

NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION & REGULAR MEETING FEBRUARY 12, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Dale Conly, Tom Cottrill, Kenneth McWilliams (Planner), Alternate Michele Holton, and Alternate Deirdre Sheerr-Gross.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Celeste Cook, Jeff Hollinger, Michael Doheny, Larry Ballin (Selectmen's Representative)

Chair Karen Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM. Chair Ebel asked Alternate Michele Holton to sit in for Celeste Cook and Alternate Deirdre Sheerr-Gross to sit in for Michael Doheny.

I. MASTER PLAN VISION CHAPTER

Chair Ebel opened the work session by ascertaining that all PB members present had received and reviewed the revised draft of the Master Plan Vision Chapter. Also present in the audience were D. J. Lavoie and Robert Lavoie, who were provided with a copy of the draft. Ken McWilliams advised that PB Member Cook had submitted written comments as had the Kearsarge Area Council on Aging (COA)

Mr. McWilliams described the approach he took in revising the draft Vision Chapter. He explained that the chapter had been written from the perspective of looking backward ten years hence. He advised that he had moved specific details to an Appendix and, as a result, the Vision Chapter was now a broad overview and only five pages long. Chair Ebel inquired about the format. She asked if the summary at the beginning of the Vision Chapter were to be considered the executive summary. Mr. McWilliams responded affirmatively, and advised that he had heard that directive from the Master Plan workshops. He said the chapter contained three parts: (1) where New London has been, (2) actions taken, and (3) an executive summary.

Chair Ebel said that she had thought the order would be to have a broad executive summary of the entire document and then a short summary paragraph at the beginning of each section, like a brief paragraph summarizing the vision for the Utilities chapter with the details in the appendix. PB Member Conly concurred. PB Member Sheerr-Gross also concurred and suggested that the brief summary of each subject could be formatted as bullets with the details presented in an appendix. Chair Ebel opined that there should be a brief paragraph to get the general concepts across. Mr. McWilliams said that he had tried to take the main points into consideration, including them in the executive summary in the draft presented to the PB for review.

PB Member Cottrill suggested, as an example, that there could be a bullet for the New London Hospital and everything about the hospital could be included under that bullet; likewise there could be a bullet for Colby-Sawyer College and everything related to the college could be included under that bullet. PB Member Conly added that a third bullet could be the Kearsarge Regional School District. PB Member Sheerr-Gross recommended a broad summary statement, e.g., the Town of New London works cooperatively with the Kearsarge Regional School District, Colby-Sawyer College, New London Hospital, and many other organizations. Resident R. Lavoie opined that the summary paragraphs should be general statements.

PB Member Sheer-Gross opined that the workshop attendees wanted their ideas to be reflected in the Vision Chapter so their ideas wouldn't be lost before implementation of the Master Plan. Resident R. Lavoie opined that specific ideas should not be presented in the front of the document that should address issues, i.e., raise questions in a general way. He agreed that it was important to retain constructive ideas, but he said that they did not need to be in the front of the document. PB Member Cottrill opined that items 8-18 could become a general statement.

Chair Ebel opined that the vision statement should contain an overall executive summary and that there should be an introductory paragraph or two for each section. She said this was what she believed was the outcome of the workshop discussion. Mr. McWilliams said that he did not get that from the meeting. PB Member Sheer-Gross agreed that that idea came out of the workshops. Mr. McWilliams said that he had tried not to be specific in the vision statement. Chair Ebel made suggestions for the paragraphs. Ms Sheer-Gross suggested even broader statements. Chair Ebel said that putting details in an appendix would be fine. She recommended putting the categories up front with a global statement about each category. She opined that that format was what workshop attendees wanted.

Mr. McWilliams reminded the PB that the next revision would be the third and final revision before the final draft and that the PB would not review it again until the end of the Master Plan process. He said that, in his

opinion, under his contract anything more would require additional compensation. The PB began its page by page review of the January 28, 2008 draft.

Page 1:

Paragraph 3, line 4: Replace “also be” with “make it”.

