

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
APRIL 22, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Dale Conly, Celeste Cook, Jeff Hollinger, Ken McWilliams (Planner), Larry Ballin (Selectmen's Representative), Michele Holton (Alternate), Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate). Tom Cottrill and Michael Doheny arrived shortly after the meeting opened.

Chairman Karen Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM. She asked Alternate PB Members Michele Holton and Deirdre Sheerr-Gross to sit in as replacements for Michael Doheny and Tom Cottrill, respectively. PB Member Cottrill arrived at 7:35 PM, and Alternate Member Sheerr-Gross stepped down.

I. CHAPIN SENIOR CENTER – Discuss Spring Yard Sale (Tax Map 84, Lot 75)

Nancy Friese, Executive Director of the Kearsarge Area Council on Aging (KCOA), advised that the KCOA would like to hold a yard sale at its 37 Pleasant Street property on Sunday, May 18, 2008. She said that the KCOA believed that by holding the sale on a Sunday it would not interfere with other traffic and parking demands in the area. Ms Friese advised that last year the KCOA had blocked off its parking area and placed tables in the parking lot.

Town Administrator Jessie Levine advised that she had granted a permit to the KCOA last year; however, the regulations contain one line that refers to temporary sales that take up parking spaces. She said that in those cases, she did not have authority to issue a permit without prior PB review and approval. Town Administrator Levine said that she would like the PB to amend the regulations so that applicants would not need to go to the PB for approval; instead she would be able to approve requests and issue permits.

Chair Ebel said that she would like to talk about the issue more generally rather than focus specifically on the proposed yard sale, so KCOA would not have to come before the PB for every event. She asked where people attending the event would park. Ms Friese responded that most of the people parked in the Lake Sunapee Bank parking lot and walked across the road. She advised that last year there had been cashiers at either end of the KCOA driveway. She said that she had not noticed anyone parking along the sides of Pleasant Street. Chair Ebel asked if the KCOA held other events for which parking was an issue. Ms Friese responded in the negative. Chair Ebel asked if the KCOA had spoken with abutters regarding parking. Ms Friese replied that abutters had not been contacted, but the KCOA could do so.

PB Member Ballin opined that the PB really needed to address the issue of requiring PB review in order to issue permits for temporary "sidewalk" sales that impinge on parking spaces. He said that the BOS wanted to remove some of the "hoops" applicants encountered. Chair Ebel opined that the PB's action should be broad enough so that similar events involving parking would not need to come back to the PB. She said that the PB meeting schedule was not conducive to the expeditious review of permit requests. She recommended that the KCOA notify abutters well in advance of any such activity.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT TO HOLD A YARD SALE AT 37 PLEASANT STREET ON SUNDAY, MAY 18, 2008, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY THE CHAPIN SENIOR CENTER, AND THAT FOR FUTURE YARD SALES AND SIMILAR EVENTS CONDUCTED DURING NON-BUSINESS HOURS THE KCOA BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN A PERMIT FROM THE TOWN ADMINISTRATOR WITHOUT HAVING TO GET PB APPROVAL. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Michael Doheny having arrived to join the PB, Alternate Holton stepped down.

II. AUSBON SARGENT LAND PRESERVATION TRUST – Discuss Open House June 5, 2008

(Tax Map 84, Lot 78)

Deborah Stanley, Executive Director of the Ausbon Sargent Land Preservation Trust, referred the PB to her letter of March 27, 2008 regarding an open house planned for June 5, 2008 at the Trust's new offices located at 71 Pleasant Street. She said that the event would be from 5:30-7:30 PM, with the formal dedication scheduled for 6:30 PM.

Ms Stanley advised that approximately 100 invited guests were expected to attend. She said that the plans included a tent that would be erected either on the lawn or in the parking lot. She presented letters from abutters The WFK Ice House Foundation, Inc. and Echo Communications, Inc. granting the Ausbon Sargent Land Preservation Trust permission to use parking available at the Ice House, the Country Press, and Accumail during the open house event.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any plans to hold similar events in the future. Ms Stanley said "no", but responded that she would notify abutters should any such events be planned. She opined that the businesses contact would probably be willing to extend the parking arrangement should the need arise.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT TO HOLD AN OPEN HOUSE AT 31 PLEASANT STREET ON THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 2008, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY THE AUSBON SARGENT LAND PRESERVATION TRUST AND THAT FOR SIMILAR EVENTS CONDUCTED DURING NON-BUSINESS HOURS, THE AUSBON SARGENT LAND PRESERVATION TRUST BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN A PERMIT FROM THE TOWN ADMINISTRATOR WITHOUT HAVING TO GET PB APPROVAL. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

