

**PLANNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 4, 2014 at 7:30 PM
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

In attendance:

Members: Kate Connolly, Judith Esmay (Chair), Joan Garipay, Michael Mayor, Iain Sim; Nancy Carter (Selectmen's Representative)

Alternates: None

Staff: Vicki Smith, Judith Brotman

Others: See Attendance Sheet

MINUTES: The minutes of January 21, 2014 were approved.

P2014-02 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION – FINAL REVIEW - BY CARL SANDIN AND WILLIAM & CRISTINA HAMMOND, TO DIVIDE ONE LOT INTO TWO LOTS (1.2 ACRES & 4.8 ACRES) AT 11 ETNA ROAD, TAX MAP 28, LOT 8, IN THE “SR-2” AND “RR” ZONING DISTRICTS.

ESMAY read the Notice of Public Hearing.

Carl Sandin and Bill Hammond presented the application. Hammond said the goal is to subdivide the property to enable Sandin to build a house on the new lot. Hammond said the Conservation Commission has visited the site and approved the proposed subdivision.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- Smith said an application for Wetland Special Exception associated with this project was heard by the Zoning Board last week. Deliberations are scheduled for February 6th.

Board Comments/Questions:

- The plan should be corrected to note Parcel A as being 43,560 *square feet*, rather than acres.
- How is the adjacent Cutting's Corner Homeowners' Association land used?
 - Sandin said that is very steep property. It does not provide access to the site.

Public Comments/Questions: None

ESMAY mentioned receipt of correspondence from Don Ware, Town of Hanover Utility Engineer, and Jerry Frankenfield, Town of Hanover Fire Inspector. Ware confirmed that the town has the capacity for a new connection to the municipal sewer. Frankenfield wrote that there are no adverse conditions regarding Hanover Fire emergency service. As such, the request for waiver is withdrawn.

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by CARTER, to approve the application as complete. There being no further discussion, THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by SIM, to approve the application for minor subdivision with the condition that the wetlands special exception request be approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment prior to signing and recording the mylar. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

P2014-01 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW OF HYPERTHERM PROPOSAL TO USE TAX MAP 1, LOT 24, 9 GREAT HOLLOW ROAD, AS A LOGISTICS CENTER FOR CENTRALIZED SHIPPING AND RECEIVING

Perry Seale, Hypertherm Director of Facilities, and Jan Becker, Project Manager and Architect with Bread Loaf Corporation, presented the conceptual plan. The proposal is to put in a logistics center, a place to organize and ship out their finished product, at 9 Great Hollow Road. This site is currently used as a support building for manufacturing. They have been mindful of wetland and drainage features at the site. They hope to maintain and improve those key features. Seale displayed an approved site plan from a 2001 Planning Board application to show that the current plan is in keeping with what was approved back then. He said Hypertherm is not planning to change the building much, just create more truck docks and associate parking and provide better access. Potential issues with the new development include truck traffic, lighting, and wetlands. Images of existing conditions were displayed. Seale encouraged neighbors to connect with him to discuss the project and answer questions.

Board Comments/Questions:

- Will this require Zoning Board approval?
 - Seale said yes.
- The plan of the proposed design does not include a lot of the perimeter trees that are shown on the plan of existing conditions. Is your intent to take out those trees?
 - Seale said there is no intention to change perimeter tree plantings.
- How much truck traffic is corporate vehicles transporting materials versus external suppliers?
 - Seale said they are still gathering that information and will provide it as part of the formal Site Plan Review application. Right now, there are three Hypertherm trucks that transport raw materials and finished products amongst their buildings.
- Perhaps there is some action the Board of Selectmen could undertake to restrict trucks from utilizing Greensboro Road when they don't need to.
- Look very carefully at the Site Plan Regulations and come up with an approach that is consistent with the landscaping requirements in parking areas.
- Will you be adding to the total number of associates located on Great Hollow Road?
 - Seale said it might increase by 5 or 10, but there will be a redistribution of associates primarily coming from 21 Great Hollow Road to 9 Great Hollow Road.
- Will you have to change the driveway configuration?
 - Seale said they will look at that over the next couple of weeks.
- Lighting is very important to the Board.
 - Seale said they will follow the same lighting process that was approved at 15 Great Hollow Road.
- Is there any intent to construct the two buildings depicted in the 2001 approval that were not constructed?
 - Seale said right now the best fit is to match what is there as much as possible.

