



TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

375 MAIN STREET • NEW LONDON, NH 03257 • WWW.NL-NH.COM

NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD MASTER PLAN WORKSESSION February 10, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Dale Conty, Ken McWilliams, Larry Ballin, Tom Cottrill, Jeff Hollinger, Michael Doheny, Celeste Cook, Michele Holton (Alternate) Deidre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michael Doheny attended part of the meeting and at the request of Chair Ebel, Michele Holton agreed to replace him in his absence.

Attendees: Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley, Town Planner Ken McWilliams, Anita Gelcius, Michael Gelcius, John Chowanski, Richard Anderson, Rob Bryant (Lake Sunapee Region Chamber of Commerce), Bob LaVoie, Donna Sparks, Mary Sparks, Christina Helm, Katharine Fischer, Virginia Soule, Greg Markoff, Bill Clough, Sue and John Clough, Tony Dunsey, Terry Dancy

Chair Ebel called the MEETING TO ORDER at 7:00 p.m. and stated the purpose of this meeting was to present the results of the Community Survey. She noted that the Planning Board first needed to address the first issue on the agenda. At this time, Chair Ebel asked Donna Sparks to give a brief summary of her request.

DONNA SPARKS – FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW: HOME BUSINESS – PIANO LESSONS (Tax Map 73, Lot 24)

Donna Sparks stated she has been teaching piano, voice, and flute lessons in her studio on Main Street to all ages, Sunday through Friday for 5½ to 6 hours a day since 2000. Ms. Sparks said she is requesting to move her business to her home to be with her mother, who was also in attendance, due to the death of her father in November. At the request of Chair Ebel, Ms. Sparks stated she has reviewed the home business ordinance and confirmed there would be no employees, deliveries or changes to the property. She calculated the percentage of business use at 9½%. Ken McWilliams confirmed for Chair Ebel the application was straightforward, complied with the home business requirement with no real issues and unnecessary for the Department Heads to meet on this. When Chair Ebel opened this up for discussion, there were no abutters present and no comments.

It was MOVED (Dale Conly) and SECONDED (Jeff Hollinger) THAT THE REQUEST FROM DONNA SPARKS TO MOVE AN EXISTING MUSIC TEACHING BUSINESS FROM A STUDIO ON MAIN STREET TO HER HOME (Tax Map 73, Lot 24) be APPROVED AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS

Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams to present the results of the Community Survey. Ken McWilliams explained he would go through each question, identify the top five (5) responses/results to each question and indicate the percentage that was calculated by combining the following top categories as appropriate.

Very Significant/Significant	Very Informative/Informative	Very Supportive/Supportive	Strongly Agree/Agree
------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------

Supporting notes were also included after each question when deemed appropriate.. Mr. McWilliams noted that the results of the survey would be included in the Master Plan.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. McWilliams what the percentage of response was. He estimated it to be around 20% based on the 600-700 responses. Chair Ebel also indicated that some of the responses were prepared on behalf of households, as opposed to individuals, and that not all surveys were completed by all the respondents.. She stated that the overall goal was to review the results, discuss them and reflect them in the Master Plan chapters, as

appropriate. Chair Ebel then asked Mr. McWilliams to proceed with the presentation shown on the overhead and from the available handouts. Copies of the 1996 survey results were also included as a handout for comparison on some of the questions.

Community Survey Results

#

Planning Board Community Survey 2008 Questions

1. "Which of the following attributes do you think significantly contribute to making New London a desirable place to live and/or own property? (Please rate each attribute)"

Rank	Attribute	Very Significant + Significant %
1	Scenic vistas of lakes, mountains & open Spaces	97.8
2	Small town atmosphere with rural charm	95.3
3	Village centers with New England Charm	93.2
4	Friendly people with community spirit	90
5	Availability of numerous outdoor recreational activities	86.2

Comments: Chair Ebel noted that people support villages and outdoor charm.

Unidentified person stated that the survey didn't get into specifics on how "Villages with New England charm" would be supported. At the request of Chair Ebel, Ken McWilliams stated this would be looked at in the future in the Land Use chapters such as how the community wants to continue to support the village concept and how we can improve on that. This person also questioned the numerous recreational activities. Chair Ebel stated that there is a whole recreation section so the Planning Board will look at that, come up with ideas, and promote different concepts.

Michael Gelcius stated that some of the questions on the survey were vague and responses unclear. In addition, taking notice of some of the things proposed, he asked how people felt about the related tax implications and funding that were not addressed and asked if it was intentional or an oversight. He also asked if funding for these projects would come from the town fund or if State/Federal funding would be available.

