



# TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

## PLANNING BOARD APPROVED MEETING MINUTES May 10, 2011

**PRESENT:** Tom Cottrill (Chair), Tina Helm (Selectmen's Representative), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), Michele Holton, John Tilley, Peter Stanley (Zoning Board Administrator), Mike McCrory (UVRPC)

**NOT PRESENT:** Jeff Hollinger (Vice-Chair), Dierdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate), Michael Doheny (alternate), and Paul Gorman

Chair Cottrill called the meeting to order at 7:03pm.

### Tree-cutting request – William Hopwood, Bunker Road ( 076-047-000 )

Mr. Stanley presented a tree-cutting request on behalf of William Hopwood. Mr. Hopwood's parcel includes 48 points including the deceased tree. They are concerned that the tree will fall and take out additional trees, shrubs and their dock. Upon inspection, Mr. Stanley found it to be a legitimate concern. He added that the depth of the lot is only about 15 feet, so they are not required to have the full 50 points. The parcel is next to Terry Dancy's house on Bunker Road.

There were no concerns with this request, and so Chair Cottrill asked for a motion.

**IT WAS MOVED (Michele Holton) AND SECONDED (John Tilley) to approve the Hopwood tree-cutting request. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### Approval of Minutes

**IT WAS MOVED (Michele Holton) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve the minutes of April 12, 2010, as amended. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The minutes of the March 22 and April 26 meeting could not be approved due to a lack of attendees present at the meeting who were also present at those meetings.

### Master Plan – Land Use

Mr. McCrory said that he had restructured the chapter. He separated the quantitative information, pulled out the important points of the community input, and included goals and recommendations.

Mr. Stanley wondered if they could update the graphs and tables to include 2010 data when available. He noted that there has been no growth from 2000 to 2010 to speak of. It has not been like the timeframe of 1980-2000, which showed phenomenal growth. Mr. Stanley liked the approach to the chapter because the numbers from the survey didn't lead the reader anywhere. The summary explained what it all meant. Mr. McCrory said that specific survey results would be referenced in an appendix of the Master Plan.

### Page 1

Mr. McCrory agreed to paraphrase the RSA because as it is written, there seemed to be too many "ands" which was confusing to read.

Chair Cottrill said he didn't like the word "constraints. Mr. Stanley noted that the land, itself, limits development and so "constraints" was the right word. Mr. McCrory would re-word the sentence to include "analysis of future development potential."

#### *Land Use Patterns and Trends*

Chair Cottrill asked Mr. McCrory to update the table headings to reflect the tables as referenced in the text. Mr. Stanley suggested adding a notation after any text which references a graph or table on a following page. The notation should not say "see next page" but rather specify a page number.

Chair Cottrill opined that instead of stating the actual numbers of dwelling units, the information should be displayed as a percentage to show absolute vs. relative numbers.

#### Page 2

Mr. McCrory suggested that he would like to change the range for Table 1 to reflect the years between 1980 and 2010 and keep it at 30 years.

Chair Cottrill suggested having the columns with percentages shaded to distinguish the results. He also asked that the word "county" be spelled out and not left as "CO."

#### Page 3

Table XI-2 – Chair Cottrill suggested highlighting the percentages.

Table XI-3 – Chair Cottrill said he took out the dash and put "c." (Circa) to clarify they were talking about the year. He thought the percentages columns should be shaded as well.

*Recent Subdivision* – Chair Cottrill asked to have the table headings re-named to coincide with what is written in the text.

#### Page 4

Mr. McCrory agreed to update the information to reflect 2010 data.

Chair Cottrill said he would email the appropriate file to Mr. McCrory for inclusion in the table.

#### Page 5

Mr. McCrory agreed to update the Summary of Building Permit Activity table to display figures from 2001 to 2010.

Mr. Tilley said that there were too many references to "2003" in the sentence. It should read "...was mapped using 2003 aerial photography."

Mr. McCrory showed a slide of the current land use as of 2008. This map was not going to be redone. Mr. McCrory said that the map records commercial, residential, outdoor recreation and current use. Mr. Stanley said that the map could become an 11x17 fold-out in the end of the Master Plan. Chair Cottrill wondered if they could put the map online so people could zoom in on certain areas. Mr. Stanley said that the digital image would get fuzzy very quickly because it was not a high resolution photograph.

