

Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting of October 12, 2010

Members Present: Tom Cottrill (Chair), Michael Doheny (Secretary), Peter Bianchi (Board of Selectmen Representative), Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate), Michele Holton, Jeff Hollinger (Vice Chair)

Members Absent: Paul Gorman (Alternate), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), John Tilley

Others Present: Ken McWilliams (Town Planner), Peter Stanley (Zoning Administrator), Richard Lee (Public Works Director), Jessie Levine (Town Administrator), Jay Lyon (Fire Chief)

Chair Cottrill called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:05pm. He appointed Deirdre Sheerr-Gross to sit in for Emma Crane, who was absent from the meeting.

Review of Capital Improvement Program

Chair Cottrill asked Mr. McWilliams to provide an overview of the CIP process. Mr. McWilliams explained that the CIP is a Planning Board-driven process/project and that the Planning Board appoints the CIP sub-committee of 2 PB members, 3 from the Budget Committee, one selectman and the town manager. The sub-committee then interviews all department heads and others that have CIP budgetary needs and forms the draft of the CIP for consideration by the Planning Board. At this meeting, the PB can choose to adopt the draft report which then is forwarded to the Selectmen for consideration and finally to the Budget Committee. Mr. McWilliams noted that Ms. Levine some department heads were there to help with questions.

Ms. Levine said that the bulk of the report began on the bottom page 11 and continues for the next two pages. She added that a recent question was raised as to whether the CIP was tied to the Master Plan. She said that currently was not and didn't think it had been so in the 10 years she has been involved with it. Mr. McWilliams said that there are some things in the Master Plan that identifies needs for improvement and equipment. Ms. Levine opined that they do need to do a better job at tying the two documents together in the future.

Ms. Levine noted that tables 1-6 were historical in nature. Tables 7 & 8 were for the Wastewater Department, which is going to continue its program of depositing \$20,000 per year into a capital reserve fund. They are hoping to be able to spend \$85,000 on repairing the main controls at the pump station. There is no grant involved in this expense, and the funds needed are in capital reserves.

Highway Equipment Replacement: Ms. Levine explained that there were a number of changes this year. Two 1-ton trucks were extended, the trash tractor was extended for two years, and the pick-up by another year. They will try to do some work on the grader to be able to extend it another couple of years. The Highway Equipment fund and the Equipment Replacement fund were combined but this caused no change in the budget even when added together.

Ms. Levine said that Table 11 represents a new capital reserve fund. They need to do some work on the original highway garage and replace the sand and salt shed. They will be saving for four years on the garage and then will replace the old salt shed after that.

Tables 12-13 represent the police cruiser program, which didn't change. The table shows that they have just estimated some future costs. One of the administrative issues with all the tables is that with change to a fiscal year they needed to clarify that they are using a 2012 year in the tables. They go from 2011 to fiscal year 2013, which begins on July 1, 2012.

Chair Cottrill asked if they look at other police cruiser manufacturers to see if any offer a longer life expectancy. Ms. Levine said that it has come up before about life expectancy of these vehicles but believes it is a matter of usage, not longevity. Chief Seastrand generally looks at the Crown Victoria for cruisers, but noted that they are looking into a motorcycle program, which would help extend the life of the cruisers. They did extend the cruisers to four years but it has added to these models' upkeep and questionable reliability. They have stopped using the older vehicles as much for fear they would not be dependable.

Tables 14-15 show that they have closed the police dispatch account. Their purchases are pretty small and will be part of operating budget when the time comes.

Table 16-16a are a combined for the Fire Apparatus Replacement schedule and Apparatus Refurbishment and Maintenance schedule. Ms. Levine said it was notable that even with creating a second capital reserve program, they are depositing the same amount of money than when they were with just the one. It nets out to be even a little less money annually. Ms. Sheerr-Gross asked who does the specking for the new trucks. Chief Lyon said that they do it themselves. He said the last one was about 98 pages.

Table 16B is SCBA Apparatus to be reinstated this year, as it wasn't funded last year. Chief Lyon is hoping for a grant to offset the cost. Their plan is to purchase this apparatus in 2017. He said that 15 years is the expected life of these air packs. They had to refurbish them a few years back but are still using some components from 1978, which are not NFPA compliant. They put in a grant for just under \$155,000 to replace 24 air packs and are hoping for a 95% match. Chief Lyon said they hope to find out if they have been awarded the grant before December. He commented that he has gone to some grant writing seminars which will hopefully help their chances of winning this competitive grant. There are 32,000 companies able to apply for this grant from homeland security. 25,000 applications were received and there is \$320 million dollars available.

