

PLANNING BOARD
June 7, 2016 at 7:30 PM
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET

In attendance:

Members: Kelly Dent, Judith Esmay (Chair), Michael Mayor, Iain Sim, Kate Connolly, Jon Criswell, Nancy Carter, Brian Edwards

Staff: Vicki Smith

Others: Kevin Worden, Laura Beliveau, Lisa Hogarty, John Scherding, Robert Ceplikas, Joseph Broemel, Richard Whitmore, Bill Wolpert, Rod Finley, Alan Saucier, Ellen Arnold, Bill Massey, Vinicius Gorgati, Judith Reeve, John Colligan, Sandra Hoeh, Keri Kraft, Harold Frost, Frances Manasek, Dan O’Dea, Dale Eickelman, Jon Fox, Darryl Hotchkiss, Harriet De Barge, Larry Litten Carol Weingeist, Ruth Lappin, Robert Metz, Nina Lloyd, David Dent, Julie and Josh Kim, Barbara and Alan Callaway, Rich Rothstein, Same Hopkins, Anne Wilson, Tom Csatari, Joe Pyor, Corinne Fortune, Andrew Bernard, Maggie and Rich Joseph, Susan DiStasio, Rebecca and Peter Paquette, Marilyn and Bryant Denk, Rob Wolfe, Jeff and Maureen Doyle, Jan Skinner, Barry Harwick, Bob Riessen, Bill Bittinger, Gert and Jan Assmus, Tara Velozo, Bill Young

1. Minutes of May 3, 2016

The minutes of May 3, 2016 were reviewed and modifications made. **On a motion by CONNOLLY that was seconded by DENT, there was unanimous approval of the minutes as amended.**

2. P2016-17 Submission of Application for Modification of Approved Site Plan (021-002P2006-05) by Gile Drive Phase 2 Ltd. Partnership to change lighting, underground utilities, and paving, and to replace a community building with a storage shed. The property is located at 5 White Pine Oval, Tax Map 20, Lot 6, in the “OL” zoning district.

Kevin Worden and Laura Beliveau described each part of the proposed modification to the approved site plan. The Housing Association requests that the parking between Buildings 11 and 12 be converted from gravel to paved surface. In Kevin’s opinion, there is little difference in the stormwater run-off of gravel compacted by vehicles and pavement. He noted that there is rilling now. If paved, the parking lot could be striped which would result in more efficient use of the space. There will be no changes to the location of accessible spaces.

Four new lights are proposed for the back side of Building 5. These are proposed to be LED and downcast to illuminate the walkway behind the building

At Building 4 which was changed from the originally approved condominium to rental, four additional LED downcast lights are proposed. These will continue the established lighting pattern.

The underground power feed to Building 4 has been located in a slightly different alignment at the request of the power company.

Finally, the Homeowners' Association has requested that the community building be replaced with a lawn accented by boulders. The Homeowners Association has no interest in a community building with its maintenance expense. The Association values the flat open space. A storage shed is proposed to hold odds and ends. The area will be re-graded and re-seeded once the construction around it is complete.

Board Comments /Questions:

DENT asked about the soils on site and learned that they were mostly thin covering blasted ledge. The parking areas are typically 18 inches of gravel on cut/filled blasted granite. Stormwater treatment areas are located across the site. There is not expected to be an increase in stormwater runoff as a result of paving the parking area.

SIM inquired about the landscaping around the parking area. The landscaping is as was initially approved. The landscaping does not show on the plans submitted for the modification. He wondered about landscaping around the new common area and was told that there are trees along the wetlands and the perimeter of the site.

Public Comments/Questions:

Darryl Hotchkiss wondered if there was a budget for the community center and whether the condominium documents had been modified to remove the community center. Laura Beliveau replied that she had been involved in the legal process in the conversion of the last building from condominium to rental and one of the conditions of approval of the change in form of ownership was that the lawn area replace the community center. ESMAY noted that this information is contained in letter from Rich Geiger, president of the Homeowners' Association.

The hearing was closed.

Waivers have been requested for:

- 1) survey plan
- 2) site context map
- 3) vicinity sketch
- 4) vehicular and pedestrian circulation plan
- 5) elevation plan
- 6) utility plan
- 7) landscaping plan
- 8) grading and drainage plan
- 9) construction staging plan

Staff commented that the plan, site plan, paving, grading and drainage and lighting plan are proposed for modification and have been adequately addressed by the plans submitted with this application.

