

# CHAPTER 8: HOUSING

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Town of Hanover offers a unique mix of employment and cultural opportunities, excellent public schools, public services and natural amenities. It is home to more than ten thousand residents including more than four thousand students at Dartmouth College. The attractiveness of the community to nonacademic residents, especially retirees combined with the housing needs of faculty, College staff, and students creates a tight housing market characterized by a low vacancy rate and high housing costs.

Single-family residential growth in Hanover has been dispersed throughout the town, some in remote locations. New subdivisions and the many single-family lots developed in the past decade lack neighborhood characteristics and are difficult to service with transit options. There has been little diversity in such single-family development.

Recent multiple unit residential development in Hanover has mostly been retirement, assisted living housing with several examples of planned residential developments for single-family units or attached condominiums. The principal exception has been the multiple unit residential complex at Park and Wheelock Streets, constructed by Dartmouth College for its faculty and staff. These patterns lend themselves to be served by transit and public water and sewer. (see Map 9-1)

Older residential neighborhoods near the downtown have remained stable and highly attractive to buyers, given their proximity to schools, business and employment and their appealing character.

The challenge for Hanover planners at this time is threefold:

- protect and enhance the stability and character of existing neighborhoods.
- encourage new housing development within transit, sidewalk, and water and sewer service areas.
- increase housing diversity in town.

## 2. COMMUNITY VALUES AND GOALS

The 1994 Survey of Residents yielded some interesting attitudes about the town's future residential development. Among those results are that:

- 55% of respondents believed that Hanover should guide residential growth by encouraging it in some places and discouraging it in others.
- 44% of respondents thought there was a need for more rental housing.
- 54% of respondents thought there was a need for more housing for low to moderate income families.
- 38% of respondents thought there was a need for more single family housing.
- 37% of respondents thought there was not a need for additional housing for the elderly and handicapped in contrast to the 36% who did think there was a need for more of this type of housing.

- 48% of respondents favored clustered subdivisions with reserved natural areas as the preferred pattern of residential development. Twenty-eight percent favored residential development in planned subdivisions on large individual lots. Twenty-five percent favored single-family development along existing public roads.

The Hanover real estate market reflects the tight supply of housing in town. Turnover is limited and rapid. There are very few rental units available. Frequently, unable to purchase existing stock, many people resort to new construction to meet their needs.

Housing in existing neighborhoods is highly valued by residents, especially that within the areas within walking distance of downtown or served by transit. The density, scale and architectural quality of the in-town neighborhoods all contribute to their value.

The *Hanover Affordable Housing Feasibility Study*, prepared by Hadfield Associates in July of 2001, analyzed Hanover's demographic, economic, and housing conditions in great detail, as well as focused on housing affordability issues. The recommendations of that study were accepted by the Selectboard which in September, 2001 appointed an Affordable Housing Commission to:

- Develop and recommend housing policies and regulations that would encourage permanently affordable housing;
- Promote affordable housing policies and identify Town resource that could assist in the effort to provide affordable housing;
- Explore, recommend and oversee partnerships with existing organizations such as Twin Pines Housing Trust and Habitat for Humanity; and
- Evaluate and report the effect of Town policies on affordable housing.

This action by the Selectboard and the mission of the Affordable Housing Commission are evidence of the Town's focus on addressing the issue of affordable housing for Hanover.

### **3. EXISTING RESOURCES**

Discussions of the factors that create the affordability gap in Hanover, population to be housed, household size and type, housing stock including housing for Dartmouth College and employees, housing costs and incomes relative to housing cost, follow.

#### **General Population**

The 2000 U.S. Census reports a 17.8% increase in the number of people including students living in Town over the last decade. The population of non-student residents grew by 23.6%. The total population increase of 1,638 people, including students, is one indication of the growth dynamic of the housing stock and the pressure growth exerts on it. As shown in Figure 8-1, the median age in Hanover is less than that of any of the surrounding communities due to the large student population which puts additional stress on the housing market.

