

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

In attendance:

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

Alternates: Mike Hingston, Iain Sim

Staff: Vicki Smith, Jonathan Edwards

Others: See Attendance Sheet

1. **MINUTES:** The minutes of June 7, 2011 were approved as amended.

2. **11-15 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR MINOR LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT BY JAMES MOIR, AGENT FOR JAMES MOIR & JOHN HOLLAND, PROPERTY OWNERS OF RECORD, TO ANNEX .1 ACRE FROM 90 LYME ROAD, TAX MAP 8, LOT 8 TO 88 LYME ROAD, TAX MAP 8, LOT 6, IN THE "RR" ZONING DISTRICT AND TO ANNEX .1 ACRE FROM 88 LYME ROAD TO 90 LYME ROAD**

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

Ann Kynor of Pathways Consulting presented the application explaining that the proposed adjustments will result in the driveways of each parcel being located on their individual lots and increased side setbacks for both parcels. Ultimately both parcels will end up with the same acreage they started with. Kynor said an existing easement for shared use of the driveway that provides primary access to 88 Lyme Rd will continue.

Board Comments/Questions:

- The view easement depicted on the proposed site plan was questioned.
 - Kynor said view and mowing easements are proposed to allow the owners of 90 Lyme Rd to maintain its view of the cove by restricting tree planting and allowing mowing of the easement areas and to allow the 90 Lyme Rd owners access to an existing shared dock.
 - The easements will run with the property deeds.
 - There are other existing easements between these properties relative to a shared well that will also continue.
- The proposed narrowing of the 90 Lyme Rd parcel was questioned and whether it will meet the 50' setback regulation
 - Kynor said it would.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- Edwards questioned the frontage for 88 Lyme Rd, noting that it is not shown on the proposed site plan.

- Kynor said it will increase to 224’.
- Smith recommended marking the boundaries of the view easement area.

Public Comments/Questions: None

It was moved by HINGSTON, seconded by GARIPAY, to find the application complete. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

It was moved by HINGSTON, seconded by GARIPAY to approve the application. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

3. DISCUSSION REGARDING RE-ZONING PROPERTY OWNED BY ALTARIA, LLC SOUTH OF MINK BROOK IN HANOVER

Copies of Edwards’ “Centerra North–Initial Plan of Action”, dated January 11, 2011; revised January 13 & 18, 2011, were redistributed to the Board. PK Knights said in 2006 the zoning designation for the Centerra North area was changed from BM to F to prevent inappropriate development. There was a projected plan to work with DHMC & the College to look at the concept of a village center in that area. DHMC & the College are unable to allocate the time to be a part of that planning process. Knights said there seems to be a desire from the Town to move forward with a village center at this site, because the Master Plan designated it. If these are the Town’s goals, the Board has to act.

Knights said there are no zones under which a developer can cooperate with the Master Plan for this area. The Master Plan and Town Planners contradict each other and the current zoning does not enable the ideas of either of them. Taking no action, leaves it in the hands of those that decide to do what they can under the current zoning without regard to Master Plan intentions. Knights asked the Board for an opinion or comment on what the next steps might be for him to move forward to develop his portion of the property in this area.

Edwards said when the zoning change was made the Planning Board was not ready to proceed with a village center planning effort. They felt that active cooperation of the relevant property owners would be critical. He said Master Plan implementation is done in order of priority set by the Board. SIM said he supports working with interested landholders to develop a total concept and zoning description to fulfill it. Whether this is a priority or the Board has the time for it right now is up to the Chair.

ESMAY said the Board’s position on the area south of Mink Brook has not changed from the last time Knights met with the Board. However, their current focus is to revise the residential zones in accord with the Master Plan. GARIPAY suggested finishing the residential zoning work, then move on to this.

HINGSTON said it is not the Board’s job to work out these details in subcommittees nor do they have the time to do this. A proposal should be put together of what is envisioned in the Master Plan and how to enact it as zoning.

Smith questioned why the Board would entertain a rezoning effort that would add to the overloading of Route 120. So much is unknown about traffic impacts and infrastructure to support a village center development in this area. HINGSTON said a zoning proposal would need to be aware of the limitations on Route 120 and Hanover’s infrastructure. Without that

quantification, the Board does not have the information necessary to decide whether to support rezoning. CONNOLLY said unless and until the infrastructure problems are settled it would be utterly foolish for the Board to try to rezone to a high intensity use of a small portion which is in no way connected to Route 120 other than through long internal roads in Lebanon. She said the intensity of a BM district is too intense and the planning for this area should involve regional & area planners.

Edwards said this is at best the 3rd highest priority (behind the residential zoning project and reviving the CIP) in terms of long term issues. He questioned if there is anything in terms of public interest that would make this a higher priority. He said the developer has his own homework to do regarding egress, sewer, water, etc. which are serious and unaddressed. Knights said he has worked out those details on the Lebanon side.

Knights said he should not be asked to plan for a village center, which would be a very different development than he would propose singularly. Edwards said infrastructure issues would still need to be addressed for a smaller mixed use complex. SIM said the smaller development should be considered in the context as a phase of development for the village center, not as an isolated project.

CONNOLLY asked whether Knights would consider using the Hanover portion of his land to serve as the residential portion of his larger project. Knights said he is entirely flexible but will lose that flexibility as time goes on.

