

**PLANNING BOARD
JULY 5, 2016 at 7:30 PM
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

In attendance:

Members: Jon Criswell, Kelly Dent, Judith Esmay (Chair), Nancy Carter (Selectmen's Representative);

Alternates: Brian Edwards

Staff: Vicki Smith; Catheryn Hembree

Others: John Scherding, Robert Ceplikas, Joseph Broemel, Richard Whitmore, Rod Finley, Ellen Arnold, Vinicius Gorgati, Alicia Larsen, Judith Reeve, Frances Manasek, Carol Weingeist, Ruth Lappin, Nina Lloyd, David Dent, Anne Wilson, Maggie and Rich Joseph, Marilyn and Bryant Denk, Rob and Francie Riessen, Bill Bitteringer, Sally Boyle, Philip Hastings, Harold Frost, Judy Reeve, Gert and Jan Assmus, Janet Hurd, Susan and Alan Distasio, Joan Kelly, Peter and Rebecca Paquette, Dale Eickelman, Alex Halpern, Jane Masters, Sheila Tanzer, Boris Makarov, Olga Vandycheva, Corinne Fortune, Kristin Lynch, and Alan Saucier

1. **MINUTES:** The minutes of the June 21, 2016 meeting were reviewed and modifications made. **A motion to approve the minutes from the June 21, 2016 meeting as amended was made by CARTER and seconded by EDWARDS. The motion passed. VOTE 4-0 with DENT abstaining.**

2. **P2016-22 Submission of Application for Minor Subdivision by Timothy Rockwood, Agent for Stephen & Joan Kelly, property owners of record, to divide 285 Dogford Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 32, in the "RR" zoning district, into two lots (creating lots of 3.18 acres and 107 +/- acres).**

ESMAY introduced the case by reading the Public Notice. Mr. Timothy Rockwood, representative of the owners, Stephen & Joan Kelly, addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Rockwood explained the Kelly's own land on both sides of the road that were under a conservation easement with the Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests except for a 3.77 acre portion which was left out of the conservation easement for a house. The Kelly's are wishing to build a new home but the Zoning Ordinance does not allow two principal uses on the same lot. The Conservation Easement requires that the land must stay with the same owner. To be zoning compliant, three acres need to be subdivided in order to build the new house. The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forest has given approval for the subdivision. Subdivision plan including access point, house location, and utility improvements for the 3.18 acres have been approved by the necessary departments.

Board Comments/Questions:

ESMAY asked the board if they had any questions for Mr. Rockwood. DENT asked Mr. Rockwood for clarification on the non-conservation portion of the property, and if the 3.77 acres where the existing house is located has ever been under conservation. Mr. Rockwood explained the 3.77 acres has never been under conservation but was always part of the parcel, it was never a subdivision. EDWARDS asked if the existing house was occupied and what the Kelly's plans for the house included. Mr. Rockwood explained the house was currently not occupied and eventually the Kelly's plan is to fix up the house. ESMAY asked if this request was propelled by the Town of Hanover's rules that there can be no more than one principal use per lot and this would preclude the building of the second house, and so the owners need two lots? Mr. Rockwood stated that ESMAY was correct. ESMAY was reluctant to set up a situation in which there were two conveyable parcels but the easement requires the land must be sold as a whole. ESMAY wanted to know by what instrument can the Society use to prevent the sale of the new 3.18 acres in the future. Mr. Rockwood explained the prevention of a situation like ESMAY described relies in the wording in the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forest conservation easement and it is recorded with the deed to the property. The Kelly's are aware of the restrictions.

ESMAY entertained a motion to find the application complete. It was made by EDWARDS, seconded by CRISWELL to accept the application as complete. The motion passed unanimously. EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. VOTE 5-0

Public Comments/Questions:

ESMAY opened the floor to the public. No one came forward to speak for or against P2016-22.

