

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
MARCH 25, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Dale Conly, Celeste Cook, Michael Doheny, Jeff Hollinger, Ken McWilliams (Planner), Larry Ballin (Selectmen's Representative), Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate). Tom Cottrill arrived at 7:33 PM.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michele Holton (Alternate)

Chairman Karen Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM. She asked Alternate PB Member Deirdre Sheerr-Gross to sit on the PB as a replacement for Tom Cottrill. PB Member Cottrill arrived at 7:33 PM, and Alternate Member Sheerr-Gross stepped down.

**I. COLBY-SAWYER COLLEGE – Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record
(Tax Map 85, Lot 33 & Tax Map 96, Lot 3)**

Douglas Atkins, Colby-Sawyer College's Vice President for Administration, was accompanied by Stephen Jesseman and Richard Fink (Jesseman Associates, P. E.)

Richard Fink demonstrated on the plan displayed the lots to be merged. PB Alternate Member Sheerr-Gross asked who owned the house on the property. Douglas Atkins replied that Colby-Sawyer College owned the house. Ms Sheerr-Gross asked what use the college made of the house. Mr. Atkins advised that a portion of the house was occupied by a college employee and the remainder of the house was used to accommodate guests of the college. PB Member Cottrill asked about the location of the Institutional District boundary line. Mr. Fink demonstrated the location on the plan.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE VOLUNTARY MERGER OF TWO LOTS OF RECORD, TAX MAP 85, LOT 33, AND TAX MAP 96, LOT 3, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY COLBY-SAWYER COLLEGE. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Voluntary Merger form was presented for signature by members of the PB and forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**II. COLBY-SAWYER COLLEGE – Preliminary Site Plan Review: Addition of Dorm Rooms & Parking Lot
(Tax Map 85, Lot 33)**

Douglas Atkins, Colby-Sawyer College's Vice President for Administration, was accompanied by Stephen Jesseman and Richard Fink (Jesseman Associates, P. E.)

Richard Fink described the information presented on the cover sheet of the plans for Residence Hall Renovations and Construction of Parking Lot 'O'. He pointed out the list of abutters, the Executive Summary, and the plan sheet index. He then proceeded to go through each of the plan sheets.

Mr. Fink advised that Sheet C-2 showed the main campus and its relation to the work area. He noted that Sheet C-3 showed specific site features for Colby and McKean Halls, e.g., external staircases on the easterly side of the buildings with walkways leading away from the buildings. He advised that the windows in the renovated areas were designed for personnel egress. He said that there would be foundation drains that would direct water to a storm drain that goes into a closed drain behind Colby Hall to the Seamans Road drainage system that goes to a detention system behind Pizza Chef. Mr. Fink said that there would be silt fencing in areas where erosion could occur during construction. He mentioned a catch basin and rock and gravel soil erosion controls, as well as mulching, as necessary. He advised that the drainage system was a foundation drainage system, not a surface water drainage system. Stephen Jesseman added that there was an existing foundation drainage system, but it was not working. Mr. Fink said that the drainage would go into a closed drainage system.

Mr. Fink said that Sheet C-4 showed the external staircase and walkway for Shepard Hall. He advised that Sheet C-5 provided all of the information pertaining to the proposed Parking Lot 'O' that would be needed by the construction contractor. He said that it showed the length and width of parking spaces and the parking aisle width. Chair Ebel asked how many spaces would be constructed. Mr. Fink responded that there would be 43 new spaces; however, construction of a connector would eliminate three existing spaces, so the net gain would be 40 spaces. Chair Ebel asked where the stone wall was. Mr. Fink responded that Sheet C-6 showed a stone wall on one side of the chiller, some between Ivey and the connector, and some between Lot 'O' and the garage at Colby Farm to protect the garage during snow plowing.

Mr. Fink said that drainage from the parking lot would flow diagonally from SW to NE through grading. He said that the corner would be raised about two feet above the existing height and the area near the chiller would remain at current grade. He said that drainage would flow toward Colby Farm where it would be stored for a short time in a grass swale and then flow to existing drainage areas. He advised that the plan was to drain a small pond by directing water toward Susan's Swamp. He pointed out that the driveway to Colby Farm would be relocated and the existing drive would be removed and reseeded.

Chair Ebel asked about snow storage. Mr. Fink replied that, after meeting with municipal department heads, they knew that they would need to show snow storage on the plan with both the required values and the proposed values for the amount of snow storage. Mr. Fink advised that Sheet C-6 showed pedestrian crosswalks and test pit data. He said that the soil was glacial fill and the plan showed details for percolation rates. He advised that they would have to bring in gravel to address drainage issues.