Chair Ebel clarified that the purpose of this session was just to review the results and not address the finances at this time. She noted that if people are in favor of public funding, she was sure that the Town would do its utmost to find grant money to help fund it, so such projects could be achieved with more than property taxes. The roundabout is an example. In addition, Chair Ebel stated that the financial impact in whole or in part was not addressed in most questions. For certain questions, a funding question was specifically included, for example, for the community center and a fiber optics program but such finance-related questions were not intentionally omitted. Chair Ebel stated in doing the Master Plan, they could investigate more and develop these concepts. At this time, Chair Ebel also welcomed any future comments on the remaining survey questions.

Bob LaVoie wanted to know if once the Board figured out from this survey what might change in the Master Plan, would that be part of further discussion at worksessions? Chair Ebel stated that these issues would absolutely be addressed then. To focus on the purpose of this session, Bob LaVoie commented we should identify what's in the survey, listen to ideas and take notes for the future. Peter Stanley agreed and stated that the Master Plan is a direction, expressing the feeling of the Town on what should be done. It's not so much the nuts and bolts, or how the Town gets it done.

Gary Markoff referenced the October visioning sessions and the question he asked then regarding future budgeting plans and trends, and suggesting that the Town solve, plan, and match revenue to expenses per capita. He observed that that approach follows Michael Gelcius's comments concerning the negative impacts on the environment. Due to the tightness of the current economy he asked if there was any projection done concerning town expenses, budgeting and demand curve. Chair Ebel stated this was not done as part of the Master Plan process, but it's a good idea for implementation of the recommendations. Ken McWilliams noted that the Master Plan's companion financial document is the Capital Improvement Plan or CIP.

Gary Markoff commented that it's very dangerous to plan out 15 years and not look at the expenses. He added that a good example is what the country is fighting nationally now and he emphasized that one just can't keep printing the money. Gary also stated that there has to be some call into the community to say how much more are citizens willing to take on as a tax burden.

Selectman Larry Ballin stated the CIP set aside money for the future, but that there were cuts this year due to the economic reality. He noted that the BoS also have a financial impact statement currently being developed re: the former middle school community center. Mr. Ballin suggested that a great thing to do would be to expand commercial 50% because if there's no commercial and industrial development, the residential tax rate goes up. He emphasized this survey is at the planning conceptual level and the next implementation plan would be the cost, necessary funding, and action plans to get it done.

Bob LaVoie agreed that things were being mixed up. He stated the Master Plan is not a financial document, but a planning document. PB Member Jeff Hollinger emphasized this doesn't necessarily mean the Town has to move forward with what is in the Master Plan; it is just a feel for what people would like to see. Richard Anderson emphasized, as well, that the sense of this survey is to provide guidance.

Zoning Administrator Stanley stated that there have been several community surveys that were done over the past 7-8 years where about 20 towns broke out costs for commercial, residential and no development. Based on the surveys, the overall conclusion was that there was a higher financial burden for residential development, lower for commercial and very little or no burden for undeveloped land. Since New London is a small town, he said it was hard to look at its data. Mr. Stanley also stated that everything is a moving target and that most large land acquisitions projects include Town, State and Federal funding. He also stated that the Master Plan presents reasonable goals for the Town, assuming that resources are available.

At this time, Bill Clough asked for clarification on what was meant by "Small town atmosphere with rural charm". Chair Ebel stated that it was a number of things and referred to Question 10 which had examples of New London's best characteristics. Mr. McWilliams added that the small town atmosphere is the characteristic of New London that everyone loves, such as charming roads, stone walls, scenic views and open fields. Bill Clough noted that a lot of these things relate to agriculture and Chair Ebel stated there's a definite attraction to New London's agricultural heritage.

2 "Please indicate how important you think each of the following objectives is for planning for the future of New London over the next fifteen years. (Please rate each objective)"

Rank	Attribute	Very Important + Important %
1	Attracting a more balanced mix of resident age groups	68.5
2	Restricting industrial development	68.4
3	Limiting commercial development	61.3
4	Expanding commercial & professional services only to meet the Town's needs	56.5
5	Attracting clean, non-polluting light or high-tech industries	54.6

NOTE: The only other one worth noting at 50.4% was "Continuing to function and expand as a regional commercial & professional service center"

Chair Ebel commented that these responses were interesting, but #2 and #5 could be viewed as contradictory. She asked Ken McWilliams for his thoughts. Mr. McWilliams stated he believed the respondents opposed to heavy industry but were in favor of high tech companies and that this subject would come out again in another question. Chair Ebel noted that the Board will investigate this further during the Master Plan process.

