

**PLANNING BOARD  
DECEMBER 10, 2013 at 7:30 PM  
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

In attendance:

**Members:** Kate Connolly, Bill Dietrich (Vice-Chair), Judith Esmay (Chair), Michael Mayor; Iain Sim; Nancy Carter (Selectmen's Representative)

**Alternates:** None

**Staff:** Vicki Smith

Others: See Attendance Sheet

DIETRICH served as Chair.

1. **MINUTES:** The minutes of November 5, 2013 were approved.

ESMAY arrived and took over the Chairmanship.

2. **P2013-47 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW - BY CARL SANDIN AND WILLIAM & CRISTINA HAMMOND, TO DIVIDE ONE LOT INTO TWO LOTS (1.2 ACRES & 4.8 ACRES) AT 11 ETNA ROAD, TAX MAP 28, LOT 8, IN THE “SR-2” AND “RR” ZONING DISTRICTS.**

Skip Nalette, of Pathways Consulting, presented the conceptual review. He said the applicants wish to amend the current proposal by reducing the newly created parcel from 1.2 acres to 1.0 acre. This requires a relocation of the subdivision line 30-40' to the north. Relative to utilities, the intent is to tie into the municipal sewer line and drill a well.

Board Comments/Questions:

- What is the minimum acreage in the SR-2?
  - Smith said 20,000 square feet in Class 2.
- Any specific basis for the proposed amendment?
  - Nalette said after reviewing the plan, the property owners felt the change would present a neater plan.
- Have there been discussions with DPW to connect to the sewer line?
  - Nalette said no. That will be addressed prior to final application submission.
- Consideration should be given to Section 302, Lots in Two Zoning Districts, and Section 210.1A, Accessory Uses, Driveways, of the Zoning Ordinance.

Public Comments/Questions: None

Staff Comments/Questions:

- The Sandins will be seeking a Wetlands Special Exception from the ZBA. They are looking for feedback from the Planning Board regarding the proposed design prior to submitting a ZBA application.

There being no further comments/questions, DIETRICH said the Sandins are good to go to the Zoning Board.

### **3. P2013-48 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW OF HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT'S ADDITION AND RENOVATION AT THE RAY SCHOOL, RESERVOIR ROAD, TAX MAP 4, LOT 4, IN THE "I" ZONING DISTRICT.**

Jonathan Brush, SAU #70 Director of Facilities, Patricia Tope and Jeremiah Goulet, of Banwell Architects, and Charlie Draper from CLD Engineering, presented the conceptual review. Brush said the project will be done in two phases. Phase One to be constructed over the summer of 2014. Phase Two to be constructed during the summer of 2015. The intent of the project is to remove the temporary classroom and replace it with a permanent structure that will house three new classrooms, and to construct a kindergarten pod as the kindergarten program is expanding and will be all-day. The 40-year old HVAC system will also be replaced.

Phase One consists of the building additions, a 1,600 sf kindergarten pod and three new classrooms totaling 4,800 sf. Reconfiguration for improved security and function is also planned. Classroom size is partially driven by a State requirement of 900 sf per classroom for elementary school and 1200 sf for kindergarten classrooms. Temp classrooms will be removed.

Phase Two: Brush said the turnaround area for buses does not accommodate the number of buses that meet at the school all at the same time. Parent parking in the drop-off area rather than the parking lot is also a problem. The proposal is to create a sole entrance/exit to the site, separating bus and parent drop-off areas. Parking will also be reconfigured. Parking for after-hour events can utilize the bus loop and parent drop-off areas for additional parking. These changes will add 17,000 sf of impervious area. Some drainage features are proposed within the 75' wetland setback of Girl Brook for treatment and retention purposes. Right now there is no treatment on site.

#### Board Comments/Questions:

- Has the pupil population changed? Grown?
  - Brush said it is expected to increase slightly.
- Any other interior renovations anticipated?
  - Brush said the hallway carpets will be replaced with a hard surface, the front entrance will be reconfigured, and there will be ADA upgrades to the restrooms. There is also potential to convert classroom lighting from fluorescents to LED. The front entrance will lead to a shatterproof window where visitors will identify themselves and request to be buzzed in. From there they will access the office to obtain a visitor's tag; then on to the rest of the building.

