

**PLANNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 5, 2013 at 7:30 PM
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

In attendance:

Members: Kate Connolly, Bill Dietrich (Vice-Chair – arrived late after attending a ZBA meeting), Judith Esmay (Chair), Joan Garipay, Michael Mayor; Iain Sim; Nancy Carter (Selectmen’s Representative)

Alternates:

Staff: Vicki Smith, Judy Brotman (arrived late after attending a ZBA meeting)

Others: See Attendance Sheet

1. **MINUTES:** The minutes of January 8, 2013 were approved.

2. **P2013-02 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION BY TIMOTHY ROCKWOOD, AS AGENT FOR SANDRA TOWN, PROPERTY OWNER OF RECORD, TO DIVIDE ONE LOT INTO TWO LOTS (CREATING LOTS OF 1.23 ACRES & 0.48 ACRES) AT 14 GIBSON ROAD, TAX MAP 24, LOT 33, IN THE “GR-1” ZONING DISTRICT.**

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

Tim Rockwood presented the application. He provided a brief overview of the history of the existing lot, which includes two subdivisions, impacts from the development of Route 120, and the creation of an easement that is now Gibson Road. Rockwood said the minimum lot size in the GR district is 10,000 sf. The proposal is to divide the current lot into two lots. The lot to the east, containing the existing townhouse, will be 1.23 acres. The lot to the west, containing an existing shed, will be 0.48 acres.

Rockwood said most of the adjacent steep slopes are located on State-owned land. The new lots will meet the 75% minimum lot area requirement of Section 207.2. There are no wetlands on site, but there are wetlands on an adjacent State-owned lot. The proposal also meets the square box requirement Section 209.1. Fire hydrants are located on both ends of the existing lot. This is a Class One lot which means it is served by municipal services.

Board Comments/Questions:

- CONNOLLY advised of a site visit she conducted and of activities she witnessed that did not appear to comply with current zoning regulations. She said any approval should be subject to the condition that there be no validation of any violations.
- SIM said he also conducted a site visit and suggested the activity reflects that of a landscaping business. He proposed that Judy Brotman, Zoning Administrator, visit the site to confirm whether the current activity conforms with the Zoning Ordinance.

- Smith said there have been on-going conversations between Brotman and the property owner about uses that might be occurring. Smith said Brotman has reviewed the current application and is mostly concerned about the driveway.
- Rockwood confirmed that the property is currently used by a landscape-type contractor. He said goals of the subdivision are to eliminate that use, to discontinue the driveway, and to market the western lot. Rockwood said the property owner is happy to comply with the driveway regulations and would not object to the imposition of a condition that the maintenance use must go.

Public Comment: None.

Possible Conditions of Approval:

1. The circular driveway be discontinued.
2. Any driveway on either lot be no wider than 14’.
3. Approval of the application does not validate any present or future illegal uses of the property. (This language was suggested by Town counsel.)

Waivers Requested: None

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by CONNOLLY, to accept the application as complete. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION. Dietrich abstained.

It was moved by SIM, seconded by CARTER, to approve the application with the conditions that (1) the circular driveway be discontinued prior to the sale of the new lot, (2) the driveways on both lots be reconfigured to be zoning compliant and no wider than 14 feet, and (3) approval does not validate any illegal use. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION. Dietrich abstained.

3. DISCUSSION OF ZONING AMENDMENTS FOR TOWN MEETING 2013

13-1: Accessory Building Heights, Roof Overhangs & Vegetative Screening

To amend Section 209 to read:

“209.3 Side and Rear Setback Regulations and Exceptions:

- A. No structure *or roof* shall project into any required side or rear setback.
- B. Exceptions: A garage, carport or any accessory building, ~~whether or~~ not attached to the principal structure, not exceeding ~~15 feet~~ **12 feet at its highest point and including roof overhang not closer than 7 feet to the side or rear lot line.** ~~in height and n~~No part of which is used as a dwelling space, as well as a deck, patio, swimming pool or tennis court, may be located within the side or rear setback, but not closer than 7 feet to the side or rear lot line. ~~These exceptions shall not apply to any lot within the BM, B, D, OL, or I District which adjoins a residential district.~~
- C. Bus shelters and public utility structures or equipment, including, but not limited to, water and wastewater treatment and filtration plants and appurtenances thereto, which because of function cannot reasonably be located other than wholly or partially within a required setback, are permitted.