Virginia Soule thought the Town should encourage attracting clean, non-polluting light and high tech industries tucked into rural areas near the interchanges that would provide good paying jobs and increase the tax base. She

referenced a company in Sutton, Labsphere, as a good example. Ms. Soule also noted that since New London is so desirable, the cost of land has always been a problem.

PB Member Celeste Cook agreed with her, and stated that with the taxpayers being so concerned with the tax base, if the Town didn't attract more business, it would be in trouble. She also noted that if the Town wants to attract a balanced mix of people, it will make sense to promote light industry. PB Member Michael Doheny commented that 42% of the people thought that as well. Chair Ebel noted that when a Town attracts younger people one has to be mindful of provide economical housing opportunities and that it also raised school issues.

3 What overall pattern of future residential development would you prefer to see in Town? (Please rate each pattern)

Rank	Attribute	Strongly Agree + Agree %
1	Concentrate residential development within or adjacent to village centers with outlying areas remaining low density	65.1
2	Spread evenly throughout Town, but not in visible, residential strip pattern along existing roads	57.3
3	Scattered throughout Town	50.7
4	Residential strip development along State and Town roads	7.3
5	Focus residential development around lakes and ponds	6.4

Chair Ebel noted that this goes along with the current thinking these days of developing town in concentric circles with the bulk of population near services. She noted that these discussions also came up at the vision sessions.

Ms. Soule didn't feel people want this type of planning even though it sounds good. Virginia also stated if people don't have a choice in some of the more populated areas in southern NH, an apartment is probably better than no house at all, but in this area most people want their own space.

4 Which of the following best describes your reaction to this population growth? (Please choose one)"

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Neutral: Okay with growth as is	55.4
2	Unfavorable: Discourage growth	30.8
3	Favorable: Encourage growth	13.8

PB Member Jeff Hollinger stated we can't discourage growth; it's not healthy. Chair Ebel referred to the 1996 survey noting the 1996 vs. 2008 showed a shift from opposition to growth to neutrality. Mr. Ballin noted that a lot of people are energized and feel growth is a good thing.

Gary Markoff stated he was shocked that at the turn of the century the population was around 700-900; in the last decade there was good growth then no growth for a while (1,000 a hundred years ago) and asked the Board why. Several members of the board responded it was I-89 that resulted in that shift. The population doubled between 1960 and 2000. Michele Holton added that the interstate changed everyone's lives and added growth. Ken McWilliams noted that the widening of Route 93 made a big impact on New London by making it quicker to get here. Mr. Stanley commented that in the 1960s lake houses were going for back taxes and couldn't be given away, and observed that things changed dramatically in 1969 due to I-89.

Chair Ebel also noted that telecommuting has had a big impact on everyone's lives allowing more people to work from home.

Michele Holton agreed with some development in the center of town but stated she didn't want to see it change like Cohasset, MA that currently has a very congested area along their business route on Main Street.

Sue Clough said she would be curious to see what the Board thinks would solve that because whether growth was in the outlying areas or in town, the residents would still shop in town. She thought that folks living in town could decrease traffic rather than increase it because more people could walk. Ken McWilliams responded walkability in the center of town and bike trails are helpful with cutting down traffic. Virginia Soule asked how they could even think of increasing density in the center of town and noted the traffic-related problem when people take short cuts through several side streets to avoid the center already. Chair Ebel stated there would be a land use chapter in the Master Plan that would get into this. Gary Markoff asked if these questions will come up again based on the response choices and Chair Ebel stated the PB would focus on the majority, but there wouldn't be another survey.

Terry Dancy stated in the previous master plan process people voted against expanding the commercial area of town. Ken McWilliams added that the Planning Board recommendation was based on the strong vote against it, including from the Town's business community. Ken also added that in the 1996 survey, most people did not support commercial growth.