- What classes will be put in the new classrooms?
  - Brush said the French class and special education class currently housed in the modular will be relocated to these new rooms. Special services, whose current room will be displaced due to kitchen alterations, may be housed in the third new room.
- Will the three classrooms retain use of doors leading directly to the outdoors?
  - Brush said this construction is being developed as a separate building. Appropriate firewall protection will be utilized to negate a requirement that these classrooms have doors leading to the exterior.
- Have recreation department directors been advised that the Ray School property will be not be available for use or as a cut-through to Storrs Pond during construction?
  - Brush said yes, recreational programs will be relocated to the RMS or elsewhere. He has not yet advised them of the property pass-thru restriction.
- Can the roof support new HVAC equipment and necessary baffling?
  - Brush said the existing units are located within a penthouse enclosure on a concrete slab supported by steel I-beams. The new system will be installed in the same location.
- Students exiting buses will be lead to the gymnasium?
  - Brush said no, to the main entrance.
- What is the current traffic situation on Reservoir Road and how will the proposed singular entrance/exit impact it?
  - Brush said Peter Kulbacki, Public Works Director, is in agreement that eliminating the Ray School entrance located directly across from Dartmouth's day care facility would be beneficial.
- What proportion of children is dropped off by parents versus by bus?
  - ESMAY said a 2009 report indicates that 54% of students arrive by bus, 6% is assumed to walk, and 40% are dropped off by car.
- To the extent that one can encourage more use of the buses and less single-occupancy drop-offs will be beneficial to the environment.
  - Brush said increased ridership is discussed annually between the Principal and parents.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- Putting off all of the exterior improvements until summer 2015 would delay the need for ZBA approval. The point of site plan conceptual review is for the Planning Board to approve a conceptual design that would then presented to the ZBA. This conceptual review should include the wetland and driveway issues.
  - Brush said the phasing is necessary to accommodate the various contractors involved with the various portions of the project. They don't want to redo the driveway while cranes are on site and in use for the building construction.
- A prominent design feature should be treatment of stormwater. Could treatment be located within the new green areas of the reconfigured parking lot rather within the wetland setback?
  - Brush said treatment will be provided in those areas. The problem is that the site is clay and runoff will not infiltrate. Treatment must be broken up rather than concentrated in large areas.

- There is a major trail corridor in close proximity to the site. Consideration should be given to formalizing crossing of Reservoir Road. It should be safe for all users at all times, regardless of whether school is in session.
  - Brush said he will continue to talk to Town staff about that and include Smith in the conversation.

Public Comments/Questions:

- Lyn Miller questioned whether rain roof options were considered or roof-mounted solar panels and whether the new heating system will be based on current heating use or effective heating use after the upgrades?
  - Brush said a green roof will require structural changes which will add to the project cost. Solar panels will not work given the roof's shape and sloping. They are considering biomass, which has quicker pay back than solar. Heat will be provided by propane or pellets.
- Ben White said this seems to be pushing into a play area.
  - Brush said the playground areas will not be changed.
- Doug Deaett expressed concern for potential impact to traffic, bikers, and pedestrians who want to pass through the school property. He said the Bike Committee wants input.
- Susan Edwards expressed concern for drainage and an existing path in neighborhood used by kids. She asked whether the steep drop in grade leading to Reservoir Road will be dug out.
  - An applicant representative said yes, there will be a much more gradual grade, flaring out at the road for improved visibility.
- Michelle Poisson said the current drainage system is overwhelmed quite easily and impacts a play area used by dozens of children.
- Brian Edwards said a plan on the SAU website seems to depict a lot of streetlights illuminating the parking lot. He does not want a huge amount of light pollution for a “business” that essentially closes at 3:30PM.
  - Brush said current lighting is inadequate and has caused a number of accidents. We do not plan to flood the lot with massive light pollution. Lighting will be programmed to be turned off when the building is not in use. They will not run until midnight or all night long.
- Lyn Miller asked of existing trees in the driveway.
  - Brush said it has not yet been decided whether to protect or relocate them.
- Miller suggested using solar panels in the parking.
  - Brush said solar panels were considered but are way out of our price range.

**4. P2013-52 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW OF AT&T PLANS FOR SITING A TOWER ON MOOSE MOUNTAIN.**

Will Dodge of Downs Rachlin Martin PLLC representing AT&T, Patrick Nysten of SAI Communications, Tim Whalen of Centerline Communications, Tom Johnson of ProTerra Design Group, and Rod Finley of Pathways Consulting appeared on behalf of the conceptual review.

Dodge said that AT&T has coverage in Hanover by virtue of roaming off of a Verizon Wireless site. Verizon can no longer accommodate AT&T roaming services. AT&T needs its own facility. A temporary Cellular on Wheel Facility (COW) was installed while AT&T negotiated for use on an existing tower or to construct a new one. Dodge said use of the COW is permitted through September 2014.