Mr. Fink advised that Sheet C-7 was the utilities plan for Colby and McKean Halls. He opined that it was quite "busy" and confusing to anyone other than a contractor, who would need to know the location of utilities before beginning construction. He said the Sheet C-8 was the utilities plan for Shepard Hall. Mr. Fink pointed out that Sheet C-9 was the utilities plan for Parking Lot 'O'. He advised that a 10-inch water line ran parallel to the center island on the plan. He said that it would be extended beyond the proposed access drive. He said that it would not be connected to anything right now; simply planning for the future. Mr. Fink said the sheet showed the conduit for two light stands and lighting near Colby Farm for the benefit of the electrical contractor.

PB Member Ballin said that he did not have a copy of Sheet C-10 in his packet. Mr. Fink responded that the information was not available yet, so Sheet C-10 had not been prepared. He said the light coverage had not been done yet.

Mr. Fink said that Sheet C-11 addressed mitigation of the regulatory requirement for landscaping in parking lots to have one tree for each ten parking spaces. He advised that the plan would be to plant five trees, perhaps 6, next to the parking lot. He said that they would like to have the option to put vegetation in the island, but not a tree, perhaps low shrubs without large root systems that could infiltrate the pavement. PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked how large the proposed trees would be. Mr. Fink replied that they would have a planting height of 10 to 15 feet. PB Member Conly quoted the regulation regarding parking lot plantings. Mr. Fink said that most of the trees would grow to 50-60 feet, except for the spruce near the chiller. He said the spruce would be about 10-feet wide and could grow quite high. He said that the municipal department heads had opined that the trees were quite far from the parking area. Mr. Fink responded that they were trying to avoid the drainage swale and get beyond threat to the pavement from root infiltration. At the meeting with municipal department heads, he said, the issues of safety and light coverage were raised. Mr. Fink advised that they would do more work on the landscaping plan. Chair Ebel advised Mr. Fink that page 20 of the Site Plan Review Regulations described the landscaping requirements for parking lots. Mr. Atkins said that he would ask the college's Director of Safety, Peter Berthiaume, to talk with the New London Police Department about personal safety in the parking lot and the tree placement in the spirit of the regulation. PB Member Doheny said that the trees didn't have to be large trees, for example, they could be dogwoods. Mr. Fink opined that stone walls qualified as landscape features.

Mr. Fink advised that Sheet C-12 showed the construction details of the island interface between parking Lot 'M' and Lot 'O'. He said that they didn't want to leave the surface with just mulch or stone. He said that there would be a 2% slope in the pavement to promote drainage. He advised that the chiller would be in a raised island with sloped granite curbing and a grass surround with an arbor vitae screen. He advised that there would be a 2%-3% longitudinal slope in the area near Colby Farm to assist sheet flow drainage. He pointed out that the plan sheet showed the stone diaphragm that would slow down drainage sheet flow leaving the pavement. He said that water would soak through it quickly, but the low percolation rate on the site made drainage issues challenging. He said that the water would be stored in two nearby areas. Mr. Fink said that the plan also showed the proposed guard rail at the edge of the parking lot to prevent drivers from driving over the edge in the belief that the lot continues. He said that New London Police Chief Jay Lyon had recommended scaling it back. PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked how the guard rail would affect snow removal. Mr. Fink responded that there had been discussion about using removable rails. He said that Sheet C-9 showed the location of the cross section. Mr. Fink opined that where there was no chiller, the island could be extended. PB Member Sheerr-Gross said that on the easterly side, it looked like there were eight feet between the pavement and the stone wall. Mr. Fink said that the area was not expected to see a great deal of flow since the lot would be raised. He opined that they would be able to construct a swale in a 10-foot span.

