

**APPROVED**

August 11, 2009

Planning Board – Master Plan Work Session

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Cottrill (Chair), Tina Helm (Board of Selectmen Representative), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), Karen Ebel, Michele Holton

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Michael Doheny (Secretary), Jeff Hollinger (Vice-Chair), Deirdre Sheerr-Gross, John Tilley (Alternates)

**ALSO PRESENT:** Peter Stanley (Zoning Board Administrator), Ken McWilliams (Town Planner)

**1. Kearsarge Regional School District - Public Hearing****Non-binding Site Plan Review of a Proposal to Reuse the Former Middle School Building & Site (Tax Map 73, Lot 76)**

Chair Cottrill called the meeting to order at 7pm. Representing the Kearsarge Regional School District was Mr. Dan Noyes. He handed out a plan of the building and explained where they would like to have certain offices, classrooms and programs. Included in the plan is a Parent Info Center for the James House Preschool, a Culinary Arts program, (currently at the High School in Sutton), some professional development classrooms, and the SAU offices. Mr. Noyes explained that this plan does not include use of, or upgrade to the 1941 building (classrooms/gym). For the rest of the facility, the scope of the work for this project is a local area network for computer networking and a sprinkler system as required by the fire department. This sprinkler system will not be tied directly to the town water system for several years, but will include a hook-up (building hydrant) for a fire truck (water pumper) to attach the sprinkler system to a live fire hydrant upon arrival to the site. Mr. Noyes also mentioned that the school board may choose to sell the current SAU building.

Mr. McWilliams said that he had attended the Department Head meeting earlier in the day. Regarding these plans, there were some comments that should be brought forth: From Jay Lyon, Fire Chief, who said that if there were to be a wood-fire boiler installed, as had been mentioned earlier, a rear access roadway would have to be added to complete a perimeter driveway around the entire building for fire truck and emergency access. Also, if parents with children were going to use the Parent Info Center, a second means of egress must be added to that room. There is also a need for more exit signs and lighting within the building.

And from Richard Lee, Public Works Director, who said the school district may need to study the traffic flow with the current pattern and decide if it should be changed to allow for any greater impact. He suggested looking at the plans that the Kearsarge Community Center (KCC) had come up with when they were looking into using the building. He also suggested the school board consider an entrance from Main Street, as problems may arise as it is set now. Mr. Lee also suggested coordinating the scheduling of activities as to not overwhelm the available parking on site. There was also some discussion as to the future use of the old SAU office. It was Mr. Lee's belief that the district should try and retain the building so that they could make use of the property in the future.

Peter Stanley noted that the school is not subject to town regulations, but if there were a town entity or group using the space, they would be subject to the regulations of the town. He also said that any future demolition of parts of the existing building would need to be coordinated with the Public Works Department.

Fred Downey, meeting attendee and resident, had some questions. He wondered about the decision to use the building for educational purposes and why they felt that the proposed use was considered the best use. Mr. Downey felt that it would be a unique opportunity to use it as a community center. In the past they had worked to create such a center which would increase quality of life in town. He opined that they should consider more fully what the options are and how the building could be used more constructively for

everyone, of all ages, in the community. Mr. Downey was also concerned with possible demolition to parts of the building.

Mr. Noyes responded, saying that the demo area they have in mind is the lower-level (8<sup>th</sup> grade wing). There have been many problems with that section over the years, mainly with flooding. The other area sited for possible demolition is the gymnasium in the 1941 section of the building. There may be some structural concerns in that area, but Mr. Noyes stressed that before any demolition to the old gym, an engineer would be consulted to make sure it was necessary.

Mr. Noyes said that in the past several years, there had been much discussion to lease to the Kearsarge Community Center the space of the 1941 section, the old gym and part of the cafeteria, some of which would be used for a performing arts center. Mr. Noyes went on to suggest that Mr. Downey get an answer on the rest of his questions from the Superintendent, as he, himself, is mostly involved with the actual building aspects of the project and was not prepared or authorized to answer questions regarding the educational goals and decisions of the space.

