

## **APPROVED Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting of July 13, 2010**

**Members Present:** Chair Cottrill (Chair), Peter Bianchi (Board of Selectmen Representative), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), Paul Gorman (Alternate), Dierdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate)

**Members Absent:** Jeff Hollinger (Vice Chair), Michael Doheny (Secretary), Michele Holton, John Tilley

**Others Present:** Mr. McWilliams (Town Planner), Peter Stanley (Zoning Administrator)

Chair Cottrill called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at **7:00pm**.

Chair Cottrill appointed Ms. Sheerr-Gross and Paul Gorman to sit in for Jeff Hollinger and Michael Doheny, who were absent from the meeting. He explained that even though Richard Lee (Dept of Public Works) was not going to be at the meeting, due to a recent medical emergency, he would still like to go over the wastewater information, as planned, and later, confirm or seek details when Mr. Lee is able to attend at a future meeting.

Mr. McWilliams said that this chapter was an update of the Utilities chapter, which appeared in the 1998 Master Plan.

Chair Cottrill explained that he had some extensive changes, additions and re-arrangements to the first few pages of the document. He read aloud his suggestions, which were numerous, and asked if they were acceptable. The members of the Planning Board agreed that they were. Chair Cottrill offered to make these adjustments electronically. Mr. McWilliams agreed that this would be helpful and said that he would forward the document to Chair Cottrill so that the changes could be made.

### **Page 2**

Chair Cottrill asked who put the moratorium on new connections to the treatment plant in 1972, as was referenced in the end of the first paragraph. Mr. McWilliams and Mr. Stanley both thought that it was put on by the State due to what was happening in Keazar Lake. A portion of land (30 acres) which meets the low plane was constructed to have a tertiary treatment plant. They wanted to pick up the Elkins sewage but the State stopped that plan and made them connect with the Sunapee facility.

Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that it didn't say anywhere what year the plant was actually built. It was said that it had exceeded its 20 years of service, but didn't say how old the plant was. Mr. Bianchi said that he thought it was about 30 years old, and that the information she was seeking was readily available. Mr. McWilliams agreed to include this bit of information in the chapter.

Mr. Bianchi noted from his meetings with the Sunapee Wastewater facility that the "headworks" of the facility has one capacity and the trenches have another, and so it is hard to determine where they are standing with capacity. He said he doesn't know the true figures and wonders if it can really be figured out.

*Community Survey Results*

Chair Cottrill said that in this section the part that notes that “52.9% of the respondents indicated that they did not know how to rate the service” should appear before the sentence that says that “37% of the respondents rated the Sewer Service as excellent” to show that the majority of respondents were probably not users of the Town Sewer.

Chair Cottrill asked about the labeling of graphs and tables. It seemed to be confusing to several, the way they were labeled. Mr. McWilliams reminded the PB that this is the way the figures and tables had been identified all throughout the other chapters of the Master Plan, and to change this naming convention at this point would be time-consuming and costly.

### **Page 3**

Ms. Crane said that on page 3, it says “VIII” and it should read “VIII.”

### **Page 4**

Chair Cottrill wondered if the referenced 2007 study had been updated any later than 2007. Mr. McWilliams said he wasn’t positive, but thought that it had not. Chair Cottrill thought it would be good to find out if there was a later version. Others on the board agreed.

### **Page 5**

Chair Cottrill thought it would be good to have a date near the footnoted mention of “NL Public Works Dept” to show when the information was supplied. Mr. McWilliams said he could go back to his notes to find such a date. Ms. Sheerr-Gross agreed that this would be useful information to have.

Ms. Crane said that the table on this page was labeled in the text as “VII” instead of “VIII.”

### **Page 6**

Chair Cottrill asked to have a date listed after the “Source: New London Public Works Department.”

Ms. Crane asked if the descriptive text could precede the table and to perhaps have both table and text on the same page. Mr. McWilliams said that it was possible.

### **Page 7**

Ms. Sheerr-Gross commented it would be interesting for the next Master Plan to consider changing the terms “figures” to “graphs.” Mr. McWilliams said that they should find out how much it would take to make the changes. Ms. Sheerr-Gross believed it to be considered a major change.

Ms. Sheerr-Gross asked why there was a huge spike in the graph during the time from 2005-2006. Mr. Bianchi thought that it could be from infiltration. Also, the sewer department started charging users by reading the incoming water meter. Users then became more conservative about water use. Mr. Bianchi said it could also be because of the Sewer Dept’s method that was used to read the amount of wastewater gallons. It was his recollection that system meters were not properly gauged the same. Mr. McWilliams said that the figures had to do with houses meters. He understood that that year they based the sewer numbers on the water use from individual houses.