- How does Hypertherm intend to keep truck traffic off Great Hollow and Greensboro Road?
 - Seale said they tell their vendors where to go and where not to go. If vendors do not follow their direction, Hypertherm will no longer do business with them.

Staff Comments/Questions:

- Can you indicate where you expect there to be impact to the wetland buffers?
 - Becker said the wetlands have moved in toward the site since the 2001 project. The 25' buffer area will be impacted as well as the 250' setback from Mink Brook. Most impacts are related to one area of the site.
- Do you have a sense of what the overall stormwater management concept will be for the parking lot?
 - Becker said they are hoping to create a rain garden to provide some treatment. They will probably have to do something additional in another area of the site. All of the edges of the parking will create buffer/filtration.
- Would you consider the same surface used at Hypertherm's Heater Road site?
 - Seale said no, that would require changing the elevation of the building by several feet.
- Please attend to pedestrian safety in the parking lot that will connect to 15 Great Hollow Road.
- Hypertherm's trail system now goes on to Town property. It is the Town's intention to convert Shed 2 into a recreation facility that will probably involve a pedestrian bridge across the brook. Swapping out an existing trail easement along the north end of the property for a public access easement would provide a safe way for pedestrians to access the trail system. There will be great opportunities for loops and more connection for walking. The Trails Committee would be happy to work with you.
 - Seale said Hypertherm is on the same page regarding trails, recreation and utilization of the site. As far as pedestrian safety, they will separate truck traffic from associate traffic.

Public Comments/Questions:

- Nancy Collier said this seems like a good use for this building. Great Hollow is an industrial area but is also residential. We are trying to keep it peaceful, natural, and dark. Anything to further that is helpful. She expressed concern regarding the installation of noise-making equipment and exterior lighting. She encouraged the Board to consider avoidance of any light shed on the public right of way and to look at pedestrian recreational opportunities across all of Hypertherm properties. Collier suggested future consideration should be made to improve an existing pedestrian bridge.
- Jonathan Ross asked for an aerial view. He said he has great anxiety about the safety of Greensboro Road. It is a very dangerous road not only because it is in poor repair but because the traffic way exceeds the capacity of the road. A lot of joggers, skiers, bikers, pedestrians, etc. use that road. Ross said there should be an absolute requirement that Hypertherm-related truck traffic be forbidden on Greensboro Road. He urged the Board to do something active in this regard to protect the many people that use that road.
 - It was noted that Greensboro Road falls under the purview of the State of NH.

PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING AMENDMENTS PROPOSED FOR CONSIDERATION AT TOWN MEETING 2014 These amendments were previously discussed at the January 7th and January 21st meetings. Changes are noted in bold italics.

ESMAY advised of a memorandum the Board received from Smith, dated January 28th regarding the five amendments before the Board. The Board is to take one of the following actions on each of the five amendments: (1) place the amendment on the ballot for consideration by Town Meeting in May, (2) consider the amendment at another public hearing in its current form, (3) modify the amendment and hold another public hearing on the amended proposal; or (4) determine that the amendment should not be considered further by the Board or Town Meeting.

ESMAY opened the public hearing on the proposed amendment **Banners**.

Delete Section 317.2 E.: ~~In the I district, institutionally owned art museums, the primary purpose of which is to collect, promote the study of, and present to the institutional community and the public, works of art, such as painting or sculpture, are permitted, in addition to signs otherwise allowed, to use signs and banners both to identify the museum to the public and to announce exhibitions open to the public. These signs or banners may contain the name of the museum and/or the title of an exhibition, and may also contain graphic designs, either permanent or periodically changeable, related to the works of art in the museum's collection or to the nature of any special exhibition taking place at the museum. Signs or banners shall be placed only on private property; may be affixed to standards, lamp posts, or buildings; and may be posted throughout the year. Not more than three signs and banners identifying the museum or its exhibitions may be posted at any one time facing each public street on which the museum has frontage; the sign or banner closest to the public street may contain the name of the museum and pictorial elements, either permanent or periodically changeable, related to works of art in the museum's collection only; each such sign or banner shall not exceed fifty square feet in area on each of two sides.~~

Renumber subsequent subsection.

