

TOWN OF NEW LONDON
PLANNING BOARD
JUNE 27, 2006

PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chair), Sue Ellen Andrews, Dale Conly, Tom Cottrill, Jeff Hollinger, Ken McWilliams (Planner).

ABSENT: Sue Clough, Celeste Cook.

Chair Karen Ebel opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. The Planning Board addressed seven items of business during this meeting.

1. Preliminary Site Plan Review for Club House Expansion at Lake Sunapee Country Club

Prior to tonight's meeting, Planning Board members received copies of:

- o The site plan application.
- o Executive Summary to accompany the site plan application, including a Project Overview; charts showing the existing, proposed and net change in square footage to the lobby, inter-landing/stairs, Sarazen room (all in Phase 1) and to the kitchen, dining rooms, reception/bathrooms (all in Phase 2); chart outlining the days and hours of operation and amount of employee/customer/business traffic; notes pursuant to the application requirements and relevant requests for waivers; diagram and photograph of the proposed new light fixtures; diagrams of the proposed new seating plans for both the Sarazen Room and the Main Dining Room.
- o The 2003 ZBA Notice of Approval for the requested variance to the terms of Article XX §A-2 and B-3 of the New London Zoning Ordinance, allowing the expansion of the non-conforming use.
- o During this meeting, a color rendering and to-scale plans for the proposed project were provided.

Kate Phelan, Project Coordinator for the expansion, reminded the Planning Board that in January of 2003, applicants came before this Board with a conceptual master plan for expanding (by 9000 feet) and improving the club house. At that time, they did obtain Zoning Board approval for the variance. Since then, they have scaled down the proposed expansion to 3500 square feet, to be completed in two phases.

During Phase 1 with tentative dates of October 1 to May 1, 2007, they would like to improve and add 303 square feet to the main lobby, including a new entry vestibule and ADA compliant restrooms; add 9 square feet to the internal landing and stairs area, including a lift for handicapped patrons; and add 815 square feet to the Sarazen dining room. In addition, Phase 1 will include reconfiguration of the parking lot on the northeast side of the clubhouse. This will be paved and landscaped, with some additional site lighting. The existing terrace will be relocated and enlarged.

In Phase 2 tentatively scheduled for 2008/2009, they would like to enlarge the kitchen by 204 square feet, the dining rooms by 862 square feet, and the reception area by 1305 square feet. She pointed out that currently they have two levels of dining rooms. Those will be combined at one level. In response to PB member Sue Andrews' question about height of that new dining area, she said the new dining room will be the same height as the current room with the fireplace. She went on to point out that right now, they have bathrooms at only one end of the building. The bathrooms added in Phase 2 will provide bathrooms at both ends.

She referred to the Notes/Waivers section in her Executive Summary, and pointed out that this is an existing building, not a brand new one. Ken McWilliams, Town Planner, noted that in the Executive Summary, applicants respond to 13 application requirements, but are requesting waivers for only numbers 1, 2, and 4.

Before Chair Ebel opened the floor to comments and questions from Board members, PB member Jeff Hollinger informed the Board that he is a member of the country club and asked if he should recuse himself from discussion. Chair Karen Ebel said that the criteria for recusal is that the PB member must decide individually whether he or she is unable to review the application objectively and asked if, pursuant to that standard, PB member Hollinger would like to recuse himself. PB member Hollinger indicated that he felt he could review this objectively. Other Board members said that they did not think it necessary that he recuse himself.

PB member Sue Andrews opened some discussion on the increase in number of people that may be using the country club at any one time. She asked for clarification of the “reception” area to be constructed in Phase 2. Ken McWilliams asked if they knew how many additional seats the square footages were going to accommodate. Kate Phelan said she does not have those numbers, but can get them.

Chair Ebel opened discussion of parking. Ken McWilliams said the floor plan for the main dining room shows seats for 158 people, which would require 48 parking spaces. The floor plan for the Sarazen room shows seating for 87 people, which would require 26 parking spaces. Areas outside of those dining areas comprise 4800 square feet which would require another 20 parking spaces. That’s a total of 94 spaces required, and the current plans are for 230 parking spaces, so they meet the ordinance requirement, plus allow extra spaces for golfers. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley said the standard for an assembly area as delineated in the fire code is 15 square feet per person. Karen Ebel asked what the standard is for golf courses. Kate Phelan said she has heard—but will research to determine more accurately—that as many as 120 players may be on the 18-hole golf course at a time. Ken McWilliams referred to the Site Plan Review Regulations which state that number of parking spaces required for outdoor recreation areas as golf courses should be determined by “board review.”