209.3 Height Regulations and Exceptions:

- A. The height of ~~any~~ **principal** building shall be measured from the average finished grade along the building front, and shall not exceed the height specified in Section 204. See also Section 209.4F.”

Bryant Denk, proponent, distributed pictures of his neighborhood. He said his concern is for the height of accessory buildings adjoined to the property. The proposal is to name a 12’

maximum height, and eliminate the 2' overhang allowance. Relative to screening, Denk said that the regulations require screening when propane tanks are installed. Those tanks are only three to four feet in height. There is no screening required for these accessory structures. When applying for the construction of an accessory structure, details should be provided of existing vegetative screening and plans for additional screening. Keeping natural vegetation goes with the Master Plan.

Board Comments/Questions:

- SIM questioned the 12' maximum height. He said this issue was identified by the Residential Project Committee (RPC). Their opinion is that the minimum setback anywhere in town should be 10', with no exceptions, for reasons of health and safety.
 - Brotman suggested that the current height calculation was adopted seven to twelve years ago. The thought at that time was to encourage storage of things such as HVAC equipment, within the roof peak, rather than mount it to a roof's exterior, for aesthetic reasons.
 - CONNOLLY said the 15' height was also to make sure there was not a second story.
 - SIM noted that mechanical penthouses are exempt from height limits.
- CONNOLLY agreed that the 7' exception should be eliminated and that there should be a maximum height identified rather than calculating height as being half the distance between the bottom and top of a roof.
- ESMAY said addressing the setback width and honoring the setback would in part address the matter of the height of these accessory buildings.
 - Smith said changing setback widths will create a lot of non-conformities.

Public Comment/Questions: None

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by CARTER, to carry this amendment forward to a public hearing with refinement to dimensions and height in consultation with the Zoning Administrator. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

13-2: Animals in RR

To amend Section 210.1C to read:

“210.1 C. Gardens and Animals:

Cultivating the soil, harvesting crops, and raising or keeping household animals not for gainful business. The raising or keeping of poultry, horses or other domestic animals whether or not for gainful business is permitted as an accessory use in the F ~~and RR~~ Zoning Districts; ***and in the RR Zoning District with a minimum lot size of 3 acres and with minimum setbacks for such uses of 50 feet front, side and rear. The raising or keeping of poultry on a lot less than 3 acres is allowed only by Special Exception in the RR Zoning District.*** In the SR, GR and I Zoning Districts the keeping of poultry, horses, or other non-household animals as an accessory use is permitted only when not for gainful business and only by Special Exception.”

Bryce Wing, proponent, said the minimum lot size in the RR district is three acres for a minor subdivision and ten acres for a major subdivision. The neighborhoods of Blueberry Hill and Trescott/Partridge Roads would be considered major subdivisions today. With respect to the 7' setback exception rule, currently a horse shed, under 15' in height, could be located 7' from a boundary line. That is too close and not very practical. The solution is to update the Ordinance to require the minimum lot size in the RR district for the keeping of

large animals and maybe to allow chickens as a use permitted by special exception, as they are not as large.

Board Comments/Questions:

- CONNOLLY said Blueberry Hill and the bird streets were created before the 1976 Ordinance. They are all two-acre lots. This seems like a perfectly reasonable request.
- SIM quoted the RPC's position on this, as noted in the Residential Project - Policy Development - Final Compendium - May 14, 2012, that "*Farming should not be allowed on small lots, such as those created in recent subdivisions... There should be three zones with respect to agriculture: Urban zone, Suburban zone, and Rural zone.*" He said Brotman was asked by the Board to hold back on a proposed amendment regarding the keeping of chickens. The intent of the neighborhood meetings is to get public input on these and other issues identified by the RPC and to then make collective community decisions.
 - Wing said it will probably take a long time for those decisions to be made. He and others in his neighborhood are of the opinion that this needs to be addressed now.
- SIM suggested the language should be changed to name a minimum lot size, regardless of the zoning district in which a parcel is located, except for chickens. They may still be allowed by special exception under certain conditions.
 - Brotman said the ZBA granted a number of special exceptions to allow the keeping of chickens with a very specific set of conditions. Her zoning amendment proposal was to allow chickens without a special exception if those specific conditions, identified by the ZBA in those decisions, are met.
 - DIETRICH said each situation is unique; a special exception should apply.
 - The proponent was encouraged to work with Brotman to refine the amendment to incorporate ideas from her proposal.
- CARTER asked why the amendment includes pigs.
 - Wing said they fall under "domestic animals". Allowing a pig sty on a residential lot should require special exception review due to the smell impact.
- GARIPAY asked of enforcement options when the presence of animals becomes offensive after a permit has been issued to allow them.
 - Wing said that is why it is necessary to not allow them if a lot is less than the three-acre minimum.