Mr. Downey asked what the time schedule was regarding the transfer of the SAU office to the building. Mr. Noyes said that they anticipated the move happening sometime during Christmas Break 2009. He indicated that the projects currently being proposed should be completed in early December.

Mr. Downey asked if taxpayer approval was required for any alterations with the building. Mr. Noyes answered in the negative, but went on to say that he did not really have a complete knowledge. Peter Stanley said that money that is appropriated by the town must be approved by the taxpayers, and that the school board has generally been given approval for these projects.

Paula and Leigh Henderson, residents, arrived at 7:13pm and asked for a recap of the meeting, as they were unable to find location of the meeting. Mr. Noyes gave a review of their plans. Mrs. Henderson asked why the Kearsarge Community Center (KCC) was not going to happen. Mr. Noyes said that the KCC backed out because of finances. Mr. Downey added that it wasn't just about the finances, but a question of sustainability to keep the building maintained.

Resident, Lee Morse, asked if it was true that the site plan review would not be necessary for these projects. He asked if the only thing they needed to do was to work with the Fire Department directly to get their project done. Mr. Cottrill said that as long as it is education based, the role of the Planning Board is advisory only and that the school board is not be required to submit to a full site plan review.

Michelle Holton asked if there was any thought to doing some of these things at the new middle school instead of the old middle school. She said that the new middle school should have a lot of empty space, as it was built for an 800 student enrollment and the current enrollment was about half that, at around 400+/- students. Ms. Holton asked how much square footage the SAU office would require. Mr. Noyes said the use of the new building was not considered for these programs, as they are currently looking at what to do with the old building. He also indicated that even though enrollment was not high at the new middle school, most of the space is being utilized.

Ms. Holton asked if the professional development center would be for students, teachers or the community. Mr. Noyes said that it would be for anyone who wanted to utilize its services. He said that it is a community building and would be available for the community to use.

Bob Lavoie asked if the proposed sprinkler system would be a temporary set-up. Mr. Noyes answered in the affirmative and noted that there would be four phases to be completed over the next four years ultimately resulting in a direct connection to the town water main and a complete sprinkler system in the building.

Mr. Downey asked what the cost would be to refurbish the current space where the SAU would be relocated. Mr. Noyes said that they would be spending very little and would be looking for volunteers over

the holiday break to help with the move. Mr. Noyes emphasized that nothing substantial would be done to the rooms; only painting and cleaning up.

Chair Cottrill asked when the fire system would be operational. Mr. Noyes said that it was their hope to have the first phase completed in early to mid December. Upon fire alarm activation, a fire truck would be hooked up to a hydrant and to the school. This system has been approved by the Fire Department.

Mrs. Henderson said that when the controversy was brought about concerning what to do with the old middle school, everyone complained about the building and “tore it apart.” She wanted to know why, if the building was such dire condition and in need of major repairs just to operate and function as an educational facility, (why) is it that it now only needs to be painted and sprinklered before other offices and a culinary arts program can be ready to go in? Mr. Noyes said that he couldn’t comment on this. He felt that the building was salvageable for the community.

Michelle Holton said that the town was told that the building was falling apart and was unhealthy for the children, but now they are saying that it is OK for the town to use. It was once described as unusable, but is now being promoted as usable. She cautioned the school board to act very carefully because people could be confused. She said this subject is a very sensitive one, and has fragmented the town in some ways. Mr. Noyes said that he was not employed by the District when all of the discussions over the old building occurred, and said that he couldn’t provide any information on this matter.

Mr. Lavoie asked if it was possible to get someone to come to a meeting to answer the questions that Mr. Noyes was unable to answer. Chair Cottrill interjected by saying that the purpose of this hearing is to consider the proposed plans for the building from the perspective of the PB. He asked that all move the discussion towards the building plans and traffic patterns that had been proposed. He suggested that perhaps the Board of Selectmen could submit a letter of interest to the school board to seek answers to such questions however, Tina Helm said she wasn’t sure that the Board of Selectmen would have jurisdiction over any of these matters. Peter Stanley said that they do have jurisdiction over building permit, which had already been granted for this project.