Zoning Administrator Stanley reminded everyone that one of the uses for this facility will be for functions, and it would not be unrealistic to anticipate occasions when there will be over 300 people there. He suggested that applicants include in their final application some arrangement for interim parking for special events. PB member Andrews asked if the total of 230 parking spaces include all those down by the tennis court. Kate Phelan said yes. Ms Andrews agreed that the applicants should think about where people will park if there is a reception or other event going on at the same time the golf course is full, and Chair Ebel agreed that that would be a concern, especially if every seat in the dining rooms is filled, and every one on the golf course drives a car, but she thought that was unlikely. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that they should calculate .3 of a space per seat, and .3 of a space for each golfer. Even if there are 400 people at an event, and 120 people on the golf course, they still have enough parking. PB member Cottrill pointed out that even if people have to park along the street there, it is not in a constricted area where that would be a problem. He asked how many people can be inside at a time. Zoning Administrator Stanley said including the potential to set up a tent outside, 400 (not counting the golfers). Kate Phelan said there is additional parking up near the driving range as well. Chair Ebel asked about the field space in that area. PB member Hollinger said there is space between holes 16 and 17. Kate Phelan added that there is also space beyond the cart barn and along the edge of the air strip as well. She said they don’t anticipate ever having more than 300 people there at a time. Chair Ebel said that it would be good to have a back up plan. She suggested applicants add a note to the plan designating where they will accommodate overflow parking if necessary. Kate Phelan asked how they would like that information presented. Town Planner Ken McWilliams said just in a narrative would be sufficient.

Kate Phelan asked for the Board’s responses to the three requests for waivers.

1. They request a waiver from the requirement to show buildings on abutting properties, as they are significantly removed from the project area. They have shown on the plans the project buildings and those located within or immediately adjacent to the project area. She said there are no other structures within 200 feet of the project. In addition, they have shown on the plan the surveyed boundary lines with the abutters, but have only indicated the abutters’ buildings. Abutters Gus and M.J. Seamans said they approve of this expansion, feeling the country club needs to do this to remain competitive, and it will be good for the Town.

Abutter Gus Seamans went on to say that the additional 3500 square feet will require a sewer payment of \$3500 or \$1 per square foot. As they are going to complete the project in two phases, they may make two payments—the first for \$2000, and the second for \$1500.

2. Applicants request a waiver of the requirement to show 2-foot contours within 200-feet of the project, as the terrain there is all relatively flat, surrounded by a golf course. Ken McWilliams pointed out that the project will be dealing with a relatively small portion of the 13-acre parcel.

4. Applicants request a waiver of the requirement to conduct a drainage study, and provide a drainage report. This request is based on Pathways Consulting Engineer Russell Rohloff's determination that the proposed paved area is not significant enough to impact the drainage. His rationales are:

1. No closed drainage system is being constructed.
2. The area of impervious surfaces is not being substantially changed.
3. For purposes of drainage calculations, the existing gravel parking areas are treated substantially as the proposed pavement areas.
4. No detention of storm water is required by the project since the storm water flow volumes and directions will not substantially be changed.
5. Treatment of storm water from the impervious areas will be accomplished by grading the parking and walkway areas to discharge storm water through a perimeter grassed or landscaped zone.
6. No in-ground drainage structures or culverts are proposed for this project.

Chair Ebel said there will be an increase in impervious surface (roof area), and she asked if they know how much of an increase. Kate Phelan said she will find that out. Chair Ebel clarified that the parking there now is all gravel. She said bluestone is frequently considered to be about as impervious as asphalt, but there probably is a bigger difference between less compacted gravel and asphalt. PB member Andrews suggested applicants think about where that water (runoff) is going to go, and think about a swale there. Kate Phelan pointed out the location of an existing swale on the golf course. Ken McWilliams referred to rationale #5 of the drainage waiver request and suggested that they look at where generally that additional flow is going to go, and how they are going to address that. If the run off is going to go out onto the golf course, the Board has got to see that. He suggested applicants could simply expand on #5 by providing more detail. In addition, Chair Ebel asked that they provide more information about the roof area, including the square footage. She asked about the patio area. Kate Phelan said that will drain the same as the parking lot.