5 How should New London respond to pressure for additional commercial growth generated by the population growth in the greater Kearsarge/Sunapee area? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Promote regional commercial growth	36.5
2	Promote local commercial growth	32.1
3	Do not promote commercial growth	31.5

Note: Evenly split, no strong direction

6 In what part(s) of Town do you support adding areas to be zoned for commercial use? (Please choose all that apply)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	On Main St. between Parkside Rd. and Little Sunapee Rd.	33.5
2	Around the I-89 interchanges	31.9
3	Only where there is access to public water & sewer service	30.2
4	Nowhere/no further commercial development	27.3
5	Behind existing commercial zone on Main Street towards Barrett Rd. between the Village Green Shops and Parkside Rd.	26.0

Note: Evenly split, no strong direction

Zoning Administrator Stanley stated that the terrain around interstate I-89 doesn't support commercial growth, and that there is no sewer and water, so it would be foolhardy to build there. Peter also noted in the 1996 survey, people were very much opposed to developing new retail centers at I-89 because business was promoted when visitors came into the town. Chair Ebel agreed and stated that if one comes into Town to buy gas, the person might also go out to eat, do other errands, and go shopping compared to getting off the Interstate and getting right back on again. Ken McWilliams stated that some towns put shopping centers near the interstate then that kills the town. This has been seen in countless places across the country.

Larry Ballin noted one option would be to put low tech or high tech/light industry in areas where they can be tucked in back (not like Market Basket in Warner). He said those are the areas where commuters would use the services of the town

When Chair Ebel asked what land around the interstate interchanges supported this type of growth, Peter Stanley confirmed there was not much. Peter indicated there is one 4 acre lot at the corner of Exit 11 and Larry Ballin stated there might be some possibility with some small lots near King Hill road and other small lots off Exit 12.

7 Assuming additional area is zoned for commercial/industrial development in New London in the future, which types of commercial/industrial uses should be permitted in those areas? (Please rate each type of development)

Rank	Attribute	Strongly Agree +Agree %
1	Professional business offices	81.2
2	Medical offices	80.4

3	Restaurants	71.1
4	Inns and Bed & Breakfasts	67.1
5	Home Occupations & home businesses	60.5

Sue Clough stated that the Town clearly needed to consider two different commercial zones because a mix such as light industrial and bed & breakfast would not be a good idea. Chair Ebel agreed .

Rob Bryant from the Lake Sunapee Region Chamber of Commerce stated that business owners don't want growth around the interchanges, they want people to come into town.

Chair Ebel noted again that the responses in the 1996 survey and the business community's strong message to the Board at that time persuaded it that it was not a good time to expand the commercial zone.

Mr. Doheny advised Chair Ebel that he had to leave and she requested Planning Board Alternate Michele Holton to replace him at this time.

Unidentified person asked if this meant New London ignores/preclude opportunities if they did not score high in the survey responses. Chair Ebel responded that the PB would not ignore low-scoring ideas, but focus on what people were interested in the most. Chair Ebel stated that if 99% of the people said no commercial growth, the Board would probably make a recommendation on that. Mr. McWilliams observed part of the PB's job is to exercise its judgment about what is best for the Town.

8 Should New London continue to encourage the development of a regional fiber optic network to serve all areas of Town? "

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	65.8
2	Don't Know	22.5
3	No	11.7

Note: For those who know about the concept, it got very strong support.

Gary Markoff asked what percentage of the town has high speed internet service available. He also asked if there were any areas of town that want it and cannot get it, therefore having to rely on satellite. Mr. Markoff also questioned the return on investment for the town and the financial burden on the taxpayer if asked to support it.

Larry Ballin stated there are some areas including his house that can't get cable without a large price tag associated with it and confirmed he has satellite. He indicated that there was a project in the Upper Valley investigating a more high tech modern capacity for towns (wireless with more backbone) and this question was included in the survey based on that project. Jessie Levine, Town Administrator, is involved in that project. Ken McWilliams stated that the other component of this is the size of the files that can be transmitted. The hospital and the college are very interested in this because it would allow them to transmit videos and large files quickly that are just creeping across at this time.

9 If yes to the question above, should the Town invest in a regional fiber optic network?

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	70.1
3	No	29.9

Michael Gelcius asked why the town would even get involved when TDS and Comcast currently supplies this service. Larry Ballin responded to create the backbone so it becomes a competitive market where there's no competition now. As to whether the town should invest in this, Mr. Ballin stated it's a subject the Town will be addressing for many years. Gary Markoff thought if the town invested in towers it could be a drawing card for a commercial base. Terry Dancy stated this would also be beneficial for individuals who work from home who are looking for higher speed communication that can have a huge impact on their job opportunities. Many companies are even willing to pay for it and he felt ten years from now it will be essential. Mr. Dancy felt we should accelerate the investigation of this to improve the tax base.

Larry Ballin stated there would be meetings open to the public on this subject. He said unfortunately technology is moving faster than the Town's bureaucracy and finances. He stated that New London is a part of a consortium of towns looking into this and it needs to be open to various options. To answer Michael Gelcius's question, he observed that having fiber optics would be far better than what the Town currently gets through TDS and Comcast.

