

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

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

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

I. DAN WOLF (HAYWARD PROPERTY) – Preliminary Site Plan Review (Tax Map 59, Lot 1)

Dan Wolf displayed a plan to convert an existing commercial space to a more aesthetically appealing and more functional commercial space. He advised that the building would have 12,000 square feet of retail space on the street level and 6500 square feet of office space on the second floor. He indicated that the office space would house medical/dental offices. Mr. Wolf advised that the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) had granted a Variance for parking in the R-1 Resident District on January 29, 2007.

Mr. Wolf advised that the building would sit back from the road to comply with setback requirements. However, he said that he was requesting three waivers: (1) The plan displayed did not meet the 10-foot landscape buffer requirements. He said that to do so would eliminate full access for the Lake Sunapee Region Visiting Nurse Association (LSRVNA) and the Griffith properties via the curb cuts located on the Hayward property. (2) The plan displayed was 3-10 feet short of the green space requirement. (3) The plan would provide for 70 parking spaces rather than the 77 spaces required by the regulations for the proposed combined uses. Mr. Wolf said that he would work with abutting property owners to share parking in a manner that would serve all parties.

Mr. Wolf said that currently the property had no green space. He described the rear of the property as a glorified sand pit. He pointed out that the plan would maintain the existing number of curb cuts onto Newport Road. He opined that the proposed changes would be a "win-win" situation inasmuch as an existing non-compliant and dysfunctional commercial site would be rendered more usable and more compliant and the appearance from Newport Road would be improved. Mr. Wolf said that soil samples had been analyzed and had come back "clean". He advised that drainage calculations had not yet been done, as he did not want to incur the expense if the requested waivers were not granted. Mr. Wolf estimated that there would be six to eight employees in the retail area. In regard to the possibility for shared parking, he said that the abutting LSRVNA business was heaviest early during weekday mornings, and he opined that the proposed retail business on the Hayward property would be heaviest later in the day and on weekends.

Chair Ebel asked if the size of the building in the plan displayed was the same as that of the building in the conceptual plan presented to the PB earlier. Mr. Wolf replied that the upstairs area had been reduced by 500 square feet; however, the prospective retail tenants for the downstairs were not amenable to a reduction in square footage. Chair Ebel asked if the footprint was the same. Mr. Wolf replied that it was. Chair Ebel asked if he had made any progress regarding the leasing of additional parking spaces. Mr. Wolf replied that he had had no luck with regard to leasing parking spaces for 20 years, as required by the PB.

Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams to report on the meeting with municipal department heads. Mr. McWilliams said that New London Road Agent Richard Lee recommended condensing access to the Griffith property. Mr. McWilliams said that Police Chief David Seastrand agreed with Mr. Lee and also was concerned about sight distances to the west due to parking in front of the building on the Griffith property. He encouraged Mr. Wolf to work with the abutting Griffith property to try to get them to access via the curb cut on the Hayward property.

Andrea Steele (LSRVNA) asked if the department heads were suggesting that everyone should exit through the Hayward property. Mr. McWilliams responded affirmatively. Michele Holton (LSRVNA) advised that the LSRVNA had some signage directing traffic flow and expressed concern regarding confusion. PB members noted that some parking spaces required drivers to back into the traffic using the shared driveway. Ms Steele said that the LSRVNA could assign some parking to people who did not exit the property frequently. PB member Clough asked how wide the shared drive was. Mr. Wolf said that he did not have the precise measurement, but he estimated the width to be 35 feet. Mr. McWilliams performed a rough calculation and confirmed the 35 feet. Ms Clough seconded the concern regarding cars backing into traffic exiting the site. Ms Steele advised that all LSRVNA staff entered near the New London Cleaners. PB member Andrews asked if the traffic flow accessing and exiting properties via the shared drives couldn't be made one-way. Mr. Wolf said

that most of the time people entered near the New London Cleaners. Mr. McWilliams clarified that traffic would enter on the west and exit on the east.

PB member Andrews asked if there were no other arrangement for parking in back of the building so that setbacks would work better. Mr. Wolf replied that all setbacks would be met. Ms Andrews clarified that her questions related to the landscape buffer requirement. She said that she understood that the front met the 10-foot buffer requirement, but she would like to see landscaping on the sides as well. Mr. McWilliams asked if the parking in the back could be moved slightly to increase the green buffer. Mr. Wolf agreed to look at the possibility. PB member Hollinger asked if there had been any discussion with the LSRVNA about straightening the lot line between the two properties. Mr. Wolf replied that he had discussed easements with the LSRVNA, but he didn't know what would be gained by changing the lot line. Mr. Hollinger said that adjusting the lot line might give more room in the rear for parking.