ESMAY suggested the Board needs to review why this area was designated for a village center. However, speaking personally, she said she needs to finish the residential zoning project to be able to look at this parcel more clearly.

4. 11-25 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW (DESIGN REVIEW) BY JOLIN KISH, AGENT FOR JOSHUA POVILL, PROPERTY OWNER OF RECORD, TO CONVERT 1ST FLOOR RESIDENTIAL SPACE TO A DENTIST'S OFFICE, CONSTRUCT 2ND & 3RD FLOOR RESIDENTIAL UNITS, AND PROVIDE ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND PARKING AT 31.5 SOUTH PARK STREET, TAX MAP 34, LOT 104, IN THE "RO" ZONING DISTRICT

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

Jolin Kish presented the application explaining that existing conditions include a 2-family house, deck, and pool on the site. The lot has 2 front setbacks and 2 side setbacks. Some of the existing building is located within the front setback of Summer Court, making it a non-conforming structure. A Special Exception is being sought from the ZBA to enlarge this non-conforming structure. The Zoning Ordinance requires that you keep the same number of dwelling units when adding offices. The basement apartment will be discontinued. The residential units will be constructed on the 2nd and 3rd floors. 9 parking spaces are needed to accommodate the proposed office and residential uses.

A rain garden is proposed to address drainage. Kish read into the record excerpts from an email she received from Don Ware of Hanover's DPW, "*as far as the drainage is concerned, the depth coverage is dependent on the existing drainage... The major concern for the Town is the amount of additional flow that would be expected in the Town's system. Based on your*

site drainage report, the rain garden will hold more than the expected increase in flow for a 25-yr storm, so there should be no impact.”

Kish said some of the staff comments noted on the application summary sheet have been addressed and incorporated into the revised plan set submitted to the Board. DPW requested relocating the water service and sewer lines to the building. Construction of these will require two periods of disturbance of S Park St.

Board Comments/Questions:

- When did this become a 2-family home?
 - Kish suggested between 1989 & 1993, following the grant of a Special Exception.
- Is “office” the appropriate term for the proposed dental use?
 - Kish said the ZBA consider the use “office”, as has been the designation of other dentist offices on the same street.
- Is all of the parking shown on the site plan truly needed? If so, can the driveway be straightened out a bit?
- Is the parking peninsula needed because this involves more than 6 parking spaces? It would serve a better purpose if it were stretched out around the parking lot somehow and the parking lot made smaller. Kish was encouraged to redesign the parking and request a waiver of the peninsula requirement.
- What is the proposed height of the bldg?
 - Kish said it will be similar to the white bldgs at the corner of E Wheelock/S Park St – a colonial with dormers on the top level. Elevation drawings will be provided with the Final Review submittal.
- What is the proposed size of the apartments?
 - Kish said they will be 3-bedroom apartments.
- How many employees will the dental office require and where will they park?
 - Kish suggested 2 employees. She said an adjacent dental office has more office space and less parking available, and that dentist stated at the ZBA hearing that he has never had an issue with parking. The hope is that students & college employees will avail themselves to these services without needing to drive there.
- Floor plans of the entire house will be necessary for Final Review.
- Tenant outdoor space was questioned.
 - Kish said there is room for recreational activities, a picnic table, and grills.
- What type of tenants is this designed for?
 - Kish said most likely graduate students or business students, but possibly families.
- The location of the propane tank was question.
 - Kish said it was chosen by the propane provider and will be located underground.
- Dates/times of construction were questioned.
 - Kish said 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM, Monday through Friday.
- What surrounds the parking lot?
 - Kish said a mini retaining wall. The lot slopes downward from the S Park St side. The elevation of the parking area needs to be built up to effectively direct drainage to the rain garden and to reduce the grade of the handicap ramp.
 - A guardrail is proposed on top of the retaining wall for safety purposes. A Special Exception is also being sought for the rail height.

- There was lengthy discussion about the use/design of the guardrail above the retaining wall; whether it is necessary or appropriate for the adjacent residential area. Kish was encouraged to make it look residential & domestic.
- Access from parking was questioned.
 - Kish said walkways from the parking area lead to the tenant staircase entrance, basement, landing, and to the handicap ramp.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- Please have the designer put a bar scale on the drawings.
- Consider eliminating the front walkway, leading from S Park St, to direct foot-traffic to the rear entrance.
 - Keeping the walkway will retain the residential look to the property.
- Consider adding a walkway from the rear entrance to the Summer Ct sidewalk.

Public Comments/Questions:

- Natalia Streltsov suggested the front walkway could lead toward Summer Ct.

ESMAY recapped the items above that the Board will be looking for in greater detail in the Final Review submission.

5. OTHER BUSINESS:

Letter from Hanover Bike & Pedestrian Advisory Committee: Edwards suggesting filing the letter with potential Subdivision & Site Plan Regs amendments. He will prepare a draft response for ESMAY's review.

Parking Analysis: Edwards said a MOU between the Town and College was drafted to cover the points brought up with respect to the Hanover Inn project review. The College is still reviewing the draft. The Town has hired a parking consultant to do the work covered by the MOU and provide data about the Town's parking infrastructure. The Town is trying to get the Chamber of Commerce involved but they have not yet responded to information provided to them. ESMAY suggested forming a Planning Board subcommittee to work on parking.

6. ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 10:30 PM.