

**PLANNING BOARD
AUGUST 9, 2011 at 7:30 PM
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

In attendance:

Members: Bill Dietrich, Judith Esmay, Michael Mayor, Kate Connolly (Selectmen's Representative)

Alternate: Iain Sim

Staff: Vicki Smith, Jonathan Edwards

Others: See Attendance Sheet

1. **MINUTES:** The minutes of July 5, 2011 were approved as amended.

2. **VOLUNTARY MERGER REQUEST BY DARTMOUTH COLLEGE TO MERGE TAX MAP 38, LOT 88 WITH TAX MAP 38, LOT 83.**

John Scherding, of Dartmouth's Office of Campus Planning Design & Construction, presented the application. He said it was recently discovered by Ryan Borkowski, Building Inspector, that a property line runs right through McCulloch Hall, which creates building code problems. There are no surveys available of these lots and no legal definition of the smaller lot being its own lot.

Board Comments/Questions:

- The remaining lot will be bounded on all sides by streets with the exception of the 5 lots noted in the application as exceptions.

Public Comments/Questions: None

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by MAYOR, to merge lots 88 and 83 on Tax Map 38. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

3. **11-26 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW (FINAL REVIEW) BY DARTMOUTH COLLEGE TO DEMOLISH AN APARTMENT BUILDING AND CONSTRUCT A NEW 23-BEDROOM SORORITY AT 17 EAST WHELOCK STREET, TAX MAP 38, LOT 88, IN THE "I" ZONING DISTRICT.**

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

John Scherding, of Dartmouth's Office of Campus Planning Design & Construction, presented the application with Woody Eckels, of Dartmouth's Residential Life Office, Andrew Garthwaite, of Haynes & Garthwaite Architects, Paula Espinosa, of Saucier + Flynn Landscape Architects, and Kevin Worden, of Engineering Ventures. Scherding said the

proposed building will have a lower roof line, more in keeping with the residential character of the neighborhood. In response to concerns raised at the June 7th Design Review hearing, the plan was changed to now utilize occupancy sensors to control stairwell lighting and to retain existing landscaping. Espinosa provided a landscaping overview as shown on Sheet L1.00, which includes new oak, maple, and crab apple trees, flowering shrubs, and perennial plants. There are also existing pine and oak trees.

Scherding advised of replacement wording Don Ware, of the Public Works Department, requested for the Notes section of Sheet C1.1 related to capping abandoned sewer lines. Scherding said Dartmouth is willing to comply with his request.

Scherding said Dartmouth is without a heavily detailed construction logistics plan. Sheet C1.1 depicts the proposed location of construction fencing. Vehicles will enter the site from N Park St through a gate and exit out the southern end of the site via E Wheelock St. A tire wash will be utilized at the exit gate. A construction trailer is needed but its location has not yet been identified.

Board Comments/Questions:

- The project address was questioned (2 N Park St being noted in the application materials vs. 17 E Wheelock St being noted in the public hearing notice).
 - Edwards explained that the Assessor's records identify the parcel Tax Map 38, Lot 88 as "17 East Wheelock Street". This particular building, located on that parcel, has a physical address of 2 North Park St.
- What will be the construction traffic flow to and from this site?
 - Scherding said he did not know; it will depend upon the contractor. He said Dartmouth considered restricting the way vehicles exit the site but could not figure out if one route was better than another.
- Where will construction workers park?
 - Scherding said they will park at the Dewey Field parking lot where there are plenty of surplus spaces. It is a relatively short walk from there to the site.
- Will there be protection of pedestrian traffic on the west side of Park St?
 - Scherding said yes, but was unable to explain what protections would be provided.
- The constitution and function of the tire and vehicle wash area was questioned.
 - Scherding said it will be a combination of large enough stone to rattle the teeth of the vehicle driver and shake the tires free from dirt and debris. At the same time, there will be the opportunity to hose down the truck.
- It will be at someone's discretion whether vehicles are hosed down?
 - Scherding said yes. Unless someone is driving onto the disturbed site they will be passing through the site on paved surfaces. Trucks making deliveries and continuing on should not pick up soil.
- What is the disposition of the sink-hole rectangle at the end of the project?
 - Scherding said that will be cleaned up and returned to its existing stage.
- Staff Review comments include a note about being sure the front of the building is 20' from the property line. How is this affected due to the lot merger?
 - Scherding said there will be a 5' buffer between what is required and what is proposed.
- Staff Review comments also include the request that the statement "23 beds" be modified on the plan to designate an occupant count, rather than a bed count.
 - Eckels said there will be 23 single-bedrooms for a total occupant count of 23.