ESMAY asked the Board for a motion. CRISWELL made a motion to approve the subdivision of 285 Dogford Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 32, into two lots as presented in the application. EDWARDS seconded the motion. The Motion passed unanimously. EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. VOTE 5-0

- 3. P2016-08 Continuation of submission of application for Site Plan Review by the Trustees of Dartmouth College and public hearing on construction of a 69,860 sqft indoor practice facility on the "sunken garden" site, east of Boss Tennis Center, 4 Summer Court, Tax Map 34, Lot 102, in the "P" zoning district.**

ESMAY introduced the case by reading the Public Notice. DENT recused herself from participating in the case. Representatives from Dartmouth College included Mrs. Ellen Arnold, Mr. John Scherding, and Mr. Robert Ceplikas. ESMAY stated that the case was under final review for completeness, once application is found complete the floor will be open for a public hearing and a decision will be made. She also repeated the order from last meeting that the Board moved to keep discussion for P2016-16 to 9 PM. Several questions were left open at the end of the last meeting and Mr. Scherding presented two documents to the Board that gave information that was requested. The first document prepared is a detailed list of specific aspects of the project in which more information was requested. The second

document is an updated acoustical report. Mrs. Arnold stated they prepared a presentation in response to the questions the Board has provided.

Mr. Ceplikas, Deputy Athletics Director, started out by addressing the Purpose and Need of the new indoor practice facility. The purpose of the facility is to have a multi-team space for year around practice, especially during the winter months. A request to see floor plans was made at a previous meeting. Mr. Ceplikas walked the Board through the floorplan of the building. The building includes a practice field, mechanical room, storage, elevator, stairs, batting cages, meeting room, training room, restrooms, and lobby. The building has two stories and is a total of 69,860 sq ft. CARTER asked about an observation deck. Mr. Ceplikas showed on the floor plans where the locations of two filming and observation platforms were planned.

Mr. Ceplikas moved to the next topic of Size and Height of the Structure. Mr. Ceplikas pointed out that other schools in Dartmouth's league and similar schools with new facilities had larger buildings than what was planned. The size of the planned field is 75yds + plus an end zone. The field will be the size of half a lacrosse or soccer field if teams practice in the opposite orientation. ESMAY asked if the building will be opened to spectators. Mr. Ceplikas assured her it was not. It was only a practice a facility and the field does not meet the requirement for competitions. There is not an impact on parking since it is not a spectator building. The size of the building is restricted by the Town's zoning restrictions requiring a 150 foot buffer from the property line for a building of this height. CRISWELL asked which portion of the field would have the most volume. Mr. Ceplikas explained it depended on which sport was practicing on the field. ESMAY asked if other schools in the Ivy League had similar facilities since only two were listed on the document. Mr. Ceplikas explained that Harvard and Penn were the only two new facilities and Cornell and Princeton has indoor turf surfaces but it was a smaller surface and not used for full team practices. EDWARDS asked about the possibility of using a "bubble" over an existing field. Mr. Ceplikas explored this option under the Location portion of the document. Unfortunately, it was not feasible for the five artificial fields on campus to have a "bubble". A new field or the track would have to be moved off campus and doing so would go against the athletics department's desire of keeping the student athletes on campus in order to keep them close academics as well as their sport. CARTER asked about the possible use of the Blackman Fields. Mr. Ceplikas stated that if the new facility were to be located there it would displace two lighted practice football fields that would not be relocated to the "sunken garden" site due to lack of space and the lighting restrictions. CARTER wanted clarification that the football team has access to two football fields without a roof and one practice field with a roof. Mr. Ceplikas stated they used the different fields for practicing on natural grass and artificial turf. The new facility will allow for more flexible use of field space for all the teams.

Mr. Scherding approached the Board to explain the next portion of the document. His first topic was the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Coordination. The Bike/Ped Master Plan indicated an alignment of trails through the Chase Field area. In the proposed design the trail can continue north along the west boundary and leads to a connection point at Austin Avenue. There were no questions for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Coordination from the Board.