Add new Section 317.6: ***Banners: In the "I" district, Institutional building owners are permitted, in addition to signs and banners otherwise permitted, to install banners on private property related to institutional activities. Banners may be affixed to standards, lamp posts, or buildings and may be posted throughout the year for up to twelve (12) weeks at a time for each installation at each location or for the period of time commensurate with the term of the institutional activity reflected in the banner. Not more than three banners may be posted at one time on any building facade visible from a public street. Banners shall not exceed one hundred and fifty square feet in area on each of two sides.***

Add to Section 902: ***Banner: A banner is a large piece of flexible material with a design, picture, or writing on it, is visible from a public street, and is temporarily attached to standards, lamp posts or buildings.***

Ellen Arnold of Dartmouth College submitted to the Board a draft form of Dartmouth's internal policy regarding banners. She said this is the Board's third discussion of this proposed amendment. The final version incorporates all of the comments and recommendations made previously.

Public Comments/Questions: None

Board Comments/Questions: None

ESMAY declared the public hearing closed.

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by MAYOR, to place this amendment on the warrant for Town Meeting. There being no further discussion, THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

ESMAY opened the public hearing on the proposed amendment **Permits**.

Delete Section 1001.8: ~~No permit issued hereunder shall be transferrable.~~

Re-number remaining subsections.

Brotman said the proposal is pretty straightforward. Approval for a building permit or zoning permit runs with the land. This language seems to be contrary to that. It seems appropriate to delete it.

Public Comments/Questions: None

Board Comments/Questions: None

ESMAY declared the public hearing closed.

It was moved by CARTER, seconded by MAYOR, to place this amendment on the ballot for Town Meeting. THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

ESMAY opened the public hearing on the proposed amendment **Side and Rear Setbacks**.

Amend Section 209.3 to read:

209.3 Side and Rear Setback Regulations and Exceptions:

- A. No structure shall project into any required side or rear setback.
- B. Exceptions: A garage, carport or any accessory building, whether or not attached to the principal Structure, not exceeding 15 feet in height and no part of which is used as a dwelling space, as well as a deck, patio, swimming pool or tennis court, may be located within the side or rear setback, but not closer than ~~7~~ **10** feet to the side or rear lot line. These exceptions shall not apply to any lot within the BM, B, D, OL, or I District which adjoins a residential district.
- C. Bus shelters and public utility structures or equipment, including, but not limited to, water and wastewater treatment and filtration plants and appurtenances thereto, which because of function cannot reasonably be located other than wholly or partially within a required setback, are permitted.

CONNOLLY said this is simply to adapt our building standards to what safety vehicles require. This is a minimum setback in the most densely populated area. This was discussed a number of times by the Residential Project Committee. A couple of things have come up which make it even more useful. Garage heights have been mentioned a number of times over the course of review of this amendment. This amendment will only affect garages that are closer to the side and rear lot lines than the required setback.

Public Comments/Questions:

- Jolin Kish suggested it might make sense to change the 15' height restriction to allow for better building design.
 - CONNOLLY said the height is only confined to 15' if the structure invades the setback.
- Randy Mudge asked if the request is based on a request from the police or fire departments.
 - CONNOLLY said no.
- Mudge said the current setback designation has been 7' for a long time. To reduce the lot by six feet, you are diminishing the area to locate a house on a relatively narrow lot. If this is really a safety issue, the idea should have come from our safety services.
 - CONNOLLY said the need came from elsewhere. It was considered as part of the

emergency vehicle consideration but there are aesthetic values to this as well. The 7' designation was established in 1976. Vehicle sizes have grown since then.

There being no further discussion, ESMAY declared the public hearing closed.

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by SIM, to place this amendment on the warrant. There being no further discussion, THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

Building Height

Amend Section 209.4 to read:

209.4 Height Regulations and Exceptions:

A. The height of any building ~~shall be measured from the average finished grade along the building front, and~~ shall not exceed the height specified in Section 204. See also Section 209.4.