Staff Comments/Questions: None

Public Comments/Questions: None

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by CONNOLLY to find application 11-26 pertaining to 17 East Wheelock and 2 North Park complete with one waiver (full boundary survey). ESMAY noted that the waiver request is defended in the application materials. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

ESMAY suggested the following conditions of approval as discussed above: Ware's request for the wording, "*pressure grout existing sewer service to be abandoned from manhole to cap at edge of building excavation before any ground disturbance above location of pipeline*", and noting occupancy at 23 single occupancy bedrooms. Edwards suggested restricting use of public parking spaces by construction workers and equipment. Smith said as-builts will be needed.

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by SIM to approve the project with the following conditions:

- 1. Note S1 on sheet C1.1 should be revised to read "pressure grout existing sewer service to be abandoned from manhole to cap at edge of building excavation before any ground disturbance above location of pipeline"(see note S2).**
- 2. The approval is granted for 23 single occupancy bedrooms.**
- 3. Contractors and contractors' employees shall park in Dartmouth College-owned parking areas and not in any public on-street or off-street parking space.**
- 4. As-builts shall be submitted as a single digital file and three (3) hard copies of site work and utility as-built plans which shall be provided in AutoCAD 2000 format or later, with documentation of all utilities to within six (6) inches of actual location. There shall be separate layers for each type of utility, grading, buildings, landscaping, and unique site features. All layers deemed unnecessary by the Department of Public Works shall be removed from the digital file. In addition, engineering field notes of utility depths, crossings, and measurements shall be provided to the Department of Public Works.**

THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

- 4. 11-27 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW (FINAL REVIEW) BY KENDAL AT HANOVER FOR DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AND CONSTRUCTION OF AN ENTRANCE CANOPY IN THE LUCRETIA MOTT COURTYARD AT 80 LYME ROAD, TAX MAP 8, LOT 1, IN THE "GR-4" ZONING DISTRICT.**

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

Ann Kynor, of Pathways Consulting, and Dean Sorenson, of Kendal at Hanover, presented the application. Kynor said this is Phase 4 of Kendal's 6-phase wall reconstruction project. She provided a brief history of entire project explaining that reconstruction of the exterior walls, porches and roofs of the residential buildings is needed due to deterioration. Most of the buildings are 3 stories in height with a short overhang. Water runs off the roofs, drops straight down the exterior walls, and leaks into basements. The solution is to extend the drip edges with asphalt, sloped away from the buildings, and cover them with washed stone.

The current application, Phase 4, is essentially adding a canopy, refurbishing a patio, replacing a walkway, adding asphalt-lined stone drip edges along the buildings, and some minor re-grading. This Phase involves single-story buildings in an elevated area with steep slopes away from the building. There are no underground garages.

Kynor advised of a request from Pete Kulbacki, Public Works Director, for a drainage analysis for the entire project. Kynor said Kulbacki's position is that had the entire project been presented at one time, rather than in phases, it would warrant such analysis. Kynor said Kendal's position is that this is an unnecessary burden because the work proposed is for maintenance purposes only.

Board Comments/Questions:

- How many canopies are proposed?
 - Kynor said one new canopy, over the northeast entrance.
- The current drip edge drains into the basements. Where will it drain when the project is done?
 - Kynor indicated how water will flow from the roofs to the catch basins in the courtyard area and on to the storm drain in the area of the main entrance.
- How different will the flow of rainwater be when construction is completed compared to what was originally designed?
 - Kynor said she believes the original plan is very similar to what is being proposed with the exception of a metal drip edge that was part of the original installation and is not part of the current design. Landscaping improvements are also included in the current application.
- Can the applicant demonstrate there is essentially no difference in the direction of flow, volume of flow, rate of flow, and amount of water being captured and taken away between existing conditions and proposed?
 - Kynor said drainage patterns are changing, the amount of drainage is not.
- What is so onerous about the drainage plan staff requested?
 - Sorenson said Kendal has plans to embark on a drainage program in 2012; however, the premise of the current project is to stop water from leaking into the garages.
- Does the garage extend under the courtyard?
 - Kynor said no, just under the buildings.
- Now that all of the drainage is being directed toward the courtyard, is the courtyard sufficient to handle it?
 - Kynor said there is plenty of space there. She said she assumed the original design was to direct water to those catch basins.
- Is Phase 3 complete?
 - Kynor said no, it is 50% done.
- Has the deterioration been the same throughout the complex?
 - Sorenson said yes, every column has some form of deterioration to them. It is directly related to the water coming in from the foundation and picking up salt from the cars.
- Where does the 30 linear feet of 2' high dry-laid stone retaining wall fit in?
 - Kynor said it is shown on Sheet C4.0 and walked the Board through the plan.
 - Sorenson said the area is most problematic when it rains in the winter time and creates icy conditions.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- The current drainage plan is 20 yrs old. It concentrates water, puts it in a pipe, and discharges to the Connecticut River. How much more will get into the system? Is it so much that we need to worry about the outfall?
- If water goes into the grass of the courtyard, is it then ponded there underground?
 - Kynor said the majority of the water will get into the soil and eventually into a catch basin.
- The courtyard catch basins take water out under the garage to the central valley?
 - Kynor said yes and indicated the location of a trunk line leading the water from the basins to an open area.
- What storm event is the underground piping designed to handle?
 - Kynor said she was unsure but noted the pipe size at 18”.
- Without a drainage plan, how can the applicant be sure the site will not become saturated with water?
 - Sorenson said tonight’s proposal was accomplished in Phases 1 & 2 and Kendal has not experienced any difficulty with runoff or ponding.
- Does it make sense to spend so much money on the drip edge if there might be drainage issues with it?
 - Sorenson said Kendal has a 20-yr history of water within that courtyard. The courtyard is a large area.

