW LIGHTING FIXTURES AND A NEW SOUND SYSTEM AT MEMORIAL FIELD. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 6 SOUTH PARK STREET, TAX MAP 34, LOT 16, IN THE "I" ZONING DISTRICT.**

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

Ellen Arnold, Bob Ceplikas, and Laura Black of Dartmouth College, Russ Rohloff of Pathways Consulting, Mike Barry of Musco Lighting, Ben Swanson from RSG, and Jeff Fullerton of Acentech, presented the application and made the following assertions:

The primary objective is to extend practice times and have occasional night football games. The project involves upgrading and improving the stadium's light & sound systems, parking & traffic management, and operations plan.

Lighting: The proposed lighting design includes 7 new fixtures: 3 poles affixed to the top of Floren Varsity House, and 4 free-standing 60' poles. The same fixtures will be used as was installed at Burnham Field. The lighting goals are to: (1) try to achieve NCAA standards for intercollegiate play; (2) provide for safe practice mode; and (3) try to minimize the impact to the neighborhood. A 50 fc level will be used only 5 times a year for game level activity. The majority of recreation level activities will use a 30 fc range. A depiction was provided of projected tree growth and what that will do to block additional spill light. The system will be monitored and can be programmed to shut off automatically. Kate Connolly inquired as to lighting source and was told that LED technology was many years away.

A waiver is requested for the light pole heights, which is limited by the Site Plan Regs to 15'. Applicant contends utilizing 15' poles places the lights in the direct sightline of the players.

Traffic & Parking: Traffic and parking analyses looked at vehicle & pedestrian traffic, parking occupancy, and shuttle ridership. The analyses indicate that shifting the game to an evening setting will: (1) add football traffic to the lower background volume, resulting in a lower overall traffic level in town; (2) slightly lower the overall parking demand in town; and (3) slightly lower peak pedestrian traffic, but still have quite a lot of pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the field. RSG recommends a police presence be maintained at peak crossings. The bulk of overflow parking occurs at the Dewey Field Lot, which still has quite a lot of capacity. RSG recommends continuing shuttle service to/from that lot.

Sound System: Applicant advised of the Zoning Administrator's ruling that use of the existing sound system is permitted. A noise level of 70 dBA or less has been set by the Zoning Administrator.

The proposal is to replace the current speakers with modern speakers that focus sound in the immediate vicinity and to augment them with additional speakers located in closer proximity to the spectators. The net result will be having a lot more speakers, utilized at a lower decibel level, that will far more effectively contain the sound to the stadium itself. Acentech recommends the system be zoned such that volumes of individual zones can be reduced or turned off. The maximum threshold allowed is 85 decibels.

Community Outreach: Letters were sent to immediate abutters and others describing the project, advising of an informational meeting, and welcoming feedback. Applicant stated people are generally quite supportive of the investments being made.

**Board Comments/Questions:**

- Will the sound system be used at night?
  - Applicant said yes.
- Does the change to allow evening use of the facility necessitate compliance with the 55 dBA evening noise standards?
  - Edwards said no, the non-conformance status exists without respect to time of day.
  - Applicant said the use (sound system) is not changing; rather the mechanism by which it is delivered is changing and those changes will make the system less non-conforming.
- Will the multiple speakers create an echo effect?
  - Applicant said echo from one side to another will be very minimal.
- How do you avoid the fact that the arrival time from the different speakers is different?
  - Applicant said it comes down to trying to get the speakers as close to the audience as possible.
- Will air-horns be utilized?
  - Applicant said coaches have not used air horns for a long time.
- Would it be difficult if a limitation was placed on the kinds of announcements that could go out?
  - Applicant said the College would be reticent to agree to a condition that regulates the content of the announcements and would much prefer to stick to the limits of what is actually regulated.

**Public Comment:**

Bryant Denk expressed concern for the amount of light that will be generated from the proposed installation of 69 1500 watt bulbs. He said there has been talk in Hanover about lowering the carbon footprint with the streetlights and questioned how this will affect that. He said there will be a lot of light bouncing off windows from adjacent properties. Denk provided pictures of various illuminated playing fields and pictures of properties adjacent to those fields. He said extending practice time to 9:00 PM will have a major impact on the neighborhood. People already do not want to rent units adjacent to illuminated playing fields.

- Applicant rebutted stating the light will be very contained as per the materials provided with the application submittal. The College is trying to limit the number of occasions where there would be a higher fc usage. The College is regulated by NCAA requirements in that regard.

John Schumacher advised of an error in the depiction of one of his properties included in the submission materials. He said this development will significantly adversely affect his

properties; they will be more difficult to rent. He spoke about an existing buffer of pine trees along his property and asked if the College could be required to replace them with a like structure should anything happen to them. Schumacher requested that the sound system not be utilized during practice sessions.

- Applicant said the sound system will not be used during practices and the College would be glad to replace the pine trees if something happens to them.

Marilyn Denk questioned the wording of the operations plan as it states '*5 events will be allowed annually after 7:00 PM*' then states '*none of the 5 events will be scheduled to start later than 7:00 PM.*' She expressed concern for the 9:00 PM practice session cutoff and questioned the excessive use. Denk asked who will coordinate the use of these fields and how to restrict use of all of the illuminated fields at the same time. She questioned tailgating activities and whether they would be restricted from lasting into the night hours. Denk said crowd noise cannot be controlled and will impact the neighborhood. She said Hanover is losing its sky to tall buildings, losing its night sky to lighting, and losing its rural character.