Mr. Scherding moved on to the Stormwater Management and Site Utilities portion of the presentation. Mr. Scherding stated the project meets or exceeds all local and state requirements for Stormwater and the impact post construction provides a reduction in the rate of flow of stormwater compared to predevelopment rates. One positive change is the planned utility cut is no longer on the table. Mrs. Smith verified the Department of Public Works have reviewed the plans and the stormwater system is compliant. The Board did not have any questions for the Stormwater portion of the presentation.

Mr. Scherding moved on to Landscaping and stated the landscape plan has not changed except for the removal of the planned utility cut. Mr. Scherding went into detail on the plantings shown in the landscape plan. Specific arrangements have been made with the Doyle's. It was not possible to top the existing trees and the Doyle's approved the plan to replace the trees with five Canadian Hemlocks. The Board did not have any questions for the Landscaping portion of the presentation.

Mr. Scherding moved on to the HVAC Exterior Locations and Noise Generation portion of the presentation. Mr. Scherding pointed out the locations of the mechanical room, two gravity ventilators, three condenser units, an exhaust fan, and louvers. The entire building will not be air conditioned. The mechanical room, the elevator control room, and the meeting room will be the only rooms with air conditioning. The louvers would all be facing existing fields and away from any residential areas. ESMAY clarified there were no louvers on the north side of the building. CARTER asked about the need for a heat exhaust fan when the purpose of the building was to have indoor practices during the winter. Mr. Scherding stated the facility will be most used during inclement weather but it will be used year around. CARTER asked Mr. Scherding if they were requesting the Board to approve a twelve month a year facility. Mr. Scherding stated yes it will be similar to the existing field house. ESMAY asked if the Town's recreation program would ever have access. Mr. Scherding stated that the times they would be most interest would be the times the building would have the greatest demands from the College's teams and he was not in the position to make any promises. Mr. Scherding turned the floor over to Mrs. Alicia Larsen to go over the sound study. Mrs. Larsen stated that when looking at existing mechanical noise they looked at sound coming from the Boss Tennis Arena and the Thompson Arena at four points on Tyler Road. Ambient noise from traffic would add to the numbers found in the sound study. Mrs. Larsen said they looked at mitigation options and with those options sound would stay the same or actually be reduced because the building would act as a buffer. Mrs. Larsen said they also looked at sound levels at the property line for the PA system, and interior activity. The sound levels of all three individual studies were added to create an aggregate predicted sound level. In all four positions it was found the aggregate predicted sound level was less than the Hanover nighttime limit for Institutional Zones. CARTER asked about the PA system and why is it needed in a noncompetition facility. Mr. Ceplikas stated that all college facilities have a sound system to play music; as with the others, this one will have volume limits set. Mr. Ceplikas stated that the shown aggregate predicted sound levels are a worst case scenario with all three components set to as loud as possible. CARTER asked if it was correct to assume that situation could happen. The representatives stated that it could happen. ESMAY asked if there were any questions from the Board.

Mrs. Nina Lloyd, resident, stood from the audience and said she would like to point out a relevant issue. She stated that in 1998 before the Boss Tennis Center was constructed ambient sound levels were taken. Under this current study, what is considered ambient sound levels has been redefined to include the Boss Tennis Center. There were no other questions from the Board.

Mr. Scherding continued with the Kalwall Glazing and Interior Lighting portion of the presentation. Mr. Scherding explained that Kalwall Glazing is a high quality insulated light filtering panels. The building plan is proposing a panel that has a light transmittance rate of 10-14%. Mr. Vinicius Gorgati came forward to demonstrate the light filtration quality of the panels. All the light in the building will be vertical and no light will be shining directly on to the panel. ESMAY asked what the purpose of the product was if it transmitted so little light. Mr. Gorgati stated that some light comes in during the day to get some natural light. CARTER asked about lighting the ridge of the structure and what happens when balls go up into the rafters, are those players compromised in their ability to see those balls. Mr. Scherding stated that 25% of the light will be going up. ESMAY asked about what happens to the lights when the building is closed and when is that time. Mr. Ceplikas stated that the buildings operating hours were based on the need of the facility and believes the extreme would be 11PM to Midnight. Mr. Scherding stated the lights would be on occupancy sensors but would automatically go on to a level set at 10%. Lights will also be controlled at the front desk. There were no further questions about lighting.