Drainage Study:

ESMAY spoke in favor of granting staff’s request for the drainage study based on what she’s heard and read and due to the fact that the site is bounded on a long edge by the river. SIM questioned whether the request is more in the nature of a study for Kendal’s purposes internally rather than a function of whether the plan could benefit from it. CONNOLLY said Board has never willingly approved something that was questionable by our expert people on Town staff. She asked why Kulbacki is so specifically worried. Kendal is correcting something that should not have occurred in conjunction with deterioration that is unusual. CONNOLLY said she half agrees with Esmay; T’s should be crossed and I’s dotted to avoid future problems. Kynor said Kulbacki’s point is that this is an opportunity to bring things up to current code. Right now, treatment is handled by grass swales and overrun flow which are current but not high-tech and some might argue are not as effective.

SIM proposed allowing the applicant to continue with the next phase with the understanding that they will come back with a complete site drainage model before they are allowed to move on to Phases 5 & 6. Their risk is that work might have to be done around the buildings that were previously addressed because the model shows that work was inadequate. Edwards suggested the analysis include evaluation of effectiveness of work already done.

DIETRICH asked of the time and budget to conduct the analysis. Kynor suggested it would take 2 or 3 weeks at a cost of \$2,500 - \$5,000. Sorenson noted that construction on Phase 4 is not scheduled to begin until spring. DIETRICH said if not starting until spring, Kendal should do drainage analysis before starting.

MAYOR spoke in favor of SIM’s proposal.

DIETRICH and ESMAY favored requiring the analysis citing concerns for riverbank erosion.

Smith suggested continuing the hearing until after the analysis is done.

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by DIETRICH, to continue this matter to October 4th with instruction to the applicant to come forward then with a drainage analysis requested by Peter Kulbacki. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

5. OTHER BUSINESS:

Board letter to Hanover Bike & Pedestrian Committee: Edwards reported on the Board's letter to the Bike & Pedestrian Committee regarding their request that bicycle and pedestrian impacts be considered in the standard scope of study for traffic studies. In the letter, the Board pledged to consider the Committee's suggestions when next amending the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations.

Staff letter to City of Lebanon: Edwards reported on a letter he sent to the City of Lebanon in response to a boundary line adjustment proposal off Wyeth Road that was noticed as a Project of Regional Impact. Following a site visit and concurring with Esmay, staff sees no reason for the Town to have any concern over the proposed adjustment.

Parking: Edwards provided an update on the traffic analysis required per the Board's approval of Dartmouth's Hanover Inn project. He said Dartmouth has provided the required funding, the Town has tentatively hired a consultant, Dartmouth is still reviewing his draft MOU, and a small committee is being formed to oversee the analysis. SIM agreed to join the committee on behalf of the Planning Board. MAYOR suggested the group consider the results of a recent parking questionnaire conducted by the ILEAD attendees.

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

September 9th: 4 applications to be heard

September 13th: downtown walk to review projects approved over past 10 yrs

September 20th: recap of downtown walk & overall planning session

Planning Conference: Edwards said State funding has cut the ability of the Office of State Planning to sponsor planning conferences and workshops. The UVLSRPC is willing to organize a Saturday morning seminar in this area. Esmay and Edwards pledged the Town's interest in attending.

Faulkner's resignation: ESMAY reported on Faulkner's decision to resign from the Board following his term's expiration. She remarked on his long tenure with the Board and said she hopes the Town will make proper note of it at the next Town Meeting.

6. ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 9:35 PM.