The proposal is for a 150' self-support monopole communications tower to provide coverage for Moose Mountain and its immediately surrounding area. The tower will accommodate up to three commercial carriers and have capacity for public safety. ZBA approval of a wetland special exception to construct portions of the access road within the 25-75' wetland buffer and a variance from the 30' height restriction are required. Wetland calculations and the functions/values assessment required by zoning have not yet been completed. A tower height of 150' is needed to replicate or improve current coverage and allow for additional capacity. The applicant is further required to show that every effort has been made to collocate on an existing tower (Zoning Ordinance §322.3A(3) and 322.1). Dodge said the Moose Mountain tower no longer meets the standards of the International Building Code due to recent changes to ice and wind standards. Radio frequency engineers have determined that the only other ideal location is the Town's land to the south of the current tower. That land is under conservation and is being contested. Other sites on Shumway property were also considered.

The proposal meets all setback requirements and noise standards. Lighting and markings are neither required nor proposed. Access will be provided by a Class VI Road following a cross country ski trail. A balloon test indicated that site will not be visible along Appalachian Trail. Photo simulations from the balloon test show limited visibility from Three Mile, Dana, Morgan, and Wolfboro Roads and the South Peak Summit view of an adjacent scenic vista. Dodge said a monopine, a monopole disguised as a pine tree, may cause the tower to stick out more. AT&T is willing to explore that option if the Board prefers.

Dodge said for the record how greatly he appreciates Mr. Shumway's efforts with this project.

Proposed tower will be over 400' from scenic easement. The access road will be just shy of 1,800'. The existing ski trail will be used as much as possible. It must be widened to accommodate construction vehicles. Once constructed, it will be used for maintenance visits. Winter access will be by snowmobile.

The proposed tower compound is 45'x45', has equipment shelters, an emergency generator, and drainage swales. Erosion control measures and slope stabilization are needed along the road. Some changes are proposed along the current access road. The ZBA asked that they look at bringing compound closer to the trailhead. Dodge said that may be problematic for radio frequency, would require additional height and would increase visibility.

Board Comments/Questions:

- What type of foundation is required?
  - Dodge said a concrete mat foundation, typically 4' below ground and roughly 25'square and 4' thick.
- There is no hope for an agreement with NHPTV?

- If a current proposal fails, it will likely be the last.
- It is very hard to ask any detailed questions given the large amount of information being presented to the Board without the benefit of receiving information in advance of the meeting.
- It was noted that CONNOLLY, SIM, GARIPAY, and DIETRICH witnessed the balloon test.
- What will the compound look like?
  - Dodge said it will be designed to house equipment shelters, tower, generator, and a 12'x20' turnaround area in the front. It will be surfaced with gravel and be surrounded by a 6' or 8' chain-link fence with barbed wire on the top. Screening is not proposed as the location is so deep in the forest.
- Is it preassembled?
  - Dodge said it will take a day or two to assemble the tower at the site, using a crane to stack it.
- How will the wetlands be affected?
  - Dodge said project impacts will be to a wetland buffer area.
- How much of the buffer will be impacted?
  - Dodge said only preliminary wetland calculations have been done.
- The Board will want to know what will be done to attempt to minimize impact.
- SIM noted that the COW was requested and approved for one year. That approval has expired. He said for the integrity of the planning process and authority of this Board, that application should be requested to be extended through September 2014.
  - Dodge apologized and said he will include an extension request when he files for Site Plan approval.
- This is the only tower that provides coverage to the Town?
  - Dodge said no, it's the only tower providing coverage to the Moose Mountain area. Other coverage is provided by other sites in Hanover & Norwich.
- It would be useful to see the total coverage for the Town from the various towers.

Public Comments/Questions:

- Tom Hall advised of problems associated with a tower that these applicants constructed on Dartmouth's property in Centerra near the River Valley Club. Hall said Julia Griffin, Town Manager, submitted a letter to Lebanon stating that the Centerra tower would be jarring and upsetting to neighbors in higher elevations. The Lebanon tower is white and does not blend into the background. Neighbors are quite upset with the view impact. Hall invited the Planning Board to meet with residents of Gates and Stevens Road to witness the Lebanon tower and discuss this new proposal. Hall further suggested that regional notification should be provide to VT towns in addition to NH towns and that the balloon taset should be done with different colors. He urged the Board to look at a tower that exists, from Etna, before blindly accepting pictures of how it will look from a distance.
  - Dodge said the white design of the Lebanon tower was chosen because of concerns expressed by Dartmouth College, the Town of Hanover, and the DART owner. The Hanover tower will be matte-gray, as gray tends to blend more than a different color. Dodge offered to show what a monopine would look like.

