

## **Residential Project Meeting**

**August 15, 2011**

### **Meeting Notes**

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

#### **Minutes of August 1 and 8, 2011**

The minutes of August 8, 2011 were reviewed and amended. Kate Connolly made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Iain Sim seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Jonathan will distribute the minutes of August 1 for review next week.

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

##### Goodfellow Commons

###### General Discussion

Whether or not children would live in the proposed apartments and the possible impacts were discussed. Based on a statewide study of housing occupancy across New Hampshire, a dwelling unit generates .42 school children per unit. The average would actually be greater in Hanover since so many families desire a Hanover education for their children. The need for a small playground was pointed out. Interest in a gas station was expressed. Some members noted that the buildings are too large for the site. Instead they suggested reducing the scale and size of the buildings. More, smaller buildings would be more to scale in the rural area. Can sewage be adequately treated on site? A community septic system would be needed. Can the buildings be architecturally distinctive?

###### A. Is the use appropriate for the proposed location?

-No, most of the issues came up in cases 1 and 2 last week. It is too large for the rural area.

-The housing is a good feature, but can this be done in an architecturally harmonious way? The project might be appropriate if buildings retain something of the character of the neighborhood.

-A convenience store is a good idea here.

-Consider New London with the sprawl located between I89 and Spring Ledge Farm. Should that be brought to Route 10?

-Retail is inappropriate especially if Goodfellow Road is used for access. If DHMC established an office there, that would not be good. The project program and 60,000 sq ft are too big.

This would be a knock-out punch for the area. The project is not of the same character as the rural district.

-Not appropriate at all. Ok with duplex every 3 acres. Why not use area south of northern round about more efficiently? Water and sewer service is available there to serve dense housing.

-Urbanists should not be planning rural areas. This project has too heavy a concentration of all uses. It is unrealistic to expect a convenience store to succeed. The hours of operation for offices are hard to enforce. This would start a "Miracle mile", most of which are the result of poor planning.

-One concern is the scale of the two buildings. It is not in keeping with rural nature. Density of population on route 10 is ok. The mixed use component is all right. It is unlikely that the

convenience store will be viable. Small offices would be acceptable. There are parts of this that are acceptable and do not sound crazy.

- Gas pumps would make a convenience store work.
- This is a better proposal than the one reviewed last week. If we want another village center, we need good village center standards. This project would get a “no” vote. There is room in the rural area for one village center especially in the future when gas prices are really high.
- We could have a floating village zone rather than designating a specific area for village center.
- Should there be anything commercial north of the Chieftain and south of Lyme?
- The fuel efficiency of cars is going up and up, along with the price of gas.
- The villages already exist in Hanover and Lyme. There is no need to have anything in between.
- Lyme Road corridor is a major arterial and not a rural way as is Ruddsboro Road.

**RECAP- The majority of the Committee is that there is no problem with the mix of uses or number of people. The scale of the buildings is the problem.**

- B. Are there individual details that cause concern?
  - 100 parking spaces is large. Almost an acre would need to be provided. Underground parking is unlikely. This is a big parking lot for the rural area.
  - It would be difficult to restrict the hours of the office workers. Offices would not be open to the public.
  - How would egress on Goodfellow be proposed?
  - The scale of egress is not rural. It is too wide
- C. Details of proposal that alleviate concern
  - Office hours are limited.
  - Site lighting truly is minimal.
  - Location of parking behind the buildings is very good.
  - Two buildings rather than one building is better.
- D. Changes to the proposal which make it better
  - No commercial use.
  - Smaller entry.
  - What is the difference between office and commercial use?
- E. What attributes are missing?
  - Architectural design; the massing of buildings. Do the buildings need to be identical.
- F. What are potential effects of concern.
  - Noise; general increase in traffic especially with retail.
  - Need a curb cut on Route 10.

#### North Meeting house

- A. Is the use appropriate for the proposed location?
  - Let us leave aside constitutional issues that relate to siting of churches.
  - As long as it has traditional architecture, it is acceptable. Meeting space could be used for other community events which would be beneficial to the community.
  - A church is not a bother. However, there are a number of residences in area. Other activities that might take place there might cause great concern. Is it appropriate to put church in that neighborhood?

-This would be acceptable in the village center. It is a fish out of water on Route 10 and should be located in population center.

-Can you provide sewage disposal for 300 people? Are there appropriately sized lots? There is no problem with church use at this location.

-As nucleus to village center, nothing could be better. This should be built where people are. Will the church have landmark form?

-Yes, it is appropriate. A church can be interesting without being traditional architecture.

B. Are there individual details that cause concern?

- As proposed, no; however, with more and more activity at churches that are accessory there are larger impacts on the neighborhood than strictly church use.

- Location.

- Sewage disposal.

- Modification to Slade Brook for the creation of the duck pond. The duck pond might be used for fire protection. The proposed parking is really large. The parking lot should not be visually obtrusive. Outdoor services might create noise. Footprint is 2600 sq ft. Mid week hours are acceptable. Light shut off is a good idea.

C. Details of proposal that alleviate concern

-Hours are reasonable. The design of the church. Landscaping must be done to screen parking. Keep park like setting with lots of trees. Lighting is good. Traffic is not a problem.

-More intensive potential accessory uses.

D. Changes to the proposal which make it better

-Entry from Lyme Road.

E. What attributes are missing?

-Need to know about accessory uses and housing for ministry. An accessory use such as day care is a traffic concern. Where will the parking be?

What are potential effects of concern and changes to the proposal which make it better were not discussed.

### **Recap of 20,000 square foot Tennis Club**

The general concept not an issue. The club use is acceptable, however the public 's use of the snack bar and arcade not acceptable. As proposed, the club is too large and would have detrimental effect on character of the area. In addition, tennis bubbles are ugly. The Town should have guidelines to deal with size and architecture. Would there be accessory uses of the club such as parties or other events? The volume of traffic is not a problem but rate of traffic could be if, for example, clinics were held that brought a large number of people to the facility at one time.

### **Recap of Small Office proposal**

The main question is: What is an acceptable size? 10,000 sq ft is too large. Offices are different- medical offices are traffic generators and different from lawyers and from accountants. Good definitions are key. There should be no parking in front of the buildings. These types of uses exist in residential areas. This proposal just gathers them in one place. Home business works because they are separated and integrated into a residential setting. This might cause sprawl. In your face structures belong in village center. We should not bring NJ commercial campuses to Hanover. These things by themselves don't

work unless adjuncts to individual residences unless in village centers. The village center itself will be noteworthy. No strip or sprawl should be on Route 10.

**Recap of Large Office**

No one wants this. It is too large. The mixed use concept is fine. As part of village center, it makes more sense, rather than as a stand alone proposal. Smaller buildings clustered might be better than a large office use. Not all offices generate the same amount of traffic.

**Recap of Church**

There is indecision as to whether a church should be part of a village center or if it can exist as a stand alone structure and use. Potential accessory uses may be problematic and impact existing housing. A fire station could be part of village center.

**Zoning Amendment Proposal**

A request has come in regarding accessory use limitations. The Committee decided to determine what the Planning Board needs to determine what is best with regard to accessory uses with regard to the policy point of view. This provision is an on-going problem for the Zoning Administrator. In the short term, it is harmful to people with small houses. The proposer should develop a ZARC form and the Planning Board should decide if the proposal should go forward to Town Meeting.

Iain will be absent next week so will send his comments to everyone.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35

Respectfully submitted, Vicki Smith, Scribe