- Applicant said the operations plan wording was borrowed from a previous Board approval. The language means that the 5 event limit applies to any event that reaches 7:00 PM, regardless of its start time. The second statement refers to the fact that no events will be scheduled to start any later than 7:00 PM.
- Applicant suggested use of the field would be minimal in December, intermittent in January (depending on the weather), and more regular in February, March, and April.
- Applicant said the proposal is to allow fewer events per year at this facility than is allowed at the other illuminated fields and for an extra hour of practice time as that does not involve spectators, traffic, parking, and sound system levels. The general experience with neighbors around Scully Fahey is favorable feedback from them.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

A site visit to Burnham Field was suggested. There was no consensus to conduct a site visit.

### **Waivers Requested:**

#### Procedural:

1. Design Review

#### Submissions:

1. Certification, dated within six (6) months, of a currently valid boundary survey by a land surveyor licensed to practice in New Hampshire.
2. Off street parking spaces, loading and handicapped spaces
3. Height and number of stories of existing buildings.
4. Existing and proposed grades and contour intervals are not shown.
5. Water resources and manmade drainage features.
6. Existing location of water resources and manmade drainage features.
7. Elements of the circulation plan including non-vegetated areas, including existing and proposed streets, driveways and loading areas with traffic patterns and dimensional data.
8. Building elevations
9. Utility plan
10. Landscape plan including areas designated for snow storage and landscaping

11. Grading and Drainage Plan including existing and proposed grades, surface and subsurface drainage systems, temporary drainage controls, and phasing plan.
12. Snow removal plans
13. Construction staging plan with displaced parking.
14. Road and utility plan

Standards:

1. Pole height to exceed 15 feet.

**It was moved by HORNIG, seconded by MAYOR, to grant the waivers listed above. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

**It was moved by HORNIG, seconded by MAYOR, to find the application complete with the above listed waivers. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

There was open discussion amongst the Board, applicant, and public regarding proposed conditions of approval.

**It was moved by HORNIG, seconded by DIETRICH, to approve the proposal subject to the following conditions:**

1. Use of the sound system and lights shall be as presented in the *Memorial Field Lighting and Sound Systems Operations Plan* prepared by Dartmouth College Athletic Department, April 4, 2011;
2. During the five year period following the completion of the project, the vegetative screen of trees and shrubs located along the southern edge of Memorial Field and north of Lots 34/69 and 34/70 shall be maintained such that as trees die, they are replaced with viable, comparable fast-growing species;
3. Contractors and construction workers are prohibited from parking on-street or in public parking spaces; and
4. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the light and sound levels at the property line will be verified, and the light or sound system altered if necessary to correspond to the levels set in the Zoning Ordinance.

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

4. **11-11 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW BY THE TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION TO THE PENTHOUSE LEVEL OF MACLEAN ENGINEERING SCIENCES CENTER BUILDING. THE PROPERTIES INVOLVED INCLUDE: 33 TUCK MALL, TAX MAP 33, LOT 22, AND 14 TUCK MALL, TAX MAP 33, LOT 83; BOTH IN THE "I" ZONING DISTRICT**

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

John Scherding of Dartmouth College presented the application and made the following assertions: A one-story addition is proposed on the top floor where there is currently a mechanical penthouse. The addition consists of 11 faculty offices and a graduate student work area. A construction logistics plan, requested by staff, will not be available until a contractor is chosen and puts one together.

**Board & Staff Comments/Questions:**

- What is in that space now?
  - Applicant said it is flat roof area.
- What is it that brings this project before Site Plan Review?
  - Smith said review is required because the addition is larger than 1,500 sf.
- Is it reasonable to assume the project will involve cranes and/or scaffolding?
  - Applicant said some sort of lift mechanism will be necessary. Some materials may literally come up the elevators.
- Pedestrian traffic patterns were questioned.
  - Applicant said there is a sidewalk of concern where the work will be taking place. There may be times when that traffic will need to be redirected.
- What is the anticipated construction period?
  - Applicant suggested a construction period of September to December.

**Public Comment:** None.

The public hearing was closed.

**Waivers Requested:**

Procedural:

1. Design Review

Submissions:

1. Certification, dated within six (6) months, of a currently valid boundary survey by a land surveyor licensed to practice in New Hampshire.
2. Off street parking spaces, loading and handicapped spaces
3. Existing and proposed contour intervals are not shown.
4. Proposed off-street parking spaces.
5. Existing location of water resources and manmade drainage features.
6. Elements of the circulation plan including non-vegetated areas, including existing and proposed streets, driveways and loading areas with traffic patterns and dimensional data.
7. Utility plan
8. Lighting and landscape plan including areas designated for snow storage and landscaping
9. Grading and Drainage Plan including existing and proposed grades, surface and subsurface drainage systems, temporary drainage controls, and phasing plan.
10. Snow removal plans
11. Construction staging plan displace parking.
12. Road and utility plan

Defense of each of these waivers is provided in the submission materials.

**It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by HORNIG, to grant the waivers listed above. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

**It was moved by HORNIG, seconded by MAYOR, to find the application complete with the above listed waivers. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

**It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by HORNIG, to approve the proposal subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. A construction operations plan including a plan for temporary re-routing of pedestrians acceptable to Town Staff be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit; and**
- 2. Contractors and construction workers are prohibited from parking on-street or in public parking spaces.**

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

**5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

The Planning Board and Affordable Housing Commission will meet April 12<sup>th</sup>.

Staff was asked to arrange a meeting with Dartmouth College to discuss their Riverfront Master Plan on April 19<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup>.

The Town has a new website that is now up and running. The web address is [www.hanovernh.org](http://www.hanovernh.org). Board comments are welcome.

**6. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 10:15 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Rivard