Mr. Downey said that it would be good to have the town of New London work with the school board and maybe some non-profits to find out how the building could best be used. He said that they should collectively come together as a community to figure out how to use the property. Ms. Helm said that she would talk to the Board of Selectmen about the matter.

Regarding Mr. Downey’s question about demolition to parts of the building, Mr. Noyes explained that there would be much evaluation done of the building before any demolition was done. He said that there were parts of the building that have significant importance to the community.

Michele Holton asked Mr. Noyes if he would ask the school board if they would consider allowing a Citizens Advisory Committee to sit in on the meetings so the facility and the use of it could be worked on together. Mr. Morse said that someone from each town should be a part of any committee such as this. He reminded everyone that it is a seven-town building. Everyone agreed.

Peter Stanley stressed that unoccupied and unused, the building would become a derelict in a very short amount of time. The fact that they are going to be using it for something, will keep it from being a problem later. To use it at all in the future, someone needs to be doing something with it now. Whether or not it is what the building should be used for in the future, it is a practical use for it now.

Chair Cottrill asked how many staff members would be using the SAU offices in the proposed space. Mr. Noyes said between 14-16 people. He also said that there would be about 100 students at one time within the building, which would include those in the Culinary Arts program and professional development/education part.

Chair Cottrill asked if the Parent Info Center would be staffed as part of existing staff at the James House. Mr. Noyes said there would be between 6 and 12 people staffing the info center when the James House is open.

Chair Cottrill asked where parking is proposed. Mr. Noyes said that the SAU staff would park between 7am -5pm in spots around the back of the building. They would be using the entrance on the back side of the building, so there would be minimal impact on Cougar Court traffic. The Culinary Arts students would be bussed in from the high school. This should also create minimal impact on the driving, as they will most likely be dropped off in the front of the building 1-4 times/day, depending on how the program is arranged. Mr. Noyes added that the professional development/community education center would host late afternoon and evening courses. He explained that the occupancy for these programs would be at their highest when the elementary students have gone home. Classes would start at 3:00pm or 3:30pm at the earliest.

Chair Cottrill asked if there would be any foreseeable changes in the traffic pattern. Mr. Noyes said that the school district has been given the authority to try and sell off the existing SAU office building, however, due to the fact that it includes valuable frontage, which can impact the egress of property, they feel it would be best to try and keep that property to help keep the traffic moving onto Main Street.

Chair Cottrill asked for confirmation that they will be adding exit signs and lighting inside building as requested by the Fire Department. Mr. Noyes answered in the affirmative. He said that those things are considered maintenance and upkeep of existing equipment and would most certainly be done.

Mr. Morse said that if you look at the front of the original 1941 building, on the left side, there is a grassy area where teachers have recently used as a parking area. He said he understood that area was not authorized for parking spaces. Chair Cottrill said to his knowledge, parking in that area had not been part of the site plan until the KCC came to the PB. Peter Stanley said that that area was part of the site plan review presented by the KCC to meet parking requirements for their proposed use. Mr. Morse asked if this new plan shows that area for parking. Mr. Stanley said the KCC needed to use those spaces to utilize the entire building. However, they were able to do without those spaces for the initial phase, but ultimately, at build-out they needed to use those spaces to meet their needs. Chair Cottrill noted that this new plan does not call for parking in this area.

Mrs. Henderson asked what would need to be put in to have the Culinary Arts program brought to the building. Mr. Noyes said that nothing would need to be brought in; they would be using the cafeteria and the existing kitchen, both of which had better equipment and a more space.

Mr. Downey asked when the Culinary Arts program be moved to the building. Mr. Noyes said that it would be early in 2010.

Chair Cottrill asked Peter Stanley to summarize what needed to be done by the school board in order to be able to move into the building. Mr. Stanley said that they would need to: Meet all fire codes, implement their sprinkler installation, which was agreed to by the fire dept in the 4 phases, (with the final phase meeting a requirement of the water precinct to upgrading the water main in that area), implement the emergency exit signs and lighting, egress to the parent info center and if a wood fired boiler were added, a rear access roadway.