The age of the population in Hanover, together with the increase in family income levels relative to those in the rest of the region, and the high turnover rate of Hanover home occupancy, all indicate that the Town's population is gradually changing toward an older and more affluent

population when compared to both Hanover's earlier demographic conditions and existing conditions in the other communities in the Upper Valley region;

- Hanover's non-student population growth of 23.6% during the 1990s increased the demand for housing and reducing the supply of vacant and seasonal units;
- Hanover's housing costs are not conducive to first-time home buying; the prime age group associated with first-time home buying (25-34 years of age) has been declining as a proportion of the total population;
- The 45-54 and older age groups have been increasing relative to the general population consistent with the national demographic trend and perhaps because this age group has access to the financial resources to live in Hanover; and
- Hanover family income levels have increased at rates commensurate with the rises in housing costs; however, it is likely that these incomes are not those of the same families, rather new families who can afford to live in Hanover.

Non-student population in group quarters has grown remarkably during the 1990's, with the expansion of nursing homes and more particularly assisted living and continuing care retirement facilities;

- The number of people in the 65-74-age group increased by 21%, reflecting the growing trend of providing residences aimed at the elderly, as well as the fact that nationally ours is an aging population.
- The population of residents 65 and over rose from just under 10% of the 1990 population to 13.6% in 2000, a substantially greater increase than has been the norm for the surrounding Upper Valley communities. Excluding students from the population, the 65-74 age group increased from 9.2% to 19.3%.

### **Household Size and Types**

General household characteristics and changes between 1990 and 2000 are as follows:

- Total households increased 22%, from 2,321 to 2,832;
- Family households (comprised of individuals related by blood, adoption, or marriage) increased 17.9%, from 1,493 to 1,761;
- Non-family households increased 29.3%, from 828 to 1,071;
- Individual householders living alone increased 32.5%, from 554 to 734;
- Average household size declined from 2.49 to 2.47 persons; and
- The number of people living in group quarters increased from 3,444 to 3,849, an increase of 11.8%;
- The resident student population also increased by 11.8% from 4,541 to 5,077; and
- The population in nursing homes, assisted living facilities, and continuing care retirement communities increased by 425% from 122 to 641. A substantial portion of this difference reflects the opening of Kendal at Hanover shortly after the 1990 Census was taken.

As might be expected with the presence of the Dartmouth College student population, the percentage of non-family households is higher in Hanover than it is in Lebanon and other surrounding communities. In addition, while it might be expected that the off-campus student population would increase the number of persons per unit resulting in overcrowding, the 2000 U.S.

Census figures do not substantiate this. As shown in Figure 8-1, while the average household size of renter occupied units (2.25 people) is higher than the corresponding average for Lebanon (2.00), it is consistent with that of other Upper Valley communities. This may be because the Hanover Zoning Ordinance allows no more than three unrelated individuals to inhabit a dwelling unit.

### **Housing Stock**

Hanover's housing stock has grown significantly over the last decade, both through new construction of dwellings and through the conversion of formerly vacant units, particularly non-seasonal vacant units, to full-time occupancy. The number of housing units increased by 14% (366) to 2,989 between 1990 and 2000. Of the 2,989 units existing in 2000, 2,832 are occupied and 157 are listed as vacant. Comparing these to the same figures from 1990 in which there were 2,623 units of which 2,321 were occupied and 302 vacant, it is evident that not only has there been growth in the housing stock but also more efficient use of the existing units. Of the units occupied in 2000, 1,869 (66%) are owner-occupied and 963 (34%) are renter-occupied. The vacancy rate for year-round owner-occupied units is 0.8% and for rental units the rate is 0.9%; both rates are extremely low.

Characteristics of Hanover housing reported in the 2000 U.S. Census are as follows:

- There are 2,136 single-family houses (71.5% of total housing units); 232 dwelling units (7.8% of total) are in buildings of five to nine dwelling units, whereas 209 units (7.0%) are in buildings of 10 to 19 units and 104 units (3.5%) are in building of more than 20 units;
- Hanover has six mobile home dwelling units;
- Ten percent of Hanover's housing stock was built in the 1990's while 25% of the housing stock has been built since 1980 and 42% since 1970; only 26% of Hanover's housing stock was built before 1940;
- Sixty-three percent of all Hanover households moved into their present dwelling in the 1990's (25% in 1999 and 2000, 23% between 1995 and 1998, and 15% between 1990 and 1994); 19% moved into their current dwelling in the 1980's, and 9% did so during the 1970's.
- Median number of rooms per dwelling unit is 6.5;
- Only nine dwelling units are in physically substandard condition (defined as lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities);
- Only thirty dwelling units have no telephone;
- Over 98% of housing units are occupied at a rate of one person or less per room.

