

**RESIDENTIAL PROJECT MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY
APRIL 11, 2011**

Present: Judith Esmay, William Dietrich, Jonathan Edwards, Kate Connolly, Judith Brotman, Vicki Smith

Minutes April 4, 2011

The minutes of April 4, 2011 were reviewed and amendments suggested. On a motion by Bill which was seconded by Kate, there was agreement to approve the minutes as corrected.

Discussion of Rural Policies

The Committee reviewed tables of recent population growth in the Upper Valley and Jonathan's analysis of population change in Hanover since 2000. The growth rate in '00s is much less than in the '90s. In the 1990's growth rate was 18%. In the '00s, the growth rate was just under 4%. Both decades had large multi-unit projects: the '90s included Kendal; the '00s included Velvet Rocks and Gile Hill.

A lot of the discussion in the Master Plan is reflective of the growth rate in the '90s. Theories as to why the growth rate is not as robust in the following decade were discussed. The fact that the growth rate might best be calculated using the resident population excluding students for a more valid comparison with other towns was mentioned. Land use policies, unavailability of land, and lack of work opportunities and workforce housing can impact the growth rate.

Most people like the town the way it is, but realize the town must grow. Slow growth is part of "the way it is" and that is apparently acceptable. There is a lot going for the Town by virtue of the way Hanover is. Some felt it important to fill in the gap in age distribution between the mid-twenties to fifties and to provide work force housing. We also have a low pre-school population.

There are a large number of workers for the College and businesses in town as well as tradesmen and domestic help who may not want to live in a Gile Hill type of development. The Planning Board should ensure that not all workforce housing is in a Gile Hill building form. Maybe the Town could offer development density for guaranteeing affordable housing.

Discussion turned toward the rural policies.

Preservation of what we like about the rural area, including hills, views, night sky, peace and quiet, wildlife, low traffic, roads that are 2 lane, no shoulders, no sidewalks, etc.

Preserve settlement pattern as a way of preserving its natural pattern and natural beauty. Respect the settlement pattern as it has evolved. There are focal points to rural neighborhoods. The schools were the historic focal points. Maybe common open space could become the focal point with higher density housing in some neighborhoods. Maybe rural focal points should be restored to re-emphasize the rural settlement pattern.

Other ideas flowed, such as: focal points around which a rural neighborhood can be articulated; grant a certain density to a place that meets these criteria; we value those focal points and need

to define what they are; public access and enjoyment draws your attention and enjoyment; could be low density surrounded by sparse density; could be that focal points are selected for a couple of neighborhoods and not throughout the entire rural area; and each node or focal area is unique and not the same.

The rationale for keeping low density, seasonal development on Moose Mountain includes distance for police and fire and length of response time; ease of access due to steep slopes; proximity of Appalachian Trail (National Park) which should be buffered as suggested in the Open Space Plan; economically feasible forestry lots need to be at least 50 acres in size; it is a good place to grow trees and a great area for wildlife habitat; and by allowing seasonal home development we guarantee property rights.

Having run out of time, the Committee agreed to start discussion again with the complicated landscape and to continue to follow the policy ideas listed in the minutes of April 4th.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Smith, Scribe