It was moved by SIM, seconded by CONNOLLY, to find the application complete with the waivers requested. All Board members voted in favor of the motion. The motion carried.

It was moved by SIM, seconded by DENT, to approve case # P2016-17 Application for Modification of Approved Site Plan (021-002P2006-05) by Gile Drive Phase 2 Ltd. Partnership to change lighting, underground utilities, and paving, and to replace a community building with a storage shed at 5 White Pine Oval, Tax Map 20, Lot 6, in the "OL" zoning district, as shown on a map prepared by Engineering Ventures, Project No. 14746, dated 06/07/16, with the condition that the applicant shall fully comply with the previous approvals, on January 23, 2007 for Case P2006-05, on August 28, 2007 for Case P2007-17, on June 3, 2008 for Case P2008-19, on April 2, 2013 for Case 021-002P2013-09 and on April 5, 2016 for Case 021-002P2016-11. All Board members voted in favor of the motion. The motion carried.

3. P2016-08 Submission of Application for Site Plan Review by the Trustees of Dartmouth College to construct a 69,860 sf indoor practice facility(IPF) on the "sunken garden" site, east of Boss Tennis Center, 4 Summer Court, Tax Map 34, Lot 102, in the "I" zoning district.

DENT recused herself from the Board. SIM wanted to know if the hearing was proceeding as a design review or a final review.

John Scherding noted that the application submitted was for design review, but routinely the College submission is complete enough to proceed to final review. He said that the College had not gone through design review on any other project and has not requested a waiver of design review.

Ellen Arnold said that design review is part of the preliminary consultation phase. The intent is for the Board and applicant to look at an undeveloped site. Considering the volume and detail of the material submitted and the well-established and orderly process the Board uses for site plan consideration, she advised a final review. With final review, more robust input from abutters and interested parties is expected. The conversation between the applicant and Board can be binding. Ellen concluded that the College was ready to discuss a final submission and interested parties want to be heard.

CONNOLLY said that this is the first time that design review has been questioned. She thought the application was complete and it was important to continue with the submission and hearing since there was a room full of people.

SIM concurred that with the room full of abutters and neighbors that the Board should proceed to final review but also wanted to be sure that the Planning Board scheduled a site visit. He thought public comment was needed and that would help focus the Board on neighbor concerns. He thought that notice of final plan review was a fault of the Town's process, not of the applicant. He did not think that non-binding suggestions would be fruitful.

EDWARDS said that without a site visit, it would be difficult to get a sense of the magnitude of the project.

ESMAY said that site visits and many meetings are routinely part of a complex review. She noted that the Board wrestles with projects during both the design review and final phases of the process.

Ellen Arnold pointed out that acceptance of the submission starts the statutory review clock.

Jeff Doyle wanted the Board to know that up until yesterday, the College had been involved in conversations about putting the IPF on the Blackman Fields and moving the Blackman Fields to the sunken garden. He mentioned that maybe the Planning Board would be disinclined to rule against the project or that the Zoning Board of Adjustment might be disinclined to approve variances. He suggested that it was premature to move ahead to final review until the openness of the Town to allow the IPF at the Blackman Fields was fully explored.

Francis Manasek thought that just because Dartmouth College had never had a project reviewed in both design and final reviews, that it was not an argument for not starting a design review for this project.

CONNOLLY made a motion to move to final review, noting that design review is usually held before plans are solidified. SIM noted that the field swap issue was not before the Board so there was no basis for the Board to review the IPF at Blackman Fields. CARTER wanted to be sure that by proceeding with final review, that the Town would not be biasing the College against the possibility of putting the IPF on the existing Blackman Fields. Ellen Arnold said that the College had considered the possibility at the request of abutters and the evaluation of that new location was in part what led to the postponement of the hearing on the IPF. Ellen said that the conclusion of the College was that the sunken garden was the better site.

ESMAY asked for a motion to review the site in the design review process. There being no support for design review, ESMAY suggested that the final review begin.

John Scherding described the Chase Field complex as being 41 acres and all in the "I" zoning district. In his view, the field house is permitted "of right" as it is a permitted use with no ZBA review necessary. The IPF is the next in a series of athletic buildings that includes Leverone, Thompson Area and the Boss Indoor Tennis Facility. By placing the building in the sunken garden, the neighborhood is buffered from parking, lighted fields and the PA systems at the other fields.

