

PLANNING BOARD
AUGUST 2, 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); Iain Sim; and Michael Mayor

Alternates: Brian Edwards

Staff: Vicki Smith; and Catheryn Hembree

Others: John Scherding, Richard Whitmore, Rod Finley, Ellen Arnold, Vinicius Gorgati, Francis Manasek, Ruth Lappin, Nina Lloyd, David Dent, Anne Wilson, Maggie and Rich Joseph, , Rob and Francie Riessen, P. Friedman, Alan Saucier, Joe Pych, James Pike, Sophie Augustiniwicz, J. Kamas, Philip Hastings, Andy Bernard, Corinne Fortune, Harriet DeBarge, Jeff Fullerton, Bob Ceplikas, Rob Wolfe, Michael Kiefer, Michelle Farrell, Clifton Farrell, Boris Makarov, Lou ?, Julie and Josh Kim, and Lisa Hogarty

1. **MINUTES:** The minutes of the July 19, 2016 meeting were reviewed and no modifications were made. **A motion to approve the minutes from the July 19, 2016 meeting as presented was made by SIM and seconded by EDWARDS. The motion passed. EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. VOTE 6-0 with MAYOR abstaining.**
2. **P2017-01 Submission of Application for Site Plan Review by James Pike, as Agent for the Trustees of Dartmouth College, property owner of record, to conduct landscape maintenance and improvements in the area stretching from the west side of Lord Hall to the east side of North Mass & Hitchcock Halls. The properties are located on Tax map 33, Lot 102, in the "I" Zoning District.**

ESMAY introduced the case by reading the Public Notice. Mr. James Pike, representative of the Trustees of Dartmouth College, property owner, addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Pike explained the project consisted of four main pieces; to complete deferred maintenance around Gold Coast, to improve pedestrian safety, to improve emergency access, and to continue to address erosion control issues in the cemetery. Mr. Pike went into detail for all four parts of the application. The list of deferred maintenance includes repairs to sidewalks and pruning over grown trees. This area of campus is home to a number of residence halls so there are a lot of students walking. There is parking on the street that makes it harder to see pedestrians crossing the street. Parking spaces on the street will be removed to improve pedestrian safety. Mr. Pike pointed out that several of the buildings in this area are wood framed and do not have sprinklers. It was important to improve fire department access and to do so parking and street design needed to be altered so the ladder truck could make turns. The fire department

has approved the plans. The erosion control issues of the cemetery include reducing impervious, stabilizing the bank, and adding new catch basins.

Board Comments/Questions:

ESMAY asked the board if they had any questions for Mr. Pike. DENT asked Mr. Pike for clarification on where the erosion control issues were in the cemetery. Mr. Pike explained that there was a large area that all lead to one catch basin that cannot handle the amount of stormwater in the area. The plan calls for the removal of the old basin and the installation of a new one. There is an agreement with the Department of Public Works to improve erosional control and stormwater in this area. ESMAY asked if this was a band aid for a larger problem, and what was the long term plan. Mr. Pike responded by explaining that to completely fix the issue a pipe that runs through the cemetery would need to be replaced. The existing pipe is 14-16 inches and the new pipe might need to be up to 36 inches. SIM stated that the plans look good but he was concerned about execution when it came to fixing the issues. Mr. Pike understood the concerns but felt many of the issues will be solved. The new landscape plan addresses many issues and the College has a new Parking Director that will be tougher on illegal parking. SIM stated that he visited the site while it was raining and a number of the catch basins in the area had issues. Mr. Pike explained the new road will have curbing behind it to prevent water from going down the bank into the cemetery and there will be a reduction in impervious surface. EDWARDS asked Mr. Pike if there were any suggestions in the engineering report that was submitted with the application that were being incorporated in the landscape plan. Mr. Pike explained the report addressed the catch basins that are failing outside of the project area and what would need to be done to handle the amount of stormwater in the area. There are ongoing conversations with Public Works to address this issue. MAYOR asked about storm trap structures and are those being taken into consideration. Mr. Pike explained those require a lot of maintenance and if they are not properly maintained it could make the matter worse. MAYOR asked for clarification on what the circles on the deck and pavement around Housing Center B represented. Mr. Pike explained those circles were the locations of planters. DENT asked where parking was being taken out and if ADA parking was being moved. Mr. Pike stated that removing parking was key for the Fire Department to be able to make turns and for water collection for the catch basin. The ADA parking spaces are being moved to lots by Hitchcock and by North Mass. DENT was questioning about how to manage stormwater where it falls and if it was possible to catch stormwater off the roof. Mr. Pike explained that the new landscape plan calls for less impervious surface so there is a reduction of stormwater flowing to the catch basin. CARTER asked if there was a bike shelter. Mr. Pike stated that there is an existing bike rack but the shelter would not be any larger than the existing concrete pad. SIM asked about parking in the Dewey lot and Mr. Pike stated they are keeping 620 unallocated parking spaces. CARTER asked Mr. Pike how parking on campus worked. Mr. Pike explained that staff could buy a permit that would only allow them to park in specific lots.

