

**Planning Board
Board Room, Municipal Building – 7:30 pm
April 22, 2008**

In attendance:

Members: Nancy Collier, Judith, Esmay, Jim Hornig, Michael Mayor, Kate Connolly

Alternates: Joan Garipay, Mike Hingston

Selectmen's Alternate: Bill Baschnagel

Staff: Vicki Smith, Jonathan Edwards

Others: See attached sheet

1. Concept Plan Review for two minor subdivisions on land owned by John & Lise Richardson located at 97 Dogford Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 62, and 81 Dogford Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 61, in the "RR" zoning district.

John & Lise Richardson presented their concept plan to subdivide the last 2 working farms in Hanover. They indicated the location of their existing home and two alternative proposals for a second home on the other farm. One proposal depicted a house site along Dogford Road. The other involved the creation of an interior lot, set back from the road, conserving as much farm land as possible. Road frontage for the interior lot proposal would be provided by a private drive off of Wolfeboro Road. Mr. Richardson said they had no intention of building a second home at this time, but wanted to be sure the potential to build one would continue in perpetuity. The Richardsons reported about their work with the Upper Valley Land Trust (UVLT) on conservation easement.

CONNOLLY pointed out that Wolfeboro Road was a Class VI Road. The Richardsons would need approval from the Board of Selectmen to use it to provide access to the proposed interior lot. COLLIER asked the Richardsons to explain their intended use of Wolfeboro Road and to speak to the importance of protecting the agricultural use as part of their application submittal.

HINGSTON suggested the Richardsons seek legal advise about whether the road construction would have to occur to effect the vesting of the subdivisions.

2. Discussion of possible amendments to the Site Plan Regulations

The Board reviewed Gabe Zoerheide's Draft of Proposed Amendments for Site Plan Review Regulations, dated April 15, 2008, and made the following comments/suggestions:

[Mr. Zoerheide is the Transportation Director for the Upper Valley Transportation Management Association.]

- Changing 5f to read, “A description of the proximity of the project to public transit *and provision of same* and other non-single-occupant-vehicle facilities;”
- Change 4ci to read, “A PTDM Plan is non-compliant when the vacancy rate is less than 100% of the approved rate and/or when the Planning Board deems that the objectives of *these regulations or of* the PTDM Plan are not being met...”
- Clarify the description of the vacancy rate, rather than in terms of 100%.
- Clarify the goal: to reduce the number of cars (single-occupancy) and where they travel
- Add a new paragraph to 3c to specifically allow the Planning Board to place conditions on the PTDM plan approval to ensure that the goals and objectives of the PTDM provisions are met. Mention examples of conditions that could be imposed, such as requiring applicants to set aside land for peripheral parking.
- Address compliance/enforcement concerns (obtaining required status reports, what would happen if an applicant could not afford to provide peripheral parking when plans fail, etc.) Provide sanctions to deem plans non-compliant.
- Language should be strong enough to ensure that the proposed plans will work.
- Clarify what the “20%” refers to in K2cii. “Number of TDM Participants, generally not to exceed **20%** of the total number of parking users, as determined by the Planning Board.”
- Consider not limiting the number of employees that may participate or the number of parking spaces that may be located elsewhere.

The Board agreed to continue this discussion and review Vicki Smith’s, Changes in the Threshold for Projects Requiring Site Plan Review, dated April 16, 2008, to June 10, 2008.

3. Consideration of re-constituting a group to work on rural planning concerns (Continuation from January 15, 2008 public meeting)

COLLIER said the charter to the most recent rural study group was to focus on the Master Plan and look at moderate and high-resource lands (steep slopes, hilltops and ridgelines, and agricultural lands). Mr. Edwards asked to recognize the efforts of Nancy Cole, Iain Sim, Joyce Noll, Ruth Hupart and Jason Hurd on the latest works.

COLLIER advised of three letters the Board received on this topic from Anne Crow, Elaine Bent, and Dave Cioffi. COLLIER read into the record the letters from Mrs. Bent and Mr. Cioffi. She said an effort had been made relative to Mrs. Bent’s improved mapping request. A GIS committee had commenced.

HORNIG said the goals of the rural planning group were extremely important to pursue. He suggested the overall sense of what occurred at the January meeting did not reflect what was most likely the consensus of the people in attendance. Mr. Sim agreed stating that the

January meeting should not be taken as being the place where a decision was made to act no further. That action should be reserved for Town Meeting. Mr. Sim said the January meeting helped to highlight deficiencies in the data, provide feedback, and indicate what still needs to be done. He applauded the Board's efforts to keep this going.

HORNIG spoke in opposition to Mr. Cioffi's suggestion that the Town purchase the lands identified for preservation. HORNIG said he supported a major program of land acquisition, but those purchases should be targeted toward large tracts of particularly vulnerable lands, not segments of steep slopes or ridgelines. MAYOR concurred stating that Mr. Cioffi's point of view suggests that preservation must be limited to a process of purchasing private lands for the benefit of the private landowner. MAYOR said the record needs to be clear in response to Mr. Cioffi's vigorous assertion that there are no workable strategies to pursue. Part of those strategies is to reconstitute the rural study group. HORNIG recommended proceeding more carefully on steep slopes and ridgelines, without further consideration of agricultural lands.

GARIPAY suggested there be more flexibility, more discretion by the Board, to allow things to happen that are perhaps already in the regulations.

ESMAY asked how much of an impediment the Town's inability to generate maps with some kind of particularity would be to continued work. Mr. Edwards suggested taking a map-less approach and relying on verbal descriptions.

HINGSTON suggested breaking out the "RR" district to provide clarity. He questioned how much more information a rural study group could provide of the three areas of interest already reviewed at length (steep slopes, ridgelines, agricultural soils). MAYOR said breaking out the "RR" district would get entangled with the issue of respecting property rights. He suggested improving their approach to better facilitating things like the establishment of conservation easements.

BASCHNAGEL suggested assembling a new group of people to focus on preserving the rural character of the larger areas, understanding what "rural character" means, and facilitating a process to preserve what little is left. He encouraged the group to think in more positive terms of projected outcomes.

COLLIER recapped the charge to a new rural study group: implementation of protection of hilltops and steep slopes, and look at innovative development/regulatory design. MAYOR said the Master Plan calls for a balance between in-town and out-of-town growth. If that is going to be managed, they must consider a more broad perspective. HINGSTON suggested staff work on the implementation language. COLLIER asked that they describe the Board's vision and set policy statements to go with it. Ms. Smith asked the Board to think about the process and how to constitute a new group. Things must be done differently. The group should be more accessible to different people. A female speaker from the audience suggested involving more Etna residents in the process. Joyce Noll defended the efforts of the last rural study group to increase participation opportunities and involve people from the rural areas. She said their work was valuable and was supported by many.

The Board agreed to continue this discussion to the second week of June.

4. Approval of Minutes: Review of the minutes was postponed.

5. Other Business: None

6. Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Rivard
P&Z Administrative Assistant