Table 17 reflects the CIP committee's recommendation that they bond for the library work. It was originally planned for the library to request \$90,000 per year for the next three years to keep up with major reconstruction projects. Instead of doing this, the CIP recommended borrowing \$350,000 to get the projects done and also to leave some cushion for anything else that may come up. Ms. Levine said that this may change as they address sprinkling the building.

Table 18 is the Library's Computer Replacement fund. The CIP committee recommended eliminating this fund and adding it into the operating budget.

Table 19 is the Gravel Road Paving Program. Ms. Levine noted that they spent some time looking at bonding for this as well and found that the cost of bonding for 15 years is the same as spreading out the project the current way over the next 15 years. The primary advantage to spreading it out is that town meeting can vote on the program every year, leaving some flexibility for voters to say they do or don't

want to fund it each year. The other issue is that they are not sure they can get 20 +/- roads prepped to be paved, should they bond and try to get the program completed all at once.

Chair Cottrill asked if goal was to pave all roads in New London. Ms. Levine said that this was not the plan, but that there was a score card with roads having been given ratings on need, with regard to maintenance. The current list includes all the high-need and most of the medium-need roads. Ms. Levine said if there is overwhelming opposition to paving a road, it probably won't get done.

Table 20 is the Recreation Facilities Capital Improvement Program. The CIP committee decided not to fund this for 2011 but the Recreation Department is looking for some sort of capacity for storage, whether it be on the second floor of a possible Bucklin Beach building upgrade, or whether it be an added bay to the new garage at the pumping station. The CIP committee thought more information was needed in order to move forward with the high ropes course and the Elkins Beach rehab.

Table 21 represents the Sidewalk Capital Improvement fund which includes a matching grant for Elkins. It also includes some more work to be done on Main Street. Ms. Levine noted that Parkside and Gould Roads may be eligible for the Safe Walks to School Grant. A portion of the Elkins Grant and the Intersection Fund will be used for work in Elkins. Chair Cottrill opined that sidewalks would seem to rank fairly low on the priority list as the town has managed many years without sidewalks. Ms. Levine said that the Facilities chapter of the Master Plan notes that citizens have expressed a want for sidewalks, but agreed that it may not be a high priority.

Mr. Hollinger asked what happened to the Pleasant Street sidewalk project. Ms. Levine said they have a grant but no plans from DOT yet. The State has had the project since June and she was hoping they would be able to come through in the spring. Chair Cottrill asked if the cash was set aside for that project. Ms. Levine said that it was.

Table 22 represents Town Building Maintenance. The sub-table is there to show the expense for fixing some of the mapping problems they have in town. The GIS boundary lines are inaccurate and do not match the ortho-flyover photos. This \$65,000 project would fix that by systematically gps-ing boundaries. They plan to save for this expense over three years and then do it all at once.

Chair Cottrill asked who gets harmed if this wasn't done. Mr. Stanley said that it affects anyone who uses the data. On Pleasant Lake one person was being taxed for having a peninsula of land, which was actually the property of the neighbor. Mr. Stanley went on to explain that a surveyor made tax maps using non-ortho rectified maps and force-fit all the boundaries to those maps. As a result, nothing is as it seems on the tax map in many places. Some boundaries are hundreds of feet off. Mr. Stanley opined that it is important to have an accurate visual representation of property lines.

Mr. Bianchi vaguely remembered that several years ago, someone was to have come in for a summer job to match deeds to the tax map dimensions. Ms. Levine said that this hadn't been done since she has been working for the town. Mr. Bianchi said that it was sometime in the 80's. Mr. Stanley said that this is probably what started the mess. Mr. Bianchi said that it didn't make sense to him why all the deed dimensions were linear non-ortho rectified. Ms. Levine said that this should make the problem of discrepancies go away. This will fix not only the dimensions but the angles too. Mr. Bianchi said he

didn't understand why a picture from the air goes against what 3-4 different properties have. Mr. Stanley said that photos from the air are rounded. Mr. Bianchi asked if the dimensions on the deeds were not correct. Mr. Stanley said that in many cases, they don't line up. They may have the amount stated, but not in the area they believe. He explained that bounds are hard to find sometimes and added that surveyors also make mistakes from time to time. They need to refit the tax map data to more accurately represent the town as they know it to be. Mr. Bianchi asked that if he was in a squabble with his neighbor over who owns which portion of the property and they both have their property surveyed, would that survey not be correct? Ms. Levine said that it would be, but then this adjustment has been addressed to just two properties. There are many more that need to be done.