Add new subsections to 209.4:

G. ***The height of multi-family buildings used for residential purposes in the GR-1, GR-2 and GR-3 zones may exceed the maximum height permissible in Section 204.5 by Special Exception provided that:***

(1) ***The height of the building shall be consistent with the height and character of other buildings in the immediate neighborhood.***

(2) ***In a multi-family building whose utility requirements necessitate the building height exceeding the maximum height permitted in Section 204.5 as a result of the granting of a Special Exception, no space in that building above the height for buildings specified in Section 204.5 shall be used for human habitation.***

H. ***The height of structures used for agricultural purposes, but not residential buildings, in the RR and F zones may exceed the maximum height permitted in Sections 204.7 and 204.8, respectively, to a maximum height of 45 feet by Special Exception provided that:***

(1) ***The height of the structure shall be consistent with the height and character of other structures in the same zoning district with a similar agricultural use.***

(2) ***Such accessory structures shall not be permitted within the front, side or rear setbacks.***

I. ***The height of accessory structures shall be limited to the height permitted in Section 204.***

Amend Section 902 to read:

Building Height: Vertical distance measured from the average ~~elevation of the proposed~~ finished grade ***along the building front*** ~~at the front of the building to the highest point of the roof for flat and mansard roofs, not including any parapet less than 2 feet high, and to the average height between the eaves and the ridge for other types of roofs including the upper slope of gambrel roofs.~~ See Section 209.4 for exceptions ~~in the Institution Zone.~~

CONNOLLY suggested keeping “shall be measured from the average finished grade along the building front” in Section 209.4. SIM suggested referencing Section 902 to see the definition. CONNOLLY said that puts an unnecessary burden on an applicant. This is a basic direction that belongs in the regulations. ESMAY agreed, this is regulatory, not a definition. Smith suggested capitalizing “height” to indicate that it is defined within the document.

SIM said the proposed wording of 209.4G(2) is hard to understand and is grammatically incorrect. He questioned whether the statement about utility requirements in relation to building height is necessary. CONNOLLY said she does not think it is unnecessary when you are talking

about multi-family buildings that require additional floor space than single-family homes. The utility reference was added as a result of testimony presented to the Board previously. Without it we will be short-changing multi-family buildings. Brotman said there must be criteria for the Zoning Board to grant a special exception. The criteria established is that you need the extra height to allow for the utilities that go between the floors. ESMAY suggested separating the two points of subparagraph 2; one to address that the additional height must be needed to accommodate utilities and the other to say that the space above the height restriction shall not be used for human habitation.

ESMAY recapped the proposed changes as a restoration of the current wording of Section 209.4A and restate the text of 209.4G as three subsections rather than two. CARTER said the reorganization will be much clearer to pick out the meaning if looking at it quickly.

ESMAY opened the public hearing.

Public Comments/Questions:

- Tim McNamara of Dartmouth College said 209.4F deals with buildings on sloping sites in the “I” zone. Given the assumed intention of this amendment is to deal with residential zones, could you insert something that specifically says the new definition does not apply to the “I” zone? This would make buildings in the “I” zone have the same requirements for measurements on both flat and sloping ground.
- Ellen Arnold of Dartmouth College said the current definition allows for averaging. This proposal eliminates that. Dartmouth’s preference would be to retain the current definition of building height in the “I” zone, so it is consistent between flat ground and sloping ground. If you want to change how you measure building height in other districts, create that distinction in the definitions.
 - Brotman asked how many 60’ peaked roof buildings have been built in the “I” zone in the last ten to twelve years. The definition we are seeking to go back to is what was in place when most of Dartmouth’s buildings with these criteria were constructed.
- John Scherding of Dartmouth College said two buildings at Dartmouth constructed in the last eight years (Alumni Gym and Tuck Residence Hall) would become non-conforming if this amendment is adopted.
 - Smith said 209.4 regulates “I” district height within 150’ of a residential district. That buffer provision allows for a smooth transition between the two districts. Not including the “I” zone will put that buffer in jeopardy.
 - Arnold said that is another reflection of the fact that there are a lot of uncertainties and questions to be answered about how the proposed amendment will apply.
 - SIM said impacts to the “OL”, “B”, “D”, and “BM” districts have not been discussed either. What was intended to perhaps address a very narrow concern is now spread about the entire town and has rather extensive ramifications that need to be taken into account.
- Scherding said his perception as an architect is that this amendment discriminates against pitched roofs and encourages flat roofs or low efficiency roofs. He displayed drawings of three different roof forms. They indicate that the biggest impact is to the pitched roof, which is arguably the building form most traditional to a New England village and one we would want to promote. Scherding said if the objective is to lower the height, then change the maximum limits allowed instead of changing how it is measured. That is more equitable for the different building forms and will go a long way toward preserving the character of the area.