Figure 8-2 shows that Hanover has a significantly higher proportion of rental housing than the Upper Valley region in general, with the exception of Lebanon, but about the same as the rest of Grafton County; this is not unexpected given the numbers of college and graduate students and the markedly high proportion of the population living in group quarters

Vacancy rates in other communities parallel Hanover for owner-occupied units, with the exception of Lyme, which shows an ownership vacancy rate of 2.5% (neighboring Orford is 2.1% and Piermont 2.4%). However, rentals are more available in Enfield (2%), Canaan (3.2%), and Lebanon (2.1%). Further north and east from Hanover, the availability of rentals increases, with Orford (2.1%), Piermont (3.7%), and Dorchester (10%). The vacancy rates, both for owner- and for rental-occupied housing units are much lower in Hanover and adjacent municipalities than for Grafton County as a whole. The Hanover vacancy rates for owner-occupied housing units is .8%

and for renter-occupied housing units the rate is .9%.

Although mobile homes have become the only recourse for many who seek home ownership but have limited incomes, only six of the Town of Hanover's 2989 housing units, 0.2%, are mobile homes. By contrast 4.3% (59) of Norwich's residences are mobile homes as are 4.2% (238) of the City of Lebanon's housing units. However, other communities have been even more open to mobile housing units, 447 (8.9%) of the Town of Hartford's housing units were mobile homes and fully 11.4% (246) of the units in the Town of Enfield were mobile homes.

A review of housing units in the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Region reveals that only 24 (equal to 0.8%, of Hanover's 2,989 housing units) are subsidized by state or federal funding. All of these housing units are located at Summer and Park Streets and are for elderly or disabled people. By comparison other nearby municipalities have provided both larger numbers and higher proportions of subsidized housing units: Lebanon hosts over 525 subsidized housing units, or approximately 10% of the its total housing units; Hartford, VT 303 units, or 6% of that town's housing stock; Newport 194 units; Charlestown 78 units; Enfield 55 units; and Canaan 24 units. In 2003, Town Meeting authorized the development under Town auspices of 60 affordable and workforce housing units in the Gile Tract.

***Housing for Students and College Employees*** In 2001, Dartmouth College had a total undergraduate enrollment of 4,400 students of whom 3,807 were enrolled in classes at the Hanover campus. Of these, 3,284 lived on campus, while 523 resided off-campus in the greater Hanover area. Over the next five to ten years, Dartmouth plans no growth in its undergraduate population. Current undergraduate targets are admitted classes of approximately 1070 each year, with a goal of no more than 3,800 undergraduates enrolled in courses in Hanover in any given term.

The College currently has 3,244 permanent undergraduate beds in Hanover, including those in residence halls, academic affinity houses, and College and privately-owned Greek organizations and undergraduate societies. In addition, the College has an additional 84 beds approved by the Town of Hanover for temporary use until August 2004. The College hopes to construct another 500 permanent beds for the area north of Maynard Street, which would allow the College to address life-safety issues and overcrowding in existing facilities, as well as to bring approximately 125 students back on-campus from off-campus rental housing. This would leave 350-400 students in rental housing located in Hanover and surrounding communities.

The total graduate and professional student population currently numbers 1,514. Of these, approximately 135 live in Tuck Business School dormitories, 29 in graduate student housing on the west side of North Park Street, 7 in other College-owned units close to campus in Hanover, and 131 in graduate housing units at Sagem Village in Lebanon. Construction of 82 additional graduate student beds on North Park Street is nearing completion, and the College is working with the City of Lebanon to permit the College to renovate 74 existing residential units, replace 57 existing units and add 73 units of graduate student housing at Sagem Village. The Tuck School would like to be able to house 70% of first year students on campus, and hopes to build an additional residence hall in the next ten years. Future College plans for residential units in the redevelopment of the South and Sargent blocks in downtown Hanover will include a number of new housing units, and a portion of these units may be available to graduate students as well. Today, even assuming that the units at the

permitting phase have been built, more than 1000 graduate and professional students need to find non-College housing in Hanover or adjoining communities.