#### *Existing Land Use Patterns*

Chair Cottrill asked for clarification within the text, as the percentages don't add up. It should be made clear how it would add up to 100%. Mr. McCrory suggested including text that says "Agricultural open use represents about 4%. Another 25% is developed." Mr. Tilley said the three sentences with percentages need to refer back to the last sentence. There needs to be a breakdown of the 75%.

It was determined that the paragraph that began with "According to the Society..." should be deleted.

Mr. Tilley suggested starting the last paragraph on the page by explaining that 75% of the land in New London is un-developed. The remainder is made up of “x, y, and z.”

Page 6

Chair Cottrill suggested shading the sub-total rows.

Mr. Tilley thought the second sentence of the first paragraph was confusing. It should simply say “Since the mid-1980’s their attendance has increased. Also, he didn’t think they should explain the buildings at Colby-Sawyer College, but that rising enrollment is necessitating the landscape to change. Topic headings were determined for each paragraph, including Town Center Development, Colby-Sawyer College, and Rural Residential. The last two paragraphs would become one.

Mr. Stanley said that almost every subdivision that has occurred has been along major roadways. Development has trended towards the interior and away from the gateways of New London. He suggested changing the paragraph, as they do not strip develop and haven’t allowed it. This type of development makes the town seem rural. From the same paragraph, Chair Cottrill suggested removing the adjective “high-priced.”

Page 7

This page consisted of a map of the current land use in New London.

Page 8

Chair Cottrill indicated that an emerging trend is residential employment (those that work from home). It was decided to take out the phrase “telecommuting”, and add that there are people who work from home.

It was noted that “soils” was spelled wrong under the “Development Constraints” list. Mr. Stanley asked to add “surface water” to the list of constraints, which was 12.5%.

Chair Cottrill asked if there were really just two areas of “steep slopes.” This was changed to “a few.”

Mr. Tilley suggested cutting back on the redundancy of the wording that seemed present in several places. It was determined that the term “eye-ball guess” should be avoided. Mr. McCrory wondered about development not connected to water and sewer and whether that was discouraged. Chair Cottrill said he they cannot really answer that until they’ve had some time to discuss it with the entire board. Mr. Stanley said that a critical part of development is maintaining the illusion of the rural nature of the town. Zoning changes have been made in the past involving density and lot size.

Page 9

This page consisted of a map of development constraints.

Mr. McCrory said he wanted to add the water and sewer service areas to the map. He looked at the map and experimented with converting the developed and un-developed areas into black and white. He then overlaid the development constraints. The white area included un-developed areas (steep slope, surface water.) To him, this showed that there are spaces that still have potential for development. Mr. McCrory noted that there seemed to be some fairly restrictive soils in New London. In his assumption, septic fields will likely have to be “raised beds.” Mr. Stanley agreed and said that the exception is the ends of the lakes, due to glacial deposits. Additionally, the easterly end of Little Sunapee has a very high perk rate. The map shows where the gaps are for future development potential.

Mr. Stanley pointed out that a section of the white portion of the map (Morgan Hill Road) would be a potentially valuable place to develop and could be serviced by town water and sewer. He also noted that a lot of the white space is wet and is not buildable. Mr. McCrory wanted to point out that town water and sewer were real assets. Mr. Stanley said where there is reasonable land for development, those areas are also the town's visual and agricultural assets. He said that the map would serve as a guide only but they have to look at the actual ground to see what they are dealing with.

#### Page 10

Mr. Stanley said the build-out analysis referenced did not utilize GIS mapping. Chair Cottrill wondered when the update of the analysis was done. Mr. Stanley said that in 2003 they went through each parcel to determine what could be subdivided in town. Chair Cottrill noted that reference to the "1994" build-out analysis as shown is too far in the past and he wondered if there were any more recent analysis. Mr. Tilley suggested the text "based on the 1994 build-out study and the 2003 update..." He also suggested getting rid of the verbiage that was not helpful. There should be just one paragraph explaining what a build-out study was.

Mr. Tilley asked about the college and how that would impact the growth. Mr. Stanley said that the study didn't include the students. He added that without a major shift in everything they do, the college is nearing capacity. They can hold a maximum of 1,300 students. Mr. Tilley thought they needed to emphasize that this survey was talking about full-time residents and not college enrollment.

Mr. McCrory said that it was important to keep in mind the college's contribution to the community and the importance of it as a part of the community. He would keep the land uses and policy orientation to maintain the college in the town. Future build-out analyses would need to be sensitive to the college's disposition and growth needs.