- Randy Mudge also provided illustrations of different building forms, how they are affected by the current regulations and the newly proposed. He said the problem, as described, is the need to match the initial requirements of the character of a neighborhood. He mentioned the size of garages most people desire and noted that garages are allowed in the setback. Mudge said the proposed definition will create a problem and will change the character of the residential zone.
- Bryant Denk said he drove through all of the residential areas in Hanover looking for three-story flat roof buildings and found only ten of them. The proposed height is sufficient if you are not trying to put a third floor of living space in a residential neighborhood. Denk said comments made at a previous meeting stating that the Howe Library and homes on Currier Place would not conform to the new height restructuring are false. The Library is 35' and the Currier houses qualify within the existing zoning if measured from the front.
- Jolin Kish said if the goal is to reduce height in the residential neighborhoods why not reduce the height allowed in those neighborhoods rather than change the definition of height for the entire town. Changing the definition effects a lot of things that are probably not intended to be affected.
 - CONNOLLY said we are not reducing the height of homes but reflecting what is apparently the majority of houses on the ground.
- Kish asked when a building fronts on multiple streets, which street is the height measured from?
 - Brotman said it would be the average finished elevation along those two fronts, as it is currently measured.
- ESMAY said a compendium of definitions used by various municipalities throughout the US, provided by the American Planning Association, has half a page on building height. In some places the definition begins at the sidewalk level.
- Margaret Bragg said she looked at the cons that Bruce Williamson sent to Smith. She said her impression is that these last three amendments sprang from one infamous project and asked what the project was.
 - Smith suggested she contact Williamson to inquire about his reference.

ESMAY declared the public hearing closed.

ESMAY suggested that this amendment should not go forward to warrant without additional polishing. SIM said the "RO" district should be included, as it is essentially to appear as a residential district, but allow for office purposes as well. Problems arise when you try to take one size and make it fit all neighborhoods and districts. Smith said final wording is not required for submission to the Town Clerk until early April. SIM said if shelved until 2015, this will lose momentum. CONNOLLY said there must be a simpler way to apply this provision to only the residential zones. Smith said one of the goals is to make the Zoning Ordinance more easily understood. Having different ways of measuring building height is crazy. SIM said you need different sets of standards for different types of zones where you are looking to achieve a different outcome. GARIPAY spoke in favor of moving forward with the amendment.

It was moved by MAYOR, seconded by CARTER, to modify the amendment in accordance with the discussion of this evening and present it for a later public hearing. There being no further discussion, THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

GR/SR Lot Coverage

Amend Table 204.5 to read:

Table 204.5

"GR" General Residence

Area and Dimensions: (all measurements in feet and inches unless otherwise stated)

District	Class*	Minimum Lot Size		Area per Additional Family	Minimum Setbacks			Maximum Height	Building Footprint	Lot Coverage
		Area	Frontage**		Front	Side	Rear			
GR-1	1	10,000	80	5,000	30****	15	20	35	≠ 25%	≠ 50%
	2	15,000	125	10,000	30****	15	30	35	≠ 25%	≠ 50%
GR-2	1	10,000	80	i	20****	10	20	35	≠ 25%	≠ 50%
GR-3	1	21,780	80	21,780	20	10	20	35	≠ 25%	≠ 50%
GR-4****	1	5,000	60	5,000	25	15	20	35***	≠ 25%	≠ 50%

- i: 3,000 square feet for second family; 2,000 square feet for each additional family.
- ii: For lots of ~~20,000~~ **more than 30,000** square feet **and GR properties fronting on West Wheelock Street or South Park Street the or less**, building footprint shall not exceed 35% and lot coverage shall not exceed 65%; ~~for lots of more than 20,000 square feet, building footprint shall not exceed 55% and lot coverage shall not exceed 80%.~~

- * Explanation appears in Section 208.
- ** For lots on the turnaround portion of cul-de-sacs, see Section 209.1.
- *** Maximum height in the GR-4 district may be increased to 45 feet subject to the limitations stated in Section 502.3.C(3).
- **** For hotels in GR-4, the following area and dimensional standards shall apply instead of the above:

Minimum Lot Area:	10 acres
Minimum Frontage:	200 feet
Minimum Setbacks:	
Front:	50 feet
Side and Rear:	50 feet
Maximum Height:	35 feet
Floor Area Ratio:	0.2

- ***** See Section 213 West End Neighborhood Overlay District.