10 How important do you think the following attributes are in creating the unique character and rural charm of New London? (Please rate each attribute)

Rank	Attribute	Very Important & Important %
1	Scenic views & vistas	96.3
2	Agricultural lands, open fields	94.7
3	Landmarks & historic buildings	92.9
4	Stone walls	92.3
5	Attractive landscaping	92.2

Note: Village Architectural quality and Tree Lines both – 92.1%

Bill Clough stated it was a bit ironic that everything in the Town seemed to work against agricultural development right now and wondered what could be done to reengineer things to help them survive. He felt this would be a point worth discussing. Ken McWilliams stated that this issue would be related to the Conservation Commission and Open Space lands and suggested that the Town might consider developing an agricultural commission. Peter Stanley stated that the State encourages active participation in agricultural growth and Chair Ebel asked the audience if they thought agriculture is a form of commercial growth. Mr. McWilliams said he didn't think so. He stated that there was not a specific question related to this on the survey, but he thought it was important to support local farms. Chair Ebel suggested the PB could identify the best agricultural land, not just what is presently open fields, and the best people, and try to find a way of promoting agricultural in New London.

Peter Stanley said the Conservation Commission has already identified the land and the people but not the agricultural potential. Peter also added that he has identified fields in the draft conservation chapter of the Master Plan he's been working on. The last field inventory showed 470 +/- acres and now it's up to 675 acres of open fields in New London. This is a considerable amount of agricultural land with statewide importance. Peter said that New London definitely has some worthwhile agricultural land and soil worth protecting that is located in the commercial zone.

Chair Ebel noted that the Town should keep its eye on the "agricultural ball" and try to figure out how to promote agriculture in the Town. At the suggestion of Larry Ballin, Bill Clough agreed to bring the issue of agricultural promotion before the Board of Selectmen and noted that if it received such a high degree of support in the survey, it should be pursued. Chair Ebel noted this concept should be one focus of the Master Plan. She also said that looking at the Spring Ledge operation, one can certainly argue that promoting agriculture would be good for the Town's economy. It employs a lot of people and brings a lot of people into Town.

Bill Clough also noted that the open fields in most of the surrounding town have all grown in, but that New London has a significant amount of open fields left. He emphasized the Town should encourage the preservation and development of agricultural growth as it would be a shame to lose them due to commercial growth. Bill also noted that the areas mentioned in the survey were the obvious ones. He added that it's the properties that aren't obvious that don't get the support, referring to the parcel behind Hannaford's. Ken McWilliams confirmed it is zoned commercial.

Chair Ebel thanked Mr. Clough for raising such an excellent point. Other PB members concurred. She noted that when reviewing the survey results, the Planning Board will also have to use their knowledge and experience along with public input to set the direction for the Master Plan.

11 How would you rate the importance of protecting the following scenic views? (Please rate each view. Refer to the accompanying map for the locations of the views listed.)

		Very Important
--	--	----------------

Rank	Attribute	+ Important %
1	Fields along Main Street (Views of Mt. Kearsarge, Mt. Sunapee & former King Ridge)	87.9
2	Views along Pleasant Lake	86.5
3	Views from Burpee Hill of Mt. Sunapee & Lake Sunapee	83.8
4	Main Street	83.6
5	Views & fields along Rte. 11 & King Hill Road	83.6

12 Workforce or affordable housing is housing affordable to all income levels and generally applies to mortgage or rent, insurance and taxes being no more than 30 percent of a household income.

Do you think there is a need for workforce/affordable housing for people who work in New London such as police, firefighters, teachers, health care providers, etc.? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	66.0
2	No	18.0
3	Don't Know	16.0

Note: Pretty straight forward and pretty strong response.

Virginia Soule asked how could anyone be against this,,but wondered where to put it and how to afford it. She stated she liked Mr. Markoff's discussion of money because that's going to be an important part of the equation.

Larry Ballin noted that the State mandates workforce housing, but gives no direction and leaves it up to the Planning Board to figure out where to put it. Mr. Ballin also stated this was not the forum to dwell on this, it was just a broad question. In addition, Mr. Hollinger emphasized this was just a hypothetical question and not the forum to discuss this issue.