PB member Clough asked if the LSRVNA used all of its parking. Ms Steele replied that it did. Ms Holton said that in the best of all worlds, the sheds behind the LSRVNA that are currently being used for storage could be razed, thereby creating more parking area; however, that wasn't possible at this time. She said that she had discussed the issue with Mr. Wolf. Ms Clough noted the requirement for intermittent landscaping in parking areas exceeding ten spaces.

Chair Ebel asked if Mr. Wolf had talked with abutters about leasing parking spaces without a 20-year agreement. Mr. Wolf responded affirmatively, and he said that the abutters were amenable. He said that the number of parking spaces had been calculated using the regulatory 4.5 spaces/1000 square feet of medical/dental area and 4.0 spaces/1000 square feet of retail space. He said that, based on that calculation, 29.25 spaces would be required for the upstairs of the proposed building.

Ken McWilliams opined that the strip of land along the west of the property could accommodate some perimeter landscaping. PB member Andrews added that a strip along the east could also do so. Mr. Wolf said that the plan provided perimeter landscaping on the 12.5-foot strip on the west. Ms Andrews asked if the land identified as "other land of Hayward" could be all green; then that side would be okay. She said that she was really concerned about the other side. She said if a future owner of the LSRVNA property were to park right up to the property line, that would not be good. That's why the perimeter landscaping was so important. Mr. Wolf opined that landscaping in a parking area impeded plowing and maintenance and that open area was preferable. Ms Andrews responded that that was not what the PB wanted to do; it didn't want uninterrupted paving in parking areas.

Mr. Wolf said that he was trying to provide green space where it would have the greatest impact on the public and trying to put the parking in the rear of the building. Chair Ebel consulted with PB members and then advised Mr. Wolf that it was the sense of the PB that he should try to increase the green space. PB member Clough opined that access between parking areas and shared driveways were to be encouraged. Ms Holton asked if the reason for the buffer were not to keep the green space visible. She wanted the PB to consider the green space in front of the building.

Chair Ebel consulted PB members on whether the PB was in a position to grant any of the three waivers requested. PB members Hollinger and Cook said that they tended to approve the requested waiver of seven parking spaces. PB member Andrews said that she would like to wait to see what could be worked out with parking based on the recommendations made by the PB. Mr. Hollinger said that the PB wanted to work with Mr. Wolf on the project, but it wanted to maximize green space.

It was MOVED (Conly) and SECONDED (Cottrill) THAT A WAIVER OF SEVEN (7) OF THE 77 PARKING SPACES REQUIRED BY THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF TAX MAP 59, LOT 1, BE GRANTED AS REQUESTED BY DAN WOLF. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED BY VOTE OF 6 IN FAVOR, 1OPPOSED (Andrews).

Ken McWilliams asked Mr. Wolf if he would like to Continue the Preliminary Site Plan Review or go directly to a Final Site Plan Review. Mr. Wolf said that he would return to the PB for a Final Site Plan Review.

II. JONATHAN FEINS – Continued Public Hearing on Final Plans for Stonehouse Road Access to the Harborview Subdivision in Sutton

G. Dana Bisbee (Pierce Atwood) appeared on behalf of Jonathan Feins. He thanked Ken McWilliams for sharing the suggested conditions of approval in advance of the meeting. He said that his client agreed with all of the conditions except for the requirement that the entire length Stonehouse Road in New London be paved.

Mr. Bisbee noted that the first two conditions of approval on the draft referred to the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NH DOT) approval. He opined that the February 9, 2007 letter issued by NH DOT covered the first two conditions in the suggested conditions of approval. Mr. McWilliams agreed that the letter covered the first condition regarding approval of the intersection and drainage design; however, it did not contain written approval of the 30 mph advisory speed control signs on King Hill Road as required by the second condition for approval.

Chair Ebel advised Mr. Bisbee that the final bill for services provided to the Town of New London PB by Louis Caron (L. C. Engineering Company, LLC) exceeded the amount of money remaining in escrow for that purpose. Mr. McWilliams advised that an additional \$1,663.75 was needed; therefore, that would be an additional condition of approval.