Paragraph 4, line 6: Replace “off” with “of” (D. J. Lavoie)

Page 3:

Paragraph 1, lines 1 and 2: Replace “, as new homes and new roads” with “and as new homes and roads” (Chair Ebel)

Paragraph 1, line 7: Add pollution to “more congested roads, and more impervious surfaces”. Change “accelerated water run-off” to “accelerated polluted water run-off” (McWilliams). PB Member Conly recommended adding that it was a particular concern in New London because of the town’s topography.

Paragraph 1, lines 7 and 8: Chair Ebel recommended re-ordering the list so that water resources would come first and wildlife would be last. R. Lavoie opined that character of the community should be first.

Paragraph 2, line 4: PB Member Cottrill recommended replacing “The pending widening of Interstate 93 will...” with “In anticipation of the widening of Interstate 93 that will...”.

Paragraph 2, line 5: Chair Ebel recommended deleting “So, rather than wish it away, ...”. Replace “it” with “the impending growth”.

Paragraph 2, lines 6 and 7: Replace “guide the future” with “guide New London’s future” and delete “of the community”. (Ebel)

Paragraph 3, line 11: Insert “and commercial” between “residential” and “growth”. (Cottrill)

Paragraph 3, lines 12 and 13: Replace “homes they” with “residential development there”. (Ebel)

Paragraph 3: PB Member Cottrill said that the paragraph was confusing because of the statement that workshop participants were asked to work through three exercises, but the three were not clearly identified. Chair Ebel agreed. PB Member Cottrill recommended that in the third from the last sentence, “In another exercise” be replaced by “In a second exercise” and that “And finally” in the last sentence be replaced by “In a third exercise”.

Paragraph 3, last two lines: Chair Ebel recommended inserting “current and future” between “their” and “concerns” and deleting everything after “concerns”.

Paragraph 3: Chair Ebel recommended making the paragraph shorter. R. Lavoie suggested creating sub-paragraphs. Mr. McWilliams replied that he would need to re-work the paragraph.

Page 4

Paragraph 2: Chair Ebel opined that the paragraph was too informal. She recommended replacing “The ideas were many!” with “There were many good suggestions.” Likewise, in line 4, she recommended replacing “lots” with “many”. She stated that Mr. McWilliams might want to re-organize the paragraph. She recommended deleting the final sentence.

SUMMARY VISION STATEMENT – A REPORT FROM THE FUTURE.

PB Member Sheer-Gross recommended including 2020 in the title, e.g., Summary 2020 Vision Statement.

PB Member Conly opined that the introductory paragraph was a really good summary, and he would like to see a similar paragraph for each topic.

Paragraph 3, line 1: Enclose “from the future” in quotation marks.

Paragraph 3, lines 3 and 4: Delete the third sentence. Replace “So, it is a report not of what is, but rather of” with “It is a report of what we hope will be in place in 2020.” (Cottrill)

PB Member Cottrill said that he was confused by the paragraph and couldn’t figure out if it described things that had been done or things that needed to be done. He said that he had drafted a version in which he had changed the tense from past to present, and he read his version to the PB. Ken McWilliams requested a copy, which Mr. Cottrill gave him.

PB Member Cottrill recommended prefacing each bullet with “In 2020”.

Bullet 2: PB Member Holton asked if the general tenor of the workshops was to keep development in the villages. R. Lavoie suggested replacing “minimal”.

Bullet 3: Replace “with public trails through the use of the Conservation Development approach to land development” with “including public trails, focusing on natural resources”. Mr. McWilliams suggested that the bullet could describe conservation development without using upper case to identify it. Chair Ebel suggested that it could be defined in the appendix. R. Lavoie asked if it could be defined in one sentence. Mr. McWilliams responded that conservation development was planning around natural resources on properties and identifying where on the properties development would be possible with interlinking trails and open space between properties. Following discussion, Mr. McWilliams said that he would re-phrase the bullet without using the term “Conservation Development” and make similar revisions elsewhere in the document.

PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked if the definition of terms, such as LID (Low Impact Development), should be right up front. R. Lavoie asked why not have a paragraph right at the beginning containing definitions.

Bullet 4: Replace “become a” with “become an increasingly”

Bullet 5: Delete “have been built to” in the first sentence. Change “has been” to “is” in the second sentence.

