



TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES – MASTER PLAN WORKSESSION April 26, 2011

PRESENT: Jeff Hollinger (Vice-Chair), Tina Helm (Selectmen's Representative), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), Michele Holton, Michael Doheny (alternate), Peter Stanley (Zoning Board Administrator), Rachel Ruppel & Mike McCrory (UVRPC)

NOT PRESENT: Tom Cottrill (Chair), Dierdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate), Paul Gorman, John Tilley

Vice-Chair Hollinger called the meeting to order at 7pm. He asked Mr. Doheny to sit in for John Tilley, who was absent.

1. Tree-Cutting Request, Ann Parkhurst (043-014-000)

Mr. Stanley described the situation. There was a single dead tree in a segment that had 75 points worth of tree score. Ms. Parkhurst wanted the tree to come down. There were no objections to the request.

IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (Tina Helm) to approve the tree cutting request for Ann Parkhurst. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Discussion with Bruce Sanborn – patio concept at Hole-In-The-Fence

Mr. Sanborn, owner of "Hole in the Fence Café" came to the Planning Board to see about a reduction in the amount of open space required at their site, for the purpose of the installation of a pervious patio area for seating in a space that is currently grassed. The Planning Board unanimously agreed (without a vote) that this made sense and would be a great opportunity to improve Mr. Sanborn's business. He will come back with a more formalized plan subject to the Site Plan Review process.

3. Telecom Chapter – Review of Application form - Rachel Ruppel

Ms. Ruppel went through the first page of the application form and asked for questions or comments. Mr. Stanley suggested adding a space to include work numbers, cell numbers and email addresses.

Mr. Stanley added that a reference was made to a conditional use permit on the application and asked her to clarify. Ms. Ruppel explained that there is a difference between a Site Plan Review (SPR) and a conditional use permit. With a SPR the use is allowed. It deals with the site and not the use. If the site provides a threat to the health safety or welfare of those in the area, they would be hard-pressed to say the use wasn't allowed. The conditional use permit holds it to a higher standard. The Planning Board has the ability to judge whether the use is appropriate at a certain location. Ms. Ruppel likened this to a special exception, which is granted by the Zoning Board of Approvals (ZBA), who goes through specific criteria to see if the impact of use for a location is appropriate.

Mr. Stanley said the biggest issue right now was with the zoning. Right now they are dealing with the current ordinance and the current application refers to it. When the ordinance changes, the application will also change.

Ms. Ruppel referred to the second page, which speaks to the required, yearly inspections of the towers. If a tower is abandoned, it must be taken down. Mr. Stanley noted that the tower company has to provide security up front to insure a tower's removal, should the need arise.

Ms. Ruppel explained the third page, which showed a checklist of information needed for co-locating and new towers. New towers have to comply with the second checklist, which requires two separate approvals from the Planning Board. Two notices would be needed; one for conditional use and one for site plan review. Both would happen at the same meeting.

Ms. Ruppel explained that 10-12 years ago a lot of towns adopted telecommunications facilities operations applications but never developed a checklist for them. There has been some confusion about what information is actually required. In the fall, the recommendation was to put all the information into a checklist to make sure it was all collected. Ms. Stanley said that this checklist will help to keep those involved aware with the various timelines.

Ms. Helm asked why there was a column in the checklist for "n/a." Ms. Ruppel said that the "n/a" column was there because she was sure there would be an instance down the road that would necessitate it. She felt in most cases, all of the items would be relevant and would need to be submitted.

The fourth page showed the deadlines and requirements for paperwork and notification. Mr. Stanley said that each time the applicant meets a step they will be able to make a note of when the next step is due.

There were no questions regarding the application. Mr. Stanley asked Ms. Ruppel to email the document to him after she had added the contact information update. He would then show it to the Planning Board, who would approve it and add it as an addendum to their ordinance.

Ms. Ruppel noted that with regards to the 90-150 day deadlines, as long as the town (Planning Board) and the applicant talk about and agree on an extension, it would be fine. They don't want the Planning Board to push things off and not inform the applicant. Mr. Stanley didn't think it would be a problem for things to be a few days to a few weeks late, but they would encourage communications between the Planning Board and the applicant(s).

4. Master Plan – Review of draft Utilities Chapter – Mike McCrory

Mr. Hollinger opined that the chapter read very well and he actually learned something about the sewer system.

Mr. McCrory said that they would be doing some updates of the information and would modify the projections at the end of each section. Previously, they had talked about shortening the language of the chapter and making the issues and recommendations match. He understood this but had not done it for this chapter.

The Planning Board agreed to go through the chapter page by page and to offer comments as needed.

Page 1 – No comments

Page 2 – There was an extra "to" in the phrase "Wastewater at to.." that needed to be removed.

Page 3 – The word wastewater was misspelled after "2005."

Mr. McCrory showed a map that was not included in the current chapter. It showed the places where public water supply areas were located. He commented that DES recommends not publishing this on

electronically public areas and asked if they could omit specific well locations. Mr. Stanley said that this would be fine.

Mr. McCrory indicated that the table entitled "Method of Sewage Disposal" would have information updated all the way through 2010.

Page 3 – Mr. McCrory wondered why the reported 2010 information went from 212,000 gallons/day to around 193,000 gallons/day as the current figure. Mr. Stanley said that it is because of the tightening up of things by the Department of Public Works (DPW), as well as the drought they had this past summer. The deep drop they see in 2006 to 2007 is a result of the infiltration studies and repairs done by DPW.