The College's plans for new on-campus housing promises to ease the rental housing availability for non-students and to reduce upward pressures on rental rates. Currently, Dartmouth College does not have enough capacity to provide on-campus housing to every undergraduate student, or even to every undergraduate student who would wish to live on campus. Campus planning considerations have led to a commitment to provide significantly increased on-campus housing for off-campus undergraduate students over the next ten years by building new dormitories.

The College currently rents approximately 285 units of housing off-campus to faculty and staff. These units are located in apartments, houses, and duplexes which are scattered throughout Hanover, the vast majority within 1 ½ miles of the Dartmouth campus. The College also owns and rents four single-family homes in Lebanon. Because of this limited amount of rental housing, only a portion of which turns over each year the College is only able to provide housing to approximately 22-28% of the employees who apply for it. In order to try to accommodate new employees moving to the area to begin new jobs at the College, employee rental units are considered to be transitional housing and tenants are encouraged to only stay in College housing until they can find permanent residences elsewhere. Unfortunately, the shortage of available and affordable housing in the area (both rental and for-sale) makes it difficult for people to move out of College rental housing. Those tenants who do move are generally forced to relocate outside of Hanover.

In addition to providing rental housing, the College has constructed 55 single-family homes off Grasse Road. Twenty-three of these houses came to market in 2001 and applications to purchase all of them were filled by prospective buyers in just a few hours' time. Final sale prices in 2002 ranged between \$199,500 to \$384,000, with the average price being approximately \$291,000. The College also owns an undeveloped 72-acre tract on the other side of Grasse Road, which could provide a site for additional College employee housing.

Dartmouth owns other property in Hanover which might be suitable for development as high-density housing, including the 70-acre Sullivan/Gibson tracts (also known as Sandhill). The existing Rivercrest, Fletcher/ Chandler, and Burton Road housing areas might also be considered appropriate sites for re-development into higher density with a variety of modern housing units.

Students demands on the rental housing supply, not surprisingly for a College town, have placed severe limitations on the ability of non-student renters to be accommodated in Hanover's rental housing market.

### **Housing Costs**

All communities should provide a sufficient supply of quality housing to insure healthy families and a stable workforce; both are necessary for a sustainable economy. Hanover does not now have a sufficient supply of affordable housing for the workforce upon which the community depends. With careful forethought and planning, Hanover can progress toward this goal.

Housing costs in Hanover are significantly higher than in surrounding towns. The most

useful measure for comparing housing costs across communities and over time is median housing cost. In Hanover, average housing costs would be skewed by the relatively high prices of some newly constructed houses. Hanover's median housing cost continues to be significantly higher than that of other towns in the region.

A report entitled *Housing Profile for Hanover, New Hampshire*, prepared in July 1993 by Douglas J. Kennedy & Associates examined the median value of a home in Hanover and its commuter-shed, which is defined as a 20-mile radius of the town. In 1990 over 50% of the Town's housing stock exceeded \$200,000 in value, whereas the similar figure for the commuter-shed is 14%. In 1990 the median home value for the Town was \$215,476 compared to that commuter-shed figure of \$113,889, or almost twice as much.

The New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority (NHHFA) tabulated the median purchase prices of homes in New Hampshire communities from which Hanover employees are commuting and, for which a large enough sample was available for the year 2000 (Figure 8-3). For that year, the median purchase price of an existing single family home in Hanover (excluding condominiums) was \$310,500 compared with a median price for a single family home in the Hanover-Lebanon market area of \$122,500.

Affordability is generally defined as dwelling units for those households whose annual income is less than 80% of their county median income; and whose housing costs are no more than 30% of gross household income including rent or mortgage payments, utilities, taxes and insurance.