Chair Ebel said that the PB also had to consider the hours of operation. A review of past Minutes, revealed that in the most recent PB review in which hours of operation had been addressed (New London-Springfield Water System Precinct), the starting time was set at 7:30 AM. Town Administrator Jessie Levine advised that the New London Highway Department began work at 7:00 AM. PB member Clough noted that the New London-Springfield Water System Precinct had been working in a residential neighborhood. PB member Cook said that Stonehouse Road was also in a residential neighborhood. Chair Ebel opined that 7:30 AM was a little late and suggested a 7:00 AM start with no end time. PB member Cottrill asked if there would be any issued with no stop time. PB members Cook and Hollinger opined that there would be an issue. PB consensus was for a start time of 7:00 AM and a stop time of sunset. PB member Cottrill emphasized that the start time was the time at which trucks could be started, i.e. engines could not be started earlier in anticipation of a 7:00 start time.

PB member Cottrill asked about suggested condition 8.a. regarding the security release. Mr. McWilliams explained that release of security would be done in stages; however, security would be withheld for the final one inch wearing course which would not be put down until all subdivision roads were constructed or three years from the time the binder pavement was placed on the New London portion of Stonehouse Road, which was earlier.

PB member Cook asked if Mr. Bisbee's comment meant that Mr. Feins had agreed to the suggested conditions as outlined in Mr. McWilliams' e-mail. Mr. Bisbee replied that Mr. Feins was in agreement with all except the condition requiring the paving of the entire length of Stonehouse Road in New London. He said that Mr. Feins had agreed to paving the road wherever there was curbing; however, there was approximately 140 feet of the road that Mr. Feins had not yet agreed to pave.

PB member Clough asked if the PB had to address the letter received from abutter G. Mason Delafield and the letter from abutter Anna Boyle concerning the article that she saw in the *Argus Champion* regarding the need to renegotiate drainage easements. Chair Ebel explained that drainage calculations were reviewed and the PB had decided that renegotiation would not be necessary. Ms Clough noted that Mr. Delafield was still concerned about the intersection of Stonehouse Road and King Hill Road. Chair Ebel briefly summarized the concerns raised by each of the abutters and advised the PB that copies of the letters had been distributed.

PB member Cottrill asked if NH DOT needed to be asked if it specifically approved the plans.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Andrews) **THAT FINAL PLANS FOR STONEHOUSE ROAD ACCESS TO THE HARBORVIEW SUBDIVISION IN SUTTON BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO (1) *Written approval of the intersection and drainage designs by NH Department of Transportation.* (2) *Written approval of the 30 mph advisory speed control***