Page 4 – Mr. Stanley said that 5 lines down it should read: "requirements maintain adequate capacity "for" both" instead of "of" both.

Mr. McCrory said that the sewer collection paragraph would be cropped down a bit further. Mr. Stanley said that the last paragraph says "not accessible," but should really say "possible" (by pump stations). Mr. Doheny said the word "preventive" should be used instead of "preventative."

Page 5 – Mr. McCrory said that they have changed the projections for the wastewater flow objectives. The best estimate they had for occupied dwelling unit was 2.35 persons, which he thought was down from the year 2000, which was about 2.56. They have received new information on Colby-Sawyer College, which tweaks the projections a bit.

Mr. McCrory added that by 2020 they should still have about 30% remaining capacity at the plant. He noted that the incremental increase over time may not be as dramatic as in the past due to advances in technology.

Page 6 –With regards to the phrase "Lack of long-term planning," Mr. Stanley said that the DPW is currently planning for long-term. He thought a more positive statement would be better. He noted that changes to management hopefully will result in improvements in long term planning. McCrory said that he would shift the emphasis away from the operators and say "Long term planning is important." He would include multi-community coordination and balancing of land use planning and demands.

Mr. Hollinger thought the second issue should recognize that they need to continue addressing infiltration and turn it into a positive. McCrory said he would keep the issue as a statement, but would also create a statement of good progress. It would say something to the effect of "continue its maintenance program to improve conditions." It was noted that they should give credit to DPW for this, and recommend future diligence.

It was decided to remove issue #3. Mr. McCrory said that he would tweak the recommendations to reflect the issues.

Page 7 – Mr. Stanley noted that the second paragraph refers to "reservoirs" which were intended for emergency use. This is not the case. They are an alternate source of water. He added that there are no provisions for treatment, so cannot be used for emergency use. McCrory said he would tweak the language to reflect this. Mr. Stanley said the tank that has been placed at Colby-Sawyer College is actually their emergency water source.

Page 8 – Mr. McCrory said he would cut the text down a bit with regards to the water supply section.

He showed a table, which was not in the current version of the chapter being reviewed. It was an Average Daily Water Consumption table and he wondered if it was anything they should include in the chapter. Mr. Stanley didn't think the table offered much information; it would be useful if it spanned a larger number of years to be able to find a trend. Mr. McCrory agreed. Mr. Hollinger thought the average annual water consumption over a number of years would be helpful, as it would give a trend.

Page 9 – It was agreed to delete figure VIII (Water Consumption by Type of Use for Metered Water Services).

Mr. Stanley shared that the Water Precinct thinks that giving the wells a rest is increasing their longevity. The more they are used, the more erosion is experienced. The more that this can be slowed down, the less natural plugging of the well occurs and the longevity is increased.

Page 10 – Mr. Stanley asked Mr. McCrory to re-write Recommendation #1, as it didn't read smoothly.

Page 11 – Mr. Stanley felt that under “Stormwater Utility” the New London sentence was awkward and thought it needed to be tweaked. He added that there are public catch basins intended to catch storm water. Some of these become the prevue of the public but there is no specific stormwater utility, as such.

Page 12 – Mr. Crane suggested the inclusion of Fiber-optic service in the downtown area by TDS, within the telecommunications section. Mr. McCrory indicated that he had asked Ms. Ruppel to update the broadband section, but that it was a bit verbose.

Page 13 – Mr. Stanley suggested taking out “distance” as it pertained to learning and teaching, and to replace it with “internet-based” teaching.

Mr. McCrory said that one thing to keep in mind was that stormwater permitting has become more intensive on the State level. In New London, with as much shorefront as there is, it will be a big deal. Soil mapping is really being addressed for the larger developments. Mr. Stanley said that soil mapping is always required for any size development in New London. Also, for any new subdivision, stormwater infiltration is required at every site. New London has comprehensive regulations in place.

5. Other business

There were not enough people in attendance who were present at the April 12th meeting, so approval of those minutes would wait until the first meeting in May.

The next meeting was scheduled to begin at 7:00pm on May 10th. Mr. McCrory would arrive closer to 7:30pm, when they would review the Land Use Chapter. Mr. McCrory warned the Planning Board that the new chapter would be significantly different from the last version of it.

Mr. Stanley thought they could start the meeting by talking about possible zoning changes in the coming years. There have been difficulties with wetland regulations. In New London, they mapped streams and wetlands and have setbacks, but they have not evaluated the wetlands. They started going in by having a subcommittee to evaluate them. Mr. Stanley said that he was on a commission that had designed a strategy to do this work and felt it could be applied at the local level. The strategy entailed scoring wetlands on a scientific rate for thresholds. Some wetlands may be worthy of a buffer, and some may not. This process would give a scientific approach to evaluate the wetlands. He explained that a neighboring town, Springfield, has a required 100' setback to all wetlands, which thwarts development. Mr. Stanley felt they should protect the things that should be protected, and not the things that don't. They shouldn't have arbitrary buffers.

Mr. Stanley added that a law has just been passed by DES that has eliminated the need to get wetland permits to cross man-made wetlands.

There being no other business, Mr. Hollinger asked for a motion to adjourn.

IT WAS MOVED (Michael Doheny) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to adjourn the Planning Board meeting of April 26, 2011. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35pm

Respectfully submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary
Town of New London