

**RESIDENTIAL PROJECT MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY
DECEMBER 5, 2011**

Present: Judith Esmay, Jonathan Edwards, Vicki Smith, Kate Connolly, Iain Sim, Michael Hingston, Timothy McNamara, Joan Garipay

Minutes November 14, 2011

The minutes of November 14, 2011 will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Discussion about Residential Parking

A memo prepared by Jonathan listing possible policies was discussed.

- All residential uses shall provide adequate on-site parking. This concept is paramount and all other concepts must be aimed at ensuring that it is adequately met.

The definition of adequate was discussed. Having enough parking so the effects are not externalized to the public was suggested. Are there underlying assumptions? Yes, these include: the assumption that on street parking should be reduced or contained and that the parking lot look in a residential neighborhood should be avoided. That streets will not be home for a car anywhere is the real underlying policy.

On street parking over night is forbidden in the winter. A lot of streets restrict parking to two hour parking. On some, no parking is allowed. There are many prevailing local laws. Maybe all of those laws needed to be reviewed and consolidated.

A primary tenet of neo traditional planning is to allow on street parking especially for visitors. The off street parking rules should apply to cars associated with the residents. For multifamily structures, there is definitely the need to accommodate visitors and guests in the count of on-site parking, but not for single family residences. Should we allow for on street parking on private roads?

- Exact location and configuration of on-site parking should be flexible enough to accommodate the variety of existing and proposed development types.

Parking in the front setback should not be allowed for property maintenance and aesthetic reasons. What about for households with 3 cars where the first car is in the garage, the second behind the first and the third in the driveway in the front setback? An extra large apron should not be encouraged. People will always park in their driveway in the front setback. Does this prohibition need to be continued especially since it is hard to enforce?

It is not desirable to have the fronts of houses dominated by parking and garage uses. Tandem parking is allowed in PRDs now. The concept of tandem parking was discussed. It was agreed that the conversation would deal with single family homes, only. It was agreed that two spaces should be planned for as long as they are outside the front setback and tandem parking should be allowed. When an accessory dwelling unit is added, there needs to be a new parking space. In the "SR" district, should an extra parking space be required? Should tandem parking be allowed

to block more than one space? Kate thinks it is unsafe and could result in not being able to access a car.

- True multi-family development has needs that are different from single family development. Different rules may be required.

The number of spaces available and coordination of their use can be different from single family situations. Experience at the Park and Wheelock development suggests that fewer parking spaces may be appropriate. Should additional parking be required for guests? At South Block, the parking requirement has been dropped down to one space per unit. Maybe this is the right rate for the downtown. There is also a local phenomenon wherein a single person lives in a 2 bedroom unit, so only one car is needed. The Town does not benefit from excessive lot coverage to be developed for parking. The goal is to have adequate parking, but not excessive parking. Could the Planning Board be empowered to decide if parking spaces should be required?

- New large-scale development, even if it is comprised solely of single-family dwellings, may be better served by flexibility in rules.

Staged parking may be applicable here. Our general rule results in too much asphalt. The L parking arrangement versus double tandem were compared. Tandem parking is allowed in a PRD, but not for a multi-family structure. In a development with private roads, could there be parking in the road? Private owners can make more direct rules regarding plowing and parking. At Sachem there is a private street with perpendicular parking on both sides of the street. Being able to back up into the street is essential and removes the need for difficult parallel parking. Multi-family and PRD developments are reviewed by the Planning Board but the number of spaces is determined by the Ordinance. An excessive parking scenario could be rejected by the Planning Board. New rules could encourage flexible and creative parking designs. In certain circumstances the rules do a disservice to the place. Adequate on site parking that does not present a palpable danger to public safety could be the performance standard. Open concrete lattice work finishes used for parking so that there is more infiltrative surface may not be suitable where snow plowing occurs.