Amend Table 204.6 to read:

Table 204.6

"SR" Single Residence

Area and Dimensions: (all measurements in feet and inches unless otherwise designated)

District	Class*	Minimum Lot Size		Front	Minimum Setbacks		Maximum Height	Building Footprint	Lot Coverage
		Area	Frontage*		Side	Rear			
SR-1	1	30,000	130	35***	20	50	35	35% 25%	65% 50%
	2	60,000	200	35***	30	75	35	35% 25%	65% 50%
	3	100,000	300	50***	30	75	35	35% 25%	65% 50%
SR-2	1	15,000	100	35	15	40	35	35% 25%	65% 50%
	2	20,000	125	35	20	40	35	35% 25%	65% 50%
SR-3	1	10,000	85	30***	15	20	35	35% 25%	65% 50%

- * Explanation appears in Section 208.
- ** For lots on the turnaround portion of cul-de-sacs, see Section 209.1.
- *** See Section 213 West End Neighborhood Overlay District.

Amend Section 209.5 to read:

209.5 Building Footprint and Lot Coverage:

~~In the RO, GR and SR Zoning Districts the percentage of the total area of a lot of record covered by a building footprint, including accessory buildings, shall not exceed 35%. Lot coverage, that~~

~~is, the percentage of the total area of a lot of record covered by structures and improvements including but not limited to decks, porches without roofs, driveways, parking areas or facilities, or impervious surfaces shall not exceed 65%, except that for lots of more than 20,000 square feet in the GR Zoning District a building footprint, including accessory buildings, shall not exceed 55% and lot coverage shall not exceed 80%.~~

For Open Space Developments, Planned Residential Developments, and Continuing Care Retirement Communities, building footprint and lot coverage shall be determined by the standards in Article V.

Delete Section 304:

~~Section 304 Building Coverage, Open Porches, Carports and Garages~~

~~304.1 The portion of any structure located underground shall not be included in the calculation of lot coverage or setback.~~

~~304.2 In determining the percentage of the total area of a lot of record covered by structures and improvements, lot coverage shall include but not be limited to decks, porches without roofs, driveways, parking areas or facilities, or impervious surfaces.~~

Amend Section 902 to read:

Lot Coverage: The ~~percentage~~ **portion** of a lot of record covered by structures and improvements including but not limited to decks, porches without roofs, **parking areas, all** driveways, **accessing** parking areas or facilities, ~~or~~ **and all other** impervious **and improved** surfaces **and constructed areas**. ***“Lot Coverage” excludes the portion of any other structure located underground.***

CONNOLLY said the proposal has been adjusted in response to testimony given previously. She said Brotman performed additional building coverage calculations for more “SR” and “GR” properties, focusing on those that are the smallest in size and closest in town. The subsequent calculations still indicate 90% conformance with the proposed building coverage. As to lot coverage, CONNOLLY said calculations she performed resulted in room for a 2,500 sf home on a 10,000 sq parcel with room for eight parking spaces. The home could also be expanded by three stories. CONNOLLY said this is a perfectly reasonable proposal and is a reflection, literally, of what occurs on the ground.

ESMAY opened the public hearing on the proposed amendment

Public Comments/Questions:

- Margaret Bragg asked what Connolly is speaking to when she says “the character of the neighborhood”. There seems to be more than one neighborhood involved here. She asked how much of the town is covered by this reduction.
 - CONNOLLY suggested Bragg talk to the people around her that have been working on this for over a year. The calculations were of properties closest to the middle of town areas. As you get farther out, this has less of an effect because the lots are larger.
- Bragg said it wrangles her a bit to think of those percentages changing after having owned her property for 20-40 years under the existing guidelines.
 - CONNOLLY said when the current percentages were added, they were generous guesses. Of the ≈330 properties Brotman reviewed, 90% of them will conform.
 - ESMAY displayed a zoning map and said the yellow areas would be affected.
 - Keri Craft said all of the neighborhood meeting minutes include discussion of character of neighborhood and how to protect what we have now. The overall character is what residents of each neighborhood define it as. Craft said her neighborhood meeting was held a year ago. Since then, they have been working with Connolly and Brotman on this amendment to protect the character of their neighborhood. They branched out to include all neighborhoods in town because all of us enjoy all in-town neighborhoods. Craft said

her neighborhood is not trying to impose their beliefs; they are trying to protect what exists today. She humbly asked that the Board place this on the ballot and let the voters decide.

