

Orford Planning Board

January 15, 2018

Board Minutes

Approved February 19, 2018

Present

- *Committee Members:* Jim McGoff (Chair), Kelley Monahan (Vice Chair), Dave Smith (Select Board ex officio), Paul Carreiro, Chase Kling, Deb McGoff, Tom Thomson, Mark Burger (alternate)
- *Resilience Planning & Design LLC:* Liz Kelly
- *Public:* Ruth Hook, Stacie Marshall (recording secretary)

7:00 PM: Jim called the meeting to order.

1. Review of December 18, 2017 Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Paul moved to accept the December 18, 2017 minutes as submitted; Chase seconded. Jim opened the topic for discussion.

The group requested a number of updates, including the following:

- Kelley asked that the spelling of her name be corrected.
- Kelley asked that the last sentence in paragraph 3 in item 1 be removed (“She mentioned that...”).
- Chase noted that the Select Board Alternate should not be listed as absent since his attendance is not needed unless Dave is unable to attend.
- Dave asked that page numbers be added to the document, and pointed out a grammatical error on page 3.
- Chase asked that his reference to state policy for road improvements on page 3 be amended to remove the qualifier “great.”
- Dave corrected grammatical errors on pages 5 and 6.
- Chase asked that the Town Report item be moved from the Old Business agenda item to New Business, since it had not been previously discussed. Paul agreed, suggesting that the first five paragraphs of that item be moved, leaving the last paragraph (“Paul informed the board...”) under Old Business.
- Tom asked that the fourth paragraph on page 4 (“Tom responded that the town...”) be amended to reflect that the tires on the grader were weather-cracked from sitting unused in the sun.
- In the following sentence (“Tom updated the board...”), Dave clarified that the sentence referenced ambulance services.
- In paragraph 3 on the last page of the report (“Paul noted...”), Paul recalled that no determination had been made about how to distribute the survey, and that suggestions made in the December meeting would be solidified in the January meeting. The group agreed.

After Jim confirmed no additional discussion, **Paul moved to approve the December 18, 2017 minutes as amended; Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

2. Master Plan Survey Discussion

Dave began the discussion by raising a potential budget-related issue. After reviewing Dave's budget spreadsheet from January 10, Mark diagnosed the problem as an accounting error. He promised to follow up with Sheri.

Chase noted that in the budget hearing on the 20th, the Planning Board's warrant article was not listed; Kelley confirmed that it was included in a meeting she had attended this past Wednesday.

The group reviewed two drafts of master plan survey questions, one prepared by Liz, and the other by Paul. Paul noted that his draft used many of the same questions as Liz's, but that he had done some wordsmithing of questions, had removed some redundancy in the matrixes, and had reordered to make the questions flow more intuitively. He walked the group through how his questions related to the questions on Liz's draft.

Chase disliked the format of the survey questions, feeling that they were too directed. His strong preference is for open-ended, general questions. He thought that the current draft survey questions seemed directed toward a town with zoning, and noted that he didn't see the questions he had suggested in the last meeting. Paul agreed that any questions asking about focusing future development get to the issue of zoning.

Dave noted that the questions on Liz's draft should be numbered, and also asked that the question about rating community service be edited to include town road, highway and bridge maintenance. He thought that recycling and solid waste disposal could be combined. Paul shared that he had dropped the question on his draft of the survey, since satisfaction with town services fell under the Select Board, and would not inform the master plan update. The group generally agreed, though Chase thought asking about the level of town and government service the community expects, and how much they'd be willing to pay, would be relevant to the master plan.

Jim directed the group to discuss Liz's survey draft question by question.

Question 1: Which of the following should the town actively encourage?

Tom asked that the agritourism option also include agriculture. Paul noted that in his draft, he had removed this question, incorporating the options into other questions. Deb shared her preference for Paul's draft, noting that it was shorter, and seemed easier to complete.

Question 2: What types of development would you prefer to see in Orford?

Paul noted that his question was very similar, though he used the word "encouraged." Chase wondered how development could be encouraged, and thought the question was unclear. Paul fully agreed, noting that master plans are typically zoning support documents. The group agreed to use Paul's question, but to provide examples for each choice, ensuring the inclusion of agritourism/agriculture as an example of a commercial business. The group brainstormed examples for the other options in the list.

Question 3: In your opinion, which statement best characterizes Orford's rate of growth?

Paul suggested using the word "development" in place of "growth;" the group agreed.

Question 4: Where should future development occur?

Liz noted that her question 4 was similar to Paul's third question. The group wondered what the community would consider the center of town, and discussed differentiating Routes 10 and 25A in the question's options. Further discussion resulted in the group discussing whether the question should be included at all; ultimately, it was decided to strike the question.

Question 5: Which of the following commercial enterprises would you like to see in Orford?

