

**Residential Project Meeting
Meeting Summary
October 10, 2011**

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

Minutes October 3, 2011

The minutes of October 3, 2011 were re-drafted by Michael Hingston. These minutes were reviewed and amendments suggested. On a motion by Judith Esmay and a second by William Dietrich, there was support for approving the amended minutes with everyone but Kate Connolly voting in favor.

Summary Discussion about Agriculture

No one could think of anyone in Hanover who is making a living doing agriculture. An agricultural enterprise large enough to support a family does not exist and might be considered a form of “big” agriculture.

Removal of the “for profit” part of the current zoning definition of agriculture would be a step supported by the Committee and members of the public who would like the agricultural portions of the zoning ordinance changed.

The Committee had hoped to have a better understanding of the agricultural uses existing today. The Committee decided to have a meeting at Trumbull Hall to hear what the public has to say about gardening, farming and raising of livestock. For the Planning Board, this will be a listening meeting about uniquely rural agricultural activities. The Committee wants to learn and provide an opportunity for residents of the rural area to inform the Committee. This would not be a discussion about residential uses or development on fragile natural resources. However, forestry would be included in this public discussion.

The Committee is not worried about small scale enterprises except when animals are being raised. Large farms have smells and associated distribution traffic that impact neighbors.

Sugaring and raising and keeping of horses are pursuits taking place in the rural areas. Committee members were interested in exploring whether licensing would be an appropriate way to regulate raising of livestock.

Discussion about Forestry

There is a lot more forestry happening than meets the eye because it is hidden from roads for the most part. There is usually a long duration between cutting activity on a particular property. Large lots are needed to support economically viable forestry. Yield tax might be a good way to assess how much forestry is occurring. Forestry is allowed in three zoning districts.

Issues around forestry include traffic, erosion, and noise when cutting is occurring and management of the forest is an issue when cuts are not occurring.

As a rule of thumb, ten acres are needed to supply a single house with firewood for the year. Sawmills need to be considered based on their location. On-site kilns generate a lot of smoke. Logging trucks arriving everyday can have a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Impacts on wetlands, noise, unsightly views in recently logged areas, traffic, best management practices, slash, and rutted roads are concerns associated with forestry.

A definition of forestry should be developed for the zoning ordinance. Operating sawmills are thought by the Committee to be inappropriate in rural Hanover. The definition of temporary saw mill is very different from an operating saw mill. Sawmills are very portable now. One question that needs to be answered is: Is a mobile temporary sawmill part of forestry without being separately licensed?

There are a few sections of the zoning ordinance that deal with forestry. The state definition of forestry is very broad. Concern is traffic, noise and best management practices. The Committee wants to know how forestry and agriculture fit best into the rural area from the perspective of residents and landowners.

Randall Arendt would encourage putting agriculture and forestry on common land at conservation open space developments and at PRDs.

Rural Policy Draft and Differential Density Discussion

Three types of density adjustment were discussed.

Community context

This includes road infrastructure as well as water and sewer infrastructure. A rural place should not be a location which is just an intersection of roads. Trying to create these nodes is probably not desirable. Etna and Hanover Center are the remaining desirable nodes. Other nodes are probably not a good idea now. Hanover does not need to be chopped up that much. This attribute has already been discussed especially during the case studies.

Natural resource and development potential

This is a site by site criterion. Local regulation should not impede open space development. Things like frontage requirements, subdivision road standards and large turnarounds, cause disincentives to cluster development. Incentives are a way to induce developers to use an open space pattern. Inherent differences that result in savings in development costs often need to be augmented in order to result in the developer choosing the open space layout.

Public benefits

These items are listed for consideration for incentivization. Less road and utility infrastructure is a benefit which should be listed. Minimization of disturbed area is another benefit.

If you do an innovative development, a big wide road may not be necessary. There could be a hierarchy of development roads like those that exist for community roads. Design standards for the infrastructure should be tailored to the needs of the development proposed. A developer seeking a bonus by claiming an improvement is a public benefit (when it is really not valued by the public) should not be rewarded.

Extra regulatory requirements are not incentives. In some cases, determining a yield plan is not relevant. There is value to knowing about the natural resources in proposed open space area. The area proposed for development should be the most intensively mapped.

The creation of lots for a minor subdivision was discussed. Should there be more oversight and review of minor subdivisions given that they are the dominant development type in the rural area? Clustering even minor subdivision housing sites could make sense. There are no incentives for minor subdivision clustering.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Smith, Scribe

NEXT MEETING ON MONDAY OCTOBER 17 at 1:30 pm.