

**Residential Project Meeting  
August 8, 2011  
Meeting Notes**

**Present:** Judith Esmay, Bill Dietrich, Iain Sim, Michael Hingston, Kate Connolly, Jonathan Edwards, Vicki Smith

**Analysis of Hypothetical Situations in the Rural District**

Working from a list of potential developments on Lyme Road, the Committee members were asked to assume that the proposal could be permitted under existing zoning regulations. Comments from Committee members are reported below in order to get a sense

**Tennis Club**

A. Appropriateness of location?

If it looked like a barn it might be acceptable, but should be located closer to town.

Use is appropriate.

Bubble structures are impossible to hide.

Snack bar and arcade not ok, otherwise ok use.

A member's inclination is not to allow. The area is very rural and very residential and the project too big and not residential or agricultural.

Appropriate use, but too large.

Tending into yes range, but concerned with specifics- would need to be much bigger for 12 tennis courts.

B. What individual details are cause of concern?

Sprawl effect, traffic, big use

Design and volume of building

Sufficiently removed from road for heavy landscaping; sprawl

No arcade, snack bar, or lounge should be allowed.

You must hide it well, if something is large, rte 10 is a good place.

Visual effect and size of it; use is appropriate; the better it is hidden, the more comfortable I am; the more it feels like a commercial establishment, the less happy I am.

20,000 sq ft building is out of scale with rest of RR; visually intrusive unless very good landscaping; hours of operation widens window of traffic so hours should be restricted noise, lighting, hubbub with cars; not a good idea to switch from a private club to commercial establishment with arcade; height of building

Too big; road can handle the traffic; hours of operation are too long; parking estimate too low; snack bar and lounge are part of every tennis facility; video arcade and public snack bar are inappropriate.

C. What details help alleviate concerns?

No details could make this appropriate.

Not heavily populated so sewage disposal will not be a factor.

Screening the facility is important; the fact that all activity is contained internally is appropriate for rural area; traffic flow is consistent with what the road can handle.

Being a club rather than a public facility makes a big difference; I am comfortable with a club, but not a commercial facility.

D. Changes to make it more appropriate for the location

Move it south of the Chieftain for water, sewer and AT service.

Reduction of size to be no larger than the largest barn in town and removal of video arcade in a building.

Appropriately located on State highway

24 cars seems high; video arcade introduces a commercial element which is not good.

Landscaping, hours of operation could be regulated by general standards for rural district, compatibility of building to what is rural area now, is it the size or intensity of use that is wrong? Size. The closer you get to Dresden Village, the easier to increase the scale. Parking is undersized for 12 courts. I would not want to see more parking.

Physical size is important and fewer courts would be better unless it is closer to Town.

The scenario of a riding arena in lieu of tennis facility was discussed.

E and F. Missing details and what are potential effects of concern?

Landscape scale consideration of the introduction of sprawl between Hanover or Lyme.

Does parking need to be surface, lighting provisions exterior and interior

Frontage should have no parking

Compatibility with surrounding area is subjective, specific rural-ness is a consideration

Noise and light needs to be controlled, signs need regulation, compatibility assessment should be made by the Planning Board, separation from neighboring uses important

Noise, traffic, appropriateness of development scale. No lighting should be permitted to facilitate play on outside courts. Parking lot lighting would be regulated. Septic would be on site.

Separation from whatever is there in the neighborhood needs to be analyzed on a case by case basis.

**Office Space at corner of Route 10 and Goodfellow Road**

A. Appropriateness of location?

With lots of caveats proposed use would not be inappropriate

Smaller size preferred, use less appropriate, benign form of commercial, signs need to be modest, less concerned about this, design it so it is traditional

Ok for where it is proposed on Route 10, but not ok on Two Mile Road, modest office use on Lyme Road, spun by relative lack of office space in Lyme and Hanover

Marginally appropriate, building as close as setback allows, ability to treat waste

Grudging assent to this use, small step forward from home business to allow a few businesses in same building, could be helpful

Why allow sprawl and how will this look?

With caveats, this is ok.

B. What individual details are cause of concern?

Ten thousand sq feet acceptable, 16,000 too large and out of scale. I don't want a downtown building in the rural area. Good landscaping is necessary and getting parking right for this type of facility is critical. Entry on Goodfellow may not be the best idea. We need input from traffic engineer.

The Planning Board needs aesthetic regulatory powers to deal with signs and architecture. it would be better to be in a commercial cluster than by itself.

This will not pull in drive by traffic and needs to be less visually intrusive.

Access from Goodfellow is not appropriate. Medical offices are not a drive-by affair. This does not need to be visible from the road.

I am less concerned about the size of the building than what is happening in the building. Once you get up to 16,000 square feet, it is not very rural. The building is too close to road. The parking is not big enough for what is proposed. I like the idea that parking is behind the building, but underground parking would be best. Categories need to be made to better design for different uses. How would maximum parking rules would be enforced if new tenants had a greater parking demand than what the property can offer?

D. Changes to make it more appropriate for the location

No changes offered.

E. Missing details?

No details offered.

What if this was the reuse of a barn? Should we restrict the frequency of such facilities? Or should we start a new village center?

#### **Larger Office Space at corner of Route 10 and Goodfellow Road**

Not appropriate for rural district.

Negative visceral response. Reminds me of New Jersey with separate campuses, exquisitely landscaped, and totally car-dependent.

Too large; Retail not appropriate.

Too large; I would like the retail aspect, if the retail became a community asset or is for craftsmen.

I do not want overnight care for animals. Barking would be a problem. This should be a planned community center rather than a single use. It is too major a change of use for the rural district.

Too large scale. Dogs would be too noisy. Retail is tough because you could get everything from MacDonalds to crafts outlet.

It appears we have successfully arrived at scale with only negative reactions. If this were the nucleus of a village center, it might work, though the program may not work for village center. A single building might not be as appropriate as many buildings with same square footage. We should not try to make it look rural. It should be developed with lots of density and get rid of the landscaping.

Next meeting on Monday August 15 at 1:30 PM. The rest of the hypothetical land uses on Route 10 will be evaluated and another set of cases will be drawn up for other parts of the rural area.

Meeting adjourned at 4:18

Respectfully submitted by Vicki Smith