

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING  
MARCH 27, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Tom Cottrill, Dale Conly, Ken McWilliams (Planner), Larry Ballin (Selectmen's Representative)  
MEMBERS ABSENT: Sue Ellen Andrews, Celeste Cook, Jeff Hollinger

Chair Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM.

Chair Ebel welcomed Larry Ballin to the Planning Board as the Board of Selectmen's newly appointed representative on the PB for 2007.

**I. GAVIN CAMPBELL – Concept Site Plan Review**

**(Tax Map 84, Lot 78)**

Gavin Campbell called the PB's attention to the plans displayed for a proposed 32' x 60' addition to the commercial building located at 71 Pleasant Street. He stated that the proposed addition would be office space, and that the addition would conform in all regards.

Mr. Campbell advised that the driveway would remain "as is". He said that four (4) parking spaces would be added on the "Kidder-side" of the property and three (3) parking spaces would be added at the bottom, thus bringing the total number of parking spaces to 15. He said that 11 parking spaces would be needed to meet the regulatory requirement. Chair Ebel clarified that the regulatory requirement would be 10.3 parking spaces. Mr. Campbell stated that there would be one handicapped-accessible parking space located near the entrance to the building. PB member Cottrill asked if all of the parking spaces would be nine (9)-feet wide and angled. He asked if parking spaces #9, #14, and #15 would all conform to regulatory size requirements. Mr. Campbell replied that all would conform to the 9' x 20' size required for full-size cars. He said there would be no compact-car-size spaces. Mr. Campbell advised that the traffic pattern would remain the same as it was at the present time.

Chair Ebel observed that it appeared as if there would be more open space than would be needed to meet regulatory requirements.

Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams to report on any issues raised at the afternoon meeting with municipal department heads. Mr. McWilliams said that the Fire Department wanted the doors to swing outward, not inward, the smoke detectors to be interconnected, the exits to be marked by signs, and emergency lights to be installed. He also mentioned a new water service line; however, he said that item fell within the purview of the New London-Springfield Water System Precinct, not within the municipal departments.

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised the PB that Mr. Campbell had removed a large, illegal parking area on an adjacent property. PB member Ballin asked how Mr. Campbell could have removed the parking area if he did not own the property. Mr. Campbell explained that he had approached William Berger (Tax Map 84, Lot 77) and offered to split the cost of removing the parking area. He said that he had used a similar approach with the Kidders in regard to removing a hedgerow.

PB member Cottrill said that he was generally in support of the proposal; but he'd like Mr. Campbell to tighten up the dimensions of the parking spaces. After consulting with other members of the PB, Chair Ebel advised Mr. Campbell that the PB's reaction to the proposed changes was positive. She complimented Mr. Campbell on the way in which he had achieved positive changes by engaging abutters in cooperative efforts to improve their sites as well as his. She reiterated that the amount of open space provided by the proposed plan would exceed the regulatory requirements, and said that she was supportive of that as well.

**II. NEW LONDON HOSPITAL – Continued Preliminary Site Plan Review**

**(Tax Map 72, Lots 16 & 17 and Tax Map 59, Lot 4)**

Lori Underwood, New London Hospital's Senior Director for Planning and Projects, advised the PB that she was accompanied by Trustee William Helms, New London Hospital CEO Bruce King, Jeff Galvin (Lavalley/Brensinger Architects), and Martin Risley, P.E. (Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP). She said that legal counsel Mark McCue (Hinckley Allen Snyder) might be joining them later.

Ms Underwood summarized New London Hospital's response to issues raised by the PB during earlier meetings. She said that the PB had referred the hospital to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) a waiver of the setback requirements along County Road and Colonial Plaza and variances to the height requirements and to allow Phase 2 parking to extend into the rural residential district. She advised that the hospital was on the ZBA agenda for April 9, 2007. Ms Underwood said that the hospital had met with the Conservation Commission on March 21, 2007. She advised that based upon the good advice received during that meeting and the meeting with municipal department heads, the hospital had modified its drainage plans and was now looking at both improved water quality and decreased drainage flow.

PB member Conly said that the Conservation Commission recognized the importance of the hospital to life in New London and the fact that the hospital was "in a bind" given what it has to deal with on the site; however, the commission wanted to see improvement in the water quality entering the wetlands and a decrease in the drainage flow. He said that the commission was very concerned about Lyon Brook and the quality of the run-off from parking areas. Mr. Conly advised that the commission wanted the water to be treated at all points where the water exited the parking lot, i.e., at all four (4) points, not only at the one (1) point indicated on the preliminary plans. New London Hospital reacted to the financial impact of that recommendation on the budget and originally indicated that it would not be possible.