13 Please indicate your level of support for the following methods of how New London could address the need to accommodate housing for people who work in Town? (Please rate each method)

Rank	Attribute	Very Supportive + Supportive %
1	Expand opportunities for "mother-in-law" apartments	71.8
2	Expand opportunities for rental units	55.9
3	Encourage housing over businesses in the Commercial District	55.3
4	Permit conversion of large single family homes into multiple units in New London Village	53.0
5	Provide a density increase for workforce/affordable housing	50.4

14 Should the Town conduct a study of whether to create historic districts such as Elkins Village, Old Main Street, and Main Street from Crockett's Corner to Spring Ledge? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	56.6
2	No	25.6
3	Don't Know	17.8

Note: Educational opportunity about what historic districts are.

Chair Ebel stated the Board has worked on the historical chapter already and is getting a lot of input from the Historical Society which was greatly appreciated.

15 How important do you think it is to preserve the following historic attributes? (Please rank each attribute)

Rank	Attribute	Very Important + Important %
1	Individual historic buildings	88.5
2	Historic sites	87.7
3	Historic features, such as stone walls	86.2

Note: Strong support for all three categories.

16 Do you support continued efforts by the Town to protect land that is considered significant to the Town's character (i.e., the Philbrick-Cricenti Bog and the Town Common)? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	93.1
2	Don't know	3.1
3	No	3.8

Note: resounding

17 If yes to the question above, should the Town invest in the protection of additional lands considered to be significant to the Town's character? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	73.9
2	Don't know	16.0
3	No	10.1

Bill Cough asked for an explanation on the meaning of "undeveloped land". Ken McWilliams explained that it is open fields and crop land, for example, that is not developed for urban-type use.

18 Please indicate your level of support for conserving the following types of properties. (Please rank your level of support for each type of property listed)

Rank	Attribute	Very Supportive + Supportive %
1	Scenic views	90.4
2	Wildlife habitat & corridors	86.4
3	Wooded areas	80.2
4	Undeveloped agricultural land	77.7
5	Wetlands	78.8

Note: Land adjacent to currently protected lands - 68.3% was incorrectly listed on results handout as #5.

19 "Existing land use regulations do not protect the natural resources listed below. Please indicate your level of support for protecting the following natural resources through amendments to local land use regulations. (Please rank each natural resource)"

Rank	Attribute	Very Supportive + Supportive %
1	Groundwater resources	86.5
2	Wildlife habitat	86.2
3	Scenic resources	82.4
4	Agricultural land & open fields	79.7
5	Ridgelines & hillsides	74.1

20. Should the Town study amending its land use regulations to allow and facilitate the use of alternative energy sources such as wind generators and solar energy for residential uses? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	81.3
2	No	9.4
3	Don't Know	9.4

Chair Ebel stated that the Town has already started the process due to State legislation mandating that no Town could unreasonably infringe on the ability of people to get wind generators. She noted that the legislation passed after the PB developed its survey, and that it looks like people want this anyway which is good. Ken McWilliams stated a proposed zoning ordinance on this subject will be up for voter consideration at Town Meeting.

Should the Town study amending its land use regulations to allow and facilitate the use of alternative energy sources such as wind generators and solar energy for commercial uses? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	73.2
2	No	13.4
3	Don't Know	13.4

22 "Sustainability is commonly defined as: "Meeting the needs of current generations without compromising the needs of future generations." To determine if something is sustainable, three elements must be considered: economics, environment, and social equity.

Should the Town work toward sustainability in its own operations (i.e. energy conservation) and promote sustainable practices on a town-wide and regional basis?"

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	83.7
2	Don't know	10.3
3	No	6.0

When questioned about this, Larry Ballin confirmed that the Board of Selectmen do recycle; promote energy conservation; have a no idling policy for town vehicles and are promoting on energy efficiency in buildings. He said that the new sewer pump station has already saved a great deal of money. The Town has working on this, but he observed that energy efficiency is hard with old buildings.

23 Do you support expanding public transportation to major regional transportation hubs? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Very Supportive + Supportive	66.5

24 "Do you support studying the feasibility of developing public transportation within the greater New London regional area? (Please choose one)"

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Very Supportive + Supportive	51.8

Note: Pretty even split with no strong direction

Celeste Cook stated that this is confusing as to whether the populace wanted the Town to study or support this. Chair Ebel said we will have to work on this through the Master Plan process.

Unless indicated, there was no discussion on the following survey results.

25 Do you support developing a local transportation center in New London? (Please choose one)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Very Supportive + Supportive	37.0

Note: Pretty even split with no strong direction

26 "Do you support the concept of developing a community center in New London to serve people of all ages and provide a variety of activities? (Please choose one)"

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Very Supportive + Supportive	53.4

Note: Pretty strong support but not overwhelming

27 "Do you support the creation, addition or expansion of the following public facilities on the lakes listed below? (Please rate each type of facility for each of the listed lakes)"

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Very Supportive + Supportive	39.7

Note: No major support for any

28 Where and what type of improvements for pedestrian and bicycle connections do you support?

Sidewalks are paved and allow pedestrians but not bicyclists. Multi-Use Paths are constructed of crushed gravel and allow multiple uses such as walkers, runners, & mountain bikers.