III. 177 & 159 POOR ROAD TRUSTS – Revised Annexation Plan (Tax Map 90, Lot 1 & Tax Map 91, Lot 5)

Clayton Platt (Pennyroyal Hill Land Surveying & Forestry, LLC) presented a revised annexation plan between 177 Poor Road and 179 Poor Road. He stated that the plan was very similar to the plan approved by the PB at its January 29, 2008 meeting. He advised that the purpose of the annexation was to bring the smaller lot into compliance with the State minimum shore land frontage of 150 feet for each dwelling unit. He explained that the State Department of Environmental Services (DES) determines the amount of available frontage by using an average of the actual shore front and the tie distance between the property lines, a fact that he had missed when preparing the earlier plan. Using the State's measuring procedure, the previous annexation plan resulted in 146 feet of shore front on the smaller lot, a few feet less than the minimum 150 feet of shorefront.

Mr. Platt advised that the houses on each tract were both pre-existing, non-conforming structures with regard to the sideline setbacks. He said that the boundary line in the area of the houses had not been changed. He said that creating the jog closer to the lake increased the shorefront on the smaller lot to 158 feet and left 357 feet of shorefront with the larger lot.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present who would like to speak. There were none.

It was **MOVED** (Ballin) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT THE REVISED ANNEXATION PLAN FOR TAX MAP 91, LOT 5 (177 POOR ROAD REALTY TRUST) AND TAX MAP 90, LOT 1 (159 POOR ROAD REALTY TRUST) BE APPROVED, AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Platt presented a mylar of the annexation plan to be signed by PB members and thence to be forwarded to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the town of New London.

**IV. 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.)

Stephen Jesseman (Jesseman Associates, P.E.) stated that the college needed to start construction on the residence hall renovations as soon as possible to assure that the spaces would be available for fall occupancy. He advised that the residence hall renovation plans were complete; however, the college was still trying to determine how best to incorporate the new Low Impact Development (LID) requirements in the parking lot design. In order to expedite construction, it had been recommended that final submission of the residence hall renovations be separated from final submission of plans for the new parking lot construction, as the former required more time to complete than the latter. He said that the plan before the PB was still labeled "preliminary"; however, the college was seeking immediate final approval of the proposed residence hall renovations with the understanding that plans for the parking lot would be forthcoming and construction of the parking lot would be required for Final Site Plan approval.

PB Member Ballin asked Mr. Jesseman what the difference was between "final" and "final final". Mr. Jesseman replied that "final" would allow construction of the residence hall renovations. He said that "final final" would include the parking lot that would be submitted for final hearing on May 27, 2008. He acknowledged that approval of the residence hall renovations were contingent upon construction of additional parking. Ken McWilliams advised that the municipal department heads had recommended that the PB get security to ensure that the parking lot would be built before any occupancy permit would be issued for either the residence halls or the parking lot. Town Administrator Jessie Levine said that the parking lot security would be in addition to the residence hall security. Chair Ebel advised that the college would have to work with town officials regarding security, because the next business meeting of the PB was not until May 27, 2008.

Richard Fink (Jesseman Associates, P.E.) advised that there were no changes in the residence hall renovations. He said that the plans presented showed erosion control, foundation drains flowing into a closed drainage system. Mr. Fink presented a memorandum from Dignard Architectural Services responding to issues raised in the meeting with municipal department heads regarding the adequacy of toilets and showers.

Ken McWilliams reported that at the meeting of municipal department heads, it had been suggested that the project be split into Phase 1 for the residence hall renovations and Phase 2 for the new parking. Town Administrator Jessie Levine had recommended that the PB request additional security as a condition for approval to ensure that the parking spaces would be constructed. She also recommended that no Certificate of Occupancy be issued until after construction of parking had been completed. Mr. McWilliams said that Fire Chief Jay Lyon had spoken about the need for compartmentalization. The Fire Department recommended installation of magnetic "hold-backs" on the corridor/stairwell doors on the first, second, and third floors. He explained that the magnetic "hold-backs" would hold open the doors (which the students now prop open with door stops); however, if a fire alarm sounded, the doors would automatically close to prevent the spread of smoke, fire, etc. Director of Public Works Richard Lee reminded the college that it would be required to pay sewer fees for the additional rooms, and advised that storm water drainage could not be hooked into the sewer system. Town Health Officer Donald Bent questioned the adequacy of toilets and showers to accommodate the increased number of students. He asked if they would comply with IBC Code standards. He also opined that the proposed residence hall rooms didn't appear to be large enough to allow for a bureau for each bed. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley opined that security should be submitted prior to the issuance of any building permit. He said that an asbestos survey would be required and should be submitted with the application for a building permit. Town Administrator Jessie Levine said that the Certificate of Occupancy would be for the residence hall renovations and the parking lot together.