PB member Andrews moved that the Planning Board grant two waiver requests: one, that the PB waive the requirement to show location and dimensions of abutters' buildings on the plan, and two, the requirement to show 2-foot contours. PB member Conly seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Referring to items under "Notes" apart from the three waiver requests, Ken McWilliams asked Kate Phelan to discuss the plans for fire protection. Kate Phelan said they are going to phase in a sprinkler system. During Phase 1 the infrastructure for that system will be put in place, and during this period of time—at the request of the Fire Department, they will provide a temporary tie-in. In Phase 2, the sprinkler system will be complete with the installation in the basement of a cistern. All the new or renovated areas will be on the system. The men's locker room and the club room will not be, so there will be a fire door there between that area and the main building, which will automatically close when the fire alarm goes off. She added that the original farm house is where they have their offices, and they are now in discussion with the architect about how to establish a sprinkler system for that.

In response to question regarding exterior lighting, she said that existing lighting will be retained around the club house. The only new lighting will be in the renovated parking area. The application papers include a photograph of the fixtures they are considering. Chair Ebel asked that they keep in mind that the town is trying to manage light spillage, and PB member Andrews said that for that reason, they would like to encourage lights which shine downwards, rather than up. Chair Ebel asked how many additional lights there will be. Kate Phelan said she thinks

there will be six, as well as some in-ground lights along the walkway. She said that there is now and would continue to be minimum light spillage from their fixtures.

Kate Phelan referred to the requirement to show the location and dimensions of streets, driveways and sidewalks, and the Board confirmed that the information provided in the plan is sufficient to meet that requirement.

Referring to snow storage, she said no snow storage areas are shown on the plan. They anticipate pushing snow onto the golf course. Ken McWilliams cautioned her to coordinate that snow storage plan with the landscape plan He suggested they indicate on the plan those areas where the snow will go. Kate Phelan agreed to do so.

Ken McWilliams opened some discussion of scheduling. The Planning Board has a very full agenda for its July meeting. If the Country Club wishes to schedule its hearing for site plan that night, it would be very late in the evening. Kate Phelan said her only concern is the timetable within which they must work. They would like to start in October, and plan to close the country club altogether during the winter, in order to complete phase 1. She asked what the Planning Board's recommendation would be. Planning Board members concurred that they see no huge issues here, and they feel that the site plan hearing could probably be completed in one night. They encouraged her to apply for August.

2. Voluntary Lot Merger-Deirdre Scheerr-Gross and Martin L. Gross/ Tax Map 30, Lots 28 and 29

Town Planner Ken McWilliams and Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley gave a brief history of this application. On July 29, 2002, the ZBA approved the special exceptions to the terms of Article XIII §E-1 and Article XIV §D granted by the ZBA on July 29, 2002, allowing the applicants to cross a wetland and steep slope with a new driveway. A condition of that approval was merger of the two lots in question. To date, that condition has not been met, and this application including the wording to the effect that the merger "... shall not in any way impair the rights of the (owners) under any private deed covenants in relation to the subject parcels...." Ken McWilliams has looked at the deeds and did not see any outstanding issues, but the Board can ask Town Counsel to review, if it wishes. Zoning Administrator Stanley explained that this merger does not preclude future subdivision. Karen Ebel questioned that, as merger was a condition of the special exception approval. Zoning Administrator Stanley said the merger addressed that lot with the wetland, but does not preclude owners subdividing by a different configuration. PB member Hollinger moved that the Board approve this voluntary lot merger. PB member Conly seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

3. Request from Jane Hollinger to cut trees on Lot 63-002, Bunker Road

After explaining that this is to make way for installation of a new septic system which will begin on Friday, PB member Hollinger recused himself for the duration of this discussion. PB member Conly explained that the trees in question are two birches—one of which is only a trunk about 22 feet tall, the other is somewhat higher. Both trees are dead. Applicants have agreed to replant the area around the trees with eight blueberry bushes. He said there are a significant number of trees on the property, as well as some existing blueberry bushes. PB member Andrews moved to approve this request. PB member Conly seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Upon close of this agenda item, Jeff Hollinger returned to the Board.