Related housing cost statistics reported in the 2000 U.S. Census are:

- The median value of an owner-occupied dwelling was \$262,200, reflecting an increase of 22% since 1990;
- The median household monthly mortgage payment was \$1,723;
- 82.6% of owner-occupant households paid less than 30% of their income on housing costs;
- The median monthly rent of a renter-occupied dwelling was \$857 (equal to \$381 per occupant); and
- 45% of renters paid more than 30% of their income on rent.

According to the Hanover Assessor's Office, from October of 2000 to September of 2001:

- There were 41 sales of single-family houses, with an average living area of 2,107 square feet, a median sales price of \$291,765, and an average sales price of \$318,965, or \$151 per square foot;
- There were 10 sales of condominiums, with an average living area of 975 square feet, with a median sales price of \$129,000, and an average sales price of \$153,846, or \$158 per square foot;
- The median sales price for all single-family homes and condominiums was \$270,000; and
- There were 11 sales of parcels of land, with an average parcel size of 11.08 acres, and an average sales price of \$103,444.

Hanover families and households enjoyed significantly higher incomes than those residing in surrounding towns, and even more significantly higher than those residing in Grafton County and in the state. Moreover, from 1990 to 2000 Hanover family income increased at a markedly greater rate than for families in the surrounding towns, the county, and the state. A wider differential exists between household and family incomes in Hanover than in other communities listed in Figure 8-4; this can be explained by the large percentage in Hanover of non-family and student households.

Many of the people for whom housing is needed in Hanover do not currently live in Hanover. There are many people of low and moderate incomes who currently work in Hanover and who would like to live in Hanover but are currently living in surrounding and outlying communities where the cost of housing is significantly lower. These people are a part of the regional population and would not therefore be reflected in the income data for the Town.

The Grafton County median household income in 1999 as shown in Figure 8-4 was \$41,962 while that in Hanover was \$72,470. It is important to note that the income of the people in towns in the commutershed, with the exceptions of Lyme and Norwich, from which Hanover draws the significant portion of its employees, is much closer to that of the County than the town.

A comparison of the increases in housing costs with increases in family income levels (Figure 8-5) shows that in general the incomes of Hanover residents have kept pace with the rise in housing costs in Hanover. The increase in the costs of lots in Hanover, however, outstripped the increase in housing costs as well as in income, indicating that housing costs will continue to rise relatively steeply. Coupled with the relatively high level of turnover in Hanover housing occupancy, it is arguable that increases in housing costs in Hanover may tend to drive out or inhibit the attractiveness of Hanover as a place to live for households at the lower reaches of the income spectrum; in other words, that the turnover results in replacement of housing occupants with ever higher incomes.

House prices in Hanover rose more sharply than family incomes in surrounding towns and in the county and state, indicating that increasingly the Hanover single-family houses are pricing out larger percentages of the regional population. Increases in Hanover rents have kept pace with increases in home ownership costs, and have been roughly comparable with increases in regional household incomes.

Moreover, evidence from surveying in connection with the *Hanover Affordable Housing Feasibility Study* (2002) indicates that the census figures for average monthly rent may be underreported: survey evidence indicates that two-bedroom apartment rents in the order of \$1200 per month and single-family house rents of \$2200 per month are more typical.

The Upper Valley economy is supported by a large number of service sector jobs, including many in Hanover, which frequently do not pay more than \$10 per hour. The U.S. Census reports income based on where an employee lives, not where the employee works; thus the census figures for Hanover family and household incomes can be misleading as to the types of jobs and income levels of persons employed in Hanover. This large service sector is in part due to the presence of the College and the Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center.



Of the two major employers in the area, 26% of Dartmouth College's employees and 13% of Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center's employees live in Hanover. Others come from a wide variety of residential locations, the principal ones shown in Figure 8-6.

One of the populations hit hardest by the housing crunch is single parent, head of households. These families frequently must survive on one income. In 1999, in Hanover, 99 housing units, representing 3.5% of the town's households, were occupied by single-parent head of households with dependent children under 18 years of age. The percentage of single-parent households in Hanover has been falling, at least since 1989 when these accounted for 4.0% of Hanover's housing units. This could be due to the lack of affordable housing for a single wage earner. By comparison, in 1996, 24% of New Hampshire's families with children were headed by a single parent.