Chair Cottrill asked Peter Stanley what would happen if the taxpayers do not approve the funding for these required fire system upgrades. Mr. Stanley said that there would be limited usage and it could cause them to close the doors. If the voters don't want it to happen, the building won't get used.

Karen Ebel said that she got an email from Andy Deegan of writing only on behalf of himself, not any organizations. He felt that the school district presented some good ideas for the use of the building. He did have one thing that he wanted the PB to consider, and that was added traffic on Gould Road. He said that most people do not observe the speed limit on this road. Mr. Deegan noted that this was just something that should be considered and he felt that it was a good idea to use pre-existing structure for the proposed

activities. Tina Helm said that she would bring this issue of speeders on Gould Road up at the next Board of Selectmen meeting because it was not in the jurisdiction of the Planning Board.

Chair Cottrill asked if there were any further comments from the board regarding this matter. There were none, and so this portion of the meeting was concluded.

## **2. Review and discussion of the first draft of the Watersheds & Water Resources Chapter dated July 14, 2009 for the Master Plan Update**

Mr. Terry Dancy, meeting attendee and resident, asked if he could make a general comment about the chapter to be discussed. He said that it seemed to him that there was a great deal of repetitive information included. He also pointed out that the chapter included an excellent description of what a watershed was, but that such a thing wasn't really necessary to be included in a master plan. Mr. Dancy also suggested putting pages 3-13 out of the body of the chapter and putting it into an appendix. He felt that the detailed information was not useful within the chapter, itself.

Chair Cottrill suggested they go through the entire chapter, page by page, to evaluate the copy, then decide whether certain sections would be best located in an appendix.

### Page 1

Peter Stanley suggested that within the third paragraph, the last sentence should read: "New London is one of an increasing number of communities..." and he also suggested removing the "&" between "lakes" and "ponds."

Karen Ebel said that it should be said within the introduction something to the effect of: "Because of the climate change and the resulting increase the severity of storms, we need to be more vigilant about storm water and water quality protection.

Ms. Ebel also noted that in the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, "1996" should be changed to "2006."

Ms. Ebel was curious if Richard Lee had looked this over as part of the Master Plan. Mr. McWilliams said that he had not. The rest of the Planning Board (PB) felt that this would be a good idea, and so it was decided to that Mr. McWilliams would ask Mr. Lee to review the chapter.

Chair Cottrill noted that in the first line of the first paragraph, he thought the term "potable" should be included to show what kind of water was being specified. He also suggested using the term "clean water sources" instead of "supply."

Karen Ebel asked if there was any place where groundwater withdrawal could be mentioned. She noted that such a thing is overseen by the state but that it was discussed earlier as a concern. Mr. Stanley said there are groundwater withdrawal proposals every year. Ms. Ebel said she didn't want to forget this as an issue and she wanted to make sure that there was something in the chapter to help keep an eye on the issue.

### Page 2

Karen Ebel suggested adding changing the first bullet to "Continue to work with regional groups or towns to promote watershed planning."

Ms. Ebel also suggested adding "pollution" to the fourth bulleted goal.

Ms. Ebel suggested adding another goal: "Continue to monitor scientific and technical information available to inform watershed and water resource planning."

### Page 3

Chair Cottrill noted that the third line down from top of the first paragraph should say “surface water and groundwater” instead of “surface and groundwater.” He also suggested taking the word “flows” out of the second paragraph. He suggested changing the third sentence in the same paragraph to: “Groundwater drainage basin is the underground land area through which groundwater drains to a *surface* water body at a lower elevation.”

Karen asked what the source was of this text. Mr. McWilliams said he got it on the web and that he would be sure to cite the resource.

Page 4

In the second paragraph, Karen Ebel thought the words “particular watershed” should be replaced with “smaller.”

Page 5

In the last paragraph on the page, Chair Cottrill thought the last sentence should read “For these reasons, managing activities in a watershed is critical to its ability to function properly.” He also mentioned that the underlined text should be replaced with “Sunapee Area Watershed Coalition (SAWC), June 2008.