4. Request from Scott and Karen Slogic to cut trees on Lot 99-001, Shaker Street

PB member Conly said the purpose for cutting these five white pines is to make way for owners to add a semi-circle to their driveway allowing easier turn-around, and obviating the need to back out onto Shaker Street. Several Planning Board members noted that the existing driveway is really quite large as it is. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley pointed out that part of the planned driveway is within the 100-foot buffer from the protected stream behind the property (at Low Plain). Constructing the driveway within that buffer will require a special exception to the terms of Article XXII §G-3 of the New London Zoning Ordinance. For that, applicants will have to provide an

accurate drawing showing the dimensions of the driveway and precisely how close it will be to the stream. PB member Andrews moved to refer applicants to the ZBA. PB member Hollinger seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously APPROVED. Dale will relay this decision to the Slogics and refer them next to Zoning Administrator Stanley.

5. L.C. Engineering Company Inc. - Agreement to serve as Consulting Engineer for the Harborview Subdivision

Ken McWilliams said he feels the agreement is pretty straightforward. Chair Ebel noted that the Scope of Services does not include a traffic study. Ken McWilliams reminded the Board that the applicant's traffic engineer said that the number (of vehicles) is not big enough to justify a full traffic study. Chair Ebel suggested it would be good to include that in the scope of services. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley agreed, pointing out that this will open the door to access the land in back, as well. In addition, 150 acre across the road is now for sale. There will be an impact, and he suggested that the Board should at least obtain base-line information. Ken McWilliams asked if the Planning Board feels Lou Caron can provide the necessary guidance, or should another traffic engineer be consulted. Chair Ebel said she recalled he had helped with a traffic study in the past. Mr. McWilliams agreed and said that it was in the Tabor Hill/Griffith's subdivision proposal in Wilmot. Chair Ebel suggested that traffic study be added to the scope of services to keep the PB's options open, but that the PB could still seek the guidance of a different traffic engineer in the future. She also wished to make clear for the record that by signing this agreement with Lou Caron, the Planning Board is not foreclosing on its ability to get reimbursed form Mr. Feins in the future. PB member Hollinger moved to approve this agreement with L.C. Engineering subject to the addition of a paragraph referring to traffic review. PB member Andrews seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

6. CIP

Ken McWilliams reminded the Board that historically, the CIP Committee has consisted of two representatives from the Planning Board, two from the Budget Committee, the Town Administrator, the Finance Officer, one Selectman, and the Town Planner. Town Administrator Jessie Levine has informed him that the Budget Committee has adopted a new approach in its work this year, in that it had been divided into three subcommittees, each to address one large area of Town business: Administration, Safety and Public Works, and they would like to send one representative from each of those subcommittees to the CIP Committee. After brief discussion, during which it was noted that the CIP Committee's work involves more consensus reaching than actual voting, Planning Board members agreed to grant the Budget Committee's wish. PB member Andrews moved to allow the Budget Committee to send three representatives to the CIP meetings—that is, one from each of its subcommittees. PB member Conly seconded. No further discussion. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

7. Cate Family Trust-Minor Subdivision and Annexation

Members signed the mylar for this.

8. Review of Site Plan Review Regulations-DRAFT

The Planning Board began its review of this at this meeting, and will continue review at a future meeting. The following sections generated discussion:

Article III

Ken McWilliams noted that the types of development that kick in the requirement for a site plan review will now include any addition, not just those 500 square feet or more. Also, change in use or layout of multi-family or non-residential property will no longer be qualified by terms as parking, drainage, etc. At its discretion the Board may waive a site plan where it may not be required.

Chair Ebel asked if the term "Town Planner" which occurs in several places was defined somewhere. Ken McWilliams said no. Chair Ebel the suggested that it be defined to include phrasing as "... or some other

person designated by the Planning Board in its discretion.” She explained that she felt that the Town shouldn’t always be required to use the Town Planner in planning matters and should be able to use the Zoning Administrator or others, depending on the circumstances. She thought the Town should have that freedom because circumstances change over time. Also, she stated, under Article III, the word “reviews” in line two will be changed to “review.”

Chair Ebel asked if terms which are not defined in this document, but which are defined in the zoning ordinance, should be capitalized here. Planning Board members concurred that that should be done.

Article IV

Chair Ebel asked why the second half of that paragraph was deleted. Ken McWilliams said he moved it to Article XIX.

Article V

Definitions for “Outdoor Lighting” and “Landscaped Open Space” have been added. A reference to indigenous plant material will be added to the latter. An “I” will be added to “Illuminance” in #6. #15 “Spot Light” will be underlined.