Ms. Holton asked what they would do about adverse possession. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said it isn't considered as such unless the people are aware of the problem in the maps. Mr. Bianchi asked how accurate it would be when they were done. Mr. Stanley said he wouldn't know until they were done, but it would line up with the aerial photos. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that people are having surveys done and then coming in to show the town how inaccurate the tax map was. Mr. Stanley said that he often apologizes for the representation of the tax map when people come in to review them. He added that the tax maps are used as a planning tool and needs to be reasonably accurate. It is his hope that they will be within a foot or so of most lines.

Table 23 represents the annual deposits needed to support tables 7-22, including the Conservation Commission's request for \$25,000.

Ms. Sheerr-Gross asked about the air packs at the fire department. Chief Lyon said that they've applied for this grant three years in a row. He was hopeful because they were non-compliant and the tanks were very old. They have changed some of their language in the grant proposals, and in 2004 received \$50,000 for their air filling station and mobile cascade system to fill the air packs, and again in 2007 for protective clothes. No matter what happens, in 2017 the packs must be replaced. Ms. Sheerr-Gross asked what percentage of the towns in New Hampshire were non-complaint. Chief Lyon said that it is unknown, but that it is basically an un-funded mandate. Their packs in New London are tested annually and they have to spend a lot to service them. This expense is increasing with age. The packs are outdated and if they run out of air currently, they have no adapter to enable them to use a buddy system with another firefighter's pack.

Ms. Sheerr-Gross asked if the town would be held liable if something happened to a firefighter due to these packs not being compliant. Chief Lyon said that if they were not upgraded and tested regularly the answer would be yes, but they are doing these things to keep them operational. He noted that they recently took a pack out of service because the vibrant alert comes on for no reason, which indicates low air. Chair Cottrill asked how many spare packs they have. Chief Lyon said that there weren't any. There are not enough air packs for every fighter to have one. The grant requested one pack for each riding seat, which is 25.

Mr. Lavoie referred all to Table 23. He said that there are some bonds in the plan. The library has nothing in 2011 but will actually be borrowing a substantial amount of money. Ms Levine agreed on this point. It

should say \$350,000 with an asterisk to show that it is actually a bond. She said that it also doesn't include anything from the Sunapee sewer.

Ms. Levine said that she sees this approval by the Planning Board as parallel to the budget. This is the CIP that the committee recommended and can be approved as written. Parallel to that the Board of Selectmen is working on the wastewater bond that will be added to the budget. This will be done within the next couple of months. She would add the wastewater amounts for the next year. This plan will go to the Board of Selectmen and then the Budget Committee.

Mr. Bianchi said that he has always had problems depositing money in a capital reserve and the same year taking out the same amount of money. In two or three cases, this is what has happened. The intent of the capital reserve is to level out the big expenses like a fire truck or the sewer plant or a library renovation. If they look at the library after the bond, they will have spent less each year than they put in. He opined that if they are going to buy a cruiser every year they should do it, but why go through the CIP to put \$30,000 in and then take \$30,000 out. Ms. Levine said that they don't buy a cruiser each year so they can have a year they have \$0 and then the next year have to have \$30,000 available to replace the SUV. Depositing the same amount of money each year to keep the tax rate level is the point. In the purchase years there is not a big jump. Unspent money can remain in the fund to help spread things out a bit over the next year(s).

Mr. Bianchi referenced the library's funds depositing \$40,000 and using \$20,000 or \$30,000 each year. He wondered why they are doing this to build up the fund. Ms. Levine said that the library has needed a lot of work for unexpected repairs. She also said that the amounts deposited can be revisited each year. The library wanted enough money in the library fund for emergencies because they never have any accessible to them. Gravel roads can experience a negative year when they don't have enough money built up to do any work.

Mr. Lavoie asked if they should add the new bonds on table 24. Ms. Levine said that they haven't been approved yet, but that she could add them. Table 24 projects 10 years based on what exists and puts table 23 in context with annual expenditures currently. She said she could add an estimated library payment for the bond.