Karen Ebel noted that in the last paragraph in the third line, the words “10 percent” should be followed by the words “in a watershed”. Also she shared that she was aware of another study done in the state of New Hampshire that said it could be as low as seven percent. Ms. Ebel brought in an article for reference so it could be cited in the Master Plan. She thought it would be good to show that it could be even less than 10 percent.

Page 6

Mr. Dancy thought that the first paragraph under “Analysis of Watersheds in New London” could be replaced with: “New London is located at the top of three major watersheds. These are: 1. Sugar River, 2. Warner River, 3. Blackwater River

Page 8

Mr. Stanley noted that in several places it is written as both “Lake Sunapee” and “Sunapee Lake.” He said that it should be written as either “Lake Sunapee” or “Little Lake Sunapee.”

Page 9

Mr. Dancy referenced the last paragraph and asked if it included the beaver dam in the low plain. Mr. Stanley answered in the negative. He also remarked that the last paragraph didn’t go along with the next two tables on Page 10.

Page 10

Mr. Stanley said that there seemed to be missing dams in the tables. He said that most of the dams listed in the paragraph were breached to some extent.

Chair Cottrill asked if the table should be re-named.

Mr. Stanley said that Messer Pond should be changed from an “N” to a “Y,” as the road impounds it.

Page 11

Mr. Stanley suggested changing all the “N’s” to “Y’s” in the table.

Page 13

Mr. Dancy indicated that the floodplain area is extremely limited in New London. He said that only 1.2% of the town was a floodplain. Mr. McWilliams said that the floodplains in town were found primarily by the lake edges, and at the outlet of the Blackwater River, out of the Pleasant Lake Dam. Out of approximately 16,000 acres in town, only 300 acres could be considered floodplain.

Page 14

Peter Stanley noted that in the last paragraph on the page, current zoning should also have “commercial” added to the list.

Page 15

In the second paragraph, Mr. Dancy felt that results from further residential development has already been seen. Mr. McWilliams agreed to somehow work that in.

Page 16

Chair Cottrill noted that the word “from” shouldn’t be underlined.

Page 17

Bedrock Geology and Wells.

Mr. McWilliams said that he would rework the paragraph as it appears to be a bit redundant. Planning Board members asked about Dartmouth College’s bedrock geology map. Meeting attendee, Rosemary Fulton noted that it was on display at the college and supposedly could not be circulated. Ms. Helm stated that the map could probably be photographed for use by the town. She was surprised that there was no readily available map.

Mr. McWilliams said that this paragraph came from the last master plan. He said he would look into it to see if it is still the best bedrock geology map and if, perhaps, it has been made available online.

Page 18

Mr. Stanley thought the second paragraph was a little unclear and needed more detail added regarding specific locations. He also noted that the last two paragraphs refer to “toxics from home businesses.” He suggested changing this to be from “homes and businesses.”

Page 19

Mr. Stanley referenced the second paragraph. He said that it would be better to promote sewer systems, not the public water supplies. Many thought the whole paragraph should be deleted.

Mr. Stanley noted that within the list of primary surface water impacts, the word “storm water” should be expressed as one word (stormwater).

Karen Ebel said that the information about the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems permits needs to be updated and that they need to find out if they still exist.

Page 20

Ms. Ebel noted that in the second paragraph, “10 percent” should be changed to “7-10 percent.” Also, 36 should be replaced with 26.

Ms. Ebel said that at the top of the page, the second paragraph should read: “this information fluctuates but is available upon request from the DES.”

Ms. Ebel thought that fourth paragraph should say something about the salt shed and that one of the reasons it was created was to minimize the salt coming out of the shed. Mr. Dancy said that this is one area where they have been monitoring the effect of salt. He said that now that there is a new shed, there might be an implication that they don’t monitor it any more, however, LLSPA is still monitoring it.

Chair Cottrill referenced the third paragraph. He suggested listing Route 114 and that the wording referencing the use of salt on roads should be better worded.