Mr. Scherding continued the Exterior Sheathing and Finish of the Building portion of the presentation. The metal panels used for the exterior are very high quality, pre-insulated, sound insulated, and has smooth transitions between the joints. A sample was shown to the Board. CARTER asked about the architectural rendering and that is shows different shades. Mr. Scherding stated the building will have a dapple look and the shades of grey will be harmonious with the winter sky. EDWARDS asked about the roof color and material. Mr. Scherding stated it will have a traditional New England metal roof and the exact color has not been selected yet but will be as close to the building colors as they can find. There were no further questions about the Exterior Sheathing and Finish.

Mr. Scherding moved on to the Exterior Lighting portion of the presentation. In the plan it shows nine wall mounted lights on the west, north, and east sides, four pole-mounted on the north and east sides, and nine small down lights at the entrance soffit on the southwest corner. There were no questions for the Exterior Lighting portion.

Mr. Scherding moved on to the Snow Removal portion of the presentation. He stated that snow removal will be treated like it is elsewhere on campus. Snow will be plowed to keep driving lanes and parking lots clear. Once snow amounts are excessive enough it will be trucked away. CRISWELL asked about snow protection for the roof. Mr. Scherding stated there would be snow guards in place. There are no further questions for the Snow Removal section.

Mr. Joe Broemel, Project Manager, came forward to speak to the Board about the Construction Staging portion of the presentation. The construction staging area will be taking

place in the Thompson parking lot with most traffic coming down Park Street. Thirty-two parking places will be used. The 50 spots dedicated to the Town of Hanover will remain. College staff parking will be relocated during construction. It was stated that no construction workers will park on the street. Mr. Broemel went through the site plan for the construction staging area. The plan showed a fence around the construction site with emergency gates situated throughout, but those will only be used by emergency personnel if needed. The construction traffic will go through the parking lot. CARTER asked when construction would start. Mr. Broemel said he would like to start as soon as possible and construction would take about twelve months. ESMAY asked if pedestrian traffic would be allowed to pass. Mr. Broemel stated the parking lot would remain open to pedestrians but the sidewalk in some areas would be closed because it goes so close to the construction site. The staging area for the pavilion will be using the same access point. CARTER asked about carpooling for the construction workers. Mr. Broemel stated carpooling will be encouraged but not required.

ESMAY stated the Board was past their deadline but there were requests from two members of the public for additional studies. Mrs. Arnold stated they just received the information about the sound study at the end of the day and do not have anything prepared. She will be looking to the Board for guidance on what exactly is desired. ESMAY asked the board if they want more information about the sound, photometrics, and shadows. EDWARDS stated he would like more information about sound. CARTER stated she would like to look more into photometrics and the Board went through the shadow portion fairly quickly previously and would like to spend more time with it. Mrs. Arnold stated there was a video showing the results of the shadow study they could provide at the next meeting. ESMAY stated next time they need more on sound, will view the new shadow study video, and will look at what the representatives add to the photometric study. Mrs. Smith asked for clarification on what the Board wished to see in the shadow study. CARTER stated she wanted to see the entire impact, the building and existing vegetation. Mr. Scherding stated they can break the different aspects into pieces and give each section more time. EDWARDS asked why a parapet is needed. Mr. Scherding stated it was not a necessary element but felt it added to the aesthetics of the building.

Public Comments/Questions

A member of the audience asked if the exterior lights would be on all the time. Mr. Scherding stated the lights would be on as a pedestrian safety feature but he could look into the amount of lights being on being reduced to any level that meets code. Another member of the audience asked what the retaining wall at the retention pond would like. Mr. Scherding said he would get the civil engineer to address the issue at the next meeting. CARTER asked where the closest blue beacon was located. Mr. Alan Saucier stated there was one north of Boss Tennis Center and one south at the second service gate.

ESMAY asked when the Board would be available to meeting again to discuss this case. The Board, staff, and representatives agreed to meet on July 19th.