### **Affordable Housing in Relation to Other Master Plan Goals**

There has been a historic inadequate supply of subsidized rental units and other forms of moderate-priced housing. It is a goal of the Town to increase such housing.

The "fair share" affordable housing model (described in the *Hanover Affordable Housing Feasibility Study*, 2001), which found that Hanover is deficient in affordable rental housing stock by 456 units, is not binding on the Town, and it does not neglect needs for affordable home ownership units. It does, however, point out the historically inadequate supply of subsidized rental units in Hanover. The lack of utilization in Hanover of alternative housing technologies and production techniques such as manufactured housing, modular housing, sweat-equity programs, cooperative housing, regulatory incentives, and employer-provided housing (other than the College which has been a notable practitioner).

The nature of Hanover's housing market makes the construction and operation of affordable or workforce housing especially challenging. The continued, and broader, provision of lower-cost housing by Dartmouth College for its faculty and staff should be encouraged and enabled. These programs can serve, too, as models for other large employers in Hanover and nearby parts of the Upper Valley. Otherwise, the development, by public or private entities, of affordable or workforce housing will need special attention by the Town and will often necessitate the use of public sector assets. These public sector assets could include various combinations of government funds, public lands, density bonuses (to reduce new land and land development costs per unit), public infrastructure improvements, property tax abatements, relaxation of code requirements, reduced interest rates for construction loans or mortgage financing, and other measures to reduce the net capital costs (land, site preparation, and building construction) or financing the cost of housing.

### **Partner Organizations**

Fortunately, the Town and its Affordable Housing Commission are not alone in recognizing the affordability gap or the challenges posed by such a tight housing market. The Twin Pines Housing Trust is a non-profit created in 1990 with the mission of building family and community stability by providing affordable housing in the Upper Valley area. Twin Pines has created or partnered with another organization to create 108 units of affordable housing in the Upper Valley, although none of those units is located in Hanover.

The Upper Valley Housing Coalition works to increase the supply of housing for the region's

workforce. Believing that there is an inextricable link between economic development, quality of life and an adequate supply of housing, the Coalition recognizes that the extreme shortage of housing in the Upper Valley threatens the strength of the regional economy and the high quality of life. The Coalition Steering Committee is composed of a mix of business, non-profit and institutional representatives. They have developed project endorsement guidelines which serve as a guide for developers in planning new projects and as an evaluation tool for reviewing a developer's request for the Coalition's support of a proposed project.

#### **4. NEEDS**

As it grows, Hanover should plan to provide a broad spectrum of affordable housing within the income ranges of the Hanover workforce.

Hanover planning efforts should focus on:

- creating more dense housing in and near the downtown within walking distance of the campus;
- directing all new affordable housing to the water and sewer service area; and
- creating an increased number of rental units to alleviate the tight rental market.

#### **5. POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Balance residential growth such that the population across the Town continues to be proportioned 25% in the rural area and 75% in the urban area as it is now.
- Protect the quality and character of existing neighborhoods by adopting zoning controls which reflect their existing density, scale and character.
- Permit new high density housing development in select parts of the municipal service area such as West Wheelock Street, Sand Hill, Dresden, Gile tract and Centerra North.
- Encourage clustered housing with associated protected open space within the municipal water, sewer and transit service area.
- Explore increasing the supply of rental housing units by permitting the creation of accessory units in owner-occupied single-family homes and within accessory buildings throughout Town.
- Support the College's program to build and to encourage on-campus housing for 90% of its undergraduate students, to provide more graduate student housing.
- Encourage the College to build on-campus housing for more than 90% of its undergraduate students.
- Encourage the College to plan for and construct additional graduate student housing prior to the expansion of any graduate program.
- Encourage the redevelopment of downtown properties with mixed high-density residential and commercial uses, including a wide diversity of housing types and costs, consistent with the income spectrum of its downtown workers.
- Work closely with the College and other large employers to develop housing projects that are logically integrated with existing development and that provide or are accessible to recreation or open space areas, and public transit.
- Provide incentives to housing developers for the inclusion of permanently affordable workforce housing in new developments.