signs on King Hill Road by NH Department of Transportation. (3) The subdivider shall provide cost estimates prepared by a civil engineer for the road improvements, including pavement and drainage improvements, the improvements to the intersection of Stonehouse Road and King Hill Road, and installation of the 30 mph advisory speed control signs on King Hill Road. These cost estimates must be reviewed for acceptability by the Road Agent and by the Town's consulting review engineer. The final form and amount of security, including inflation, for the improvements must be approved by the New London Planning Board. (4) The right-of-way line along both sides of Stonehouse Road shall be flagged by the subdivider in all places where stone walls no longer exist to identify the boundary between the private property and the road right-of-way. (5) The improvements to Stonehouse Road and its intersection with King Hill Road shall be constructed prior to the subdivision development to provide adequate and safe construction and emergency vehicle access. (6) The entire length of Stonehouse Road in New London shall be paved with a minimum of three (3) inches of bituminous asphalt pavement. The final one(1) inch wearing course shall be withheld until the base or binder pavement is complete on all the subdivision roads and Stonehouse Road in Sutton, if required to be paved by the Sutton Planning Board, or three years from the time the binder pavement is placed on the New London portion of Stonehouse Road, whichever comes first. (7) An escrow account for engineering construction review services shall be established with the Town's consulting engineer. (8) The release of security shall be as follows: A. Temporary Certificate of Performance of Improvements: Upon completion of all the required off-site highway, drainage, and intersection improvements except the final one-inch wearing course of pavement, the subdivider may make application to the Planning Board in writing for a Temporary Certificate of Performance. This application shall include inspection reports from all affected Town departments and/or applicable outside agencies including, but not limited to, the Road Agent, the Town's consulting engineer for construction review services, and the New Hampshire Department of Transportation. The Planning Board shall issue the Temporary Certificate of Performance and release the original security filed with the Planning Board for all the improvements except the final one-inch wearing course of pavement if the Planning Board determines that the following conditions have been met (i) All of the improvements constructed are without material defects which need correction as determined by the Planning Board, and (ii) The subdivider has submitted security which is acceptable to the Planning Board to cover the cost of the final one inch wearing course of pavement, any correction of defects, omissions or failure to installation of the off-site highway, drainage and intersection improvements to comply with the approved plans. The amount of security shall be determined by the following formula: Length of the roadway x \$22.00 per linear foot x Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Cost Index at the time of the calculation / 7900 plus the cost of the final one inch wearing course. The security for the final one-inch wearing course on the New London portion of Stonehouse Road shall be withheld until the base or binder pavement is complete on all the subdivision roads, Stonehouse Road in Sutton, if required to be paved by the Sutton Planning Board, and other off-site road improvements, or three years from the time the binder pavement is placed on the New London portion of Stonehouse Road, whichever comes first. B. Final Certificate of Performance: Upon completion of all the required off-site highway, drainage, and intersection improvements including the final one-inch wearing course of pavement, the subdivider may make application to the Planning Board in writing for a Final Certificate of Performance. This application shall include inspection reports from all affected Town departments and/or applicable outside agencies including, but not limited to, the Road Agent, the Town's consulting engineer for construction review services, and the New Hampshire Department of Transportation. The Planning Board shall issue the Final Certificate of Performance and release the security retained by the Planning Board in 8. A .ii. above if the Planning Board determines that the following have been met: (i) All of the improvements constructed are without material defects which need correction as determined by the Planning Board, and (ii) The subdivider has submitted maintenance security which is acceptable to the Planning Board to cover the cost of any corrections of defects, omissions or failure of installation of the off-site highway, drainage, and intersection improvements to comply with the approved plan. The Amount of the maintenance security shall be determined by the following formula: Length of the roadway x \$22.00 per linear foot x Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction

Cost Index at the time of the calculation / 7900. (iii) The Town shall retain the maintenance security until all of the on-site roads within the subdivision and all of the off-site road improvements have been completed and approved by the Sutton Planning Board. (iv) After all of the on-site roads within the subdivision and all of the off-site road improvements have been completed and approved by the Sutton Planning Board, then the subdivider may return to the New London Planning Board for the Final Certificate of Performance. The subdivider shall furnish inspection reports from all affected Town departments and/or applicable outside agencies indicating the acceptability of the completed improvements. If all the improvements are without material defects which need correction as determined by the Planning Board, then the Planning Board shall issue a Final Certificate of Performance and release the remaining maintenance security. (9) Construction shall commence no earlier than 7:00 AM and shall cease no later than sunset. (10) The subdivider shall place an additional \$1,663.75 in the escrow to cover the final bill submitted by Town of New London's the independent engineer, Louis Caron .

PB member Cottrill recommended that the motion be amended to set the time for ceasing construction at sunset or 7:00 PM, whichever is earlier. He opined that setting a definite time for construction to cease was necessary because the hour of sunset during the summer extends well into the evening.

It was **MOVED** (Clough) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FINAL PLANS FOR STONEHOUSE ROAD ACCESS TO THE HARBORVIEW SUBDIVISION IN SUTTON BE AMENDED IN CONDITION (9) TO SET THE TIME AT WHICH CONSTRUCTION SHALL CEASE NO LATER THAN SUNSET OR 7:00 PM, WHICHEVER IS EARLIER. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

The **MOTION to APPROVE FINAL PLANS FOR STONEHOUSE ROAD ACCESS TO THE HARBORVIEW SUBDIVISION IN SUTTON, AS AMENDED, WAS APPROVED BY VOTE OF 6 IN FAVOR, 1 OPPOSED** (Cook).

III. NEW LONDON HOSPITAL –Preliminary Site Plan Review

(Tax Map 72, Lots 16 & 17)

PB member Cook recused herself from the PB.

Bruce King, New London Hospital CEO, introduced a number of hospital representatives who were present in the audience: Trustees Bill Helm, Celeste Cook, and John Callahan, Director of Facilities Todd French, Senior Director of Planning & Projects Lori Underwood, Project Engineer Kevin Thatcher (Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP), Architect Jeff Galvin (Lavallee/Brensinger Architects), Attorney Andrew Eills (Hinchley, Allen & Snyder, LLP), site designer Rob Faulkner (Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP)

Mr. King advised that New London Hospital would be requesting waivers for three of the Site Plan Review (SPR) requirements: (1) a maximum height variance, (2) a parking variance for parking in the rural residential district, and (3) the “grandfathering” of some existing abutter setbacks.