Public Comments/Questions:

ESMAY opened the floor to the public. No one came forward to speak for or against P2017-01.

ESMAY asked if the Board wished to make a site visit. There was no response from the Board.

ESMAY entertained a motion to find the application complete. It was made by MAYOR, seconded by SIM to accept the application as complete and include the following waivers: 1) Survey Map with abutters show and full perimeter of the lot on a property plat, 2) Site Context Map with height and number of stories of buildings, 100 year flood elevation information, and use of abutting properties, all roads and driveways and trail easements, 3) Site Plan with height and number of stories of buildings and use of abutting properties, all roads and driveways and trail easements, 4) Elevation Plan and 5) Procedural – Design Review as this in an addition to a developed site. The motion passed unanimously. EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. VOTE 7-0

Carter asked if the snow removal plan has changed with the new landscape plan. Mr. Pike said it would be easier with the removal of spaces. They would be able to stock pile snow close to the cemetery during storms. DENT asked if there was a long term drainage plan and a date to keep the improvements moving forward. Mr. Pike said there was an agreement but not a deadline, but it was in the forefront of improvements that need to be made. Ms. Vicki Smith said the project had come a long way since staff review and recommends approval with conditions. ESMAY read the following conditions: 1) Construction worker parking shall not occur in public parking spaces. Weekly, a list of contractor license plate numbers will be given to the Planning and Zoning Office and used for enforcement of this provision, 2) On-Site inspection of utilities and other site features may be required at the applicant's expense, 3) The maintenance protocols for storm water management facilities shall be submitted to Planning and Zoning staff prior to occupancy, and 4) At the completion of the project, a CAD file of the utilities satisfactory to the Director of Public Works along with \$1,000.00 (for as-builts to be completed by Town) shall be submitted to the Town.

ESMAY asked the Board for a motion. CRISWELL made a motion to approve the application of P2017-01 with conditions. SIM seconded the motion. The Motion passed unanimously. EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. VOTE 7-0

- 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 69,860sqft indoor practice facility on the “sunken garden” site, east of Boss Tennis Center, 4 Summer Court, Tax Map 34, Lot 102, in the “I” Zoning District.**

ESMAY introduced the case by reading the Public Notice and explained the case is still in the completeness phase of the application process. DENT recused herself from participating in the case. Representatives from Dartmouth College included Mrs. Ellen Arnold, Mr. Rod Finley, and Mr. John Scherding.

Mrs. Arnold explained they came prepared to address the sound study, photometrics, and the shadow study. Since the last meeting the representatives were recommended by Board Member Criswell through email from Ms. Smith about changing the roofline. Mrs. Arnold

explained they took this into consideration and have modified the plans to include a hip roof design. In doing so, the north wall height will be reduced from 70 feet to 50 feet. As part of the modified plans windows were eliminated on the north wall and reduced on the east wall. The remaining windows will have motorized shades that will close at sunset. These changes eliminate photometric issues the neighboring property owners had with the initial design. There are plans to keep the windows on the west wall. A new submission includes addition to the sound study that will be addressed later in the presentation. Mrs. Arnold also submitted a document that outlines the requirements for completeness in Article 7 and hopes it will be useful to the Board considering the amount of information given over the course of dealing with this project.

Mr. Scherding showed the Board and the public images of the new building design. Mr. Scherding next addressed the concerns associated with the shadow of the building. Mr. Scherding showed animations of the building shadow at different times of the year. The first animation was the building with a gable roof on December 21st. The second animation was the building with a hip roof on December 21st. The third animation was the building with a hip roof in March and September. The final animation was the building with a hip roof on June 21st. Mr. Scherding stated that in March – September the impact was negligible and in December there was maybe an hour at the end of the day where the shadow may creep across the property line but not fall on a house. Mr. Andrew Bernard, asked for clarification on what Mr. Scherding meant by “negligible” because in the March & September and December animation the shadow seemed to hit houses? Mr. Scherding explained all projects produce shadows and the existing trees are very dense and have an impact as well. He explained that for a very few days a year a shadow may be hitting the line of a neighboring property. DENT asked for the animation to be slowed down so the audience can view it since this is their first time viewing it. She stated that the December shadow will be about the same in November and in January, and that her realtor said her property value would go down if the building shadow touched her house. The technology would not allow the animations to be viewed slower but the animations were able to be paused at specific points. Mr. Scherding moved on to the photometric concerns. He stated that the issues were addressed with the new design and the motorized window shades.

Mr. Jeff Fullerton came forward to address the Board with concerns about sound and the sound study results. He explained that a new data was collected July 8th – 13th at four different points along the property line. Mr. Fullerton presented the data to the Board and public. The study concluded that the sound from mechanical systems would be lower at night, the buildings will block mechanical noise, and the total sound levels will not go over the Hanover nighttime limit. The building noise will be comparable to the other daytime noise levels in the area. At night time the levels will be higher than other noise in the area. A possible solution is Dartmouth could reduce the PA volume after a certain time by 10 decibels to be consistent with other night sound levels in the area. ESMAY asked if the College could reduce the PA system volume. Mr. Finley said yes. SIM asked for clarification on how to read the data points, were the PA and Mechanical amount additive to the ambient noise levels? Mr. Fullerton said yes, but not at the amounts shown, the PA and Mechanical noise would add a few decibels to the ambient noise levels but the total would not exceed the Hanover night time noise limit. CARTER asked how human generated noise was taken into

account. Mr. Fullerton explained that their study looked at consistent noise and short term noise, such as a shout, was not included. Mr. Finley verified that air horns were not used.