#### Page 11

Mr. McCrory added "lakes" to public parks, beaches, public roads and other privately owned public spaces. It was suggested to take out "regardless of viewpoint."

#### *Residential Land Uses*

Mr. McCrory said that #2 was what he gathered from the survey responses. It was assumed that people don't want unattractive housing, but want housing that preserves the character of the community.

Mr. McCrory said that legally, it is important to have this type of language in the master plan, showing that they do not want to exclude this type of housing.

#### Page 12

#### *Non-residential Land Uses*

When looking at non-residential uses in the survey, there seemed to be no real desire to promote commercial growth. Development should focus on meeting the needs of the community. Mr. McCrory felt that New London may be happy to be a minor regional hub, but it was clear that the strip mall type of commercial businesses is discouraged. The town wants commercial but nothing that would degrade the community's rural sense of character.

It was noted that the list of valued attributes should be specified as being listed in no specific order.

Michele Holton asked about possible controversy about possible congestion over "concentrate residential development..." Mr. Stanley said if it becomes a problem they would have to revisit it, but this is what came out of the survey. The results showed strong interest in maintaining a village center.

*Land Use Goals*

Chair Cottrill said that the first paragraph was wordy. Mr. Tilley suggested removing the paragraph altogether.

It was determined that the numbers and bullets were fine.

Chair Cottrill indicated that the second sentence include “several public meetings and results of the community survey.

Page 13

*Land Use Growth Policy*

Chair Cottrill felt they would want to get together as a complete board to decide this. Mr. Stanley said they have goals that go to recommendations. Recommendations should follow nicely from Land Use Goals. There were a number of clear contradictions that needed to be rethought a bit.

Mr. Stanley said they don't have a growth policy. They have goals and action items that get them to their goals. Mr. McCrory said he would find segments of the policy that were not in the goals.

He would take the policy section out, and go from land use goals to recommendations. Everyone thought that was appropriate and made sense.

Page 15

Possible Village Expansion Areas – this table would be deleted.

Mr. Stanley said they had talked about a subcommittee that could provide some village-type development opportunities. Mr. Tilley felt it was a valuable list and thought it should remain with the Planning Board for use later on.

It was agreed to take references of “KBM Associates” out, as the tables would be changed and updated.

Ms. Crane asked to change “Mother-in-law apartment” to “accessory” apartments.

*Recommendations*

Bulleted points should be re-worded to say:

1. Examine rezoning
2. Consider accommodating housing needs in the village: a. accessory apartments, b. rental units, c. housing over businesses in commercial district, d. conversion of large single family homes into multiple units.
3. Consider the use of commercial district boundaries...

Mr. Stanley felt that #4 was in contrast to the goals. These should be in areas near village centers that could be serviced by town water and sewer. It was suggested to check for this information in the Economic Development chapter. Mr. Stanley said he would email the appropriate wording to Mr. McCrory the following day.

Page 16

5. Consider site and building guidelines to ensure...

Mr. Stanley said that with regard to #6, ridgelines in town have already been developed. To have an ordinance to protect nothing makes no sense. He suggested either taking this out completely or to have the Planning Board consider developing a gateway protection ordinance that looks at the entrances to the town and considers things like alternative development schemes that push things back away from the roadway so are not visible. He felt that some real assets in New London are the gateways into town. He

suggested text as: “Consider Gateway Protection Ordinance aimed at preserving the town’s scenic character.”

7. Consider an aquifer protection overlay district and incorporate it into the zoning ordinance to minimize potential pollution of aquifers.

8. Explore creative land planning techniques. It was determined that this segment should be shortened as “Consider the utilization of creative land planning techniques that will help preserve the rural character.” Mr. McCrory suggested getting rid of the examples and keeping it open-ended. He suggested “Explore innovative land use practices to preserve New London’s character and natural and historic resources.

9. Development of a utility service area. Look into feasibility of areas where water and sewer could be expanded.

10. Ms. Helm said the wastewater treatment plant was predicted to be good for another 20 years, so this item really wasn’t needed. Mr. Stanley suggested combining #10 with #9 and deleting #10.

**IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (John Tilley) to adjourn the meeting.  
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The next meeting would be held at 7pm on May 24, 2011.

The meeting adjourned at 9:22pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary  
Town of New London