Mr. Bianchi said at The Seasons they have a formula for figuring out the sewer rates. All the water goes through one meter for all the units. Those are the meter readings that are given to the Town. They use a formula that determines that some of the water is not used for domestic use, but for watering plants, etc. Mr. Bianchi pointed out that people will look at this graph and ask the same questions they are asking about the spike. He thought that they should put an explanation of the spike in the graph. Mr. McWilliams agreed to add an asterisk with a brief note. Mr. Bianchi said that Mr. Lee could probably give some insight on this as well.

### **Page 8**

Mr. McWilliams said that this section, as well as Table VIII-3, requires input from Mr. Lee.

Chair Cottrill wanted to know what “secondary wastewater treatment” meant. Mr. McWilliams summarized that primary wastewater treatment is where there isn’t any treatment to the waste; they separate the solids from the liquids. Secondary wastewater treatment involves a process where there are organisms eating the organic matter. Tertiary wastewater treatment is when water that comes out can be consumed. Mr. Bianchi said that they only discharge tertiary water into the river and thought that they had all three treatments at the plant. Chair Cottrill thought that this was a question for Mr. Lee and that they should ask him to address this section.

Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that in the third line down, they should put “The original 1976 plant was designed for a 20-year life...”

Ms. Crane wondered if the last full line of the paragraph should read “the majority of the components...have outlived...or are no longer operable.”

### **Page 9**

After some consideration, the Planning Board agreed to remove the entire paragraph beginning with “Although it is tempting...”

### **Page 10**

Chair Cottrill noticed that years 1995 and 1996 had identical numbers and should be checked. Ms. Sheerr-Gross noted also that that between 1994 and 1995 the figure jumped about 40 million gallons. There should be an asterisk with an explanation for this. It was noted that the source should also be dated. Ms. Crane thought the description should go ahead of the table.

### **Page 11**

Ms. Crane noted that in the second paragraph, second line, there was a space needed between “\$380,000” and the word “and.” Chair Cottrill thought that the phrase “almost double again” could be removed from the second paragraph, third line down.

Mr. Bianchi questioned the validity of the statement regarding pump stations becoming the responsibility of the Towns Waste Water Department. He said that it is funded by the tax payers. Mr. Stanley thought

they meant to say that the wastewater operations were funded at no expense to the Town of New London but that the capital costs of the plant **are** funded by the Town. Mr. Bianchi offered that in the past when the sewer department ran itself as a separate commission, they never came to the Town for money. On various forms it was an offset. If there was \$600,000 due, it was offset by revenues. Mr. Stanley said that in all fairness, they never fixed anything and there weren't any capital reserves. Mr. Bianchi said he wasn't sure whether the statement could be misinterpreted. They should clarify that it is the operational expenses that are paid for. The operations of the wastewater systems are funded by the users and not the Town of New London. Starting in 2010, a portion of capital costs were voted to be shared by the Town.

Mr. Gorman said that it sounded confusing to him whether the private pumps would become public or vice versa. Chair Cottrill said that the private pumps will always be maintained by the associations. The other ones (such as the one on Job Seaman's Road) that were put in by a developer will eventually be taken over by the Town if they were created correctly and meet the Town's standards.

Chair Cottrill said that in the list of assumptions, he would prefer to remove the first two words of each sentence. He also commented that there was no number three in the list.

#5 Mr. Bianchi said in the text it says the Water Precinct assumes 93 gallons of water used per day per resident, but that the sewer identifies 180 gallons per person per day. He felt the figures should be consistent.

Ms. Crane said she'd like to see the information on the same page as at least one of the tables that it coincides with. She wondered if there was a better place to put the map than on page 12. Ms. Sheerr-Gross thought the map may be more interesting to appear up front.

### **Page 13**

It was noted that in table, the year 2010 had 2 commas after it. Chair Cottrill asked to have the source dated.

Mr. McWilliams explained how he derived the figures in the table, as there were some questions as to whether the population growth estimate was too high. He said that they could go back to the population chapter and adjust what they want to use for the growth prediction per year if they thought that was more appropriate. His hesitation was that they not look too short-term with the growth numbers. Mr. Bianchi said that the figures seem to be inflated not just for a year by year thing, but over a period of time. He thought they should contemplate the figures. He was thinking of the growth of the Town in comparison to building permits. He gave an example from the table that showed the units going up 270 units from the year 2010 to 2015. Mr. McWilliams recognized a few mathematical errors and agreed to check the numbers. Mr. Stanley said that it was actually 10/year dwelling units that were being considered. In terms of houses being built, they have new rooms at the college that have been added, but those don't count.