Chair Ebel asked Fire Chief Jay Lyon, who was present in the audience, how the magnetic "hold-backs" worked. Chief Lyon replied that the "hold-backs" would hold the doors open in the normal course of events. If a fire alarm sounded, the magnets would release the doors and they would close automatically. He said the

“hold-backs” would keep the doors open, so there would no longer be any need for students to wedge the doors open as they do now.

PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked Mr. Fink about his statement that there had been no changes in the proposed residence hall renovations. She said that there appeared to be a change in the design of the proposed exterior egress areas. Douglas Atkins responded that the egress areas would now be covered to improve safety and reduce maintenance.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present who would like to speak. There were none.

PB Member Ballin advised that the Board of Selectmen would like to see the Low Impact Development (LID) requirements addressed. Chair Ebel asked if the college had met with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Atkins replied in the negative, but said that it could. PB Member Conly advised that the Conservation Commission had seen the plans, but there had been not been any discussion yet.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE FINAL SITE PLAN FOR PROPOSED RENOVATIONS TO COLBY, McKEAN, & SHEPARD RESIDENCE HALLS BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO RECEIPT OF SECURITY FOR RESIDENCE HALL CONSTRUCTION AND RECEIPT OF SECURITY FOR PARKING LOT CONSTRUCTION IN THE AMOUNTS AND FORMS DESIGNATED BY THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN AS THE DESIGNEE OF THE PLANNING BOARD, AND ISSUANCE OF AN OCCUPANCY PERMIT TO BE PREDICATED ON APPROVAL AND CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING LOT PLAN TO BE SUBMITTED ON MAY 27, 2008, SAID OCCUPANCY PERMIT TO BE FOR THE RESIDENCE HALLS AND PARKING LOT TOGETHER. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

V. NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – Advisory Site Plan Review: Expanded Park and Ride Lot: Location – Northeast of Route 103A & Route 11

John Marshall, Project Manager, Mike Dugas, and Christine Perron appeared to present a preliminary plan of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation’s intent to expand the capacity of the existing Park and Ride parking off I-89 at Exit 12.

Mr. Marshall advised that NH DOT planned to expand the capacity of the existing lot that can accommodate 45 vehicles. He said that the expansion would be 100% funded by the State. He estimated a total cost of \$450,000. He advised that NH DOT would advertise the project for construction in fall 2008. Mr. Marshall said that NH DOT met with New London town officials in November 2007 with a plan for 200 spaces. At that time, the town wanted to reduce the impact of any expansion on the town. He said that NH DOT was now seeking additional input on its plan to expand parking capacity to between 120 to 133 parking spaces contingent upon the coordination with the Native American Groups due to a stone pile in the northeastern corner of the property.

Mr. Marshall advised that the expansion could be constructed in two phases: the first phase would construct 65 parking spaces and the second phase would construct the remaining parking spaces once the coordination with the Native American Groups was completed. He said that the completed lot would have a total of 120 parking spaces if the stone pile needed to be avoided or 133 parking spaces if the stone pile could be impacted.

Mike Dugas (NH DOT) demonstrated the existing 45 parking spaces on the plan displayed. He said that the 45 spaces were frequently full and overflowing along the road. He said the original plan to construct 200 spaces was an effort to accommodate future needs. He advised that it had been scaled back due to the cost and the impact on wetlands. Mr. Dugas said that construction would expand the parking lot to the south and the entry, which would provide for two-way traffic, would be moved to the south. He advised that bus traffic would continue along the same path as it currently flowed.