- DIETRICH said monopines blend in nicely sometimes. The one on I-89 South stands out.
- CARTER said rather than pretend this is something in nature; we should remember that this is a fact of technology.

The applications currently before the ZBA will be heard on January 30, 2014.

## **5. REVIEW OF ZONING AMENDMENTS PROPOSED FOR CONSIDERATION AT TOWN MEETING 2014**

### Ledyard Neighborhood

Connolly said neighborhood residents came up with these proposals in response to a neighborhood residential zoning meeting and a building permit application which produced a few problems with the Zoning Ordinance. The proposals are not all that restrictive but bring into the scale that we've had before.

- A. Reduce by a sliding scale lot coverage and building coverage for small lots in the GR and SR zoning districts. Current regulations allow for huge dwellings which simply take up good portions of a lot. On smaller lots, that produces a much more crowded area, reducing light and air aspects of in-town neighborhoods which should be preserved. The Master Plan speaks endlessly about retaining characters of neighborhoods. This does just that. Connolly said this would not reduce by a great deal the actual size of proposed buildings except when lots are less than 15,000 sf in size. She said not many properties in SR and GR districts come close to what we allow for building and lot coverage. For that reason, and to avoid anything too disastrous in the future as far as impinging on neighbors, it should be reduced on a sliding scale.

Judy Brotman, Zoning Administrator, expresses concern by written memo for the creation of non-conforming properties.

- B. Change the definition of lot coverage to include "*and necessary driveways to access garage and parking or storage*". This is to address the notion that garages can be accessed by lawn. This was not addressed in the problematic building permit application, but it was addressed by the ZBA.
- C. Change the way height is measured. It is currently measured in residential zones from the front façade. Sloping grades and roofs can allow up to 43' in height. Connolly said absolute height of roof is height.

Brotman's memo states that this will create a scale of buildings lower than those currently permitted. Connolly agreed but said this would only apply to the construction of new homes. The current scale of most existing residential properties in Hanover is much below 35'.

- D. Change side yard setback to a minimum of 10'. Connolly said this has been part of endless discussions.  
Brotman recommends by memo to include rear lot lines. Connolly said she agrees.

Board Comments/Questions:

- Would the method of calculating height apply to all zoning districts?
  - Connolly said yes. There are special caveats regarding the I and BM districts.
- This was the method by which building height was determined previously. Why was it changed to the current system? Was the goal achieved?
  - Connolly said she cannot recall why the change was made. These proposed changes reflect what exists today.
  - Bill Boyle said the current 35' restriction was set by the Hanover Water Works Company. For fire protection, heights needed to be restricted to preserve water pressure throughout the town.
- Was thought given to doing something more gradual? A change of one square foot of lot size has a significant difference in the amount of lot coverage allowed.
  - Connolly said she would not object to using a sliding scale. Her goal was to keep the proposal as simple as possible.
- This would govern what would happen if any existing building were torn down and replaced.
- How many properties would become non-conforming as result of this change?
  - Connolly said she went over a representative set of properties and most are non-conforming already in terms of lot size. The one example that shows what can happen as a result of the present percentages is 19 School Street; it is very close to 35% building coverage and easily 65% lot coverage. Look at what's left.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- Is 60 and 75% lot coverage on large lots too much?
  - Connolly said it was 55 and 80% when this regulation was instituted. Dartmouth was terribly worried that their Park Street projects would not be able to be built without very elaborate restrictions. The 35 and 65% came as a compromise from those that did not want the restriction at all.
- 75% lot coverage is atypical of the greenery that we like to see in yards and in terms of accommodating stormwater treatment it is very difficult. Not leaving area for treatment and are asking that the impervious surface to drain right into our storm drain system.
- Is the addition driveway language necessary? Who will decide whether a driveway is “unnecessary”? That adjective will cause trouble. Need to clarify “driveways” to “any outbuilding”, rather than label them “necessary”.
  - Connolly said Brotman accepted the prospect that two garages did not have to be addressed by driveways. The problem arose as lot coverage ended at 65% and did not address the necessary lot coverage on that particular permit.

Public Comments/Questions:

- Bill Boyle said if we don't define the building lots, people will clear cut trees leaving us with not really compact neighborhoods.