Martin Risley (Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP) said that there were two drainage issues: peak flow and water quality. He said that peak flow mitigation had been addressed. He demonstrated the direction of the drainage flow off-site and showed where it crossed Parkside Road at two points. He advised that they had looked at the 10-year storm impact and estimated a 2% increase in flow. He said the Conservation Commission had asked them to look for a *decrease* in drainage flow. He said that the commission had suggested using porous pavement for the parking areas. Mr. Risley opined that porous pavement was somewhat of an unknown quantity in this climate. Chair Ebel asked for verification that the 25-year storm was the standard measurement used to evaluate drainage flow. Ken McWilliams confirmed that the standard was the 25-year storm. Mr. Risley replied that they had started with a 10-year storm, but had gone up as far as a 100-year storm in their calculations.

Mr. Risley advised that the hospital, in its evaluation of parking drainage, was trying to avoid another surface detention pond at an estimated cost of \$65,000 and creation of another wetland. He said that they had looked at underground water detention and had found that use of porous pavement over "class c" hydrologic soil, essentially creating a sponge, at design point 1, reduced run-off. He reviewed the CFS values up through the 100-year storm event. He said that using the latter approach for a proposed new parking lot would cost only \$16,000. Mr. Risley said that the result would be that the hospital would be able to expand the building, add 100 parking spaces, and achieve a reduction in drainage flow. Chair Ebel asked if Mr. Risley had been in touch with the University of New Hampshire Stormwater Center. Mr. Risley responded affirmatively. He advised that the New London Hospital site was located well above the water table. He opined that the use of porous pavement in this climate would be an experiment, but the projected results were compelling. He said that he was amazed at how quickly the water was absorbed. He noted that it was used in the south to reduce water-splash on highways. He also said that Massachusetts was using it to address friction issues.

PB member Cottrill asked Mr. Risley if his reservations were because of winter's impact on porous pavement or because it might not result in as great an amount of water absorption as expected. Mr. Risley replied that he was concerned about what would happen when the ground was frozen. He said that he was concerned about possible frost heaves, but he was now convinced that it would work. He noted that a drawback of using porous pavement for parking lots was that when it came time to renovate, it would be necessary to remove the old pavement before laying a new 3-inch layer. He estimated the life of a parking lot to be 15 years.

Chair Ebel asked about Mr. Risley's reference to four drainage outlets. Mr. Risley replied that the issue of drainage outlets was from the parking lot and related to an improvement in water quality and the volume of flow. He advised that the hospital model ignored the water entering the site from across County Road because there were no hydrological studies for that site, plus the hospital wasn't generating that flow. He demonstrated the existing conditions, indicating that water from the shopping center passes through a culvert and into the wetlands and water from the hospital flows offsite into wetlands, all untreated. He identified the four outlets as

(1) drainage from parking that would be routed through a swale and treated, (2) the reduced size of one area that would also reduce drainage, (3) the replacement of drainage from one parking area with roof drainage, as the building expansion would engulf the area improving the water quality if not reducing it, and (4) the additional parking area drainage would be sheet flow with a filter strip.

Mr. Risley said that the hospital plan would address the water quality of the four outlets. Having been introduced to the "Sunapee swirler" technique by Town Road Agent Richard Lee, Mr. Risley advised that the hospital was now proposing to intercept the water from the shopping center and route it to the wetlands before adding the hospital drainage. The hospital drainage would be captured on-site and treated by passing it through a "Sunapee swirler". Mr. Risley said that the gravel service road drainage would be collected and passed through a more sophisticated, expensive treatment process, another "swirler". He said that the roof drainage would be an improvement in water quality over parking drainage. He opined that using porous pavement for the parking lots would reduce drainage flow and the gravel base under the pavement would act as a filter, thereby improving water quality.

PB member Cottrill asked about the water coming onto the site from across County Road and wondered why it could not be passed through the "swirler". Mr. Risley replied that the water from across County Road was not the hospital's water and it would be costly to enlarge the "swirler" to a size that would be adequate to treat it. Mr. Cottrill noted that there appeared to be a culvert in the area near Newport Road and asked if it drained the shopping center. Mr. Risley demonstrated the location of the existing catch basin and existing pipes. He said that the proposed plan added four (4) new catch basins with 12-inch pipes leading to the swirler and thence to storm water drainage. Ken McWilliams opined that the shopping center drainage went roughly 50% in one way and 50% the other way, away from the hospital. PB member Cottrill suggested that perhaps talking with the neighbors might get them to contribute to the cost of a larger "swirler". Abutter Jim Cricenti said that there was a culvert for drainage from the Colonial Pharmacy building and that another drainage path passed down through his field.