Mr. Dugas pointed out on the plan where there could be additional expansion if the demand arose. He said that it would be possible to keep the bus stop open during construction, and a new platform would be constructed next to the exit drive. He advised that the first phase would include construction of the first expansion of 65 parking spaces and the surrounding earthwork of the area that would provide for future expansion. He said that there would be six light fixtures instead of the two fixtures that now existed. He stated that the light fixtures would be "cut-off" to minimize light pollution.

Mr. Dugas said that an issue to be resolved relating to the crossing of streams and mitigation of the impact of chloride could be addressed by reducing the amount of salt used and/or the use of porous pavement. He advised that the only area where salt was used was along the bus traffic pathway. PB Member Ballin advised that New London Hospital had used porous pavement along travel ways. He asked if NH DOT had looked into porous concrete. Mr. Dugas responded in the negative. He said that there was a cost consideration to be addressed. Chair Ebel said that she was looking at porous pavement in terms of drainage, not salt usage. Mr. Dugas responded that the area where cars were parked was not salted. Chair Ebel said that she did not understand his point. Mr. Dugas explained that, if there were no icing problem resulting from water, little salt would be required; therefore, in his view, porous pavement would be unnecessary.

Mr. Dugas advised that there was a new issue regarding a pile of rocks that might signify an Indian burial ground. If that were found to be true, it would eliminate 13 parking spaces.

PB Member Conly advised that the Conservation Commission had discussed the proposed expansion, and would suggest the reversing the construction phases to determine the impact on wetlands. Mr. Dugas replied that the only closed drainage was one catch basin located between the driveways. He advised that the catch basin would be retained. He also said that NH DOT was planning a 4:1 slope rather than a 2:1 slope. Chair Ebel advised the NH DOT representatives that New London had adopted Low Impact Development (LID) guidelines. She asked about pollutants in the drainage. Christine Perron (NH DOT) responded that the issue of pollutants was something that needed to be addressed and would be. Mr. Marshall said that there had been discussion of using a 2:1 slope, but they decided to go with a 4:1 slope so more pollutants could filter out by slowing down the drainage. New London Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that it would be relatively easy to construct a stone diaphragm along the edge of the pavement on the downhill side. Mr. Marshall and Mr. Dugas both thought that was a very good idea and reiterated several times that they would investigate it to help solve the drainage issues.

PB Member Hollinger questioned how, if the surround for the entire area where expansion could occur were constructed, but a portion were not developed, people would be prevented from parking in the undeveloped area. Mr. Marshall responded that there had been discussion of using jersey barriers or using the area for overflow parking. He said that NH DOT did not want to have to come back to the PB again, but didn't want to pave the entire area now. He said a compromise construction cost of \$350,000 had been agreed upon and that amount would not provide for paving the entire area. Chair Ebel stated that new drainage techniques were being developed every day, so new techniques could evolve after approval, and it was unfortunate to set everything in stone now. She asked how much of the project would be built now. Mr. Marshall replied that NH DOT was putting everything in the proposed plan now so that all that would remain to be done would be paving. He said that NH DOT wanted all other elements to be in place. He advised that porous pavement had been discussed; however, its use would require tearing out all of the existing parking and construction a new base. He said that NH DOT wanted to retain the existing parking area because of the expense involved.

New London Town Administrator Jessie Levine asked how NH DOT would know if the nearby stream was impaired by drainage from the Park and Ride and not by drainage from 103A or I-89. Mr. Marshall responded that NH DOT did not know, but opined that since the stream was located 300 feet down 103A, impairment was probably not caused by drainage from the Park and Ride.

PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked if there had been/would be any problems with pedestrians walking to the bus stop. She said that the existing Park and Ride had two different heights. She asked if people wouldn't walk along 103A and would that be safe. Mr. Marshall responded that adding sidewalks to the project would add maintenance issues. PB Member Doheny asked about relocating the bus shelter to the center of the back. PB

Member Sheerr-Gross said that would necessitate re-working traffic circulation. She said that the existing bus shelter site took buses out of the traffic. Mr. Marshall noted that there were very tight turns that buses had to take. PB Member Holton said that sometimes the buses backed into the Park and Ride from 103A. Zoning Administrator Stanley added that sometimes the buses picked people up at the end of Davis Hill Road.

PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked about long-term parking. She asked how the issue would be addressed. Mr. Marshall responded that NH DOT had talked about moving long-term parking to the rear. He said they had also discussed "signing" the area. Town Administrator Jessie Levine advised that town officials had talked about the issue with NH DOT.