Public Comments/Questions:

- Jeanne Vieten, of 2 Sugar Maple Lane, said she heartily supports the proposal as it preserves a property as it is right now. There is already an existing rule for a cluster of homes to have a minimum size of three acres. This would bring Blueberry Hill and the bird streets under that umbrella of protection. Vieten said she does not wish for her neighborhood to be penalized while the neighborhood zoning project is carried out.
- Lauri Gallimore, of 118 Blueberry Hill Drive, said she agrees with everything Wing and Vieten are saying. As far as the public health issues, the setback exception rule was probably well thought out when the minimum lot sizes were changed to three and ten acres. That should be taken into consideration for those living on two-acre lots.

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by CARTER, to carry this amendment forward to a public hearing with refinement. Smith explained for the record that the Board's vote to move these amendments forward to a public hearing is not a guarantee that they would continue on to the Town Meeting Warrant. The only way to be sure an

amendment is presented to Town Meeting is to file an amendment by petition. Smith said the Board is not able to amend the wording of amendments submitted by petition other than grammatical clarifications. **THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.**

13-3: Driveway Definition

Add the following paragraph to Section 210.1A, after the first paragraph:

“A turn-around/backup area, not to exceed 20' x 20', designed specifically to permit safe exiting from a garage into the street in a forward position shall be allowed wholly or partially in a front yard setback area. The turn-around shall be screened from the street with a minimum 4' high planting. Temporary day time parking shall be permitted in this turn-around. Permanent or overnight parking of any kind shall not be permitted in this area and shall not be used to meet the off-street parking requirements of this ordinance.”

Bernie Benn, proponent, said this proposal is to amend the definition of “driveway” to include the possibility of a turn-around. The current Ordinance allows a driveway to go from the road directly into a garage. The Ordinance is silent for a turn-around. Benn said not every site allows for a turn-around outside of the front setback. The issue here is when you cannot bring cars around to the back of your house or don’t want to bring them around somewhere else. This amendment would bring the Ordinance into conformance with a practice that exists in many parts of the town.

Benn said this is a matter of safety. It makes sense not to back out onto public streets. He presented a site plan of a turn-around such that he would like added to the Ordinance. He said for a number of houses he has designed, this was the logical site plan.

Board Comments/Questions:

- GARIPAY questioned the restriction of overnight parking by overnight houseguests.
 - Benn said houseguests are required to park in the driveway and nowhere else. Allowing them to park temporarily in the turn-around area will allow them to exit the driveway in a forward position.
- DIETRICH advised of the ZBA’s deliberation of a special exception case earlier in the evening in which they voted to allow a turn-around, but not allow any parking in the turn-around area.
 - Benn said his point is that this should not require a special exception. He questioned the difference between parking in a turn-around area versus parking in a driveway. In reality, some people do not have enough room for their cars and are parking on the road.
- ESMAY said if even half of her neighbors elected to have a 20’x20’ asphalt turn-around in their front yard or front setback, with the occasional car parked in it, that would really change the character of her neighborhood. For that reason, she would much prefer that anyone that feels the necessity to have a turn-around as described, should have to have it by special exception to allow the neighbors to comment on it.
- CONNOLLY agreed stating that this suggestion would take up one-quarter of the front yards in her neighborhood. The front yard is the only part of anyone’s property where you may not park cars, except in the driveway. CONNOLLY said she has lived through numerous discussions about how neighborhoods are defined by the view from the street.

To take away the front yard to park cars is hardly a practical solution. It would damage the ambiance of a lot of neighborhoods.