- Chris Kennedy said this does not appear to look at future growth. As an architect of 35 years, this seems to be counter intuitive to what he would have thought to be the direction to take. There needs to be more thought in terms of each zone being more specifically identified for its uses. Was it a conscious decision to propose the same density potential for properties located within a mile of the center of town and those within 250-500'? How does this dovetail with the goals of the Master Plan? Height is more of a form base issue than a standard zoning. Kennedy said he feels this is a bit rushed in terms of the thought process. He does not see how it really benefits us over the next 50 years. He would rather see reduced coverages in the outlying areas than in his neighborhood. The bigger the land, the smaller the coverage when you're out in Etna.
 - CONNOLLY said this has nothing to do with density. Most of these properties can add a great deal to their dwellings. You are not going to add density to the "SR" zone. In "GR" it does not reflect the lot requirements at all, just the lot coverage. CONNOLLY said this is a desire to keep a little bit of green for aesthetics as well as ecological purposes, throughout the town.
 - Marilyn Denk cited Master Plan Core Principle 2 "*Respect, protect and strengthen the distinctive qualities of the urban and rural parts of Hanover: We should strive to sustain the present 3:1 urban/rural population ratio. We should enhance the vitality and small, college-town character of the urban area and its neighborhoods. Green space should be sustained as a background to the urban area. We should preserve the character of our rural areas and villages.*" She said in 2003, Hanover was already at 4:1 ratio. Hanover does not have a town park. That is part of the reasoning for not wanting to expand driveway and building coverages. As citizens of the community, we want to protect as much green space as we can.
- Kennedy said we should have a meeting in every neighborhood before we actually make changes that affect all of them.
 - ESMAY said we are moving in the direction of recognizing our neighborhoods as zones and not our present uses as a way of zoning. As we do that, we will look at these figures as they affect each of the neighborhoods.
- Kish said this will affect the West Wheelock corridor, an area already designated for increased use and density. A suggestion made at the recent plan charrette was to consider as much as 100% lot coverage in that area. Why are we going backwards to reduce coverage? West Wheelock and South Park Streets should be excluded from this amendment.
 - CONNOLLY said the 80% lot coverage currently allowed in those areas is excessive; 65% is more than sufficient right now. She said she predicts that by this time next year there will be a "GR-5" zone considered for the West Wheelock corridor.

ESMAY declared the public hearing closed.

It was moved by CONNOLLY, seconded by MAYOR, to put this on the warrant. SIM questioned the rationale behind the proposed coverage limits. He said they seem to have been ratcheted down to a point where there are a small number of non-conforming lots, but not too many. He questioned whether Brotman's continued calculations include outlying "GR" and "SR" districts. Brotman said she did not review the entire town. CARTER said it is time to let the residents make up their minds. It would be remiss of public officials not to let the towns

people speak. There being no further discussion, **THE BOARD VOTED FIVE IN FAVOR (Carter, Connolly, Esmay, Garipay, Mayor), ONE OPPOSED (Sim). THE MOTION CARRIED.**

OTHER BUSINESS:

Telecommunications facility application: The Board was invited to Staff Review and the Conservation Commission's site visit of a proposed telecommunications facility at 67 Three Mile Road. Both will be held February 10th; Staff Review at 1:30 PM in the Town Hall Boardroom; Site visit at 3:00 PM.

Planning & Zoning Department Budget Hearing: February 25th at 5:00 PM in the Town Hall Boardroom.

Next meeting: March 4th

Neighborhood Planning Parties: Lyme Road Village area party is tentatively scheduled for June 10th. Hanover Center residents are self-organizing. Their party should be before July 4th.

PlanNH people are wrapping up their report on the West Wheelock Street design charrette.

Conservation Commission subcommittee is working on wetland amendments, definition of agriculture and forestry and how to accommodate those uses, and generally how to deal with conserved property in subdivisions and site plans. Smith and Brotman attended a law lecture in Concord, hosted by the Municipal Association on agritourism. They will put together a memo to the Commission.

Distribution of meeting materials: CARTER expressed concern that information is not being distributed to all Board members.

New Planning Board Alternate: CARTER announced that Jon Criswell has been appointed by the Selectboard as a Planning Board Alternate. She hopes he will attend the March 4th meeting.

ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 10:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth Rivard