Chair Cottrill also indicated that “Claremont Incinerator” should be changed to “Bethlehem Landfill.”

In the third paragraph, Chair Cottrill noted that it should say: “The town should continue the designation of environmentally sensitive areas along the State roads...”

Page 21

Mr. Stanley wanted to clarify that in the second paragraph, it should be stated that the Town is making plans to remove contaminants from the lagoons; they are not planning to fill them.

Chair Cottrill noted that “waste site inventory” did not need to be underlined.

Peter Stanley referenced the second paragraph regarding the monitoring of lagoons. Peter said he was unaware of this and would ask Richard Lee about it. He would then relay any information to Mr. McWilliams.

Emma Crane said that the word “in” should follow the words “manage these lagoons” in the second paragraph.

Mr. Dancy asked about the third paragraph referring to residential development. He felt it was a strange sentence to have, as it seems to allow land uses which could be detrimental. He suggested replacing the sentence with something that explains that the town has a plan to take corrective measures so that zoning of the town does not allow detriments to the water quality... Mr. Stanley said that they have adopted the LID measures to avoid detriments to water quality.

Page 22

In the second to last paragraph on the page, Chair Cottrill asked about the figure of .003 per gallon charged for petroleum pollution cleanup. Mr. McWilliams said that he would check into the figure to make sure it was correct.

Chair Cottrill referenced the last paragraph regarding underground storage tanks. Mr. Stanley said that residentially, there is mostly propane being used instead of fuel oil. He said that most of the oil tanks have been removed in the past 20 years.

Page 23

Ms. Ebel suggested adding: “Current treatment from stormwater flows from existing homes and buildings can be a threat to water quality.”

Ms. Ebel went on to say that stormwater from commercial development in the town should also be monitored. Even though they once complied with BMPs when constructed, they may not be up to current standards. She said that they the Town should monitor old businesses and homes which likely do not comply with current requirements.

Mr. McWilliams agreed to add the two new items to the Future Land Use section as well.

Page 24

After some discussion between the board members, it was agreed to remove the paragraph which began with “Given the probably future development of the Town...”

Ms. Ebel noted that the quotation mark after the underlined text in the last paragraph should be removed.

Michelle Holton left the meeting at 9pm.

Page 25

Chair Cottrill noted that “New London Sewer Dept” should be replaced with “Public Works Department.” Mr. Stanley indicated that the Health officer does **not** have septic system records. These records are kept at the state level.

Page 26

Chair Cottrill noted that the reference to the Claremont Incinerator in the third paragraph should be replaced with Bethlehem Landfill.

Chair Cottrill also suggested the removal of the last sentence in the fourth paragraph “They did note that the stump dump may need to be permanently closed sometime in the future.” The board agreed.

Mr. Stanley thought it would be useful to add within the second paragraph that recycled appliances, metal and composting were all things that were handled at the transfer station.

Chair Cottrill suggested the removal of the Todd Farm paragraph.

The next paragraph could read “There are two major non-community water systems serving the town of New London...”

Mr. Stanley said that in the last paragraph, "...a float valve in a thirty gallon tank" should be change to "in the tank."

Page 28

Ms. Ebel asked if the fifth paragraph could be cleaned up a bit, and to have parenthesis instead of the coma after "sources."

Chair Cottrill suggested it could be stated more clearly that sewage discharge was not allowed anywhere, whether it be Class A waters (of the highest quality) or Class B waters (second highest quality).

Page 29

Ms. Ebel asked that in #7, the end of the paragraph say "mapped wetlands" instead of just "wetlands." Peter Stanley noted that the overall shoreland overlay district is 200 feet, and that it would be useful to add that it is mandated by the state, not the town, but that it has been adopted by the town.

Page 30

Ms. Ebel asked if in #8 Mr. McWilliams could define what the steep slopes are. He agreed to do so.

After some confusion as to the exact meaning of the first paragraph after #10, Mr. McWilliams agreed to re-write it. There was some confusion as to the placing and meaning of the word "except."