- SIM said there are other devices one can use to make the turn-around area still look like a grassed area. The conflict between aesthetics and safety issues is another great topic for discussion in the context of neighborhood meetings.
- MAYOR said the area available to maneuver cars on Occom Ridge lots is probably less than half an acre. He said he could not imagine not being able to back out of the garage, pivot the car, and exit a 600 foot driveway in a forward position. He suggested inserting “*by special exception*” after “by setback area.”
- CARTER asked of the relationship between the Board’s decision and a neighborhood’s decision as to how they would like their neighborhood to operate.
 - ESMAY said a neighborhood’s decision would weigh on the Board significantly. In any case, any change to the Ordinance must go before Town Meeting.
 - Benn argued that neighborhoods change; residents change; and questioned that kind of neighborhood approach.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- Smith said the RPC is of the opinion that we are already giving up too much space for vehicles. Tandem parking is allowed in driveways. Regardless of the inconvenience, it works. Smith said she likes the idea of having a pervious turn-around area, but not in the front setback. Safety concern is a real one but in many neighborhoods the speeds are not that fast to make it really unsafe to back out onto the road if you have to. It is not realistic to think that the parking in a turn-around area will only be temporary.
 - Benn countered that a plan like this would not create more cars.

Public Comments/Questions:

- A female speaker said every neighborhood has a sense of their character. Those on South Main Street might prefer a turn-around. Others on smaller streets, with smaller lots, might oppose them. She would not ban them outright.

It was moved by SIM, seconded by MAYOR, to carry this amendment forward to a public hearing. GARIPAY said she is very unconformable carrying this forward. They need to talk with the neighborhoods to enable the Board to make a better decision next year. **THE BOARD VOTED FOUR IN FAVOR (Carter, Dietrich, Mayor, Sim), THREE OPPOSED (Connolly, Esmay, Garipay). THE MOTION PASSED.**

At the request of Ellen Arnold, Associate Director of Dartmouth’s Real Estate Office and Counsel REO/CPF, consideration of the remaining amendments, all proposed by the Dartmouth, was tabled to conduct the informal review of Dartmouth’s crew dock application.

4. INFORMAL REVIEW OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE’S PLANS TO IMPROVE THEIR CREW DOCK AND ERODING RAMP LEADING TO IT

Ellen Arnold, Associate Director of Dartmouth’s Real Estate Office and Counsel REO/CPF, and Roy Schiff, Water Resource Scientist & Engineer with Milone & MacBroom, presented the proposal. Arnold said the plan is to reconfigure the dock on the Connecticut River to accommodate three new safety launches. Plans of existing conditions were provided as were

pictures of the safety launches. Arnold said there are a lot of students in the water for crew practice who are supervised and rescued via these safety launches. The flat-bottom, weightless ones are far more effective and can hold many more students. So this is really a safety driven measure.

The four elements of the project were described as:

- 1) reconfiguration of the crew dock – pulling the dock out 2.5’ and expanding it roughly 49’ on the upstream side, adding a fourth safety launch on the downstream end, and adding two more safety launches on the upstream space
- 2) dredging 87 cubic yards of gravel material at the bottom of the ramp to return the river bottom to its natural silt, which will also provide more space for storing boats
- 3) resurfacing the existing ramp with concrete to reduce erosion and make it far more effective
- 4) adding a rain garden at the top of the ramp to improve water quality along the river front

Schiff said what really causes havoc on the river is the gully washing storms of the summer. The rain garden is designed to capture a smaller storm event and infiltrate it. It will also take off the peak of larger floods. When the rain garden fills, water will overflow to a swale and into a catch basin. One of the goals of the pipe system is to lower the slope of the water, not allowing it to enter the river at a 17% slope. The first pipe will slope at 15%, the second at 1%.

Schiff said the ultimate goals of the Riverfront Master Plan are to (1) improve operations, safety and access to the river, (2) highlight the river rather than have it be a backdoor area with a parking lot, and (3) improve natural and environmental conditions.

Board questions/comments:

- CARTER asked what will happen with the large trees.
 - Schiff said four trees in the lawn area will be removed.
- CARTER asked how these changes will change the use of the site by other groups.
 - Christopher Bordeau, Head Coach of Dartmouth’s Men’s Heavyweight Rowing, said there still should be room for others to park and launch along the shore.
- GARIPAY asked where the rain garden cleanout will be deposited.
 - Schiff said the plan is to do the cleanout on the grassed area.
- SIM asked what area the rain garden will collect water from.
 - Schiff suggested the area extends up the slope a ways.
- DIETRICH asked what occurs during a heavy rain event.
 - Schiff said he has done pipe sizing calculations, based on the slope and velocity, to make sure water will not shoot out from the manhole.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- Smith said this application will be considered by the Conservation Commission later this week, and by the ZBA later in the month. It will then be brought back before the Planning Board under Site Plan Review on March 5th.