Deferring the construction of some parking or reducing the number of spaces required was discussed and will be studied. Maybe parking at Brook Hollow, Park and Wheelock and South Block could be compared to determine the difference between required and built. Kate would like to know if there are more bedrooms or parking spaces at Brook Hollow.

The following points outlined in Jonathan's memo were determined to have been covered by the discussion, so were not individually discussed.

- Innovative development has needs that are different from individual single family development. Different rules may be required.

Single Family

- Single-family residential uses shall provide adequate on-site parking.
- Stacked or Tandem parking is acceptable.
- Parking in either garages or driveways is acceptable and will meet requirements.
- In general, two on-site parking spaces are adequate for each single-family use.

- One additional space is all that is required for an “accessory” dwelling unit in conjunction with a single-family use.

Multi-family

- Multi-family residential uses shall provide adequate on-site parking.
- Stacked or Tandem parking is acceptable only if there are adequate controls to ensure minimal conflicts.(ie. stacked parking might be associated with one individual unit)
- Overall development configuration needs to be considered in conjunction with providing adequate parking.
- Inflexibility in rules may hinder appropriate development.
- One space required for a studio or one-bedroom dwelling.
- Two spaces required for any other size of dwelling.

Park and ride was discussed next.

Park & Ride Locations and Needs:

- OK on arterial or collector roads with clear regional connections, but not on smaller or more isolated roads.

Park and ride lots should be located on current commuting routes. Currently the College has lots at Lot 9 behind Jesse’s, Thompson, and Dewey Field. Each is served by shuttles. A park and ride lot has been permitted behind Trumbull-Nelson. There used to be one where the Middle School is now located. The one behind Trumbull Nelson is actually a Dartmouth College employee parking lot. Parking must be provided for those who have to come to work in Town as well as those that choose to come here for shopping or entertainment. There are no public park and ride locations in town. There is a difference between a single employer park and ride and a public park and ride.

There is a disinclination to put park and rides on smaller roads. Arterial or collector roads would be the best locations. Intercepting traffic in Enfield before it even reached Lebanon and Hanover would be ideal. One could also be located in Norwich.

- Should have a practical, though not necessarily large, size.

What is the definition of practical? That should be related to traffic volume and so it will not impact the neighborhood with lights, fumes and noise.

- OK as part of another parking lot use, such as a church or club parking area.

Trumbull Hall may be used informally as a park and ride already. Parking at Wilson’s Landing might work. Is the Town going to encourage applications for parking lots? Maybe it Is better to incorporate a park and ride in a regular development. The Zoning Ordinance should not be a barrier to use of a parking lot. There are few parking lots that are a principal use.

Trail head parking should be allowed with performance standards less onerous than those for a parking facility or parking lot. These should be permitted and be less formal, or maybe an accessory use to the outdoor recreational use of the land. Is there a difference between commercial parking and a park and ride?

Our town garage is the only commercial location. The College in fact runs commercial lots because the users must pay to use them. Free parking will only be provided by government or a church.

- Should have PB oversight with flexibility in “rules” so as to look attractive and to respect character of the area and not impinge on neighbors.

Residential Signs

Broad concept is that residential signs are to identify the property by street address and family name, not a home occupation. A sign which advertizes an accessory use business on the site should be modest. Four square feet seemed to be too large.

Should a mailbox count as a sign? Should personal identification be regulated? The names of housing developments are not appropriate in Hanover. The Identification of the house, a building project, and home business should be able to occur in different ways.

Mailboxes should not be considered to be signs. House numbers by themselves are not signs. No residential sign should be directly or purposefully illuminated. Illumination may be necessary for business signs. Historical or cultural designation signs should not be regulated by the sign ordinance. Any sign must reference what is on the property and not be advertising.

Next week: Affordable housing will be discussed next time.

Meeting adjourned at 3:43 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Smith, Scribe

NEXT MEETING: DECEMBER 12th at 1:30 pm in the BASEMENT MEETING ROOM.