Mr. Fink advised that Sheet C-13 provided drainage details, i.e. the type of grate recommended by the NH Department of Transportation (NH DOT), silt fencing detail, NH Department of Environmental Services (NH DES) recommended block and stones around the perimeter to prevent sediment from getting into the catch basin. PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked if there would be any maintenance required. Mr. Fink replied that the contractor would need to remove and replace the stone, but it would only be there until the area around the catch basin was paved and stable. Mr. Jesseman advised the PB that the contractor would be required to keep a record that would be subject to inspection by NH DES. Mr. Fink advised that the plan also showed (1) the perforated pipe and stone foundation perimeter drain that would need to be flushed periodically, (2) the flow transition from pipe flow to open channel flow where the pipe comes out of the ground. He said the velocity changes as the water exits the pipe to an erodible surface and the plan was designed to mitigate it. (3) The plan shows a cross-section of a swale. He advised that there could be changes in the drainage details after further study and consideration.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. Fink if he wanted to discuss Low Impact Development (LID) techniques at that point or if he preferred to wait until later in his presentation. She advised that New London Hospital had used pervious pavement for parking spaces and impervious pavement for travel ways. Mr. Fink responded that he was aware of what the hospital had done and that pervious pavement was not a new concept. He said that he heard of it 25 years ago when it took the form of placing concrete block under pavement. He said that airports used pipes with holes in the sidewalls under pavement. Chair Ebel said that regardless of whether it was a new concept or not, the PB wanted to know what Colby-Sawyer planned to do to comply with the LID requirements. Mr. Fink opined that it was very problematic to sustain because of the very high water table and low permeability on the site. He said the perimeter area was still glacial fill and water would not percolate into the ground quickly enough. He said the gravel under the pavement freezes and thaws repeatedly and ends up in the same condition as Main Street is. Chair Ebel asked what alternatives there were. Mr. Fink replied that from the perimeter drain, they'd try to get the water into the ground as soon as possible. He said that perforated drainage pipe (small 12' inch pipe) could be used above the water table, but below ground they'd need to assist drainage with a wide large flat area to store two to three inches of water to allow it to drain over several days through evaporation and percolation. Mr. Fink said that he hoped to combine the three features to satisfy the regulations.

Chair Ebel asked if the drainage would flow away from the site. Mr. Fink demonstrated the proposed flow pattern. Chair Ebel asked where the drainage would go. Mr. Fink replied that they wanted to get as much of the water into the ground as quickly as possible. He said that having two drainage retention areas, perimeter pipe, and a diaphragm are all options. Chair Ebel advised him that the PB was very interested in drainage and would be looking closely for details in the Final Site Plan Review. Mr. Fink acknowledged that he was aware of the PB's interest, and said that it would not be a worst case scenario.

Mr. Fink advised that Sheet C-14 regarding lighting details was not yet complete. He said that Sheet C-15 presented landscaping information, including planting and stone wall details. He said that plantings would have a granular base.

Mr. Fink advised that Sheets D-1 and D-2 contained data relating to the drainage area plan and the sub-catchment areas pre-development and post-development. He said it showed the direction of flow from the perimeter of the target area. He said that areas numbered 1 through 4 were areas he had identified as areas of concern. Chair Ebel noted that although the larger plans included Sheet D-2 re post-development details, it had not been included in the small-scale plans provided to the PB. She stated that the PB would want the post-development details for the final SPR. Mr. Fink said that areas 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17 would change. He said the surface changed and, thus, the drainage area would change. He advised that he was running the data through a somewhat magical software program pursuant to which he could change the inputs and calculate drainage. He said that some of the areas might need to change. He said that he would provide a description with soil information, ground cover, etc., for the open channel, the velocity flow, the depth of water, giving the calculation for what would be needed to address the issues. Mr. Fink said that it would impact on the final calculations and recommendations for two-year-, 25-year-, and 50-year-event flow through the proposed solution. PB Member Sheerr-Gross said that she was concerned about the PB judging the accuracy of the engineering. Ken McWilliams replied that the PB had the option to engage, at the cost of the applicant, an independent engineer to review the plans. Mr. Fink said that he recognized the PB's concern.

Mr. Fink advised that Sheet A1-1 demonstrated external egress and had been prepared by architect Roger Dignard (Dignard Architectural Services) and Sheet A1-2 presented an internal floor plan. PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked for a review of the egress plan. Mr. Fink responded that the floor plan showed the egress toward the back of the building and windows would be re-sized to permit egress through the windows in the renovated area. Ms Sheerr-Gross asked if a 50-foot allowance would be provided. Stephen Jesseman responded that Fire Chief Jay Lyon would inspect the renovations. Ms Sheerr-Gross asked if sprinklers would be installed. Doug Atkins responded that the buildings were already "sprinklered" and the existing systems would be expanded as needed. Mr. Fink assured the PB that the proposed renovations would comply with all fire codes. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley named a few of the fire code requirements that would have to be met before the college could receive a Certificate of Occupancy for the renovated areas.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. McWilliams about issues raised at the meeting with municipal department heads. He reported that the Fire Department had made several comments. It wanted magnetic "holdbacks" on the kitchen and laundry, maintenance of window access, compartmentalization of basement areas. He said that the Fire Department would work with the college regarding smoke and heat alarms. Director of Public Works Richard Lee advised that there would be a cost of \$1.00/sq. ft. of living space for sewer service, no drainage from the foundation drains could enter the sewer system, and he wanted the plans to show all drainage features and details on Sheet D-2 re post-development drainage. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley had advised that the plans did not show the required infiltration details. Fire Chief Jay Lyon opined that the proposed guard rail in Parking Lot 'O' could interfere with snow storage. Police Chief Dave Seastrand said that the plans needed to show the location of all snow storage areas.