- Charlie Faulkner shared his opinion that this proposal is not restrictive enough. He said it is difficult to find specific ways to impose restrictions on the character of a neighborhood but this is an important consideration.
- Keri Craft said this is beyond just the one project that has been very upsetting to residents within her neighborhood. We love the green space and take pride in it. This is a somewhat realistic to preserve what we have already.
- DIETRICH read from the Bryant and Marilyn Denk's letter which said if approved, the [ZBA] would be allowed to hear special exceptions where appropriate variations might be allowed and not just automatically approved. It was noted that this is not a part of the proposed amendment, just a statement from the Denk's.

The Board reached consensus to move this forward to a January hearing for further consideration.

---

Ellen Arnold said Dartmouth was notified in March 2013 that some of their banners were in violation of the Zoning Ordinance. This proposal is to (1) clarify the Ordinance to reflect what has occurred regularly for a very long time. This is specific to banners in the I district for institutional related activities. Arnold said there are internal policies at Dartmouth that deal with banners requiring review of anything hung inside or outside of a building. (2) The proposed change in size of banners reflects actual size of banners. Banners are expensive; Dartmouth does not want to have to buy new ones. Existing banners are in keeping with the scale of buildings. (3) Also proposed is a use time limit which Judy Brotman, Zoning Administrator, argues is not temporary. Arnold said most banners are not up for that long and are more likely hung for just a few weeks. Dartmouth requests a maximum time limit to accommodate events they anticipate happening. They would like to be able to keep a banner up for as long as an activity is occurring. Museum exhibits go on for a long time.

Board Comments/Questions:

- The language of §317.2E and §317.6 should both state that building owners are permitted to display banners, not that buildings are permitted.
- Is there an adequate description of buildings associated with the “arts”?
- Churches in the I zone have been using banners for about five years. They are not associated with the arts. Should this be for all institutional building owners.
  - Arnold said eliminating §317.2E would necessitate a proposed change to banner size to reflect current practice.
- It would be of interest to the Board to see the policy that guides the decision making process of what is allowed and what is not.
- Are there limitations on the content of signage at all?
  - Smith said no.
  - Then why now?
- Do we want to have a blanket I zone change? Do we want to pick up buildings that are not included in the college campus?
  - Smith said it is only fair to allow all institutional building owners to have banners.
  - CONNOLLY said she considers this to be quite specific to Dartmouth in the I zone. She expressed concern for content that might be displayed. She said some folks were

- worried about the Memorial Field scoreboard distracting people on the street. How much more distracting would a 150 sf sign on the other side of the street be?
- Arnold said it should be dependent upon the size of the building. These numbers are based on Dartmouth's biggest buildings where banners are displayed. She said given their cost, it is unlikely that an unattractive or offensive banner would be displayed.
  - CARTER said it is important that other organizations like a church and the High School have that same kind of freedom of expression. Building size and banner size and cost will limit the situation. No one in town has Dartmouth's clout, pocketbook or need.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- The proposal finesses athletic field banners in a good way as they are not facing the street.

Arnold said she would like to rework the language to address the requirement that buildings have frontage and rework §317.6. It is really a question of what is visible from a public street. Tim McNamara, of the Dartmouth Real Estate Office, said the key is the institutional use. It seems only fair to allow schools and churches in the I zone.

Public Comments/Questions: None

The Board reached consensus to carry this forward to a January hearing.

**6. P2013-51 DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT- PLANNED BUSINESS PARK OFF ETNA ROAD IN LEBANON**

ESMAY noted receipt of a copy of an application for preliminary subdivision by James Campion. She read from the application, *"The Signal Park Transportation hub will provide a secure spot for leased centralized commuter parking, fleet and equipment parking and long-term parking at a transportation nexus. This hub will include a bus terminal, limousine service, and Advanced Transit stop, and service shuttles for employee parking. It will include a central fueling depot service station that will offer gasoline, diesel fuel, bio-diesel, quick charge electric fueling, and compressed as well as liquefied natural gas."*

CONNOLLY said it is a rather large proposition. MAYOR said hidden in the text is the possibility of beginning to establish natural gas pipelines out to individual consumers. DIETRICH questioned whether results of a traffic study were available. SIM suggested a park and ride at this location would only serve employees of DHMC.

Staff was asked to draft a letter requesting a copy of the traffic study.

**7. UPDATE ON RESIDENTIAL PROJECT**

Smith said there are no additional neighborhood meetings planned. Hanover Center, Blueberry Hill, Occom Pond, and North Balch will meet in the spring. She will be doing

write-ups for Etna and Middle Mink Brook. Smith said she has heard really positive feedback from the people of Etna.

**8. OTHER BUSINESS**

Next meeting: January 7, 2014

**9. ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 10:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Rivard