Mr. Fred Downey asked question about bonding. Page 11 says that the table does not show the \$8 million dollar upgrade to the facility. He wondered when the decision on the work would be made. Ms. Levine said that it would be made over the next couple of months. Mr. Downey asked who was working on making this decision. Ms. Levine said that the Board of Selectmen, engineers, and town administrators were. Mr. Downey asked how much unused bonding capacity the town had. Ms. Levine referenced table 6, which showed plenty of financing available. He asked if they were able to refinance any bonds, as rates were so low currently. Ms. Levine said that some of the older bonds were from NH banks, and could not be refinanced. The others bonds were already pretty low. Chair Cottrill asked if Ms. Levine could list the interest rate for each of the bonds in the table. She said that she could.

Chair Cottrill asked if the Board of Selectmen arrived at a number they didn't want to surpass for bonding in 2010. Mr. Bianchi said that no number was assumed, to his knowledge. Ms. Levine said that the Board of Selectmen looks at the need for the project and whether the bond will pay for the life time of the project or not. They are nowhere near legal capacity. They have another \$30 million available. Chair Cottrill asked about some of the other projects that may require a bond. Ms. Levine said that the sewer is what they are looking at now and it is a range. Chair Cottrill noted that the sewer project is a definite project and that it is just a matter of time and wondered if it was possible to take advantage of the low bond rates now and lock in a rate. Mr. Bianchi said there will be a push to get this done. There were several options for doing the project, whether it is to do the entire project at once or do it through phasing it out over several years. The consensus was that they need to do something soon. They could get a grant for 25% and would be eligible to get a loan at a rate of 2.25%. Or they could do the whole thing through a loan at 2.5%.

Mr. Hollinger was asked his thoughts on the CIP committee, as he was one of the Planning Board's members who sat on the committee. Mr. Hollinger noted that he had missed one meeting, but recalled that the biggest discussion he was involved in was about the library and bonding versus paying year by year. There were so many problems that needed repair at the library that they would never get ahead unless they could address things all at once. He opined that this method would probably save money in the long run. Mr. Hollinger felt that the meetings were a more hostile environment as in years past, but felt this was tied to what was going on in the economy.

IT WAS MOVED (Michael Doheny) AND SECONDED (Deirdre Sheerr-Gross) to adopt the CIP for 2011-2020, as presented by Ms. Levine, with the amendments of listing the interest rates of the bonds, adding the estimated library bond payment to Table 24 and estimated library bond payments and a note about the sewer bond to Tables 23 and 24.
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Hollinger asked if anything more had come up about the Mill Pond dam. Ms. Levine said an engineer was to look at what needed to be done to the Pleasant Lake dam and didn't believe it would involve any bonding. There may be a capital reserve fund established, but they won't know until they have the conversation with the engineer. The State may give some leeway to the town and not require any work to be done until the next budget cycle. The Mill Pond dam is still being discussed by the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Lavoie asked if there was any chance of some capital improvement that would be required in some scenario. Ms. Levine said that was a chance but she didn't think it would be an issue until the next budget cycle.

Town of Newbury, NH - Elderly Housing Project

Mr. McWilliams explained that the Newbury Planning Board has received a Site Plan Review Application for a 34 room elderly housing project. It is to be located behind the wetlands that lie behind the safety services building on Route 103. The west side of the wetland backs up to Mount Sunapee. The access will be from Newbury Heights Road. The handout that Mr. McWilliams distributed at the meeting dealt with the RSA's of review of developments of regional impacts. RSA 36:55 gave the definition of

proximity to aquifers and surface waters. Newbury Harbor Brook is what is creating the wetland near the proposed structure. Drainage from the proposed site could ultimately drain into Lake Sunapee. The Newbury Planning Board is concerned with lake water quality and realizes that this structure could pose a potential regional impact. Others involved in this discussion are the towns of Sunapee and Bradford, the Upper Valley Regional Planning Commission, the Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission, and Lake Sunapee Protective Association.

Mr. McWilliams believes that the New London Planning Board should encourage the Newbury Planning Board and LSPA to closely scrutinize the plans for the facility and recommend that they retain an independent civil engineer to review stormwater erosion and sediment control plans. That would mean that an engineer working for and retained by the Newbury Planning Board, and paid for by the developer who would offer a professional review of the plans.