Chair Ebel complimented the hospital on working so well and so successfully to reduce the drainage and to improve the water quality entering the wetlands. She advised that there were no buffers on those wetlands and the PB wanted to protect them as much as possible.

PB member Conly asked if the road around the perimeter would be paved or gravel. Mr. Risley replied that the hospital now proposed a gravel perimeter road.

Mr. Risley said that the hospital hoped to make the evening's review last preliminary discussion of the proposed expansion; therefore, he wanted a sense of the PB regarding the proposed plans. Chair Ebel asked other PB members for their opinions, and the sense of the PB was that the drainage plan presented sounded good.

PB members noted that in addition to drainage, there were still outstanding issues regarding the PB waiver requests, the requested ZBA variances, the proposed sand/salt shed, and snow storage. Mr. Risley pointed out the areas on the plan that would be available for snow storage. He said that originally the plan had shown snow storage near the wetlands; however, Town Road Agent Richard Lee had advised that those areas were too close to the wetlands. Mr. Risley advised that the municipal department heads had requested that the hospital prepare a snow management plan, including temporary storage and removal. He said that Todd French, New London Hospital Facilities, would be very involved in preparing the plan. Mr. Risley advised that the total space available for snow storage exceeded the 20% required.

Mr. Risley advised that the sand/salt shed had been relocated when the hospital decided to use porous pavement for parking areas. He said that the shed needed to be accessible and that the salt shed would be covered, but both ends would be open. PB member Cottrill asked what the size of the shed would be. Mr. Risley replied that it would be 10' x 30'. He pointed out the new location on the plan. Mr. Cottrill asked if the requirement that it be 25-feet from the stream was because of the impact of the salt. Mr. McWilliams responded affirmatively. Mr. Cottrill asked if clean snow could not be plowed toward the wetlands before it was contaminated by salt. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley responded that it would be impossible to separate clean snow from contaminated snow. He said there was always some spillage that occurred. Mr. Risley said that there was also debris that collected in parking lots.

Mr. Risley then addressed the waivers requested. He stated that the hospital owned four (4) parcels: one consisting almost entirely of wetland, one containing the medical office building, one on the perimeter of the institutional zone, and one containing the hospital campus and located in an institutional district. Lori Underwood said that the hospital had been talking about the required buffers for each parcel. She advised that the hospital owned 100% of three of the land parcels. She said that the ownership needed to be "cleaned up" on the medical office building, which was "condominiumized". She said that Dr. Greg Barban continued to own his condominium personally. Ms Underwood opined that if the hospital owned 100% of all four land parcels, the setback requirements would be unnecessary, because it would all be one lot. However, at the present time, there were four (4) lots, so waivers would have to be granted wherever property boundaries abutted. She also pointed out that the institutional zone district boundaries differed from the actual boundaries of the land owned by the hospital. Mark McCue, legal counsel for the hospital, stated that the medical office building involved condominium ownership and it would take awhile to work out the legal details.

PB member Conly asked if the hospital needed to have the waivers and variances in order to proceed. Bruce King replied affirmatively. Ms Underwood reiterated that a variance to allow parking in the Agricultural and Rural Residential District (ARR) and the requested height variance would be discussed with the ZBA the following week. Ms Underwood opined that part of the desired outcome regarding the setback issue could be achieved by "grandfathering". Mr. McWilliams advised that the resolution of the setback issue would need to address anywhere that parking extended into the 10 feet required setback.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Ballin) **THAT ANYWHERE A PARKING LOT AND/OR DRIVEWAY CROSSES A PROPERTY BOUNDARY WHERE NEW LONDON HOSPITAL OWNS OR CONTROLS THE PROPERTY ON BOTH SIDES OF THE BOUNDARY, THE 10-FOOT BOUNDARY SETBACK REQUIREMENT SHOULD BE WAIVED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Risley opined that porous concrete was 200 times more permeable than loose sand and the drainage would be cleaned as well as being reduced in quantity. PB member Cottrill opined that the base layer for the porous concrete would be very important. Mr. Risley replied that usually there would be six (6) inches of crushed gravel; however, with porous concrete it would be necessary to use crushed stone leading to "bank run".

Ms Underwood asked if the ZBA decision would have to be submitted to the PB 10 days before the PB's meeting at which a Final SPR was scheduled. Mr. McWilliams replied in the negative, but advised that the decision would have to be available at the time the hospital appeared before the PB for Final SPR.