- Encourage programs that ensure that affordable housing remains affordable for the lifetime of the housing units.
- Encourage the Town to participate in increasing the supply of affordable housing.
- Minimize living costs through high quality design, energy efficient construction, and proximity to employment.

**Figure 8-1 Selected Population and Household Statistics of Upper Valley Communities, 2000**

| Area            | Median Age of Population | Non-Family Households | Average Household Size | Average Family Size | Avg. Size of Owner-Occupied Units | Avg. Size of Renter-Occupied Units |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Grafton County  | 37.0                     | 11,332                | 2.38                   | 2.9                 | 2.51                              | 2.11                               |
| <b>Canaan</b>   | 37.7                     | 349                   | 2.59                   | 3                   | 2.64                              | 2.37                               |
| <b>Enfield</b>  | 38.3                     | 683                   | 2.33                   | 2.78                | 2.42                              | 2.07                               |
| <b>Grafton</b>  | 38.8                     | 149                   | 2.5                    | 3.01                | 2.51                              | 2.46                               |
| <b>Hanover</b>  | 22.8*                    | 1,071                 | 2.47                   | 2.96                | 2.59                              | 2.25                               |
| <b>Lebanon</b>  | 37.1                     | 2,322                 | 2.23                   | 2.87                | 2.5                               | 1.93                               |
| <b>Lyme</b>     | 42.6                     | 203                   | 2.46                   | 2.96                | 2.58                              | 1.95                               |
| <b>Orange</b>   | 38.3                     | 26                    | 2.69                   | 2.98                | 2.65                              | 3.5                                |
| <b>Orford</b>   | 40.4                     | 161                   | 2.32                   | 2.84                | 2.43                              | 1.89                               |
| <b>Piermont</b> | 40.8                     | 95                    | 2.41                   | 2.9                 | 2.41                              | 2.42                               |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

\*41.1 not counting college students

**Figure 8-2 Housing Stock - Selected Upper Valley Communities, 2000**

| Area            | General Quarters | Total Housing Units | Occupied Housing Units | Vacant Housing Units | For Seasonal or Occasional Use | Home-owner Vacancy Rate (%) | Rental Vacancy Rate (%) | Owner-Occupied Units | Owner-Occupied to Total Units (%) | Renter-Occupied Units |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Grafton County  | 6,388            | 43,729              | 31,598                 | 12,131               | 10,428                         | 2.0                         | 3.7                     | 21,677               | 68.6                              | 9,921                 |
| <b>Canaan</b>   | 0                | 1,588               | 1,279                  | 309                  | 239                            | 0.7                         | 3.2                     | 1,064                | 83.2                              | 215                   |
| <b>Enfield</b>  | 25               | 2,372               | 1,975                  | 397                  | 343                            | 0.8                         | 2.0                     | 1,426                | 72.2                              | 549                   |
| <b>Hanover</b>  | 3,849            | 2,989               | 2,832                  | 157                  | 111                            | 0.8                         | 0.9                     | 1,869                | 66.0                              | 963                   |
| <b>Lebanon</b>  | 290              | 5,707               | 5,500                  | 207                  | 52                             | 0.5                         | 2.1                     | 2,893                | 52.6                              | 2,607                 |
| <b>Lyme</b>     | 10               | 752                 | 678                    | 74                   | 44                             | 2.5                         | 0.8                     | 550                  | 81.1                              | 128                   |
| <b>Orange</b>   | 0                | 134                 | 111                    | 23                   | 21                             | 0.0                         | 0.0                     | 105                  | 94.6                              | 6                     |
| <b>Orford</b>   | 0                | 561                 | 470                    | 91                   | 66                             | 2.1                         | 2.1                     | 376                  | 80.0                              | 94                    |
| <b>Piermont</b> | 0                | 394                 | 294                    | 100                  | 85                             | 2.4                         | 3.7                     | 242                  | 82.3                              | 52                    |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