Mr. Dancy asked about the last paragraph and why it seemed to be repeated in two other locations within the chapter. Mr. McWilliams said he would look and see how best and where it should be presented.

Page 31

Karen Ebel thought that under the Site Plan Review Regulations section it should be mentioned that the LID requirements in the new Subdivision Regulations were incorporated into the SPR Regulations.

Mr. Stanley suggested removing "Building Code" and the single sentence below it, as it didn't seem to fit in with this chapter.

Page 32

Ms. Ebel thought that a potential threat should be large groundwater withdrawals by organizations seeking to sell bottled water.

Mr. Stanley noted that in the fifth paragraph, the first sentence should be deleted, as it is no longer true.

Page 33

Ms. Ebel remarked about the first paragraph which is entitled "Road Salt." She opined that because of stormwater runoff, roads contribute pollutants in addition to salt, such as motor oil and gasoline. She thought this section could use more work.

Chair Cottrill said that the second sentence in the first paragraph should be written "The Town should continue to designate environmentally sensitive areas..." and also reflect that 100% salt is not being used, rather, a mixture of salt and sand is used.

Ms. Ebel asked if the statement regarding the old landfill not posing any problems was true. Mr. Stanley stated that there have been problems. He said that it is improving, but is still not ideal.

Mr. Dancy opined that it would be a good idea to try and investigate old septic systems that had not been approved by the state. He felt that the homeowners may be interested in knowing what the state of their systems were. Mr. Stanley thought perhaps trying to promote the replacement of old systems with new ones, would be a better practice. Ms. Ebel stressed that public education is key with regards to septic tanks and their impact on water quality and conservation.

Under “Business Development” Tina Helm said that she would like to see the first sentence begin with “A variety” instead of “All sorts.”

#### Page 34

Peter Stanley suggested adding the following text to the Unsound Farming Practices paragraph: The Town should establish an agricultural commission to insure that there are no unsound farming practices. Ms. Ebel added that the Town should promote the use of best management practices for forestry, as well. There was some talk about garages in town and whether they lie within or outside of the commercial district. Mr. Stanley said that there were auto service garages that are outside of the commercial district, and they are because they exist under a non-conforming use. He also indicated that in the “On-water uses” paragraph, the mentioning of “marinas” should be removed as the town doesn’t and could not have marinas.

Karen Ebel suggested adding new heading and paragraph called “Untreated Stormwater.” She said that it should say something about promoting best practices in town to reduce stormwater and possibly discuss the creation of a stormwater utility to collect and treat the stormwater. Ms. Ebel also suggested another heading having to do with increased storm activity. She thought it could be called “Increased current and predicted storm activity. Mr. McWilliams said that he would add these two sections.

Under the “Future uses” section, Peter Stanley suggested removing the second paragraph, as it had been removed in a similar section in the chapter.

#### Page 35

Mr. Dancy suggested separating the information on septic systems and underground fuel storage tanks. Numbers 6 and 15 should be re-written in a way to extract only information about one or the other of these two subjects.

Chair Cottrill made the following recommendations:

- #2 should say “The town should continue to seek assistance from the regional planning commission.”
- #5 should say “should continue” instead of “need to continue.”
- #6 the bottom of the paragraph should be deleted.
- #7 the second sentence should be removed.

#### Page 36

Chair Cottrill made the following recommendations:

- #8 the sentences on cost until “whether or not used as water supplies...” should be deleted.
- #9 this paragraph should be removed because it is references outdated information
- #10 Karen Ebel suggested deleting this paragraph.
- #11 Ms. Ebel said that this paragraph should include text such as “through improperly stored salt, as well as other impurities from the roadways, the volume of water can adversely affect water quality.” She thought this paragraph could be identified and expanded. Ms. Ebel also suggested breaking this paragraph down into two items: salt and storage, and other roadway pollutants. The last sentence of #11 referring to speed limits should be deleted.

Ms. Ebel asked that #12 be relocated, and put #s 11, 13 and 14 together as they all deal with roads. She also said that another item should be added to the list saying that the State and the Town should work together to promote water quality.

