

**RESIDENTIAL PROJECT MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY
MARCH 21, 2011**

Present: Judith Esmay, William Dietrich, Jonathan Edwards, Kate Connolly, Joan Garipay, Iain Sim, and Judith Brotman

Minutes March 14, 2011

The minutes of March 14, 2011 were reviewed. On a motion by Bill which was seconded by Ian, there was agreement to approve the minutes as corrected (with apologies to Ian Sim for misspelling his name). Kate abstained on the vote.

Jonathan handed out the newest version of the **Neighborhood Town-Wide** map.

Jonathan asked for the committee's permission to share the draft of the "Residential Project, Policy Development, In-Town Neighborhood" policy document with the Affordable Housing Commission. This draft should be first shared with the Planning Board in its draft form. Jonathan would also like to share the "Rural Density Concept" document. Judith cautioned that the Affordable Housing Commission should be made aware that the Rural Density Concept document is relatively newly developed and has not been thoroughly discussed and developed yet – both documents are drafts. * The presentation for the Planning Board is scheduled for April 12th. The Affordable Housing Commission is invited to that meeting.

Jonathan reviewed the changes to his Neighborhoods Town-Wide map.

Jonathan discussed the "Family Compound" concept – currently one land owner in Etna is looking to add 3 additional units to the current two units on family land. Other families might also wish to do something similar. Ian suggested some "blind studies" to review different types of development that have been talked about in the residential project committee work. Judith thought that this "family compound" might be considered a kind of "co-housing" development. Is this what we want to see in Hanover? Kate said that this type of PRD could have been done before the 10-acre zoning was instituted. Ian thought that this is what was suggested in Jonathan's "Differential Rural Densities" concept memo. Jonathan elaborated on his memo, explaining how land developers could choose between differentials to direct the proposed development. Judith wondered if this group should consider this concept and spend some time studying the concepts. The group agreed that it was worth pursuing.

Jonathan took the lead in the follow-up discussion of his concept– from macro to specific to public values. Ian questioned the macro idea – identify certain areas based on accessibility characteristics – and create a baseline density for each area. Specifically, he wondered if the proposal was to move more towards a baseline density for each neighborhood, and not have a differentiated major or minor subdivision for that neighborhood, but have just one baseline? Jonathan agreed that this is what he was envisioning.

Bill stated that he believed that the public policy we have now is not totally arbitrary. Judith agreed that there is a difference in the neighborhood feeling and look from a one-time subdivision development to a neighborhood that develops gradually over time – there is a certain

cohesiveness to the later. Bill thinks that density control is better under Jonathan's concept. The minor subdivision process will bring development, but it is different than a large-lot development. Ian felt this concept is fine for a large development concept, building on the four-step process. The idea of a one-lot, one-time minor subdivision is appropriate. This can run the risk of ribbon development along the street. Bill feels this concept is good for blending all concepts together. The concern is that this places heavy requirements on folks looking to develop one or two lots which is not appropriate. If the decision is to do away with the difference between types of subdivision, then the committee should be aware of the burden on the small land-owner. Kate does not want to differentiate between out-of-town developers and local developers. Local developers can also be damaging. There needs to be a certain set of basic regulations that apply to all development, without regard to types of developers. The concept of the one person with one lot subdivision could be lost with this concept proposal. Jonathan suggested looking at this first for a major subdivision type proposal, then tailor it back in scale for the one-lot (minor) type subdivision.

Kate returned to the map – what was the concept? Jonathan said that some parts of rural Hanover would have different densities than other areas of rural Hanover.

Judith defined Rural Hanover as that area between Remote Hanover and the portion of town served by utilities- with the exception of Greensboro Road. This is a “broad swath” which also has other distinguishable neighborhoods. Greensboro Road is its own area, very little left to develop. It's not rural, but it is not in-town. It is important for how the land is developed – high density is there now, but functionally it belongs in this rural discussion to establish the remaining density for the undeveloped lots. Bill suggests it be a separate area, not included in the rural areas. We will get back to it at another time.

Within the rural area, which no longer includes Greensboro Road area, we have named neighborhoods. Within these neighborhoods there will be required densities, there will be areas within these densities, where portions of the area will be permitted to have higher densities depending on their location. This is the basic model – parts of town have different appropriate densities, with locational criteria. Then the question is, what factors inform what the basic densities should become. There are four basic criteria proposed: location is the main criteria; ease of access; location in a “node” or focal point; and other factors reflecting differences in location or functional relationships.

Jonathan noted that “nodes” could have higher density than the base density of the area, or other circumstances that might be differentiated from the area around it. Kate thinks the notion of creating “nodes” is unrealistic. The Etna store is an example of how difficult this can be. She doesn't recommend spending a lot of time on this notion. Ian thinks with Planning and Zoning we may be able to create other “nodes” today that copy those old development plans. Kate thinks this discussion leads to considering reinstating PRD s in the rural district areas.

There was considerable discussion of the idea of requiring an independent consultant to assess the land area prior to considering any PRD or development in order to get good, accurate information on the site. The committee generally supported this idea.

Moving forward to next week's meeting ---

Can we formulate a series of questions that we wish to answer next time, so that we have a focus for the meeting?

- (1) What base densities should be assigned to each of these identified rural areas – the lower threshold.
- (2) Where on the spectrum – average, less than average, more than average, on a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the most dense and 1 being the least dense, is each of the neighborhood areas?
- (3) We will rate these neighborhood areas: River Road, Northwest Hanover, North, Pinneo, Hanover Center, Arvin, Ruddsboro, Highlands, Blueberry Hill, Etna Village, Etna West, Etna East, and Dogford. Jonathan will develop a list of the neighborhoods, to be filled in by discussion next week, with a density number and an area for the reason for choosing that density.

* It was the consensus of the committee , following the meeting discussion, that the Rural Density Concept document is not ready to be shared with the public. The In-Town Neighborhood document can be shared, as long as it is also sent out to the Planning Board at the same time.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ JLSB

Judith Brotman, Scribe

For next week:

1. What are the Base Densities in the RR area?
2. What is drawn from the Land Use chapter of the Master Plan document - what do we need to keep in front of us, and what may need to be changed before we proceed without policy development.