The IPF includes toilets, meeting rooms and batting cages and will not be used for assembly of a large number of people. It will serve football, lacrosse, softball, baseball and soccer teams.

Robert Ceplikas then presented a development history of the Dartmouth College athletic complex from 1996 through the construction of the softball stadium and highlighting the demise of the radio tower and regular relocation of the throwing area for hammer and discus.

There are two guiding principles in locating the IPF: 1) that it be within easy walking distance of campus and, 2) that there be buffers between areas that need to be lit and property lines so there is no light spill.

An indoor practice facility is necessary due to the long winters. Leverone is used primarily for track and field. The lacrosse, softball, baseball, soccer and football teams do not have what they need. The field hockey team is the one team that can use the AstroTurf in Leverone rather than the field turf that the other teams prefer.

Bob said that the College looked at Blackman Field as a location for the IPF, but if the Blackman Fields moved to the sunken garden, there would be light spill across the neighboring property lines and not enough area for two full fields. He said the proposed IPF site plan takes advantage of existing screening and puts a building with other athletic facility buildings.

He then described the outreach to neighbors. He said that 23 legal abutters and 32 additional property owners who might be affected were invited to a meeting on December 3. Fifteen neighbors attended this meeting where the initial concept was presented. Site walks were held on December 9 and 15. At the meeting on January 21 when Alan Saucier presented his landscape screening improvements, 15 neighbors attended. Between February 15 and 22, individual household meetings were held with four immediate abutters. On February 23, a third neighborhood meeting was held. Ten neighbors attended to review further revised landscape plans.

Bob then showed a series of slides which showed how the landscape plans had evolved. He noted that the final plan has had the most favorable response from the neighbors.

He then described a “campaign” that was forming against the project. The campaign included a website, Facebook page, Valley News ad and flyer distribution via email and door to door. He highlighted the letter of concern included in the flyer and the invitation to respond to Kelly Dent if a person wanted their name associated with the letter of concern. He wanted to look at the key language and images and present a different perspective regarding the project.

Bob reviewed the volume, height and proximity of the existing buildings, Leverone and Thompson, in comparison to the indoor practice facility. He noted that showing a house next to any of these buildings was an inappropriate way to compare building scale and said that the distance between the home and facility was actually more relevant. He noted that a Boeing 747 could indeed fit in the IPF and that both a Boeing 747 and a 737 could be parked in Leverone at the same time. He said that College athletic facilities are usually large and clustered.

He said that the neighborhood focused on the aesthetics of the warehouse look of the building. He showed pictures of the existing athletic buildings without screening, then showed a series of photographs with trees leafed out. He said that the College proposes evergreen planting to fill in when the leaves have fallen.

In closing, he asked the Board to consider whether a facility like the IPF really sets precedent and is out of place, or if it is a natural extension of the College athletic complex. He questioned

whether it would really impact the character of the Town in a negative way. He thought that it took advantage of the existing screening along Tyler Road and was a thoughtful and logical extension of the College's athletic facility and would mean a lot to the student athletes who will use it.

Board Comments /Questions:

CARTER asked if parking could be situated on top of the IPF and the facility positioned over Thompson parking lot. Bob Ceplikas answered that there have been studies considering turning Thompson lot into a parking structure, but the Thompson area buttresses are dug deep at an angle into the ground so make that site impractical for a parking structure.

SIM asked if the Board had received new information. He thought the March 1st plans were way out of date. He noted that the building height must have changed. He also requested that the presentation slides be made available to the Board. Bob Ceplikas said that most changes had taken place as a result of the neighborhood conversations. He suggested that the architect and landscape architect were more suitable for pointing out those updates.

EDWARDS asked about the logic of such a high building. Bob Ceplikas said that the building is actually reduced in height from what would be most desirable. Usually 70 to 80 feet is required for practicing football punts, pop up fly balls and long soccer kicks. MAYOR questioned the shading as shown on the elevations. The shading shown would be more consistent with March or October and not this time of year.