PB Member Conly noted the plans showed all of the landscaping trees located on the perimeter of the parking lot, not in the parking area where they would provide visual relief from solid pavement. He asked why trees could not be located in the drainage areas where water flowed. Mr. Fink replied that he tried to avoid locating the trees in the swales and "ponded" areas. He said that he would be willing to place a tree on the east side. He said that he had tried to locate trees to facilitate snow removal. Chair Ebel suggested that they could add more trees, such as red maples. PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked if the college used any salt on its parking lots. Mr. Fink replied that the college used as little salt as possible. PB Member Doheny said that the PB wanted the trees to be located within the parking lot to break up the pavement expanse. Mr. Fink replied that he recommended using shrubs, flowers, etc., without deep root systems that could impair utilities or could be damaged if repairs should be required. He said that the island was only eight feet wide; therefore, he didn't want something that would have wide branches. PB Member Ballin suggested that lilacs might work. All agreed.

PB Member Cook asked if the small windows shown on Sheet A1-2 would be able to be opened. She opined that it could be very hot in the basement. Mr. Atkins responded that the renovated area would be served by an air exchange system.

Chair Ebel directed the PB's attention to two waiver requests submitted by the applicant: (1) waiver of the perimeter boundary survey requirement and (2) waiver temporarily of the fire protection plan requirement. She said that the letter requesting the waivers stated that they did not have all components of the sprinkler system plan at this time. The letter stated that a fire protection plan would be submitted for Final Site Plan Review (SPR) and that this waiver was only for Preliminary SPR. PB Member Ballin asked if the PB could require Fire Department approval prior to or as a condition for Final SPR. Mr. McWilliams responded affirmatively.

It was **MOVED** (Ballin) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT THE REQUEST FOR A WAIVER OF ARTICLE V. PARAGRAPH B.2.f.1 AND A TEMPORARY WAIVER OF ARTICLE V. PARAGRAPH B.2.f.19 OF THE SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS BE APPROVED AS OUTLINED IN THE MARCH 25, 2008 LETTER FROM JESSEMAN ASSOCIATES, P.C.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**.

III. SPCR REAL ESTATE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP/CONNELLY RESIDENCE – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 68, Lot 5)

PB Member Conly presented a request submitted by SPCR Real Estate Limited Partnership for cutting within the 50-foot buffer at 235 Pilothouse Road (Tax Map 68, Lot 5). Mr. Conly commented on the excellent quality of the Shoreland Protection Plan submitted. He said that it was a very professional, excellent presentation.

Mr. Conly explained that the property contained four (4) 50'x 50' segments and that, under the new shore land protection regulations, the owner needed to have in each square 50 points, calculated by girth of the trees. Mr. Conly said that because the site was heavily wooded, sections one and four would be untouched by cutting. He advised that initially the owner wanted to cut a swath that would lie half in each of squares two and three. PB Member Conly advised that he had negotiated with the applicant who had agreed to leave five (5) large red pines in each of the squares. He said that the applicant would also plant 50 blueberry bushes in each section. In response to a PB comment about the types of trees included in the waterfront buffer management plan presented, PB Member Conly advised that he and Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley had decided to go with deciduous and evergreen classifications.

PB Member Conly recommended PB approval of the request; however, the applicant would also need to obtain State approval. PB Member Sheerr-Gross advised that although the State had discussed the possibility of delaying implementation of the new Shoreland Protection Act, it had decided to adhere to the original April 1, 2008 implementation date.

Chair Ebel asked where the walkway would be located. PB Member Conly replied that no walkway had been proposed. PB Member Sheerr-Gross opined that a walkway might make a difference. Mr. Conly advised that the property had a pretty steep slope. PB members opined that the property owners would want to access the waterfront.