Article VI

Ken McWilliams noted that under this new draft, a preliminary site plan review will now be required for all except a home business.

Chair Ebel noted that “and modifications” was deleted from the second paragraph in Section A. Ken McWilliams said that is covered in the definition of “development.”

In Section C, a space will be inserted between IX and “application” in line 4.

In Section D, “Site Plan Changes” should only be capitalized if that is a defined term in the document.

Section F-1 will be rewritten to reflect the current practice of distribution of plans for review.

In Section I, the second sentence will be amended to read: “Additional fees may be imposed upon the applicant by the Board ... (The underlining indicates the additional wording, though the phrase will not be underlined in the final document.) The term “account” will be amended to read “escrow account” here and in Article XIII.

At PB member Andrews’ suggestion, Section J will be revised to clarify the application submission deadlines.

In response to Chair Ebel’s question, , Ken McWilliams confirmed that the change from 90 days to 65 days in Section K, paragraph 2 (and throughout) reflects the statutory change by the State of NH. In paragraph 1 of Section K, “adjourned” public hearings mean “continued” public hearings.

In Section O, the term “as built plans” will replace “final plans.”

For Article VII, Zoning Administrator Stanley suggested clarifying that a variance requires a referral, a special exception does not.

Article IX

Ken McWilliams said that Section A requiring preliminary site plans is all new, and requirements for those preliminaries have been extrapolated from the requirements for final site plan review. These are issues which applicants should be addressing at that early stage, and during the first steps in the process. Chair Ebel asked how he has worked in the concept of “low impact development”. Ken McWilliams said the subdivision regulations cover that, and there is a cross reference in the Standards section.

PB member Andrews added “within the property line” to Section A-2-c and B-2-c.

In Section B-2-f, the number 14 will be changed to 21.

Question was raised about the phrase “if required by the Planning Board in Section A-2-f-8. Ken McWilliams pointed out that the Board is often asked to waive the requirement for showing existing and proposed structures within 200 feet of the project. With this new wording, that will no longer be required every time, but the door is left open for the Planning Board to request that if necessary. A comma will be inserted into that line.

Zoning Administrator Stanley suggested that the regulations address the issue of areas used for the outside display of merchandise. Those should be shown on plans, and perhaps should be used in the parking calculations. The Board needs to come up with a standard for those, and to assure that there are no conflicts with sidewalks, parking, visibility, drainage, and the landscaped open space requirement. Several Planning Board members suggested a provision for screening as well.

PB member Andrews referred to Section B-2-f-22, and asked if requiring that the drainage design be based on a 25-year design frequency is adequate, given global warming. Ken McWilliams said that is the standard.

Items listed under Section B-3, will be lettered rather than numbered.

Chair Ebel said that all the above changes made to the section for preliminary site plan review, should be made to the relevant sections under final site plan review.

Article XI

Ken McWilliams explained that the data shown in the tables in Section C-2 is from the ordinance where it is in narrative form. In Table 1: Width of perimeter landscaped open space required has been increased from 5 to 10 for the fronts and corners of commercial parking areas. In Table 2: Minimum percentage of landscaped open space has increased from 25% to 35% for Commercial. Also, he has added the category “Hospital Institutional.” PB member Andrews pointed out that this allows 65% of the property to be impervious surface. In Forest Conservation, 15% is allowed to be impervious surface. There was some discussion about removing the Conservation and Forest Conservation categories from this table, but Board members agreed to leave those in, in order to cover any non-conforming lots that may exist in those zones, and to increase the requirement for landscaped open space to 90 or 95% in Forest Conservation, and to 80% in Institutional/Recreational.

For Section G, Ken McWilliams will obtain feedback from departments regarding the number of square feet of additional impervious surface which would kick in a requirement for a Stormwater and Erosion Control Design.

For Section H, feedback will be obtained regarding outdoor lighting as well. There was some discussion regarding upward-directed lighting versus downward-directed lighting. In general, the regulations should discourage light pollution.

Discussion of the Site Plan Review draft will continue at a future meeting.

6. As a quorum of members who attended the June 13 meeting, was not present at this meeting, approval of those minutes was postponed.

7. Ken McWilliams reviewed the agenda for the July 25 meeting. That will start at 7 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

S.A. Denz
Recording Secretary *pro tem*

DATE APPROVED: _____

CHAIRMAN: _____