Public Comments/Questions:

John Colligan congratulated Bob Ceplikas for being as good a storyteller now as he was in 1997. Mr. Colligan thought that the comments about outreach should be disregarded as if the outreach efforts were successful, there would not be unhappy neighbors present. He thanked the Planning Board for performing their essential duty to protect the community and hoped they would give careful thought as to how the IPF will affect the character of the neighborhood. Bob Ceplikas replied that he appreciated the compliment. He explained that in order to accommodate students that choose an institution like Dartmouth to play a Division 1 sport and to receive a rigorous education, the College has an obligation to create a situation where they can juggle both responsibilities effectively. With students involved in classes, labs, and study groups, the College knows that athletic facilities must be within easy walking distance to the campus core. Only sailing is off campus. He said that the College is very deliberate about using every square inch on campus very carefully.

Someone in the audience added skiing and rugby to the off campus sports.

Francis Manasek brought up a philosophical point. He said the athletic program has specific requirements to meet but has no bearing on the issue being raised tonight by the neighbors. He wanted to be sure that everyone stayed focused on one building being proposed in one neighborhood. He said that Mr. Ceplikas had defended and described the quality and dedication of student athletes. However, Mr. Manasek pointed out that they have nothing to do with the quality of the neighborhood. In his opinion, the fact that the IPF is cast as a natural progression of athletic buildings is sheer folly. He said it is not natural and only makes a situation worse.

Bob Metz of Tyler Road truly respects Mr. Ceplikas' passion for the building. He noted that the presentation is flawed since the views are not from the level of neighbor's yards. He also said that the presentation was flawed because a large number of Dartmouth representatives are actually proposing to build an ugly warehouse. At University of Michigan, the school paid a few extra million for an architect to design and have built a more aesthetic building. He said that the southern entrance has architecture, but the rest of the building is lacking. He thought Dartmouth could do better.

Maureen Doyle said she graduated in 1985 and is so mad she may pop. She feels she has been lied to. At the first meeting, she was told that the College's plan was a "done deal" and that infuriates her. She is ashamed about the relationship the College wants to have with the neighborhood. She thinks the Rugby House and Varsity Gym are handsome buildings and hopes the College would keep that in mind.

Gert Assmus said that he was told that the building was comparable to Thompson Arena. Thompson Arena had a lot of neighborhood impacts. He said that Park Street used to be a street with elegant homes and prime real estate, but no more. He worries that the Tyler Road neighborhood will suffer the same fate as the homes on Park Street and the neighborhood will be destroyed.

Tara Velozo said that she graduated in 1997 and is the owner of record at 4 Tyler Road. She and her partner did not receive communication about the project. As a homeowner on Tyler Road she is offended by the interactions between the College and the neighborhood. In her view, she had a reasonable expectation about being notified about the neighborhood meetings.

Vinicius Gorgati of Sasaki Associates addressed three changes to the architecture of the building. First, is the massing. He showed a slide with the crest of the ridge of the roof moved. He pointed out where contours had been manipulated to break the edge of the building and bring about a softer approach to building form. Second is the surface orchestration. He said whenever possible he tries to work with symmetry and asymmetry to relax the perspective of the building. The materials were selected to bring movement to the façade. The darker colored panels touch the ground. The façade is treated like fabric to create a tapestry-like combination of colors. Third is the fenestration. He showed the elevation at the main entrance and the views from the southwest and northeast.

Ellen Arnold addressed the height of the building and referenced her June 2 memo. The question of height was raised and was in fact the subject of a zoning appeal. The College met with Kelly Dent and Jeff Doyle and modified the building height so that every façade is less than 60 feet tall. The appeal was withdrawn. She confirmed that the plans that the Planning Board has are not the most current.

John Colligan said that the punters may be happy, but the neighbors are not. He did not want to hear any more legal tutorials. John Scherding confirmed that the height has dropped two feet.

Alan Saucier of Pathways Consulting explained the changes to the landscape plan. He said that the planting on the existing slope consisted of 60 foot tall white pines with an understory of deciduous trees and shrubs. Because the plants are deciduous, there needed to be supplemental planting to provide a screen during defoliate conditions. Planting has been added to address neighborhood concerns. Loose, linear planting is proposed at the edge of the sunken garden. Hemlocks and some oaks are proposed on the northeast of the site. A 5' berm has been created along the northern façade. Spruce and more oak will be added to pick up on the palette of natural vegetation along Tyler Road to provide immediate visual impact. There are shrubs along the east side of the building. Irises are proposed along the service drive.

Maureen Doyle confirmed that this would be a paved drive. Alan said that along the north side is a fire lane and small loading dock for goals and sports equipment. The lighting will be code compliant, all LED with sharp cut off. Lighting will be recessed at the southern entrance. There is no public entrance on the north side so only minimal lights are proposed.