#### Page 37

Mr. Stanley suggested changing the word “toxics” to “hazardous materials” in 1.a. Ms. Ebel suggested changing 1.b. to “New or expanding business operations may be encouraged to improve their drainage programs.

1.c. was found by Ms. Ebel to be a bit wordy and Mr. McWilliams said he would work on the text to make it more concise. Chair Cottrill suggested taking the last sentence of the paragraph out.

1.d. Ms. Ebel thought it would be important to note that stormwater runoff should be managed from everywhere, not just a 15% slope. She wanted it to be known that stormwater runoff is being managed already, and not just at 15%. She added that stormwater runoff from land development needs to be managed to provide protection to the water sources. Ms. Ebel also thought that when businesses come to the PB with a Site Plan Review, they should try to get them to improve things or to at least promote upgrading things to best manage their stormwater runoff.

Page 38

Mr. Stanley suggested removing the two paragraphs regarding health regulations.

Page 39

Chair Cottrill suggested changing the text in the Hazardous Waste paragraph to “The selectmen could adopt...” Mr. Stanley said that the word “control” must be changed to “ordinance.”

#1 Mr. Dancy said that it should say “each watershed” instead of “each lake.”

#2 Chair Cottrill said that it should say “...should continue to call...”

#3 Chair Cottrill said that it should say “...should continue to work with...”

#5 Chair Cottrill suggested deleting this recommendation, as it was very similar to #3.

#6 Karen Ebel suggested to Mr. McWilliams that he should be sure to match the changes here with the changes made in the issues section to separate underground fuel storage tanks and septic systems into two recommendations.

#9 and #10 should be deleted, as noted by Mr. McWilliams, to coincide with the issues section.

#11 Ms. Ebel said that this recommendation should be divided between the storage of salt and roadway pollutants, and the last sentence regarding speed limits should be deleted to coincide with the issues section.

Ms. Ebel suggested moving #12 so that it falls after all the other road recommendations.

She also suggested that #14 should read “...should continue to install...”

Ms. Ebel asked to add an item to mention that the road agent should be working with the State.

#15 Ms. Ebel reminded Mr. McWilliams to match this recommendation with what had been changed in the issues portion of the chapter.

Page 41

Ms. Ebel said that it should be expressed that the emphasis should be based on watershed planning, and that this should be placed at the end of the regulatory programs paragraph.

Mr. Stanley said that the reference to the two new regulatory programs needed to be updated. Mr. McWilliams agreed to do this. Mr. Stanley also asked Mr. McWilliams to delete the entire last sentence of the Regulatory Programs paragraph.

Page 42

1a. Mr. McWilliams suggested deleting this.

1b. Mr. McWilliams said that he would reword this paragraph to make it easier to understand.

1c. Mr. McWilliams said that he would pare this down to not be so wordy.

1d. Ms. Ebel asked for this paragraph to reference all lots, not just those of 15% slope.

Page 43

Mr. Stanley suggested deleting #4 – Health Regulations to coincide with text earlier in the chapter.

Ms. Ebel asked that #5 Hazardous Waste be matched with the issues section of the chapter.

Ms. Ebel asked about the potential of inspection fees to be charged in this section. Mr. McWilliams said that he would add this.

**3. Other Business**

- A. Voluntary Lot Merger for Jesse and Jacqueline Worobel

Mr. Stanley said that this merger has been brought forth so that the two lots owned by the Worobels could be combined to make room to expand an existing house.

**IT WAS MOVED (Karen Ebel) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve the voluntary lot merger for Jesse and Jacqueline Worobel for tax map/lot #107/021-000 and #107/022-000.  
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- B. Subdivision regulations with amendments adopted July 28, 2009 for the PB to sign.
- C. Draft proposal for the 2010 PB budget. Mr. McWilliams noted that the only change is the inclusion of \$1,700 for a used filing cabinet for the PB files. All agreed to review this at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:47pm

Respectfully submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary  
New London Planning Board

Approved on: \_\_\_\_\_

Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_