Rob Faulkner distributed copies of an existing-conditions plan and provided orientation including the locations of entrances. He noted that the plan also included zoning district references. Mr. Faulkner advised that the setback requirement where the Institutional District abuts the Residential District is 25 feet and the setback requirement where the Institutional District abuts the Commercial District is 10 feet. He said that the hospital encroached on the commercial setbacks along Colonial Plaza and along County Road.

Mr. Faulkner advised that the proposed 48,000-square-foot expansion would make it possible to bring the pediatric service, the physical therapy services, and patient billing services back to the hospital campus. He said that approximately 96 parking spaces would be taken up by the expansion. He pointed out that the plan would consolidate four (4) driveways on County Road by directing all traffic through one central entrance. He said that the entrance would be moved further toward the west to improve sight distance along County Road. Mr. Faulkner advised there would also be a service road entrance that would be used primarily for the mobile unit. He said that one big improvement would be the internal access from the hospital to the mobile unit. At the

present time, anyone accessing the mobile MRI unit must go outside in order to do so. He advised that employee parking would be moved to a new parking lot at the rear of the campus to be constructed in Phase 2 of the project.

Mr. Faulkner listed the following changes to the conceptual plans: (1) Parking stalls that are 20 feet deep and 26-foot aisles between stalls will take away from some of the original landscaping proposed. (2) The perimeter curbing has been eliminated and the pitch of the grading has been changed to direct drainage as sheet flow toward the center of the property. (3) The plan shows additional parking and a salt shed to be added in Phase 2.

Mr. Faulkner referred the PB to the sheet provided regarding the parking calculation for the proposed expansion of the site. He said that the town of New London had no regulatory minimum requirement for hospital parking that was based on a formula for the number of minimum parking spaces per unit of use or visitation, as it does for many other uses in town. Therefore, the hospital proposed that the parking requirement be based on the current parking demand. To establish the current parking demand, the hospital had conducted an inventory of existing parking spaces and a study on the utilization of that parking over several months in 2005-06. It determined that the existing parking lots were 82% occupied at the peak time. He stated that there were currently 320 parking spaces. He pointed out that the proposed changes in the square footage and the use of the medical office building (MOB) would result in a reduction in the number of parking spaces required from the existing 112.5 spaces to 33.8 spaces. In addition, he said, staff would be relocated. Mr. Faulkner reviewed the hospital's calculation with the PB. He said that based upon that calculation, 423 parking spaces would be needed on the expanded hospital site. He advised that 381 spaces would be provided in Phase 1 of the project and the remainder would be provided in Phase 2 by creating employee parking further back on the property. He said that the Phase 2 parking would encroach on the Agricultural and Rural Residential (ARR) District.

Mr. Faulkner opined that the issue of conflict between pedestrian and vehicular traffic was not as dramatic as might be perceived. He said that pedestrian traffic was computed as 58 pedestrians per hour, and he opined that one pedestrian a minute wasn't that bad. He noted that pedestrian traffic was at its peak during the morning hours.

Mr. Faulkner said that the existing drainage was curbed and collected by a closed drainage system that discharges into wetlands or into a ditch leading into the wetlands. He noted that one area had sheet flow. He stated that at the west end in the proposed plan, drainage flow would be reduced by 15% due to the reduction in impervious surface resulting from the change from paving drainage to roof drainage. He opined that the water quality would also improve, as the roof drainage would not contain oils and other chemical contaminants. He said that the court yard drainage would continue to be sheet flow. Mr. Faulkner advised that drainage in the main area would increase by approximately 15%, but the hospital would be installing a system to improve the quality of the drainage water. He said that the size of the impervious surface area would increase 1.25 acres.

Abutter Jim Cricenti (Tax Map 59, Lots 5 & 6) asked about the culvert located at the northwest side of the building. Mr. Faulkner replied that the flow from the culvert would be directed into a catch basin and, thence, to the wetlands.

Ken McWilliams asked what the sequence would be for the expansion. Lori Underwood replied that the employee parking area would be constructed first, as the building expansion would extend over existing parking spaces. She advised that the activities now located in Georges Mills and on Pleasant Street would not be brought back to the hospital campus until parking and building space was available. Ms Underwood advised that the front portion of the MOB would be torn down after construction of the employee parking.