PB member Cottrill opined that, even with the elevation change, the "big" 25-foot-high wall facing County Road needed to be minimized. He opined that the proposed façade that close to the road would not be in keeping with the town. He pointed out that the existing building was set back about 200 feet from County Road. Jeff Galvin (Lavalley/Brensinger Architects) replied that the area between the existing building and County Road was the only space available for hospital expansion. Ms Underwood advised that clapboards and small windows would be used to mitigate the impact. Mr. Cottrill opined that there must be some engineering "tricks" that could be used to reduce the impact. PB member Ballin asked what the existing height of the building was at that point. Mr. Galvin showed Mr. Ballin the plan. Mr. Ballin asked what the height of the side wall was. Mr. Galvin displayed visual plans of the proposed building expansion. He advised that differing depths would be used to create shadows that would reduce the visual impact from County Road. Mr. Cottrill asked if a mansard roof would be a possibility. Mr. Galvin replied that a mansard roof would increase the height of the building, and he opined that it would give more of a "big box" feel because you'd never see the peak of the building. Chair Ebel added that a mansard roof was not a colonial feature. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that the plan presented was better than it had been. He estimated that the expanded building would be approximately 35 feet off the edge of the pavement on County Road.

Abutter Jim Cricenti opined that the impact of the expanse along County Road would not be bad for them, but the neighbor's view would probably be blocked. PB member Cottrill asked if there were any architectural tricks available to mitigate the size. Mr. Galvin replied that they were trying to match the bricks on the existing building. He said that they would add a two-layer "soldier" course under the parapet with an overhang that

would create shadow. He added that they would use clapboards and small windows as well. He advised that size could be mitigated by controlling shadow lines. Mr. Cottrill asked if there would be any lights along the side. Mr. Galvin replied that the only light would be that coming through the windows. Ms Underwood stated that the lights would be off most nights by 8:00 PM. Mr. Cottrill asked if that part of the building would be entirely taken up by offices. Mr. Galvin replied that the second floor would be offices and the second floor would be what was visible from County Road.

Chair Ebel asked if the physical therapy department would be coming back to the hospital site. Ms Underwood responded affirmatively. Trustee William Helm added that pediatrics and patient billing would also be returning to the hospital campus.

### III. DRAFT SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS & SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS: Review and Discussion

Chair Ebel advised that she and Mr. McWilliams believed further review and discussion of the draft subdivision regulations should resume at the next meeting when more members of the PB could be present to participate. The other PB members present agreed.

Ken McWilliams advised that he would re-do the drafts of the SPR regulations to incorporate comments made during the review. He distributed a memo summarizing some additional issues that have been raised since the draft of the June 21, 2006 Subdivision Regulations was distributed. He opined that the PB might want to send the draft to an engineer for evaluation. Mr. McWilliams also distributed copies of a recommended Table of Contents for the Site Plan Review Regulations.

PB member Ballin asked who attorney Adele Fulton was. Chair Ebel replied that Ms Fulton was New London's town counsel re the Harborview Subdivision in Sutton with access via Stonehouse Road in New London.

### IV. OTHER BUSINESS

#### A. DONALD CATINO: Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 42, Lot 19)

PB member Conly presented a request submitted by Donald Catino to remove a hemlock and a small red maple located within the 50-foot buffer at 64 Goose Hole Road. He advised that the applicant wanted to remove both trees because they posed a threat to the house foundation. Mr. Conly further advised that the applicant was willing to replant whatever was recommended. He said that the applicant wanted to retain the lilacs and myrtle on the site and had agreed to plant a dogwood and three (3) lilacs.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REQUEST TO REMOVE ONE HEMLOCK AND ONE SMALL MAPLE TREE LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 64 GOOSE HOLE ROAD (TAX MAP 42, LOT 19) BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO REPLACEMENT BY PLANTING A DOGWOOD TREE AND THREE (3) LILAC BUSHES. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### B. CHRISTOPHER CLAPP: Subdivision Mylar (Tax Map 95, Lot 13)

Ken McWilliams reminded the PB that approval of the Minor Subdivision of Tax Map 95, Lot 13 was contingent upon the granting of an easement to the Town of New London for a culvert to discharge to the edge of the town road right-of-way. Mr. McWilliams advised that on March 26, 2007 Christopher Clapp had executed a drainage easement agreement providing the Town of New London with the perpetual right to discharge surface water onto the property at the agreed upon place. Said water will be from either a culvert that crosses the Town of New London right-of-way or one that runs parallel with the right-of-way. Mr. McWilliams advised that a note re the easement had also been entered on the plan.

Since the contingency for approval had been met, Mr. McWilliams presented the subdivision mylar for PB signatures and forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds, along with the Drainage Easement Agreement, to be recorded.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **9:15 PM**.

Respectfully submitted,  
Judith P. Condict, Recording Secretary  
New London Planning Board

DATE APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_

CHAIRMAN \_\_\_\_\_