

**RESIDENTIAL PROJECT MEETING  
MEETING SUMMARY  
NOVEMBER 7, 2011**

**Present:** Judith Esmay, Jonathan Edwards, Vicki Smith, Kate Connolly, Iain Sim, Joan Garipay, Judith Brotman

**Minutes October 31, 2011**

The minutes of October 31, 2011 were reviewed. On a motion by Kate Connolly and a second by Joan Garipay, there was unanimous support for approving these minutes.

**Discussion about Dimensional Controls in Zoning**

*Setback in areas where a greater than 10 foot side and rear setback is appropriate* If a side and rear setback greater than 10 feet is appropriate for the neighborhood, it may not be a good idea to allow structures in the part of the setback that is more than 10 feet from the boundary. This will be discussed again in the future. The Committee is seeking to come to consensus now about issues, but until an ordinance is ready to be submitted to the Town, each consensus decision is open to further discussion and possible change.

*Residential Building, Size, Mass, Bulk* The draft policy and questions developed by Judith and Jonathan on November 3 were discussed. The working policy is that building height should be limited to 2.5 stories with a possible 35 foot maximum limit. Some thought that building size is not as important to discuss as building footprint given the height limitation. It was suggested that building size (as a factor of height and footprint) be related to other buildings in the neighborhood instead of the lot size.

While the group is striving for a harmonious sense of character in the neighborhood they are hoping to decide upon a quantitative way to do this work using dimensional controls. Kate was interested in keeping lot size relationships to determine lot coverage and building coverage, rather than relying on the height and building footprint.

The lack of authority to use aesthetic controls was discussed. Not many members were in favor of an historic district. Garage placement can be out of phase with rest of neighborhood. Some people like to occupy homes that do not relate to the neighborhood.

One member supports a graduated scale of building footprint to lot size. The percent of building footprint would vary with the size of the lot. A cap on building footprint would also be included. So that the smaller the lot, the smaller the building coverage. For example:

For lots under 15,000 square feet, allow 25% building footprint and 50% lot coverage.

For lots 15,000 square feet to 43,560 square feet allow 30% building footprint and a lot coverage of 50%.

For lots over an acre, allow 35% building footprint with a limit of 50% lot coverage.

Would these footprint limitations allow accessory structures to be added to increase the number of residential units?

Jonathan thought that a graduated scale should be reversed so that smaller lots were allowed larger footprints and lot coverages. Judy suggested that all lots be allowed to have a 25% building footprint. Another way might be to allow the lots with the smallest lot sizes to determine what the building footprint is and strive for that relationship in the neighborhood. For example, take the average of the smallest 20% lots and work from there.

Because we have received complaints, the bulk of a building on a lot must be addressed. Jonathan will test the decreasing proportionality scheme and report within 2 weeks. In addition, a flat or graduated in the other direction(Kate's proposal) scheme will be prepared. An upper limit for building footprint that will be discussed and established.

It was suggested that areas of slopes over 25% should not be calculated in lot size. Functionally this is impossible to implement in Hanover given the expense of the survey costs.

Building codes are different for inhabited and uninhabited structures. This is why we might still distinguish between an accessory building and principal building.

The relationship of size of accessory building to principal building was discussed. 25% has proven to be too small.

**Conclusions:**

All agree with the goal: Residential building size should be harmonious within a neighborhood. This range needs to be determined.

Most favor taking steep slopes out of lot size calculation. All acknowledge the difficulty in requiring surveys for every project.

Building footprint includes all structures, decks, accessory buildings whether or not connected to each other. Judy looks at attachment and imperviousness to determine if a patio contributes to building coverage or lot coverage.

Next week neighborhood character and accessory structure will be discussed. Carolyn Radisch and Robin Nuse will meet with the Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 4: 00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Smith, Scribe

NEXT MEETING ON MONDAY NOVEMBER 14 at 1:30 pm.