Chair Cottrill saw the numbers as being identical. The water side should be more and the septic side should be less. He also asked if the Colby-Sawyer College maintenance facility was included in these

figures or if it is considered a separate business. Mr. Stanley said the college gets a bill for every piece of property they own. The maintenance facility is separate, but still a part of their bill.

#### **Page 14**

Chair Cottrill went through each issue with changes he thought would improve their effectiveness. The Planning Board felt his changes were appropriate and agreed that he should make the changes in the document to reflect his adjustments.

#### **Page 15**

Chair Cottrill said that in the recommendations, number two should say that the Planning Board “should” form a task force...

In number four, the second sentence should say “should” instead of “need to...”

Ms. Crane said that in number one, the word “in” in front of “public works department” should be removed.

Mr. Bianchi said there has been discussion with the new sewer update proposal with Sunapee about the capacity of the facility. They don’t know how close it really is to capacity. He explained that some parts of town are not sewerred and the question that has come up is, if those parts of Town are sewerred, will there be enough capacity in the facility ten years down the road to accommodate these new connections?, Mr. Bianchi wondered if the Town can get a firm commitment of remaining capacity. If additions to the hospital go in, and if Sunapee decides to sewer the homes around Perkins Pond, that will add capacity to the plant. He asked if the Town was being short-sighted regarding capacity. He opined that it would be terrible 15 years down the road if someone wanted to hook homes up to the sewer in different parts of town and they aren’t able to because the Town is already up to capacity.

Chair Cottrill said #2 in the recommendations addresses Mr. Bianchi’s sentiments. Mr. Bianchi thought this capacity issue should be a strong recommendation for the Master Plan. Chair Cottrill asked if New London was allowed to go up to 65% of the total flow for the facility. Mr. Stanley answered in the affirmative. Mr. Bianchi added that no one really knows what the capacity is, currently. Chair Cottrill said that if they find themselves at that 65% capacity, what would happen to future development. Would they have to deny development?

Mr. Gorman asked if they should mention that a task force should identify and prioritize areas in the town that need to be sewerred as part of their charge.

Mr. Bianchi noted that capital reserves are meant for large items that need to be paid for in the future, such as this sort of facility. Being a hard sell or not, it is a real need.

With regard to the communication between the Public Works Department and the Planning Board, Mr. Stanley said that communication is there at the project level, but with regard to departmental activities, it is not. Department heads rarely attend Planning Board or other meetings.

**Page 16**

Chair Cottrill suggested that in the Community Survey Results section, it be noted that the reason 46% of those polled don't know how to rate the service, is due to the fact that these people are most likely not partaking of the sewer service.

**Page 17**

Chair Cottrill said that regarding the residential units served by the New London-Springfield Water System, it should be explained that they are referring to units in New London and not in Springfield. Mr. McWilliams said he would check to make sure those figures were right and that they were, in fact, for New London units only.

Chair Cottrill suggested moving some paragraphs around from page 16 and 18. He agreed to make this change to the electronic document. The Planning Board members agreed with his idea to move the paragraphs.

**Page 19**

Chair Cottrill asked if the table should include figures from April, May and June, as they should be available. Mr. McWilliams said that like all things, the Master Plan is a moving target. They've been back to Mr. Lee twice to get the numbers from him. As long as the Master Plan is still being worked on, they could just keep updating all the tables with the most current information, but when would they ever stop doing so?

**Page 20**

Chair Cottrill said the information on the bottom of page 20 should go with the table on page 21.

**Page 22**

Ms. Sheerr-Gross noted on page 22, number four references "Table VII-9" and instead, it should be "Table VIII-9."

Chair Cottrill asked to have the words "they use, they convert, they assume" removed from the beginning of the sentences.

Chair Cottrill noted that a space is needed in number four, after the reference to Table VII and the word "for."

Mr. McWilliams was asked to double-check the figure of the number of gallons assumed per day per residential service, as the Water Precinct and the Public Works Department have vastly different figures represented.

**Page 23**

Chair Cottrill said that this seems to be the same table that they saw earlier. He wanted to know where the 9480 gallons per day was allocated. Mr. McWilliams said that it is just for students. Chair Cottrill thought

it should be noted that the college has their own meter for outside water usage and that they should note that the figure is just for students using water, not other functions of the college (watering the fields).