Public comments/questions: None

CARTER asked whether Dartmouth would welcome area rowers to attend the various Town reviews to speak on Dartmouth's behalf. Arnold said Dartmouth always welcomes people to speak on their behalf. They have already reached out to other groups that utilize the river.

5. CONTINUED REVIEW OF PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS

13-4: Private vs Institutional Utilities

Amend Article XI, Section 902 – definition of "Essential Services" to read:

“Essential Services:

The erection, construction or major alteration by public utilities, *private institutional utilities*, or municipal or other governmental agencies of underground or overhead gas, electrical, sewer, steam, or water transmission or distribution systems, including poles, wires, mains, drains, sewers, pipes, conduit cables, and similar equipment and accessories in connection therewith, and including *municipal* buildings, reasonably necessary for the furnishing of adequate service by such public utilities or municipal or other governmental agencies or for the public health or safety or general welfare. For the purposes of this Ordinance, Essential Services shall not include the replacement of facilities (other than *municipal* buildings) or minor relocations or minor additions such as street lights, hydrants, wire, electrical transformers, fire alarm boxes or pipes.”

Proponent, Ellen Arnold, Associate Director of Dartmouth's Real Estate Office and Counsel REO/CPF, said the current regulations treat municipal and public utilities different from private institutional utilities. Dartmouth is really a town within a town. It has an extensive utilities network that provides services and safety to not only members of the Dartmouth community, but to the Hanover community at large through a variety of facilities. As such, there is no rational basis to treat Dartmouth utilities different than other utilities for the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.

Arnold said the Ordinance also requires zoning permits for certain structures. If Dartmouth wants to do something with its utility structure, technically it is required to obtain a zoning permit, which takes time, expense, and effort by both Town and Dartmouth staff. It is also unclear whether site plan review is required just to put in a new utility pipe. That disconnect has never really been strictly enforced; but it does exist. Arnold clarified that changes to utility networks would still require building code review, which is where all of the public safety issues would be thoroughly vetted. This proposal is not speaking about buildings, but rather the underground lines that are essential to maintain services.

The proposal is to slightly modify the definition of “essential services” to include private institutional utilities and to distinguish that only municipal buildings would be exempt from certain zoning provisions.

Board & Staff Comments/Questions:

- SIM pointed out that essential services are allowed by special exception in every zoning district.
- Smith said zoning was changed to allow the Town's Waste Water Treatment Facility to be built within an F district setback. By no longer classifying “essential service” buildings as a structure, such as that facility, they became exempt from the setback regulations. The current regulations are that municipal buildings are not structures, but if Dartmouth were to construct a water treatment facility, it would be considered a structure and would be regulated by zoning and site plan regulations.
 - Dietrich said the Ordinance currently speaks to all buildings.

- Arnold said the proposal would not change that.
- SIM asked if staff anticipates there being any other institutions that will want their own utilities.
 - Smith said not that she can envision.
- ESMAY said certain essential services are exempt from the definition of structures by our definitions. This is precisely the kind of inconsistency the residential zoning project consultants have been directed to clarify in their technical review of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - Smith said she hopes the consultants will really pick this apart, as it is long-winded and quite confusing. There must be a better way to state directly what this is intended to accomplish.

Tim McNamara, Associate Director of Dartmouth’s Real Estate Office, said the point of the amendment is to allow Dartmouth to do all of the things that the Town is allowed to do with regard to maintaining its underground facilities, with the same ease that the Town has. Ultimately, Dartmouth’s maintenance efforts will have no more or less impact on the area than the Town’s efforts. This is really limited to underground facilities.