Chair Ebel asked if the hospital had gone to the Conservation Commission with its proposed changes in the drainage, especially because the wetlands weren't buffered. Ms Underwood replied that it had not done so. Chair Ebel advised that PB member Dale Conly was the PB's representative on the Conservation Commission. Mr. Conly stated that the Commission had discussed constructing trails in the area. Chair Ebel asked if Mr. Conly thought the Commission should meet with the hospital to review the plan. She said that she thought it would be a good idea. Mr. Conly agreed.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any other places on the hospital campus where the drainage water cleaning mechanisms could be installed. Mr. Faulkner responded in the affirmative, but advised that the area where the hospital proposed to install one was the area that would be receiving the most drainage flow. PB member Andrews questioned how the drainage plan would result in a net reduction on the MOB site. Kevin Thatcher responded that some of the drainage would be redirected. He advised that 45% of the on-site drainage would pass through the water cleaning device. He said that in other areas on the campus, the on-site drainage was augmented by drainage flow from off-site, e.g., the shopping center. PB member Conly asked about the drainage flowing from Clarke's Hardware. Mr. Faulkner replied that it would go over a vegetative swale and through the clean-up mechanism. Chair Ebel asked if the devices were expensive to install. Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Faulkner both responded affirmatively. Mr. Thatcher estimated the cost to be \$20,000 to \$30,000. He and Mr. Faulkner said that the proposed location is where there is discreet drainage from New London Hospital. Abutter Virginia Soule (Tax Map 72, Lot 35) asked where the sewer line was located on the plan. The location was identified. Mr. Faulkner advised that parking at the MOB quickly falls away toward the wetlands. Chair Ebel asked New London Hospital to consult with the Conservation Commission. She advised that the Commission was very concerned about the wetlands. The hospital agreed to meet with the Commission.

PB member Andrews asked about the side of the hospital property along Colonial Plaza. She said that the size of the setback seemed small. Mr. Faulkner replied that the existing setback was about five (5) feet and the hospital would be holding the existing limit. PB member Clough asked if the hospital would be looking for a waiver regarding the encroachment on the 10-foot setback. Mr. Faulkner responded affirmatively. Ms Clough asked if the existing encroachment had been approved. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley stated that New London Hospital was built in the late 1950s. Abutter Jim Cricenti said that the MOB was built in the 1980s. Ms Andrews said that the landscape buffer should be no less than the setback. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that the side setback was five (5) feet in the Commercial District where the property was adjacent to a public right-of-way and 25 feet in the Institutional District.

Zoning Administrator Stanley said that he and Town Road Agent Richard Lee were concerned about snow storage on the site. He said that there had been no discussion about the recommended 20% of the parking, aisle, and drive areas needed for on-site snow storage. He noted that no snow storage areas were shown on the plan. He noted that there was no space for snow storage along the front and side of the property and advised that one could not put snow storage in wetland areas. He advised that the hospital needed to address how to remove snow and where to relocate it. He said that even if the hospital were to truck snow away, it would need to identify the location of the receiving site.

PB member Andrews asked about the dotted line on the plan in the area of the Phase 2 parking lot. Mr. Faulkner replied that it showed an area for possible future development.

Jeff Galvin (Lavalley/Brensinger Architects) stated that the plan shown was for a 48,000 square foot expansion. He said that the building would be fully "sprinklered". He advised 12,000 square feet of the existing building would be renovated and brought up to standards. Mr. Galvin said that the hospital would request a waiver of the height limitation contained in the regulations. He stated that the average height calculation was complicated by the fact that New London Hospital terraces over the hillside in three levels. He demonstrated on the plan the average 35-foot height/grade and stated that the existing building was actually nine (9) feet below the requirement now. He said that he had tried to limit the height of floors, but had come out four (4) inches short of compliance. He added that there was a lot of equipment that goes on the roof of a hospital; thus, the hospital would lack about seven (7) feet. He advised that the average grade would be above the first floor and the perceived average height would be about one floor. Ken McWilliams advised that if a proposed amendment to the definition of a "structure" in the Zoning Ordinance were to be approved by the voters in March, the equipment on the roof would be eliminated from the calculation and the hospital would be only four inches out of compliance. PB member Andrews opined that if the expansion were a "stand-alone" building, the four inches would not be an issue. Chair Ebel advised that the PB could send New London Hospital to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for a Variance.