**Figure 8-3 Median Purchase Price for Single Family Primary Residences  
In Selected NH Municipalities, 2000**

| <b>Municipality/Area</b>               | <b>All Homes<br/>Median Purchase<br/>Price</b> | <b>Non-condominium<br/>Median Purchase<br/>Price</b> |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Hanover</b>                         | \$282,000                                      | \$310,500  |
| <b>Lebanon</b>                         | \$129,250                                      | \$134,200  |
| <b>Claremont</b>                       | \$77,000                                       | \$77,000   |
| <b>Grantham</b>                        | \$140,750                                      | \$148,750  |
| <b>Enfield</b>                         | \$111,000                                      | N/A  |
| <b>Canaan</b>                          | N/A  | N/A  |
| <b>Hanover-Lebanon Market<br/>Area</b> | \$120,000                                      | \$122,500  |

Source: New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority

**Figure 8-4 Comparative Median Family and Median Household Incomes**

| <b>Town</b>           | <b>1989<br/>Family<br/>Income*</b> | <b>1999<br/>Family<br/>Income</b> | <b>1989-2000<br/>increase</b> | <b>1989<br/>Household<br/>Income*</b> | <b>1999<br/>Household<br/>Income</b> | <b>1989-2000<br/>increase</b> |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Hanover</b>        | \$88,016                           | \$99,158                          | 12.6%                         | \$69,752                              | \$72,470                             | 3.89%                         |
| <b>Canaan</b>         | \$46,148                           | \$46,339                          | .41%                          | \$42,308                              | \$43,220                             | 2.15%                         |
| <b>Lebanon</b>        | \$54,761                           | \$52,133                          | -4.79%                        | \$43,305                              | \$42,185                             | -2.58%                        |
| <b>Lyme</b>           | \$67,957                           | \$64,531                          | -5.04%                        | \$56,701                              | \$57,250                             | .96%                          |
| <b>Enfield</b>        | \$51,939                           | \$53,631                          | 3.25%                         | \$45,592                              | \$47,990                             | 5.25%                         |
| <b>Norwich, VT</b>    | \$78,459                           | \$78,178                          | -.35%                         | \$56,675                              | \$66,000                             | 16.45%                        |
| <b>Grafton County</b> | \$47,697                           | \$50,424                          | 5.71%                         | \$40,407                              | \$41,962                             | 3.84%                         |
| <b>New Hampshire</b>  | \$55,948                           | \$57,575                          | 2.9%                          | \$48,826                              | \$49,467                             | 1.31%                         |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

\*converted to 1999 dollars using a factor of 1.344, the consumer price index

**Figure 8-5 Increases in Housing Costs and Family Incomes**

|                 | Hanover Lot Price | Hanover Median Value Owner - Occupied House | Hanover Median Monthly Rent | Hanover Median Family Income | Grafton Co. Median Family Income |
|-----------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>1990</b>     | \$58,000          | \$215,500                                   | \$621                       | \$65,488                     | \$35,489                         |
| <b>2000</b>     | \$103,444         | \$262,200*                                  | \$857                       | \$99,158                     | \$50,424                         |
| <b>Increase</b> | 78.4%             | 22.0%                                       | 38.0%                       | 51.4%                        | 42.1%                            |

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census and Town of Hanover Assessor's Office

\*2002 median cost for non-condominiums is \$407,760

**Figure 8-6 Residence of Hanover Employees**  
March and April 2001

| town              | College Employees(1) | DHMC Employees(2) |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Hanover</b>    | 26%                  | 13%               |
| <b>Lebanon</b>    | 16%                  | 27%               |
| <b>Hartford</b>   | 8%                   | 12%               |
| <b>Enfield</b>    | 6%                   | 11%               |
| <b>Norwich</b>    | 5%                   | 6%                |
| <b>Thetford</b>   | 5%                   | 2%                |
| <b>Lyme</b>       | 4%                   | 3%                |
| <b>Canaan</b>     | 3%                   | 5%                |
| <b>Grantham</b>   | 2%                   | 4%                |
| <b>Windsor</b>    | 2%                   | 3%                |
| <b>Plainfield</b> | 2%                   | 3%                |
| <b>Claremont</b>  | 1%                   | 5%                |
| <b>Newport</b>    | <1%                  | <1%               |

Sources:

1) Resource Systems Group on behalf of Dartmouth College

2) Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center, Director of Employment