#### **Page 24**

Chair Cottrill changed some of the wording of the issues. He would make the changes electronically. Under the recommendations section, some wording changes were made by Chair Cottrill.

Mr. Bianchi asked, with regard to the first recommendation, was the 10-year CIP the CIP for the Water Precinct. Mr. Stanley said that it should be clear that the Water Precinct's CIP is not co-mingled with the Town CIP. In the Town CIP there is a verbal discussion of what the water precinct is planning for improvements over the next 10 years. It doesn't affect the tax rate but gives people in Town who are looking at the figures, an idea of what the precinct is planning to do. It will give a citizen an idea of what kind of tax changes may be coming down the road.

Chair Cottrill said it should read "should continue to communicate its capital projects and priorities." Mr. Bianchi suggested adding that the Planning Board and the Water Precinct should continue to "advise" and communicate..." to aid in the board's annual CIP update.

#### **Page 25**

Chair Cottrill thought the boundaries of the three phase power should be described as being from the Post Office to Colby-Sawyer College. Mr. Crane and Mr. Stanley noted that three phase power was also available at Seaman's Road and at the Transfer station. Mr. Stanley said that the only place there would be a real need to know this information is if there was a need for development going into town.

Mr. Crane thought perhaps information about internet access should be present.

Telephone – NE Telephone should be changed to Fairpoint and should be listed that access was available "in the western part of New London."

Mr. Stanley thought it important to add cell phone usage and the availability of those resources and that this should be its own section. Mr. Bianchi thought the introductory paragraph should include information on towers and that there should be a mentioning of cell phones being used more and more in place of land lines for some residents. Mr. Crane opined that cell phone coverage is poor in some places and that for coverage to be better they will need more towers. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said there should be something put in this section about competition between cell services. Mr. Stanley said that broadband should be mentioned. Mr. Crane added that Fiber could be considered competition for cable TV too. Mr. McWilliams said he would work this all in to the section.

With regard to Cable Television, Chair Cottrill suggested not capitalizing all of the word "Comcast" and to remove the word "TV" that follows. They should also remove the phrase "enjoy up to 265 channels."

#### **Page 26**

Chair Cottrill noted that the paragraph beginning with "The FCC" should say "aircraft" operations instead of "airport" operations. Mr. Crane thought it should also say "airport" as that was part of the regulations.

**Page 27**

Chair Cottrill said that instead of using the term “ridges”, it should be written as “The use of a *high point*...*should be* discouraged.”

Under the first principles, the word “or” should be removed before the word “public.”

Under number three, “towers” should be changed to “use of camo materials.” He also requested to have the word “mass” removed.

Number four should reference the “height of land” instead of “ridge.”

After some discussion, it was determined that the Earth Mineral section should be abbreviated, as it was highly unlikely that anyone would come into town to gather this type of resource, and it seemed to be a lot of text for something that wasn’t likely to happen.

**Page 30**

Chair Cottrill asked that the issues be rewritten to coincide with the abbreviated Earth Mineral Resource section. Also, it was decided that number two be removed.

Mr. Bianchi asked if this was the area where the procedures of going through the Zoning Board of Adjustments should be present. Mr. Stanley said that it would be appropriate. He noted that the soils in New London are usually of a very poor quality, consisting of mostly clay and ledge, and that they won’t become a focal point for mineral exportation. He added that soils from Goshen, Lempster, and Newport are trucked in to New London.

Mr. Bianchi said they have two wells at the Seasons that run constantly and overflow into Doug Homan’s pond for irrigation. He opined that there was an unbelievable amount of water there.

Ms. Sheerr-Gross thought the Utilities Chapter should reference alternative energy and the energy chapter.

Mr. Stanley said that there has been legislation for stormwater and utilities. Somewhere down the road, New London may have a stormwater utility at some point, especially if the growth projections pan out. He said that it wouldn’t hurt to include a small paragraph to explain this.

Chair Cottrill wanted to know if there were any towns considering wind power. Mr. Stanley said the cost for just one windmill is so huge that it actually took about 12 units for their use to start making sense. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that on a recent trip to the Baltic Sea, where energy is particularly expensive, there are hundreds of windmills. She opined that in ten years the landscape will change.

No minutes could be approved as there weren’t enough members present who were at the last meeting. The minutes would be reviewed at the next meeting.

**IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (Peter Bianchi) to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting of July 13, 2010. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Meeting was adjourned at 8:56pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary

Town of New London

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

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