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by DIETRICH, to carry this amendment forward to a public hearing. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

13-5: Athletic scoreboards

- 1) Delete Section 317.2(E) and re-letter following subsections accordingly.
- 2) Add a new Section (330), which would read,

317.6 Athletic Scoreboards

Athletic scoreboards will be a permitted use in any district, subject to review and approval by the Zoning Board of Adjustment as a Special Exception pursuant to Section 206 of the Zoning Ordinance. Athletic scoreboards may display:

- A. Information pertinent to the event and facility*
- B. Recognition of donors and sponsors by name only*
- C. Other general athletic or institutional information*
- D. Any other information customarily displayed on contemporary scoreboards, but not to include commercial advertising.*

- 3) Amend the definition of “sign” in Section 902 to read:

~~“Any structure or part thereof or device attached thereto or painted or represented thereon, which displays or includes any letter, word, model, banner, flag, pendant, insignia, device, or representation used as, or which is in the nature of, an announcement, direction, or advertisement.”~~ For the purposes of this Ordinance the word “sign” includes “billboard” but does not include *athletic scoreboards*, street or traffic signs or warnings, or the flag, pennant, or insignia of any nation, group of nations, state, city, or other governmental units.”

Proponent, Ellen Arnold, Associate Director of Dartmouth’s Real Estate Office and Counsel REO/CPF, said the proposal is to remove athletic scoreboards from the sign regulations portion of the Ordinance, treat them as a separate issue, and allow them by special exception.

Bob Ceplikas, Deputy Director of Dartmouth Athletics, said there have been a lot of changes over the years with the set-up of Division 1 sports venues, including technology. It is more and more standard for Division 1 football stadiums to include video displays in their scoreboards. Dartmouth is now the only Ivy League school that does not provide video

display. The Ordinance's current language does not allow for scoreboards to exist as they currently do; it does not even allow for the score to be displayed. The Ordinance should be brought up to date to reflect the real purpose of an athletic scoreboard.

Ceplikas said athletic scoreboards are different from signs. Signs are generally intended to be seen by the public. Scoreboards are inward facing, for use by the spectators at the venue. They are not intended to attract or distract members of the public with lighting or displays. Scoreboards have almost no impact on the surrounding area. As such, it makes sense to distinguish athletic scoreboards from signs and to build in protection to enable the appropriate Town entity to consider a particular application and pass judgment.

Arnold said the proposal lays out the type of information that could be displayed on an athletic scoreboard including recognition of donors and sponsors by name only, and to alert spectators of other athletic events occurring on campus. This does not include commercial advertising.

Board Comments/Questions:

- ESMAY asked of the number of existing scoreboards and their locations.
 - Ceplikas said Dartmouth has 8 outdoor scoreboards; one at each venue (football, soccer, lacrosse, baseball, softball, rugby, practice football field, field hockey).
- ESMAY expressed interest in hearing from venue abutters, particular since they would be protected by the special exception requirement.
- CONNOLLY suggested adding that the scoreboards be located just within the boundary of the athletic facility it services.
- DIETRICH asked of acoustic aspects of a scoreboard.
 - Arnold said a sound system would fall under Site Plan Review as a separate component.
 - Ceplikas added that there are no additional speakers or sound elements associated with a scoreboard. Any sound would be provided from a facilities' sound system.
 - Tim McNamara, Associate Director of Dartmouth's Real Estate Office, added that the only impacts associated with a scoreboard are visual effects. Sound can be projected whether there is a scoreboard or not. The special exception review would only consider the visual impacts.
- SIM asked to what extent a scoreboard would be visible from public streets.
 - Ceplikas said Dartmouth does take into account a scoreboard's positioning in relation to adjacent streets. He said regardless of the current regulations, the football stadium scoreboard has animation and flashing. The regulations were the same when that scoreboard was approved, and there was no concern expressed at that time for those functions of the scoreboard. In any lighted field situation, the contribution of light from the scoreboard is miniscule compared to the lighting system.

It was moved by CARTER, seconded by MAYOR, to carry this amendment forward to a public hearing. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

13-6: Education Uses

Add the following new definition to Section 902:

“Agriculture, Forestry, and Environmental Research and Education: Education and research activities at all age levels on topics relating to agriculture, forestry, or the environment. These activities may be conducted in the outdoors or inside a building. Included in this use shall be school and all age day care programs utilizing facilities on the site. New buildings specifically constructed to house activities associated with an agricultural, forestry, or environmental research and education activities may only be located on parcels having frontage on a numbered State Highway. All other area and dimensional requirements shall be as specified in the underlying zoning district.”

Amend Tables 204.7 (RR Rural Residence) and 204.8 (F Forestry and Recreation) to add: *“Agriculture, Forestry, and Environmental and Research Education”* as new uses allowed by Special Exception.”