Bike Lanes are built on the side of the road with painted stripe separating bike lane from vehicle lanes for bike use only. Bike Paths are separate paved paths for bike use only that are built off-road.

Check one response for each location.

Rank	Attribute	Multi-Use Path + Don't Know Response %
1	Along Parkside Road & under the power line to Newport Road	57.3

All the other choices listed below were evenly split in the Multi-Use Path & Don't know responses.

Along Pleasant Street from Main Street to Job Seamans Acres

Along County Road from Newport Road to Parkside Road

Along Parkside Road from County Road to power line

Along Pleasant Street from Main Street to the Public Works Department

Along Route 11 from the NL Post Office to the Transfer Station under the power line

Along Seamans Road from Gould Road to the Colby-Sawyer athletic field complex

Along Route 114 from Main Street to Bucklin Beach

From Town to Bucklin Beach

29 The Town currently has a network of hiking and walking trails in the rural parts of the community.

Please indicate your level of support for adding the following segments to the hiking and walking trail network.

(Please rate each segment. Refer to the accompanying map for the locations of the trail segments)

Rank	Attribute	Very Supportive + Supportive Response %
1	Spring Ledge – Morgan Hill Road (Messer/Bucklin)	63.2
2	Extend Kidder – Cleveland-Clough trail to Pleasant Lake	59.3
3	Pingree Road – Putney Road – Morgan Hill Road	58.9
4	Clark Pond trail from Bog Road	58.0
5	Extend Clark Lookout trail to adjacent property & Lake Sunapee	56.3

30 "Do you support the creation, addition or expansion of the following public facilities on the lakes listed below? (Please rate each type of facility for each of the listed lakes)" Can we get the color out of this chart?

Planning Board Community Survey 2008

Do you support the creation, addition or expansion of the following public facilities on the lakes listed below? (Please rate each type of facility for each of the listed lakes)

Lake Sunapee

Answer Options	Very Unsupportive	Unsupportive	Neutral	Supportive	Very Supportive	Don't Know	Response Count
Public Beach	57	56	100	94	69	50	426
Beach Parking	60	52	103	96	56	49	416
Public Boat Access	82	65	90	84	47	48	416
Boat Access Parking	83	67	97	81	37	49	414

Little Lake Sunapee

Answer Options	Very Unsupportive	Unsupportive	Neutral	Supportive	Very Supportive	Don't Know	Response Count
Public Beach	73	62	101	101	63	26	426
Beach Parking	65	63	89	121	50	28	416
Public Boat Access	87	91	93	74	33	38	416
Boat Access Parking	83	94	95	72	32	36	412

Pleasant Lake

Answer Options	Very Unsupportive	Unsupportive	Neutral	Supportive	Very Supportive	Don't Know	Response Count
Public Beach	87	69	81	99	68	22	426
Beach Parking	77	71	79	115	47	27	416
Public Boat Access	99	92	92	69	37	26	415
Boat Access Parking	93	92	96	69	33	29	412

Messer Pond

Answer Options	Very Unsupportive	Unsupportive	Neutral	Supportive	Very Supportive	Don't Know	Response Count
Public Beach	105	75	98	31	19	98	426
Beach Parking	105	77	88	35	14	94	413
Public Boat Access	100	65	97	50	15	87	414
Boat Access Parking	96	67	99	47	10	92	411

Question Totals	
Comments:	80
answered question	425

Note: Not a majority of support for any of these facilities on any of these water bodies.

Planning Board Community Survey 2008							
#31 How would you rate each of the following public services? (Please choose one rating for each public service)							
Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Know	Response Count
Fire protection service 88%	263	113	3	1	0	47	427
Police protection service 91.5%	261	130	8	1	0	27	427
Sewer service 37% (78.6%)	64	94	33	8	2	226	427
Road maintenance – summer 76.8%	114	214	71	16	4	8	427
Snowplowing 86.4%	178	191	29	6	1	22	427
Transfer station service 88.3%	256	121	31	5	2	12	427
Recycling service 79.6%	200	140	51	18	2	16	427
Library service 89.9%	292	92	9	0	0	34	427
Recreation service 69.8% (88.9%)	122	176	28	5	4	92	427
Management of Town government 75.7%	139	184	49	12	6	37	427
Educational system 59.8% (79.7)	75	180	53	11	1	107	427
Water service 48.5% (89.5)	90	117	21	0	2	197	427
Comments:							74
answered question							425
skipped question							90

Note: Some of the categories listed above were recalculated to include the responses of those who didn't know how to respond or those without water and sewer services.