It was **MOVED** (Ballin) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT THE REQUEST FOR CUTTING WITHIN THE 50-FOOT SHORE LAND BUFFER AT 235 PILOTHOUSE ROAD (TAX MAP 68, LOT 5) BE APPROVED AS DESCRIBED IN THE SHORELAND PROTECTION PLAN SUBMITTED BY SPCR REAL ESTATE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**.

PB Member Sheerr-Gross said that she would like cutting plans to show impervious areas and disturbed areas. PB Member Ballin responded that the PB was only approving tree cutting within the 50-foot shore land buffer.

IV. REVIEW OF SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF THE VISION CHAPTER FOR THE MASTER PLAN UPDATE

A. A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

Page 4, Paragraph 1, Lines 5 & 6: PB Member Cottrill recommended making each of the exercises a separate paragraph, i.e. *The third exercise* . . . would begin a paragraph, and *In the afternoon* . . . would begin another paragraph.

B. SUMMARY 2020 VISION STATEMENT:

Page 5, Bullet 6: PB Members Cook & Hollinger recommended deleting “using various conservation tools”.

Page 5, Bullet 11: PB Member Cottrill opined that the fiber optic system should have been completed by 2020. Following discussion, the bullet was revised to read: *The town supports a regional fiber optic system that has provided state-of-the-art communication.* PB Member Ballin said that the wording came up again on page 7, so Ken McWilliams would have to “do a global” to correct it in other places in the document. PB Member Cottrill noted that it was also on pages, 6, 7, & 12. PB Member Ballin suggested deleting the bullet. Chair Ebel advised that this was the executive summary, so it wouldn’t be appropriate to delete it entirely.

Recreation

Page 6, Paragraph 1: PB Member Ballin suggested replacing “New London Outing Club” with “Outing Club”. He said that the New London Outing Club was considering changing its name because it serves neighboring communities, as well as New London. He suggested revising the paragraph to read: *The Town Recreation Department, as well as the Outing Club, continues to provide recreation programs for all age groups.*

Utilities

Page 6, Paragraph 1: PB Member Ballin recommended splitting the New London-Springfield Water System Precinct and the wastewater treatment systems. **Delete** “and wastewater treatment” from paragraph 1. The Water System Precinct doesn’t do anything with wastewater.

Page 6, Paragraph 3: **Insert** “*state-of-the-art communication*” after “...fiber optic system that”. **Delete** “*for businesses, schools, the hospital, the college and the public.*”

Transportation

Page 7, Paragraph 1: The “Main Street/Pleasant Street intersection” was replaced with the “Crockett’s Corner intersection” at the PB’s last work session. See PB Minutes of March 11, 2008.

Cultural & Social Environment

Page 7, Last Paragraph: **Insert** “*increasingly*” between “now” and “diverse”.

Page 8, Paragraph 1: The final sentence was deleted at the PB’s March 11, 2008 work session.

Land Use

Page 8, Paragraph 1 (under Land Use): Chair Ebel said that “village” should be changed to “community”.

C. APPENDIX

Community Facilities & Services

Page 10, Paragraph 1: **Change** “2008” to “2009”. **Delete** “*community retirement center*” and **Insert** “*continuing care retirement community (CCRC)*”. **Define** CCRC. **Replace** last sentence with “*This very successful retirement center offers living arrangements for seniors seeking a secure future.*”

Recreation

Page 12, Paragraph 1: **Replace** “*Middle School*” with “*school building*”; **replace** “*for*” with “*used by*”

Page 12, Paragraph 4: **Delete** “*New London*” before “*Outing Club*”. **Insert** “*Area*” after “*Kearsarge*”

Housing

Page 14, Paragraph 4: **Insert** “*CCRC*” before “*retirement*”. **Delete** “*project*” Define “*CCRC*”

Land Use

Page 18, Paragraph 1, Line 3: **Replace** “*village*” with “*community*”

V. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Board of Selectmen’s Representative to the PB, Larry Ballin, announced that the Board of Selectmen had re-appointed Thomas Cottrill and John Hollinger, whose terms expired in 2008, to the PB for another three-year term.

The PB elected the following officers to serve for the ensuing year:

Chairman:	Karen Ebel
Vice-Chairman:	Thomas Cottrill
Secretary:	John Hollinger

VI. The MINUTES of the MARCH 11, 2008 MEETING of the PLANNING BOARD were APPROVED, as circulated.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **9:55 PM**.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____