

**RESIDENTIAL PROJECT MEETING  
MEETING SUMMARY  
JANUARY 25, 2012**

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

**Follow up on Meeting with Affordable Housing Commission**

Jonathan distributed two handouts: Sales 2009-2011 (for Hanover, Lebanon and Hartford), and a memo from Friday, January 13, 2012 regarding Planning Board Questions for Affordable Housing Commission

Jonathan, Kate, Judith, Iain and Joan all attended the meeting with the Affordable Housing Commission. A summary of topics discussed at that meeting was reported by those individuals:

- A philanthropic approach to providing affordable housing like Gile Community will not be used in the near future.
- Another way to facilitate the provision of affordable housing is to support Dartmouth doing a big development such as Rivercrest.
- Conversion of a large home to condominiums or apartments is another method.
- A husband and wife with a family income of \$60,000 could afford a \$250,000 house given standard mortgage lending practices.
- The housing gap in Hanover is in the below-\$250,000 houses.
- Other towns are providing Hanover's affordable housing.
- Workforce housing should be built primarily where there is water, sewer and public transportation. There should also be such housing built in the rural area to allow for lifestyle choice.
- The Affordable Housing Commission thought that the range of geographic locations for multi-family housing identified by the Residential Committee was too broad.
- Sand Hill has traffic issues.
- On Greensboro Road, smaller lots could be created to allow for more housing.
- On South Park Street, housing could replace offices.
- West Wheelock Street and Verona/Highland Avenue were other suggested locations.
- There was concern about what the public would bear in terms of integration of multi-family into traditionally single-family areas.

The Affordable Housing Commission (AHC) was left with the task of defining the economics that could incentivize workforce housing. The Affordable Housing Commission will be asked to identify the salaries of employees in Hanover and better gauge their desire to live in Hanover.

**The Residential Committee agreed that people who work in Hanover are the target population for the affordable housing.**

There was mostly agreement with the thought that by increasing supply, the price of housing will come down. The other view was that because of the huge market demand, increasing supply will not allow price to come down.

There was discussion about housing price variation in Hanover and Lebanon. Housing market dynamics were discussed.

There was interest in knowing how many new units were built in Hanover, Lebanon and Hartford in the past ten years. The Census information will be available this summer.

**The Committee agreed that the objective is to provide affordable housing. Smaller developments are preferred to large developments.**

The Committee envisions a form based code to deal with building size and architecture and meaningful site plan regulations to ensure multi-family housing fits into the neighborhood.

**The Committee agreed to a commitment to meaningful infill with the potential of changing minimum lot sizes in locations such as Verona Ave., Greensboro Rd., and the West End.**

**The Committee agreed to a commitment to the area shown on the map for multi-family housing, acknowledging that the AHC may have misconstrued the intent that smaller developments are contemplated, and over the entire area form-based regulations will tend to coalesce the multi-family units to nodes.**

### **Non Conforming Structures**

The discussion switched to non conformity. The reference book, *New Hampshire Land Use Law* by Martin, was admitted to be instructional but difficult to read.

**The Committee agreed to reduce dimensional non-conformity by changing dimensional controls in the new zoning ordinance.**

Michael distributed 1976 and 2009 zoning ordinance articles regarding non-conforming uses and structures. The two differ in the definitions of building and structure. Members were reminded to use the 2011 Ordinance to understand what we have today.

Traditionally in Hanover, non- conforming uses can be continued, not expanded, and not changed to another non-conforming use.

A brief history of non-conformity was described by Judith Brotman. Reasons for non-conformity is created by a change in prior regulation. The Committee agreed that the situations of a projection of a house and the location of a garden shed in the side setback are entirely different. In the new ordinance, the Committee would like implemented a prohibition against re-building the shed in the setback or the house in the setback. They noted that people are wed to their existing footprint. However, once a structure is derelict, the property right may be gone. The property right is only there when the building is there.

Kate reminded the Committee that the minimum front setback should be at least one car length deep so that there is some snow storage and parking area.

Which kinds of non-conformity do we want to tolerate and for how long? Non-conformity cannot be avoided completely. The new ordinance needs to acknowledge the difference between a house and garden shed in the side setback. It should be clear that the ZBA should not be granting variances for garden sheds in a side setback.

Amortization is probably not going to work in Hanover as a way to remove non-conformity. Committee members wondered whether the method of disappearance of a non-conforming structure should result in different treatment in the new ordinance; different methods of disappearance include: willful removal, flood or other acts of god such as fire, neglect and vandalism. Should public policy support inexpensive re-location of non-conforming structures?

**The Committee agreed to reduce non-conformities without undue financial burden and respecting the character of the neighborhood.**

**Next week** The Residential Committee will meet on Monday, January 30<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 PM at the Town Offices to further discuss non-conformity.

Meeting adjourned at 4:08 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Smith, Scribe

**NEXT MEETING ON MONDAY JANUARY 30<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 PM at the Town Offices.**