ESMAY asked if any member of the public had questions about sound. Mr. Manasek, member of the public, reminded the board that decibels were on an exponential scale, not a linear scale. Mr. Fullerton added that the human perception of the increase is not double. Mrs. Nina Lloyd, member of the public, stated that the College's definition of ambient noise is being redefined since 1998 when the Boss Tennis Center was constructed to include new mechanical noise. She asked that the ambient noise not to include additional mechanical noise installed by the applicant. Mrs. Arnold asked what the Board would like to see, what does the Board want to include in the definition in standard ambient noise. CRISWELL stated that it might help to actually hear the noise rather than see numbers on a screen. MAYOR stated that the new athletic building might create a sound barrier for noise coming from the Boss Tennis Center. Mr. Fullerton agreed stating that the mechanical system would be blocked by the building. Mrs. Anne Wilson, member of the public, asked how the neighborhood to the south side of the building would be affected by noise. Mr. Fullerton stated there was a substantial decay of sound over that distance and the neighborhood should not be affected. Mr. Andrew Bernard reiterated Mrs. Lloyd's point that the definition of ambient noise was changing overtime and we had to be careful not to have a creeping increase on what is the ambient noise in the area. SIM asked if the Town went to the data collection locations and measured the decibels what would the sound levels be? Mr. Fullerton explained the total sound level would be 1 to 3 decibels higher than the L90 level, the steady sound level. SIM asked if the sound during the day exceeded the Hanover limits. Mr. Fullerton stated they did not look and during the day there is so much noise it was hard to determine where it was coming from. CARTER asked for specifics on when the air conditioning units would be on and what would the cubic feet of those areas be? Mr. Fullerton stated it would be about 5-6,000 cubic feet. A member of the audience familiar with the plans explained when the different rooms would need to be cooled. The meeting room would be cooled only when in use. The elevator mechanical room and the data room would only be air conditioned when the equipment needed to be cooled. At most that would be 15 minutes out of each hour for the data room. Mr. Andrew Bernard asked about the placement of the data collection devices. Mr. Fullerton was unable to answer at the time of the meeting. Mrs. Anne Wilson asked if the College would be able to air condition the entire building. ESMAY stated it could be a condition of approval they would have to come before the Board for a site plan amendment. Mrs. Nina Lloyd asked if the raw data could be available to the public. Mr. Fullerton stated it was included in the report given to the Board. Mr. Scherding stated they were finished with their presentation for the night.

Mr. Phil Hastings, attorney for Mrs. Kelly Dent, addressed the Board. He went over several points of concern in a letter he sent to the Board. The points he wished to have addressed included having an independent sound study and shadow study done, have a neighborhood impact study done that shows the project's impact on property values and quality of life, have the wetland buffer addressed, have the need of the project in this specific location addressed, and have an operations plan from the College prepared. He stated the Board did not have enough data to make an informed decision. ESMAY stated only the Planning Board can make the decision wither they have enough information. ESMAY asked the Planning Board

if they need anything else in order to make a decision. Mrs. Arnold responded stating that there are two stages to the application process, completeness and merit. She gave the Board a document detailing how Dartmouth felt they met all the requirements for having a complete application. The additional information and studies that are being requested should be requested as part of the merit of the project as listed in Article 9. She requested new information be requested during the review of the merits of the project and limit the information submitted to what is listed in Article 7. SIM asked about the process used when dealing with wetlands. Ms. Vicki Smith, Senior Planner, explained that the Zoning Administrator looked at the plans to make sure requirements were met and she did not flag any issues. SIM had concerns with Mr. Hastings' opinion that the board should consider multiple locations. He felt the Board's position was to look at a structure at a specific location and the Board will say yes or no. ESMAY asked the Board to review the new documents they received for P2016-08 and go over Article 7 to determine if the Board has enough information to meet the completeness requirements. ESMAY asked if the public had any comments. DENT asked for the shadow animations to be posted online for the public can have access and requested a clock be added. Mr. Scherding agreed but was not sure about how to add a clock. CARTER asked if an outline could be created to show when specific topics and data was discussed and issued. Mr. Scherding stated the College brought a document that listed each item in Article 7 and which documents corresponded with that item. Mrs. Smith handed out the new information to the Board. ESMAY conferred with the Board about a meeting later this month. It was agreed to meet on August 16, 2016.

ESMAY called for a motion. CRISWELL made a motion to approve the meeting date of August 16, 2016. EDWARDS seconded the motion EDWARDS participated as voting Alternate. The motion passed unanimously. VOTE 7-0

4. OTHER BUSINESS:

No other business was taken before the Board.

5. ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Catheryn Hembree