Referring to the plans before them, Mr. Hollinger asked what the difference was between a rain garden and bio retention area. Mr. McWilliams said that a bio retention area it is design technique. They are indicating the area to be something that will control rain water, although they are at a preliminary stage in the planning. He commented that a bio retention area was a little different than a rain garden. Subdivision regulations would list some of the various designs that can be used.

Mr. McWilliams noted that the major local issue in Newbury is the use of Newbury Heights Road as the access road to the project. That is a local issue to Newbury, but it is not a regional issue. Mr. Bianchi said that it didn't look like the neighbors were too excited about the whole thing. Mr. McWilliams said they didn't check with the Newbury Heights neighbors before starting this effort. They have plans to widen the road and will not include any sidewalks. He believed elderly housing was a good idea, but having it in that area didn't seem ideal unless they get another access to it. Mr. Bianchi said that from a practical point of view, did it have a big impact on Lake Sunapee? Mr. McWilliams said that if they manage the stormwater and erosion control properly, it shouldn't be a problem. Mr. Bianchi asked if the standards in Newbury were as strict as they were in New London. Mr. McWilliams said that they were. Mr. Stanley said that in general, state-wide, there is an overall decline in water quality throughout the state of New Hampshire. Because they know that septic systems are so far advanced, they know the pollution is not coming from wastewater but from stormwater. He thought they should pay attention to these types of things going forward.

Chair Cottrill called for a motion in the matter.

IT WAS MOVED (Michael Doheny) AND SECONDED (Jeff Hollinger) to respond to the Newbury Planning Board by offering support in their efforts, and by recommending that the LSPA and the Newbury Planning Board scrutinize plans for erosion and stormwater management to insure that current levels of water quality is maintained in Lake Sunapee.
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Master Plan - Chapter VII, Community Facilities & Services

Mr. McWilliams said that he originally drafted the chapter and then forwarded to Ms. Levine for corrections, updates and general input. Ms. Levine said there are a couple things missing: 1) the school district takes its enrollment on Oct. 1st so enrollment figures are not updated yet, as the draft went out before the figures were updated, 2) The fire department figures on page 45 don't have a year-end for 2010 for the five year increment of calls. Chief Lyon said that his estimate was around 650 calls.

Mr. Downey said that they should ask themselves if they have carried out objectives of the 1988 plan. He wondered if they should list all that they did or did not implement, or was that something they didn't care about. Ms. Levine said that it wasn't that they didn't care, but she just didn't include this information in the chapter. Ms. Sheerr said that they have not done this for the other chapters either. Mr. Downey said that planning is of no consequence unless it produces activity. He said that someone should take on the job of addressing this. Mr. McWilliams said that in the introduction of the plan there is a list of the accomplishments that have been made since the last Master Plan. He added that he has drafted the introductory chapter and there is a comparable summary of the major accomplishments, like the changing in the ARR district, the forest conservation district, and about a dozen of them that were major planning accomplishments. Mr. Stanley said that the planning accomplishments were pursued as a result of major recommendations in the previous master plan.

Page 1

Ms. Levine said that the first paragraph, second to the last sentence: "It should also be noted that the..." should be removed, as it is called Community Facilities & Services. Others on the board agreed with Ms. Levine.

Page 3

Chair Cottrill felt the third paragraph down was too wordy. Ms. Levine said that the paragraph talks about potential space needs. If it is supposed to be looking out ten years, that paragraph was needed. He thought about crunching it up a bit. Mr. Stanley said paragraphs 1 & 2 were inaccurate and he would correct them.

Chair Cottrill said they should list "2008 Community Survey" at bottom of the page.

Page 4

Chair Cottrill said that all the figures should reference "Community Survey, 2008."

Page 5

Mr. Downey said that recommendation #3 encourages the continued use of volunteers, but he wasn't sure what that meant. He thought it should be more specific. Ms. Levine said that this recommendation came out of a Board of Selectmen's meeting relating to issue number two. The Board of Selectmen felt that the town needed to look to volunteers first before hiring new staff or taking on services itself.

Library Service

It was noted that they should list the items by using a, b, c, to save space.