Joanna Whitcomb, Director of Planning at Dartmouth, said the proposal is to have a more active recreation zone within the F district and to allow research and college-level education programs at the Fullington Farm site. A new definition is added for “Agricultural, Forestry, and Environmental Research and Education”. This use would be allowed by special exception in the RR and F districts. The proposal also allows for use of existing buildings for related activities. Whitcomb said Dartmouth is still working with various groups and Town staff to look at the Mink Brook Nature Preserve, some of the in-town forest and recreation spaces, and perhaps rezoning the Organic Farm parcel to allow these uses. Tim McNamara, Associate Director of Dartmouth’s Real Estate Office, said the purpose of the farm is education; not to be a commercial farm. Dartmouth wants to be able to have kids out there to teach them about farming, sustainable agriculture, and forestry, and to be able to do that in the environment where those things occur.

Board Comments/Questions:

- Smith suggested replacing “parcel” with “lot”.
- SIM questioned the inclusion of a children’s day care.
 - Whitcomb said there is already a child care at the Fullington Farm site.
 - Smith suggested incorporating groups of people of all ages; not just children.
- DIETRICH asked whether this is a temporary solution.
 - Whitcomb said this meets Dartmouth’s current needs. At some future time, because this abuts Storrs Pond and Oak Hill, and there are potential trail connection opportunities, it may need further refining. Dartmouth will continue discussions with the Hanover Improvement Society and others about enabling a more active Forest and Recreation district.

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by DIETRICH, to carry this amendment forward to a public hearing. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

6. DISCUSSION ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING PARTY

ESMAY announced that the first neighborhood planning party will be held Sunday, from 4:00 to 6:00 pm in the Mayer Room at the Howe Library. She thanked the Howe staff for allowing use of the room beyond the Library’s operating hours. This gathering involves the Hovey Lane, Buell Street, and Ledyard Lane neighborhoods. A meeting agenda, prepared by Smith was provided to the Board. ESMAY asked that as many Board members attend as is possible. She said the lists of neighborhoods and residents offering to host gatherings are growing. Smith said two groups have expressed interest in holding their meeting over the

summer. She hopes to squeeze in another one in the spring. Smith also advised that a few residents who cannot attend have already submitting their completed Neighborhood Worksheet and Reflections form.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Downtown Employee Parking

SIM reported on a presentation of the downtown employee parking report to the Board of Selectmen. Recommendations include:

Short-term:

1. Reassign where some of the downtown employees park in town. Move high school students to Thompson Arena and assign permit parking to downtown employees along lower Lebanon Street and Hovey Lane.
2. Try to make better use of the available space in the Town garage by issuing day passes to downtown employees beginning at 10:00 am.

Midterm:

3. Improve car-pooling opportunities.
4. Expand the range of Advanced Transit – currently noted as 7-10 miles from Hanover.
5. Increase meter rates, especially in the core area.
6. Extend regulated parking hours in the core area to 8:00 pm.
7. Move to a system of smart meters that accepts payment by credit card or cell phone and can be programmed to restrict meter feeding.
8. Automate some of the routine tasks in the Parking Division relative to fine payments.

Long-term:

9. Provide an intercept facility (park-and-ride).

SIM said one message derived from the survey is that people feel that their drive is already long enough. They don't want to have to wait for a transit bus that will likely be stuck in traffic. A lot of other data collected reflects people's attitudes towards Advanced Transit, carpooling, biking, etc. SIM said it does not appear to be worthwhile to make any investments to increase biking opportunities for downtown employees.

The next step is for the Parking Division to prepare two budgets: one representing conditions as is; another incorporating a few of the proposed changes.

Quick facts:

- There are 1,717 downtown employees (1/3 of which are employed by Dartmouth)
- There are 1,031 available public parking spaces in the downtown (700 are private spaces)
- 50% of the downtown employees feel that parking should be free for employees
- The largest proportion of employees entering Hanover does so from Ledyard Bridge; Access from Route 120 is second.

Next meeting: March 5, 2013 at the Howe Library

First Zoning Amendment Public Hearing: March 12, 2013 at Town Hall

Second Zoning Amendment Public Hearing: March 26, 2013 at Town Hall

Smith announced that copies of the Hanover Conservancy's Annual Report and Institutional Residential Report are available.

10. ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth Rivard