32 In 2007, New London disposed of 2,800 tons of solid waste material, including residential and commercial waste. The Town recycled 813 tons, generating \$50,000 in savings and giving the Town a 22.5% recycling rate. For 2008,

the solid waste handling budget is \$385,000 and the Town is exploring ways of saving money through increased recycling. Income opportunities from recycled goods are increasing as tipping fees increase.

Do you recycle?

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	96.2
2	No	4.2

Michael Gelcius asked why the Town doesn't recycle include more items (i.e., plastics #5 & #7). He referred to the single stream project in Concord and questioned whether it would be beneficial to New London. Larry Ballin stated there was no market for the products that aren't being taken for recycling. He said the BoS considered single stream, but felt the current system was more financially sound and efficient. Chair Ebel added that the Town doesn't presently have a composting facility, except for brush and said it could really cut down on the weight, saving tipping fees, if more was done. She felt that this was something the Town should check into further.

Terry Dancy stated that he did some research and found there is a company in Waltham, MA that uses #5 plastic to manufacture their product. He said that the Co-op in Hanover has an arrangement with this company to buy this type of plastic. Terry stated that there are other opportunities out there, they just need to be researched. He also noted that the Town has decided too quickly not to recycle such plastics and shouldn't just take the easy way out. Larry Ballin told Terry his comments were duly noted and he added his name to be a member of the Solid Waste Committee and Terry accepted.

33 If yes, do you feel you could do more?

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	63.0
2	No	37.3

34 If you do not recycle, or you feel you could do more, why don't you? (Please rank each response)

Rank	Attribute	Strongly Agree + Agree %
1	Inconvenient hours for transfer station	54.4
2	Not enough room in home to store recycle bins	34.6
3	Too crowded/not enough to sort at the transfer station	26.1
4	Too confusing to sort at home	19.6
5	Not convinced what is put in bins is being recycled	19.5

NOTE: #1 was the only response with the majority in agreement

35 "It is estimated that 40-50% of the weight of trash is food waste that could be composted. Weather permitting, composting makes sense even for non-gardeners because it greatly reduces tipping fees and "recycles" organic matter.

Do you compost?"

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	No	60.7
2	Yes	39.8

If not, why not?

Note: 195 written responses to this question

37 Would you buy an inexpensive composter if sold by the Town?

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	57.5
2	No	43.0

38 Would you compost if the Town had a composting facility for food waste? (The Town already has a composting facility for yard waste at the stump dump.)

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	61.0
2	No	39.6

39 Did you know that the Town takes electronic waste for a fee at the Public Works Department?

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	59.2
2	No	41.3

40 The Town would like to encourage recycling to save tax dollars and to promote sound environmental practices. "Pay-as-you-throw" is one alternative that has greatly increased recycling and saved thousands of dollars in tipping fees in other NH towns, while generating recycling revenues. Citizens pay a minimum amount (\$1-\$3) for each bag of trash and nothing for bags of recyclables. If it made economic sense, would you support a "pay-as-you-throw" program?

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	51.8
2	No	48.7

Note: Evenly split/need education

41 How else could the Town encourage recycling?

Note: 181 written responses to this question

42 If you are involved with a business in New London, does the business trash go to the transfer station?

Rank	Attribute	Response %
1	Yes	10.2
2	No	5.1

43 If yes, what special issues do you face in recycling and how can the Town help?

Note: 43 written responses

Ken McWilliams noted that the remaining questions were basically demographics and everyone agreed there was no need to review these.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ken McWilliams explained for the work session next month, the PB was going to pick up again on the economic development chapter. He said the survey results were going to be added into the chapter, as well as additional information added to the historic resources chapter. He said the draft chapters will then be posted on the web with hard copies available from Linda Jackman in the Town Hall.

- The MINUTES of the JANUARY 27, 2009 Planning Board Meeting, Public Hearing on Zoning Amendments and Business Meeting were APPROVED, as circulated.
- The MINUTES of the FEBRUARY 3, 2009 Wallula Subdivision Subcommittee Meeting were APPROVED, as circulated.

The **WORK SESSION** was **ADJOURNED** at 9:15P.M.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Kathleen M. LaVallee, Recording Secretary
New London Planning Board

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____