Mr. Hollinger and Chair Cottrill thought the section that began with “In 1990-91...” was a wordy. They wondered if they needed to say all of what is included in the library. Chief Lyon said that if someone was looking into a town and wanted some background info, that this would help them gain some knowledge. Chair Cottrill said that he tries to look at it in that way as well, but didn’t think all the details were needed after the size of the library. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that the children’s room and large print room would be useful for demographics. She said that they don’t have to break it down by floor and state the obvious things that a library has. It would be most useful to just mention key features.

In 2002 the Community Garden (behind the library), Chair Cottrill questioned the Olmsted Brother’s reference. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that those were renowned landscapers who also designed New York City’s Central park. She thought they should keep that reference in the text. Many others agreed.

Page 6

Chair Cottrill thought that the second paragraph was a bit wordy. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that the key words should be emphasized and they should eliminate the minor details. She suggested the text: “In their attempt to build sustainable buildings a number of features were put in...”

Chair Cottrill noted a period was needed at the end of both the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs.

Chair Cottrill felt the 3rd paragraph was a bit wordy. He was interested in the name of the volunteer who was mentioned.

Mr. Hollinger said that the 4th paragraph should be worded differently, but that it was one of the most important paragraphs so far.

Fearing that the meeting may go on later than he could stay, Chief Lyon said that for page 42, he has a new water supply map of the town. He wondered what size they would like the map. Mr. McWilliams said that existing and proposed hydrant locations are shown on a community services and facilities map, which will appear earlier in that chapter. Chief Lyon said that he has a new one that is really well done if Mr. McWilliams would like to look at it and compare. They decided to meet to discuss the map at a later date.

Page 6

Chair Cottrill wondered if they needed to state current staff hours. Mr. Stanley thought it would be nice for a comparison to see what it used to take to run the library. Ms Levine said that state law is changing on the use of volunteers, so this could be helpful in moving forward.

Mr. Bianchi noted the spelling of “catalog” and thought it should be “catalogue.”

Page 8

Chair Cottrill suggested making a pagination change so that the information appears under the graph.

Page 9

Chair Cottrill suggested including the survey reference at the top of the page.

He also asked about the second sentence, third line down which mentioned the clapboards of the library being repaired. He thought that had just been completed. Ms. Levine said that some were repaired but there were still some that needed to be done.

Page 10

Chair Cottrill suggested that number four be removed.

Recommendations:

Chair Cottrill made the following remarks:

#1 remove “and an increase” and “necessary.”

#2 remove “The library is thankful that.” Ms. Levine said that it should say that the town should continue to fund the library computer purchases through the regular budget. Chair Cottrill said they should also remove “It is important that.”

#4 remove this entirely.

#5 parking and pedestrian safety should be improved.

Deirdre suggested adding an issue and recommendation that speaks to how much the library is used in the region. Mr. McWilliams said he would take something from the segment that mentioned that the library sees 100,000 visitors each year, and put it into #3 to address this. Ms. Levine said that the trustees are trying to keep the library regional but are trying to find out how to do it. Perhaps they should charge more for library cards, however, libraries are big economic drivers for communities and they don’t want to scare people off. They may limit giving free library cards to the kids in the district, which is \$2,000 in potential income.

Chair Cottrill recalled that a couple years ago there was some conversation about the use of library and the lack of the size of the parking lot. One thought was to go beyond the garden, acquire and tear the house and so as to increase parking. Ms. Levine said that the trustees at the time never wanted to make it happen. Chair Cottrill asked if there had been any other consideration for expansion. Ms. Levine said that no expansion of parking has been addressed.

Page 11

Chair Cottrill wondered if this was the complete list of what the hospital offered. Ms. Levine said that it was the list given by the hospital.

Chair Cottrill said that in the 4th paragraph, third line down that starts with “of the hospital”...they should continue to say that “the front half of the medical hospital was demolished and the building now contains...”

Page 12

Chair Cottrill said that they need to add a dollar sign on the 2008 figure.

He added that the first item should say “further discussion *should*...”

Recreation Service

Ms. Levine said that this includes the community survey, beach discussion and sidewalk. Mr. Hollinger said one thing they should try to do is to track the number of visitors at each of the beaches in the summertime. It could make easier for the Recreation Department to get money. Ms. Levine said that they are looking into doing that.