Bullet 6: Replace “has remained” with “remains” and insert “historic” as well as natural resources. Chair Ebel suggested deleting the bullet. Mr. McWilliams said that he wanted to keep the bullet, but eliminate the “historic” reference.

Bullet 7: Change “has continued” to “continues”. PB Member Holton suggested adding technology to the list. Chair Ebel responded that there should be a separate bullet regarding technology.

Bullet 8: Change “town has continued” to “New London continues”. Chair Ebel asked to what “outside organizations” referred. Mr. McWilliams gave as examples the Lake Sunapee Protective Association, the Ausbon Sargent Land Preservation Trust, the New London-Springfield Water System Precinct, Sunapee Waste Water Treatment Plant. Chair Ebel suggested “including area towns, organizations, and institutions”.

Bullet 9: Change “has worked” to “works”.

Bullet 10: Replace “have made” with “continues to make”.

Bullet 11: Replace “has created” with “supports”. Change “to create a sustainable” to “to maintain a sustainable”. (D. Lavoie) PB Member Cottrill opined that the bullet about economic growth seemed to “stick out”. He asked what was now in place. Ken McWilliams responded that he and Town Administrator Jessie Levine had met with a state economic development group that works with towns. Mr. McWilliams also advised that the workshop comments included reference to a high technology development park. PB Member Conly said that the town could adopt tax policies to support economic growth.

Bullet 12: Replace “has reached out to” to “cooperates with”. Insert “a variety of planning and” between “on” and “economic” in the second line.

Bullet 13: Replace “has continued to support” to “continues to strongly support”. (Ebel)

Bullet 14: Change “has continued” to “continues”. Insert “and recreational” after “cultural”. (Ebel)

Bullet 15: Replace “has continued” with “continues to strongly support”. (Ebel)

Bullet 16: Change “has supported” to “supports”. Chair Ebel recommended including the town’s support of recycling efforts. PB Member Sheerr-Gross suggested “sustainable, environmentally-friendly practices to be used by all New London citizens”.

Bullet 17: Change “has supported” to “supports”. Insert “renovations,” after “building” and before “siting” in line 2. Chair Ebel questioned the reference to “Green Building Practices”. She wondered if the term would be understood. Mr. McWilliams responded that it would not be necessary to use the term; rather, the practices could be described. Chair Ebel opined that the practices should extend beyond new buildings and should also apply to renovations.

New Bullet: Chair Ebel recommended that a bullet be added regarding the environment. PB Member Sheerr-Gross reiterated her statement regarding sustainable, environmentally-friendly practices to be used by all New London citizens.

New Bullet: Chair Ebel recommended that a bullet be added to the effect that New London’s continues to encourage and support local agriculture and preservation of farmland.

New Bullet: Chair Ebel recommended that a bullet be added that New London continues to employ leading-edge, innovative planning in land development to preserve and sustain the environment. R. Lavoie opined that it could be included in the introductory paragraph.

New Bullet: PB Member Sheerr-Gross recommended that a bullet be added regarding New London’s support of education for all ages.

New Bullet: Chair Ebel recommended that a bullet be added regarding technology.

Community Facilities & Services

Page 6, Paragraph 2: Change “enrolments” to “enrollments”.

Page 6, Paragraph 6: In line 2, replace “to” with “for”. In line 4, insert “in the amount and types of” before “recycled materials”. Chair Ebel recommended including composting in the paragraph.

Page 6, Paragraph 7: Chair Ebel recommended inserting “and electronic waste” after “hazardous waste”.

Page 7, Paragraph 8: Replace “expended” with “increased”. Add “and accommodate increases in population” at the end of the sentence.

Page 7, Paragraph 9: Add child care to list of services added.

Page 7, Paragraph 10: Correct “Adult-In-Learning” to “Adventures in Learning”.

Page 7, Paragraph 11 PB Member Cottrill recommended that the paragraph be deleted, and all agreed.

Page 7, Paragraph 12: PB Member Cottrill recommended removing the reference to the Kearsarge Regional School District as that would seem to limit opportunities. Chair Ebel opined that the paragraph should encompass all New London students. The new language would state “New London continues to strive to maximize educational experiences of students”.

