

Residential Project Meeting

August 22, 2011

Meeting Notes

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

Minutes of August 1 and 15, 2011

The minutes of August 1, 2011 were reviewed and amended. Kate Connolly made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Judith Esmay seconded the motion. Bill abstained from the vote and the motion was unanimously approved by the other Committee members.

The minutes of August 15, 2011 were reviewed and amended. Bill Dietrich made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Kate seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Analysis of Hypothetical Situations in the Rural District

Transcend Dental

An addendum was distributed. The provisions of the addendum modify thoughts about General Questions E and F.

- A. Is the use appropriate for the proposed location?
Yes – eight committee members agreed.
- B. Are there individual details that cause concern?
 - None
 - Traffic especially during rush hour.
 - Appearance of the parking for 12 vehicles.
 - Two evenings per week, the length of hours. 6 PM is reasonable; 8 PM may be too late.
 - A couple clients may be less impact than a bunch of teenagers; however, this is a commercial use impacting a residential use. Saturday hours may be of concern. The noise may be a concern. What measures can be added to abate these concerns?
 - Replacement of residential with commercial as well as changing the neighborhood. This is on the sewer line.
 - the sign and its lighting. Are these appropriately regulated in the Zoning Ordinance? The number of patients is dictated by the number of patient rooms. The parking may be too small.
- C. Details of proposal that alleviate concern
 - Comfort with the proposal. Like that it looks residential.
 - Well screened parking, vary the hours, mix use of office and residential
 - Existing presence of Etna Village; if it were further out, this would not be appropriate. Etna is a rural village center. The more the project moves away from the rural village feel, the less appropriate the project is.
 - The location near the center of the village. Good setback. The project preserves residential appearance of the house. I would not support a tear down and new construction that looks commercial.
 - Preservation of existing landscaping and mature trees is really important.
- D. Changes to the proposal which make it better?

- Lighting. We may want to develop standards for light to limit lumens in the residential area.
- On street parking is unacceptable in Etna and should be posted as prohibited. Standards for lighting signs in the rural area may need to be different.
- Parking lot may be too small.
- Control of interior lighting; exterior lighting; and parking.

E. What attributes are missing?

- Will the second floor going to be residential?

F. What are potential effects of concern?

- Traffic.
- Waste products.
- Neighborhood ethics

Recap: Is there any support for expanding Etna Village Center? Yes, mixed use and a mix of uses rather than solely commercial use for Etna Village, is desirable. The structure does not need to be owner-occupied to be if there is a commercial use. Core of Village is the area comprising the store and fire station. A lot of businesses are not appropriate. The building and site attributes are as important as the use. An RO concept is good.

Weeks Links

A. Is the use appropriate for the proposed location?

- Yes
 - It is a big change, but there was difficulty in finding reasons why not.
 - Recreation is a typical use for the rural district.
 - Mixed feelings and reservations. Can't identify what is wrong with it.
 - This is a suburban use, not a rural use. There will be huge impacts on the environment.
 - Yes, recreation is fine, but details I have real problems with.
- The property encompasses the headwaters of Slade Brook and there are lots of wetlands to be impacted.

B. Are there individual details that cause concern?

- The 19th Hole is very inappropriate for the rural area. Restaurant and bar are not appropriate and should not be permitted. The restaurant will be frequented on days when there is no play.
- Private golf courses often have restaurants and bars associated with them. The private course depends on the concession revenue to be successful. Currently, golf course and private club are permitted.
- Project of this scope would require substantial review. There will be environmental impacts to water quality and wildlife.
- Restaurant and bar are part of the package. Golf course looks green but is far from it; however, this is not necessarily bad. The proposal is the minimum scope of activity being offered. Traffic will not be a problem. People will go there and be there all day to play and to socialize.
- What about other associated uses? The traffic associated with these uses will make the project unacceptable. The proposal as stated is just the start of what might actually be built here.
- The change to the land form to accommodate the golf course.
- The "members only" aspect is bothersome. This is another bauble to attract rich retirees to Hanover.

C. Details of proposal that alleviate concern

- None yet.

- Golf courses can be worse by being open to the public, more extensive hours, more crowded, less buffer, more associated uses, and less respect for the environment.
- This is an unobtrusive proposal, but I would need to know maximum number of members.
- True members only policy limits scope and scale. The size of the club house is not incompatible with the area.
- How does a golf course affect wildlife? 225 acres way more than you need for an 18 hole golf course.
- D. Changes to the proposal which make it better
 - What can be done to limit the environmental impact? Both the bar and restaurant generate more traffic on difficult roads.
 - The entrance to the proposed site on Two Mile Road is a mitigating factor. This will not be significant addition to the traffic.
- E. What attributes are missing?
 - The maximum number of members.
 - More information about the tournaments is needed.
- F. What are potential effects of concern.
 - The club will assume accessory uses (possibly: tennis court, pool, larger club house, social memberships, rental of facility for events, fundraisers, condominiums, and resort packages)
 - Impacts on water quality and wildlife.

Recap: Theoretically, this proposal could arrive tomorrow. Uses far more intensive would be permitted by the Zoning Ordinance. Is the commercial venture not appropriate especially since it will need to grow? Grudgingly, this is an appropriate use with misgivings about potential growth and intensification and environmental impact.

Bovine Busk

- A. Is this use appropriate for the proposed location?
 - Yes, this use is appropriate for this location. Six members felt this way.
 - Yes, subject to amendment.
 - No. This is not in the Etna Village core. Would like to see it in center of Etna Village.
- This is served by the sewer with four units per acre. It makes possible housing that might be more affordable.
- B. Are there individual details that cause concern?
 - A sidewalk to the store, library and Trumbull Hall is needed.
 - There needs to be a parking space for both household members. Unsheltered cars should not be in the roadway. The cars present a danger to the kids.
 - The proposal moves substantially away from current single family residential pattern in Etna Village.
 - Design might change so it would not look like Somerville.
 - Layout is a good design.
 - C. Details of proposal that alleviate concern.
 - Front yards and open space even though it is not consistent with the pattern in Etna.
 - Like the open space.
 - Cluster of three buildings is appropriate and adequate parking has been provided.
 - Shrubs, landscaping, open space, and projected to be workforce housing.
 - The setback from the road so the building would not loom over the road. Open porches are a good idea.
 - Not far from apartments at Berrill Farms, Velvet Rocks and College Hill.

This location is more appropriate than Greensboro Road because it builds the population of Etna. Its appropriateness is related to location in the Village.

D. Changes to the proposal which make it better.

- Sidewalk to tie it closer to Etna Village.

- Fewer units and possibility of single family structures on the site. Too big a step to go from single family home to a 12 unit multi-family development. More diversity in housing type.

- With a smaller number of units or more single family, it would be better.

- Better design to tuck parking away following the ideas used at the Courtyard. Focus on presentation not density.

- Different architectural style. Maybe a few different types of units in an extended farmhouse.

E. What attributes are missing?

- None suggested.

F. What are potential effects of concern.

- None suggested.

Recap: This type of commercial activity doesn't seem appropriate to this area of town. There are misgivings about the potential growth and intensification and environmental impact of this proposal.

The next meeting will be held on Monday, August 29 at 1:30 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted, Vicki Smith, Scribe