PB member Cottrill said that the abutters on County Road would see only the building instead of the lower profile as now there would be 125-foot wall. Mr. Galvin advised that 26 feet would be visible from County

Road. PB member Andrews said that it would be against the zoning regulations. PB member Clough opined that the issue was aesthetics, not zoning. PB member Hollinger recommended sending the hospital to the ZBA with a recommendation for approval. Town Administrator Jessie Levine spoke about screening around the roof-top equipment.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Andrews) **THAT THE NEW LONDON HOSPITAL BE REFERRED TO THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR A VARIANCE FOR THE FOUR (4) INCHES IN EXCESS OF THE REGULATORY HEIGHT LIMITATION, THE HVAC EQUIPMENT ON THE ROOF, AND SCREENING AROUND THE EQUIPMENT WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL FROM THE PLANNING BOARD. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Abutter Jim Cricenti asked how much higher than the cupola the building would be. Mr. Galvin replied that the it was 11 feet tall. PB member Cottrill asked if the proposed screening would be a wall. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied affirmatively. Mr. Cottrill asked if the wall would be considered a "structure". Zoning Administrator Stanley again replied affirmatively.

Mr. Galvin advised that the building would be clapboard and brick. He said that the equipment would be placed as far back as possible from all of the edges. PB members noted that the PB's recommended approval of a Variance for the HVAC equipment would go away if proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance were to be approved by the voters in March.

PB member Clough advised that the PB was concerned about drainage. She asked if the requested Phase 2 Variance regarding parking in a residential zone could be decided later. PB member Andrews reiterated the need to designate area(s) for on-site snow storage. PB members said that there had to be someplace to put the snow when roads and walkways were cleared during a snowstorm. PB member Cottrill noted that the hospital had also mentioned a salt shed in Phase 2. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that there needed to be an evaluation of the proposed salt shed to determine if it was in keeping with a residential district.

A discussion ensued as to whether the hospital should wait until after meeting with the Conservation Commission to go to the ZBA. PB member Conly noted that the Conservation Commission would not be meeting again until March 21, 2007. Mr. Faulkner opined that if the hospital were to go to the ZBA for a waiver of the parking regulations, it would not impact on drainage. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that the Institutional District had been established on the basis of the boundaries of the hospital property at an earlier time. He opined that it might be appropriate to relocate those bounds of the Institutional District during the coming year.

Chair Ebel advised that if the hospital went to the ZBA and obtained a Variance prior to meeting with the Conservation Commission and the Conservation Commission's recommendations resulted in the PB requiring a change in the placement of the parking lot, the hospital would not be able to simply change the location, because the Variance would be specific to the plan presented. If the parking lot placement changed, the hospital would have to go back to the ZBA for another Variance. PB member Hollinger opined that if the boundary lines were moved, the conversation would be unnecessary. PB members agreed, but noted that that would be at least a year away.

Mr. Faulkner said that the abutters were not concerned about the location of the Phase 2 parking. PB member Cottrill asked why not wait to seek the parking Variance later. Ms Underwood asked what the options would be. Mr. Cottrill replied that perhaps the hospital should talk with the Conservation Commission before seeking a Variance. Zoning Administrator Stanley reiterated that the hospital needed to address snow storage. PB member Andrews asked if snow storage was permitted in a residential zone. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied that it was allowed and, therefore, the hospital would not need to obtain a Variance for snow storage. PB member Andrews asked if the entrance to parking was one-way or two-way traffic. Mr. Faulkner replied that it was two-way.

PB member Andrews asked if it would be the hospital's choice to apply for a Variance now or later. Chair Ebel replied that it would be. A brief discussion regarding meeting times for the Conservation Commission and ZBA ensued. PB member Conly reiterated that the Conservation Commission was very concerned about drainage. Chair Ebel suggested that the motion to refer the hospital to the ZBA be made and then the hospital could do as it wanted from a timing perspective. Mr. King, Mr. Faulkner, and Ms Underwood all agreed that would be the best option.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE NEW LONDON HOSPITAL BE REFERRED TO THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR A VARIANCE TO EXTEND PHASE 2 PARKING INTO THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Discussion turned to the hospital's request for a waiver of the side yard setback requirement in the Commercial District and the encroachment into the commercial zone of the existing edge of pavement along County Road and Colonial Plaza. It was noted that the setback requirement was met along County Road, but the setback along Colonial Plaza had only a five (5) feet where a 10 feet were required. Hospital representatives advised that they would be perpetuating an existing condition. PB member Andrews stated that she was willing to support a waiver of the encroachment as it already exists, but she would not want the hospital to encroach any more than it did now.

Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that the hospital needed to request a waiver of the required property boundary line setbacks or merge the lots. The latter action would make the problem go away. He pointed out that the hospital had three lots: the MOB lot, the hospital lot, and all the rest of the land owned by the New London Hospital Association. He advised that each lot had requirements for boundary line setbacks. PB member Andrews and other members of the PB asked why the hospital didn't consider merging the lots. PB Clough said that she thought that leaving things in different zones allowed for greater flexibility. PB member Andrews raised the issue of the PB setting a precedent. Town Administrator Jessie Levine opined that the hospital needed to consider future possible issues, but merger would eliminate the need for the PB to set a precedent. Mr. McWilliams advised that the hospital could merge the MOB lot and the hospital lot and annex part of the other lot, leaving a part of the lot in the residential district.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE NEW LONDON HOSPITAL BE GRANTED A WAIVER FROM THE SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS TO PERMIT ENCROACHMENT ON THE SETBACK ON THE PERIPHERY OF THE LOT ALONG COUNTY ROAD AND COLONIAL PLAZA AS SET FORTH IN THE PLAN. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE NEW LONDON HOSPITAL PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW BE CONTINUED TO MARCH 27, 2007 AT 7:30 PM IN THE SYDNEY CROOK MEETING ROOM IN THE TOWN OFFICE BUILDING. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Celeste Cook returned to the PB.

IV. **JESSIE LEVINE – Discussion of Roundabout**

Town Administrator Jessie Levine distributed Right-of-Way Plans for the proposed Roundabout at the intersection of Newport Road and County Road. She said that Rob Faulkner (Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP), who was the site engineer for the proposed hospital expansion, was also the engineer for the proposed roundabout.

Ms Levine said that sheet R-101 showed the project starting at Hilltop. She pointed out that turning lanes had been added in front of The Gallery. She said that there would be a median and a new crosswalk to The Gallery on the other side of the intersection.

Ms Levine advised that sheet R-102 showed the area leading up to the intersection. She said the sidewalk would continue up Newport Road and up the hill on County Road to Hilltop.

Ms Levine said that sheet R-103 showed the entrances to Jake's and Sugar River Savings Bank. She advised that the businesses had been given five options regarding the entrances; however, they chose to leave the entrances as they now are. She said that because of this, there would be no left turn off Newport Road to enter Jake's, and there would be no left turn exiting either of the businesses. She said that the curb would be "mountable" by trucks. She advised that there would be no other changes.

PB member Cottrill asked why the sidewalk would be extended up the hill to the Hilltop entrance on County Road. PB member Cook opined that it would be constructed for the benefit of Hilltop residents. Mr. Cottrill opined that the residents would not use it for walking and that it would be difficult for the town to maintain due to the grade. He supported extending the sidewalk to the MOB. Ms Levine advised that the hospital was willing to give the Conservation Commission an easement for a trail and the town was trying to give something in return by extending the sidewalk. Ms Levine said that, in hindsight, building the sidewalk up the hill along County Road to Hilltop was not the most immediate need, but it was covered by the federal grant awarded to the town of New London.

Ms Levine said that the roundabout design would allow the elimination of seven light poles. PB member Cottrill asked when construction would start. Ms Levine responded that the project could go out for bid on March 27, 2007. Mr. Cottrill said that it would have to be approved by the voters first.

Ms Levine advised that Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP was working on a landscaping plan. She said that the New Hampshire Department of Transportation wanted the truck apron to be a different color from the rest of the roundabout, and they also had minor comments about the width of the median and the sidewalks. She said that Town Road Agent Richard Lee would be grinding and paving County Road at the same time. She also advised that the town and the New London-Springfield Water System Precinct were coordinating the replacement of water mains in that area.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. The MINUTES of the FEBRUARY 13, 2007 MEETING of the PLANNING BOARD were APPROVED, as circulated.
- B. The MINUTES of the JANUARY 8, 2007 MEETING of the SNOW SUBDIVISION SUBCOMMITTEE were APPROVED, as amended.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **10:05 PM**.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____