Page 7, Paragraphs 13 & 14: Chair Ebel opined that paragraphs 13 and 14 could be combined. PB Member Cottrill added that paragraph 8 could also be combined with 13 and 14.

Page 7, Paragraph 15: Chair Ebel recommended that paragraph 15 be combined with paragraphs 8, 13, and 14.

Page 7, Paragraph 18: Chair Ebel suggested that paragraph 18 could be combined with paragraphs 8, 13, 14, and 15. PB Member Sheerr-Gross disagreed. She said that she liked highlighting the contributions made by volunteers. PB members decided to make no changes in paragraph 18.

Page 7, Paragraph 20: PB Member Cottrill noted that including the Kearsarge Region (sic) School District would leave out Sunapee. Chair Ebel recommended inserting "area" before "towns" and deleting "in the Kearsarge Region School District".

Page 8, Paragraph 21: Correct the name of Lake Sunapee Region Visiting Nurse Association.

Page 8, Paragraphs 22 & 23: Chair Ebel recommended that both paragraphs be deleted. All agreed.

Recreation

Page 8, Paragraph 3: It was noted that the paragraph began with a sentence fragment. Mr. McWilliams said that he would fix it.

Page 8, Paragraphs 5, 6, & 7: Chair Ebel opined that these three items could be combined.

APPENDIX

Chair Ebel recommended adding an introductory paragraph containing the definitions of uncommon terms. PB Member Cottrill said that it should remind the reader that the Vision Statement is written about the state of the town in 2020.

Chair Ebel recommended that the PB take a break in the review of the Master Plan Vision Statement.

II. HOUSING & CONSERVATION PLANNING PROGRAM

Chair Ebel called the PB's attention to the February 12, 2008 Memo from Ken McWilliams regarding a grant program announced on February 8, 2008 by the New Hampshire Office of Energy & Planning (OEP). She advised that Town Administrator Jessie Levine and Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley would be available to help with the application if the PB were to decide to submit an application.

Ken McWilliams briefly described the program and reviewed his memo. He advised that for Planning Stage 1 the NLPB was only missing some of the mapping items and a build-out analysis. He opined that the mapping of Riparian Areas could be generated off of GIS maps.

Chair Ebel said that she was concerned about the timing for submission of grant applications relative to work on the Master Plan. She said that she was seeking consensus from the PB regarding whether or not to pursue a grant. PB Member Cottrill asked who would do the work. He asked if Mr. McWilliams would do the paperwork. Mr. McWilliams replied that he would think that he would be consulted. He said that there really hadn't been any discussion about who would do the work. Chair Ebel said that her understanding was that Ms Levine and Mr. Stanley would prepare the grant application in consultation with Mr. McWilliams if the PB decided to go forward with it. Chair Ebel observed that the grants could only be done in phases. Mr. McWilliams said that he foresaw it as an annual event. He said that all towns would be competing for the same dollars. He added that this was the first money for planning that the state had made available in years.

Following discussion, Chair Ebel said that she would tell Town Administrator Levine that the PB would be interested in submitting a grant application. PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked how it might be possible to move New London into an advanced level (higher planning stage) in order to minimize competition for funds. She opined that the grant was good money. She asked, if Ms Levine and Mr. Stanley could not do the work, how might the PB advance New London's position.

Mr. McWilliams advised that he did not know if the OEP would allow funds budgeted for the Master Plan to be used as a match or not.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. The MINUTES of the JANUARY 29, 2008 meeting were APPROVED, as amended.
- B. NEXT MASTER PLAN WORK SESSION: Ken McWilliams provided the PB with two documents: (1) The results from the 1996 New London Community Survey. He advised that questions that the PB might want to carry over had been identified in bold type. (2) Suggested New Community Survey Questions.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. McWilliams if he was going to circulate a draft with the summary paragraphs for each section before the next meeting. Mr. McWilliams reiterated that he would revise the chapter for a third time after getting the PB's comments and that the PB would not have another chance to look at it until the end of the Master Plan process. He opined that anything more would require additional compensation under his contract.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **9:50 PM**.

Respectfully submitted,
Judith P. Condict, Recording Secretary
New London Planning Board

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____