Mr. Downey said that in 1999 they had a number of leading citizens in town whose number one priority was having a community center built. It is now in 2010 and there is no progress. There is a need for space in town for public meetings, and organizations like COA. They did go to the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting and presented their concept, which was approved 19:0. The Board of Selectmen recommended a \$1.9 million dollar bond. Mr. Downey believed that within this document there should be a better report on what has happened with the community center since then. He said that there is 20,000 feet of space within walking distance of the Town Office. The School District is trying to determine how this space should be used. The Town's Economic Develop Committee has been established for two years and he hasn't heard at all about the use of this particular space. The cost per square foot is lower than they've ever had and they would be remiss if they missed this opportunity. Mr. Downey said that somehow, someday, the community should be alerted to that opportunity. Plans should be action-induced. He went on to say that a private group tried to activate the community center but fell into hard economic times and couldn't bring it to fruition. This was a project approved enthusiastically with financing for a scaled down plan and it was ready to go. He thought that should be in the record somewhere and he felt the Economic Committee should take it on as a challenge.

Ms. Holton said she agreed with Mr. Downey and thought it was a valid point. Mr. Doheny said at least a history or synopsis of the efforts at a community center should be included. Ms. Levine said that the information regarding this issue should be accurate. The Board of Selectmen said they would support a bond for a million and a half if the same amount was raised by a certain date. This was not done. There is a majority supporting a community center, but not a majority supporting paying for it. She didn't think there was enough information from the community survey or otherwise, to build a plan around it. The 10 years of time spent on it proved the community was ready for it. Ms. Holton said she didn't think the public understood the part of the survey that dealt with the community center. Mr. Downey said that because of economic times, a scaled-down facility was approved by the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals. Ms. Levine also noted that the business plan of the community center changed as a result of the private group, and if it was supposed to happen it would have but it didn't because of a compounding of circumstances.

Mr. Doheny suggested Mr. Downey draft a paragraph for page 15 to bring light to this issue of constructing a community center. Mr. Downey said that he has talked to the superintendent of the school about what they have in mind for the building. Mr. Downey is concerned that the building could be consumed by programs that may not be in the best interest of the community.

In response to an earlier comment about the work of the Ad Hoc School Board Committee, created by Dan Wolfe, Mr. Bianchi said very little has occurred with the committee lately. Mr. Bianchi noted that the Committee went on a tour of the old school but nothing has been done. They are concerned about the

future status of the 1941 building, however, Mr. Bianchi believes the committee goes has stopped discussing it. Mr. Bianchi said the first priority of the school board is to make a decision on that building... and there is talk that it should be torn down and the school district would keep that portion of the property because it has access to Main Street.

Mr. Downey said the issue was how the school district would agree on how that space would be used or how the community would influence the use of that space. Ms. Holton felt it was an important piece of New London history. She said she can't think of anyplace they can go to have a meeting without it costing money or that there was someplace the kids could go and enjoy themselves safely. In 1999 there was so much approval and whatever happened, it filtered down into nothing. Ms. Levine agreed and noted that one of the planned revenue sources for the community center was to charge for the use of the rooms.

Mr. Downey thought that more thought should be given to how that space should be used. Mr. Stanley said it is not the town's position to decide what the space would be used for. Legally, the town has no control over what happens.

Page 14

Chair Cottrill thought the whole section on recreation made it look like it was the most important thing in town. It seemed to go on and on. Ms. Levine said that if anything, they could eliminate the current programming options, but not the need for property assessment, beach discussions or the sidewalk discussion. She said that when they apply for grants it is important to have support in the master plan.

Page 15

Ms. Levine said that the Bucklin Beach plan they had developed created storage on the 2nd floor of the building, but that it would be cheaper to add a bay to the garage at the sewer department. The facility at Bucklin still needs upgrades, however.

Page 16

Chair Cottrill said that the acronym "OCIC" should be written out as "Outing Club Indoor Center." He also asked about #4 Lake Sunapee Beach (boating programs) and wondered if this referred to the State Park Beach. Ms. Levine said she wasn't sure. Chair Cottrill suggested it should say "Lake Sunapee State Park" not "Beach." She added that to her knowledge, there were no boating programs, but there was a boat launch.

Chair Cottrill asked if the list of equipment could be listed differently, such as comas instead of bullets, in an effort to conserve space.

Page 17

Ms. Levine said there should be a slash between "Dinner with Jack Frost" and "Town Winter Carnival."