Mr. Dugas advised that one idea that had come up was to have an area for motorcycle parking. He said that NH DOT wanted the ultimate footprint done so that further expanse would be possible.

Chair Ebel asked if it was known what percentage of usage was from bus traffic and what percentage was from car pooling. Resident Harry Blunt, owner of Dartmouth Coach and Concord Coach Bus Lines, said that bus traffic included many charter buses as well as scheduled stops by Dartmouth Coach. He opined that the situation was very unsafe and that he had considered discontinuing service this past winter. He also opined that there would be the issue of how the lot would be managed. He said that there needed to be security cameras tied to dispatch. He opined that the Park and Ride could not continue to operate as it had been. He pointed out that the buses were the only form of public transportation available to New London, and he opined that the town should be more involved in where the bus stop should be located and how it should be managed. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that NH DOT had no plan in place to deal with snow removal. He opined that snow removal needed to be addressed. Chair Ebel asked didn't parking lots usually have designated snow storage areas. Mr. McWilliams responded affirmatively. He said that he assumed that NH DOT had been plowing snow off the side of the lot.

Resident Blunt asked how many spaces would be created in phase one. Mr. Marshall replied that 72 spaces would be created in phase one. NH DOT judged that the Park and Ride operated over its capacity of 45 spaces this past winter.

Resident Blunt asked how large the Park and Ride would be if it were built to the maximum. Mr. Marshall replied that there would be 133 parking spaces. Mr. Blunt said that it was his personal opinion that 133 spaces would not be enough. He said that 13,000 people used Dartmouth Coach this past year and there would be more pressure to use public transportation and car pooling. He faulted the Master Plan process thus far for not addressing the location of the starting point and the facility for public transportation in New London even though it appears that more public transportation is the goal. Chair Ebel observed that the vision workshop was only the starting point, that the process would be much more detailed, and that the PB would love to have the benefit of Mr. Blunt's input when it got to the Transportation chapter. PB Member Ballin responded that the Board of Selectmen would be very happy to discuss a public-private partnership. Mr. Blunt opined that the Master Plan should address where in New London the facility should be located or if it should be somewhere else in the region. Chair Ebel replied that the state picked the spot, and she asked how far state financing would go. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that the state had picked the location without ever asking where the town would like the facility. Mr. Marshall said that the plan presented addressed an existing problem and that NH DOT thought it had the money to proceed. Chair Ebel stated that the issue of where to place such a facility was a regional issue and required additional planning beyond New London. Mr. Marshall agreed, and said that current placement did not preclude master planning by area towns which was to be encouraged.

Chair Ebel asked where the Park and Ride would expand if the number of spaces were to increase to 200. Mr. Marshall demonstrated on the plan where the spaces would be constructed and the landscape screening. He said that there was still time to discuss locations. PB Member Cottrill asked about land near Exit 11. Mr. Marshall replied that NH DOT was not at that point yet, but probably such discussions would be coming soon.

Chair Ebel asked what the procedure the project under discussion would follow. Mr. Marshall replied that the project would go into final design and would address issues of drainage and wetlands permitting from NH Department of Environmental Services (DES). Chair Ebel asked if the requirements of DES had to be complied

with by DOT or if it was merely an advisory process like DOT coming before the PB. Mr. Marshall replied that DOT had to comply with DES's requirements. Chair Ebel observed that in light of existing problems with chloride, she was happy that DES's requirements were enforceable, since under state law, the town's were not. Chair Ebel asked if the PB would receive copies of the final design. Mr. Marshall responded affirmatively and advised that there would also be a presentation of the final plan.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. MASTER PLAN:** Chair Ebel said that she and Town Planner Ken McWilliams had been discussing the possibility of starting the Master Plan work sessions at 7:00 PM instead of 7:30 PM. She asked PB members for their opinions. PB Member Ballin said that he really wanted a 7:00 PM start time because he got up very early in the morning. PB Member Cottrill questioned the need to start earlier during the summer months. Chair Ebel suggested deferring the 7:00 PM start time until fall. PB Member Cottrill asked what the PB's summer meeting schedule would be. Chair Ebel replied that, unlike previous summers, the PB really needed to have two meetings each month during the summer. One meeting would continue to be devoted to the Master Plan update and the second meeting each month would be a regular business meeting.
- B.** The MINUTES of the APRIL 8, 2008 MEETING of the PLANNING BOARD were APPROVED, as circulated.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **9:00 PM**.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____