Rod Finley of Pathways Consulting described the stormwater concept and noted it is a critical issue. He worked on infiltration strategies for other Chase Field improvements. Chase Field is 41 acres of a 1300 acre watershed. The site incorporates a number of stormwater management facilities. There is a large roof area. To avoid the wetlands, the IPF is located as far west as possible. In the northwest corner of the site, a hydro-pneumatic separator is proposed. A small amount of run off from Boss will also be treated. There is a roof drain to the south. The rest drains ultimately to the east side of the building. Large storms will bypass to a detention area. On the east side, stormwater will flow off the roof, to the drip edge to the bio-retention area then to the detention area.

He stated that the proposed design meets the Town standards as well as those of the State. Mr. Finley pointed out the water service, hydrant to the north of the building, and the re-alignment of the sewer to the east side of the building.

SIM noted that the lot has many fronts. Tyler Road is definitely a front lot line; there are others at Lebanon Street, Summer Court, Teagan Avenue and Conant Road.

John Scherding said that the College understands how important stormwater management is to the Town and neighborhood. He said that the project would reduce the flow during peak storm events. He submitted a third party review of the drainage plan performed by Nitsche Engineering, known to be a progressive civil engineering company. The systems at the Chase Field complex reduce the rate and improve the quality of the stormwater released. The College has also agreed to make drainage improvements along Chase Road, where about half the 750 feet of line will be replaced, and about half will be slip-lined.

Judith Reeve was worried about the noise. She can hear the Life Sciences Building from her home at North Balch Street. She said that nothing had been submitted about noise abatement from the ventilation for IPF. She thought that the fenestration along the east side of the building will look like that of an Amtrak train car especially in the winter and would be very out of character with the neighborhood. She questioned how successful the planting on the north side of the building would be since the plants will get no sun. She pointed out that iris will not bloom

in the shade and grass will not grow easily. She noted the wetness of the site and water issues that have plagued the Chase Field complex since the 1990s. She said that the soils are not absorptive and will not treat water. She mentioned the erosion at Brook Hollow is a result of the flashiness of Girl Brook. She agrees with Hanover DPW that the project should not be evaluated in the absence of the whole drainage system and a thorough knowledge of downstream impacts. She had the impression that larger pipes were needed to handle the drainage.

Anne Wilson wished to address the landscaping. She thought the 60 foot trees would be cut to accommodate the new utilities. The root systems of other trees will also be disturbed. She noted that the 8 foot detention pond will also result in tree root disturbance. In her opinion, there will be way more destruction than has been shown. She thinks the neighborhood has a beautiful sense of place. A building is not a buffer for the neighborhood. She has great concern about Tyler Road and its sense of place changing.

Bill Young representing the Hanover Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee encouraged the Planning Board and College to consider a northside path from Chase Road along Girl Brook to the Ray School. He wanted some thought given to bike/ped routes.

Maureen Doyle thought the IPF could be put on the Blackman Fields. She suggested putting one natural field at the sunken garden and another on the parking lot. She urged creative thinking. She also noted that the building did not have one sustainable feature.

Bryant Denk said that there would be a domino effect as was experienced on Park Street with owner occupancy converting to renter occupancy. He thought that the northern end of the building could be rounded since balls fall in a parabolic arc. He thought an optical illusion could be used to create a lower looking building.

John Fox questioned how the exterior looked like fabric. He was very concerned about sound reflecting into the neighborhood.

Jeff Doyle was concerned about the massive size of the building. He likened it to a frog in the a fry pan where if the heat is gentle, the frog will not realize how hot it is getting and boils to death. He did not like the "natural progression" analogy. He pointed out that a two foot separation between Boss and IPF did not really create two buildings. He would like a significant buffer created between the neighborhood and the athletic complex. He feels like the College is turning its back on the neighborhood. He hoped for better drainage plans. He remembered when the whole complex was an open field. Now there are just backs of large buildings. The buildings create an edge where there never was an edge. Park Street is an example of the ghettoization of the Town. He said that it is the job of the Planning Board to stop the IPF as it is a bad idea and suggest that the Board vote it down.

