

**Residential Project Meeting
Meeting Summary
May 2, 2011**

Present: Judith Esmay, Iain Sim, William Dietrich, Jonathan Edwards, Michael Hingston, Vicki Smith, Judith Brotman, Joan Garipay, Kate Connolly

Minutes April 18, 2011

The minutes of April 18, 2011 were reviewed and amendments suggested. On a motion by Bill Dietrich which was seconded by Judith Esmay, there was agreement to approve the minutes as corrected. Both Joan Garipay and Kate Connolly abstained from this vote.

Discussion of Rural Policies as Presented in Jonathan's Memo Draft 5-2-11

Jonathan Edwards presented an overview of the document.

Michael had some general comments.

He was concerned that the draft memo about policies was too detailed and there was some basic stuff yet to be done. He noted that the most salient point in his opinion in the whole document was that we need to establish policies about population growth, development densities, development types, and housing needs. He wondered what the population density in the rural district should be. The prospective base densities on page 14 are the Committee's way of perceiving relative densities across the rural area. These are not factors to be used for anything except ordering the areas in a relative way. Michael thought that point needed to be made more clearly in the text.

Iain Sim suggested that the memo is the basis for further discussion from which policies can be developed.

All agreed that the first order of business should be to be ready to defend neighborhood delineations and describe why these areas are similar or distinct from adjacent neighborhoods.

The discussion drifted to the build out analysis in the Master Plan. Jonathan described the analysis completed by the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission which was based on the zoning and the later refinement with low, medium and high density assumptions based on the land. Kate thought that due to the zoning change which requires ten acre minimum lot size for major subdivisions that the build out analysis completed with the three acre minimum lot size allowed for major subdivisions is no longer accurate.

Questions abounded, such as:

Are these the right neighborhoods?

Can we establish a density for the whole and each neighborhood?

Can we describe each of the neighborhoods?

If we are to re-visit neighborhoods, what are we looking for?

Michael described the difference between Ruddsboro Road valley and River Road valley and why development might have occurred in a different pattern in each valley due to the geography.

One of the tasks will be to define the achievements and failures of the subdivided areas on Route 10 North.

Each member was given the assignment: Define each neighborhood noting what we like and don't like, and what makes it distinctive. It was decided that we will use "area" as a designation instead of "neighborhood". It was pointed out that neighborhoods have focal points, and areas do not.

Jonathan will revise the map to show the conservation land as part of a residential district. Committee members should prepare a description of each rural area so that the ideas from everyone can be combined into a summary paragraph defining each area.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Smith, Scribe

NEXT MEETING ON MONDAY MAY 9 AT 2:30 PM.