Chair Cottrill asked if it was necessary to list future programming. Ms. Levine said that it is programming list and not about the facilities. This is the recreation commission's recommendation. She sees the recommendations covering a broader area. Recreation should be more like "investigate facilities needed to facilitate..."

Sewer Plant/Frothingham Road – Chair Cottrill questioned whether this amount of detail was necessary. He thought the third point was incorrect. Mr. Doheny thought the “what” was important, but not the location or “where.” Ms. Levine said that the sewer plant at Frothingham Road could be a possible site for development for these programs. She explained that it is 60 acres of land that isn’t desirable for other uses.

Page 18

Chair Cottrill said that the top of the page refers to things on next page which are not labeled. He suggested changing the pagination to have the information on same page as the chart. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that the table is information in itself, as it showed that people do not have a strong opinion on this subject matter. In the survey they should ask a question “do they support lake facilities.” When they ask which body of water, the numbers break down. Chair Cottrill asked that a reference to the table number and the survey be made.

Page 19

Chair Cottrill asked if the sidewalk information should be included in the Transportation chapter. Ms. Levine said that the survey asked both questions so it may fit better with Outdoor Facilities. The Recreation Department applied for the sidewalk grant for Pleasant Street. Chair Cottrill thought it should be called “Bikeway” plan with a secondary reference to sidewalks. Ms. Levine suggested changing the “/” to “and” and calling it “Sidewalk and Bike Path Plans.” It was suggested to call these paths “Multi-use Recreational Paths.”

Mr. Hollinger suggested making one paragraph that talked about bike paths and in that mention sidewalks. He referenced page 20, which says that bikes are not allowed on sidewalks.

Mr. Doheny asked about private recreation. Did anyone ask the outing club to provide any verbiage? Mr. Downey agreed that this was a good point. Ms. Levine said that this was the town’s master plan, not the Outing Club’s master plan. She added that their services are referenced in the plan but that they wouldn’t be making a recommendation to the Outing Club. Mr. Doheny said they should ask the Outing Club what they’d like to do. Mr. Hollinger said that if the Outing Club wasn’t around, the town would have forced the Community Center. It is a draw and is huge. Mr. Hollinger and Chair Cottrill commented that as far as programs, the Outing Club is used more, hands down. Ms. Levine said for kids who do sports - yes, but for those who don’t or who need care during the summer, it is not. The Outing Club is mostly for team-based sports. There is a niche for both.

Ms. Levine said that if they are going to ask the Outing Club about a write-up, should they also ask the college? They could give information on general growth on campus, etc. Her point was that they need to decide if it is for community facilities for the town or do they need to include everything. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said the town is impacted by all of these organizations and so they should be included. Mr. Bianchi asked where culture should fit into the town as there was currently no place in the plan that he has seen about culture. That, he felt, would address Colby-Sawyer College.

Mr. Downey said that there were three pillars of the once-planned community center: health and wellness, arts and culture, and recreation. Mr. Bianchi said the New London Barn Players should be included in culture.

Page 21

Chair Cottrill suggested that arts and culture be added by including Colby-Sawyer College, the New London Barn Players, etc.. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said for Mr. McWilliams to take a first crack at the paragraph. She said it should include some history, current programs, issues, and recommendations. Then they can take it apart if they don't like it. Ms. Holton asked if under recommendations they could explore the broad base culture and civic use of a community center.

Ms. Levine thought the question addressed who wanted a Community Center with "x, y, z" should be changed to just "community center."

Under culture, the following groups were suggested for inclusion: New London Barn Playhouse, Colby-Sawyer College, New London Area Center for the Arts, NL Bandstand Committee, Summer Music Assoc. among others.

It being late, the Planning Board decided to end the review of the facilities chapter at page 22.

Mylar Signing for the Ewing Lot Line Adjustment

IT WAS MOVED (Deirdre Sheerr-Gross) AND SECONDED (Michael Doheny) to sign the Mylar for the Ewing lot line adjustment. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes Review of Past Meetings

IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (Peter Bianchi) to approve the minutes of June 22, August 24, and September 14, 2010, as circulated. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. McWilliams noted that the next meeting would be held on October 26th and would include some Zoning amendments. Mr. Stanley said there would be two tree-cutting requests as well.

IT WAS MOVED (Peter Bianchi) AND SECONDED (Jeff Hollinger) to adjourn the Planning Board meeting of October 12, 2010. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 9:56pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary
Town of New London