Barry Harwick lives at 12 Reservoir Road and has worked at Dartmouth since 1977. His wife is an administrator at the College. He said he did not envy the Planning Board's job as members would need to decide if the proposed building was too big or too ugly. He did feel like it is the responsibility of the College to provide practice areas for the students. In his opinion, the project

is a good one that serves the College well. He wanted to point out that opposition to the project was not unanimous across the neighborhood.

Harold Frost lives in Hanover Center and has worked at the College for 35 years. He first came to Hanover in 1964 and remembers a delightful little town at the end of the road. He has held the College in high esteem. His grandfather attended the College in 1876. His son and younger brother also attended. What is special about Dartmouth is that it is an Ivy institution, but not located in an urban district. He was not in favor of the ratcheting up of the Ivy League sports program. He noted that in any league, the number of team losses equals the number of team wins. He wondered if the world is a better place if Team A wins and Team B loses. He pointed out that team sports are fun, provide opportunities for team building, and provide a basis for lifetime exercise, but wins are really not significant.

He said that some students use sports to get into the Ivy League. He wondered how many athletes are NOT recruited. He thought that athletes had no opportunity to participate in varsity sports if they are not recruited. He thought that Dartmouth could still put on a wonderful program without this building. He ended saying that it is better if Team D beats Team H.

Tom Csatri said that he played football for Dartmouth. He did not see how the proposed building would have a negative effect on his neighborhood. He was glad that the neighbors were speaking out, but wanted the Planning Board to know that not everyone thinks the project is a negative. He did not think the project will hurt the neighborhood.

Nina Lloyd wondered about preparations for the site visit.

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by SIM, to continue the submission of and hearing on this site plan until June 14, 2016 at 5:30 PM at the northeast corner of Thompson Parking lot. All Board members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

The Board hoped that updated site plans would be submitted and that balloons would be used to simulate the height and mass of the building. Nina Lloyd hoped that Planning Board members would be able to visit the front yards of neighbors to see how the views from their homes would be impacted and that some effort would be made to show how shadows would be cast from the building. Further discussion of the project will occur on June 21.

- 4. P2016-16 Submission of Application for Site Plan Review by John Scherding, as Agent for the Trustees of Dartmouth College, property owner of record, to construct a 7,600 sf expansion of the soccer pavilion building at 4 Summer Court, Tax Map 34, Lot 102, in the "T" zoning district.**

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by SIM, to continue the submission of and hearing on this site plan until June 21, 2016 at 7:30 PM. All Board members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

DENT returned to the Board.

- 5. Request for continuation of P2016-03 submission of application for Site Plan Review by The Eleazar Wheelock Society until July 5, 2016, to convert an existing mixed-use building to residential use. The property is located at 4 West Wheelock Street, Tax Map 33, Lot 37, in the “D-1” zoning district.**

The applicant has requested that consideration of this proposal be postponed.

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by CONNOLLY, to continue the submission of and hearing on this site plan until July 5, 2016 at 7:30 PM. All Board members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- 6. Request for continuation of P2016-02 submission of application for Site Plan Review by Rebecca Smith, as Agent for Kendal at Hanover, property owner of record, until July 5, to construct a 33-space parking lot at 80 Lyme Road, Tax Map 8, Lot 1, in the “GR-4” zoning district.**

The applicant has requested that consideration of this proposal be postponed.

It was moved by SIM, seconded by DENT, to continue the submission of and hearing on this site plan until July 5, 2016 at 7:30 PM. All Board members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

ESMAY extended congratulations to the Outreach Committee, SIM, CARTER, EDWARDS, DENT and MAYOR for their work informing voters about the zoning amendments and getting folks to vote at Town Meeting. She also thanked the members of the Technical Review Committee, DIETRICH, CONNOLLY and BROTMAN, and the close readers, SIM, EDWARDS, CARTER and DENT. She cited the Kendal presentation and the outreach at the Coop as being very effective. The development of the DVD has been documented so that a similar effort might occur in the future.

ESMAY intends to attend the PlanNH meeting on micro-apartments and tiny houses on June 15 at the Audubon Center in Concord.

ESMAY explained that CONNOLLY was moving closer to family and leaving Hanover. She described the legacy CONNOLLY has left and extended her thanks on behalf of the Planning Board.

- 8. NEXT MEETING:** Site Visit June 14th at 5:30 PM Indoor Practice Facility. Gathering at Thompson Arena Parking Lot’s northeast corner

- 9. ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 10:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Vicki Smith