

**Residential Project Meeting
Meeting Summary
August 29, 2011**

Present: Judith Esmay, Kate Connolly, Jonathan Edwards, Michael Hingston, Iain Sim, and Judith Brotman

The minutes of August 22, 2011 were approved as amended. [Weeks Links recap – delete sentence 1 and sentence 2. Change remaining recap to read: 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.] Michael move the amended minutes, Judith Esmay seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Judith advised the committee that she will be meeting with Julia Griffin on Friday, September 9th to discuss the prospect of town funds being allocated to for the purpose of retaining a consultant to assist with drafting the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Analysis of Hypothetical Situations in the Rural District:

Vesuvius Villa

- A. Is this overall use appropriate at the proposed location?
 - Yes

- B. Are there individual details of the proposal that cause concern?
 - 6 families on this site may be excessive
 - No storage space
 - Mink Brook cannot be relied upon for fire protection
 - Are small units too small?
 - Too many units proposed for this building?
 - Too many parking spaces/too many vehicles

- C. Are there details of the proposal that help alleviate concerns?
 - Condominium ownership with owner occupancy
 - Undisturbed areas and common areas

- D. Are there changes to the proposal that would make it more appropriate to the location?
 - Add storage areas, covered parking
 - Scale of the number of units – not sized to the overall size of the building
 - The number of units is the important factor, not the number of people
 - Fewer units means less associated stuff – peripheral uses and requirements
 - Residential appearance is important
 - Provision for or implementation of sidewalk

- E. Does it make a difference if the same proposal is for new construction instead of a re-use of an existing structure?

- No – a new structure can copy an old design but be greener
- No – copy the style for architectural harmony
- No – what matters is the size of the building on the lot and the number of people in the building.

Recap Villa:

All agreed that the use is appropriate to the location.

It is important to keep the residential in appearance (design criteria) –
exterior vs. interior parking, number of dwellings

There needs to be a balance between the number of units provided and the accessory
uses/requirements for a single unit

Owner-occupancy seemed to make a difference to most committee members

Use of common areas contributes to the sense of community

New (vs old) structure is not a disadvantage if all of the above are kept.

Arcadian Mews:

- A. Is this overall use appropriate at the proposed location?

Yes

- B. Are there individual details of the proposal that cause concern?

10 ft. setback is too close to the road for snow storage.

The number of families (units) is too high a density for the lot.

View from the road to the buildings

8 separate buildings is too many buildings

Too cluttered a view

Tandem parking – is this a concern?

- C. Are there details of the proposal that help alleviate concerns?

Small buildings, residential scale and appearance and design details

Size and layout – some of the lot untouched, horseshoe shape has presence

Two types of buildings w/2 different setbacks – appeal of variety

Organized around the green (vs road)

Garage adds to residential appearance and provides for storage

- D. Are there changes to the proposal that would make it more appropriate to the location?

Landscaping – trees diminish the scale of the building(s)

Sidewalk or provision for implementation of a sidewalk

Eliminate project sign, number houses and erect street identification sign

- E. Does it make a difference if the same proposal is for new construction instead of a re-use of an existing structure?

Not relevant – new construction project

Recap Mews:

Density is only question

Residential appearance is positive
Garages for ½ the cars is positive
Visual relationship of design of buildings is positive
Emphasize the visual standards (put into PB / SPR regulations – and enforce!)

Velvet Grove:

- A. Is this overall use appropriate at the proposed location?
Yes.
- B. Are there individual details of the proposal that cause concern?
No.
- C. Are there details of the proposal that help alleviate concerns?
Mix of styles with single family included – diversity
Set-up around the green
Village set-up
Use of land area/space
More open appearance
“Generosity” of lay out
Open integration
- D. Are there changes to the proposal that would make it more appropriate to the location?
No
- E. Does it make a difference if the same proposal is for new construction instead of a re-use of an existing structure?
Not relevant – new construction project.

Recap Grove:
Endorsed !!!

Arcadia Mews - North

- A. Is this overall use appropriate at the proposed location?
Location makes sense - especially for larger buildings with appropriate setback
Not setback too far from road
Could present as “gateway” to Hanover

Velvet Grove – North

?location?

Recap Mews North & Grove North:

Multi-family use is appropriate for this area of town

Design details are very important for any project proposed in this location

Mixed use concept would work for this location

Project could frame the entrance to Hanover – “Gateway”

Neighborhood establishment -

- Density is appropriate

- Village design

- Would change from a through road to a village street area

- Transit access

- Sidewalk

- Streetscape issues – shade trees very important

- Possible multi-family fronting on the road with single family further back

What’s next? Review the “Rural Density Factor” map.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ JLSB

Judith Brotman, Scribe

NEXT WEEK: The meeting will be held on THURSDAY, September 8th at 1:30 pm in the Board Room.