ESMAY entertained a motion to approve July 19th as the next meeting date. It was made by CRISWELL, seconded by EDWARDS to approve July 19th as the next

meeting date to continue discussion of P2016-08. The motion passed unanimously. EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. VOTE4-0 with DENT recused

- 4. P2016-16 Consideration of submission of application for Site Plan Review by John Scherding, agent for the Trustees of Dartmouth College, property owner of record, and public hearing on construction of a 7,600 sq ft expansion of the soccer pavilion building at 4 Summer Court, Tax Map 34, Lot 102, in the “T” zoning district.**

ESMAY introduced the case by reading the Public Notice. DENT recused herself from participating in the case. Representatives from Dartmouth College included Mr. Joe Broemel, Mr. Alex Halpern, and Mr. Rod Finley. Mr. Halpern explained the architectural plans, going into detail over the floor plan, the mechanical room, and the location of louvers and condensing units.

Board Comments/Questions

ESMAY had concerns over noise. Mr. Broemel explained that the building was 300ft from the next property line and part of the building was blocked by stands that would act as a buffer. EDWARDS asked the representatives look into how the noise of the building would add to the ambient noise. CARTER asked if the building would be open all year. Mr. Finley stated that it would. The building holds space for several sports teams and holds the public restrooms for events. CARTER asked if the new addition held public restrooms. Mr. Broemel stated it did not. ESMAY asked Ms. Smith if the Department of Public Works gave approval for the project. Mr. Smith said the Department of Public Works is set and have everything they need. CRISWELL asked the representatives about exterior lighting. Mr. Broemel explained the only lights would be located over the doors and along the walkways for safety reasons. CARTER asked if the footprint disrupted any fields. Mr. Broemel said it did not. When the first part of the building was constructed they had planned for the addition. Ms. Smith reminded the Board of the Waiver Requests. ESMAY read the requests as presented in the application. The Waiver Requests include a survey map, a site context map including the height and number of stories of buildings and 100 year flood elevation information, and an elevation plan including existing structures. The Condition of approval for the pavilion expansion project include:

1. A preconstruction meeting shall be scheduled and held with Town Planning, Police, Fire, and Public Works staff prior to the construction start;
2. At the discretion of the building inspector, independent code review of building plans may be required at the applicant's expense;
3. A determination from NHDES is necessary to determine if an AOT permit is required. If required an AOT permit and as well as an EPA SWPPP shall be provided to the Planning and Zoning Office prior to construction;
4. Deliveries may be made via Summer Street between 5:30 and 6:30 AM and from 9 AM to 3 PM and will not be made except during those times;
5. Construction worker parking shall not occur in public parking spaces. Weekly, a list on contractor license plate numbers will be given to the Planning and Zoning Office and used for enforcement of this provision;

6. On-site inspection of utilities and other site features may be required at the applicant's expense;
7. The maintenance protocols for storm water management facilities shall be submitted to Planning and Zoning staff prior to occupancy; and
8. At the completion of the project, a CAD file of the building footprint satisfactory to the Director of Public Works along with \$1000 (for as-builts to be completed by the Town), shall be submitted to the Town.

ESMAY entertained a motion to find the application complete. The motion was made by CRISWELL, and seconded by EDWARDS. The motion passed unanimously. EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. VOTE 4-0 with DENT recused

Public Comments/Questions:

ESMAY opened the floor to the public. No one came forward to speak for or against P2016-16.

ESMAY asked the Board for a motion. EDWARDS made a motion to approve the expansion of the athletics pavilion at 4 Summer Court with the waivers as requested and Conditions as shown in the application. CRISWELL seconded the motion. The Motion passed unanimously. EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. VOTE 4-0 with DENT recused

5. OTHER BUSINESS:

Other Business included the handing out of information of Planning for Accessory Dwellings. This information is to educate the Board and public of new laws dealing with Accessory Dwelling Units that take effect June 1, 2017. The Board is to read the information and it will be revisited on a later meeting date.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Catheryn Hembree