Liz noted that this question is similar to Paul's fifth. Paul noted that he wordsmithed to make the question more consistent with the other questions in his draft survey. The Committee discussed including a senior living facility option. Paul noted that he had included a "private apartments" option, which would be inclusive of senior for-profit housing. Mark suggested changing the question title to reference "for-profit business enterprises," rather than "commercial enterprises." The group agreed, and decided to add a row in the matrix for "for-profit senior living facility." Kelley also asked that campgrounds be separate from lodging. Dave wondered about changing "private apartments" to "rental housing," and Tom asked about changing "home based" to "home business." On the last point, Paul noted that this would make the choice grammatically inconsistent with the other choices.

Question 6: What factors should be considered in evaluating development in Orford?

This question is similar to Paul's fourth. Kelley expressed interest in soliciting feedback about law enforcement in town. Dave gave the group a quick update on where the Select Board stands in hiring an officer, noting that it is considering four candidates, and is working on increasing the base salary for the position. Dave thought the question could be more broadly defined to encompass safety, including the fire department, ambulance service, and police.

Question 7: Please rate the following community services.

Paul did not include this question, since he felt that satisfaction with community services fell under the Select Board, and was not relevant for the master plan update. The group agreed, noting that respondents could share general feedback on the "general comments" question that will be included at the end of the survey.

Question 8: Rate the following issues by how important they are to you.

This question matches Paul's with the exception of the label of "development issues." Chase noted that Rivendell spending is a political issue, and the item should be worded more generically. Dave suggested compromising by replacing the Rivendell reference with a reference to "property tax related to the education system."

Kelley turned the conversation to distribution of the survey. She suggested numbering the printed surveys in an effort to monitor returns and catch efforts to ballot-stuff. Tom noted the importance of accepting responses from multiple members of households. The group then turned to the question of which list to use for survey distribution – the property tax list, the voter checklist, or the Post Office's box holder list. Mark noted that property owners should have a voice, even if they're unable to vote in Orford. Paul pointed out that using the voter checklist would allow multiple members of the same household to receive a copy of the survey. The group briefly discussed the effort involved in reconciling the two lists to remove duplicates. Chase brought up another option, reminding the group about the inventory list collected every April, which would include apartment-dwellers. Tom suggested using the property tax list to capture everyone paying taxes, but to follow

up with a general box holder announcement directing anyone who didn't receive a survey to pick one up in the libraries or the Town Office. The surveys available for pick up would be numbered to monitor responses. The group agreed with this plan.

Paul moved to use his draft survey with amendments as discussed. Deb seconded. Chase expressed a desire to see the amended survey before considering it final. Jim indicated that the group would have another chance to provide feedback prior to distribution, and called the vote. **The motion passed, with Jim, Deb, Paul, Tom, Kelley and Dave in favor, and Chase opposed.**

Kelley noted that Sheri had indicated a willingness to print mailing labels for survey distribution; she agreed to follow up with the official request. Tom also suggested that the box holder general notice be drafted prior to the February meeting. Liz also reminded the group about the need to draft an introductory paragraph and instructions for the beginning of the survey. The group agreed to table the topic of timeline for survey distribution and collection until its February meeting.

3. Old Business

- [Voluntary Merger Application – Heide Miller](#)

Liz gave a quick update to the group, noting that she is following up with Bill McKee, who is helping to rectify the tax map issue. Liz will work with Heide to get a corrected application before the Planning Board's February meeting. The group made a photocopy of the application fee check submitted with the original application to retain with the file, and Liz will return the original check to Heide. Dave noted a probable error on the assessment for the .12 acre parcel involved in this application, noting that the valuation on the small parcel seemed excessively high. He'll mention the issue to the assessor at the next opportunity.

- [Town Report](#)

After reviewing the draft report, Kelley suggested adding some mention of the work the Board has done internally to streamline processes. Paul distributed a proposed addition to the report, with a short explanation of the Board's votes related to the Academy Building, and the results of the votes. Liz suggested adding the Board's regular meeting day, time and location.

At 8:59 PM, Chase departed. Paul moved that Mark be seated as alternate; Tom seconded. The motion passed unanimously, and Mark was seated.

Kelley moved that Paul's community development statement related to the Academy Building be added to the Planning Board report; Deb seconded. Dave recused himself from the vote given Select Board feedback on his previous involvement in votes relating to the Academy Building. The vote passed unanimously.

The group continued to discuss the draft report. Paul noted that last year's report recognized Ann and Harry, and the group decided to remove the second round of recognition. The group also decided to remove references to the Board's future activities given that the report is intended to be an overview of activity over the past year. The end of the report will, however, include a teaser for the master plan survey. Jim will also add a statement thanking the Board for their support of his role as Chair over the past year.

- [Orford Academy Building](#)

Kelley updated the group about the School Board's decision to vote for an extension. Mark wondered how expensive it actually was for the school to carry the Academy building, noting that he has not seen a line item for this purpose in the budget. Mark confirmed that the parties involved in

the Academy Building project now have until February of 2020 to secure funding. Tom shared that funding for the project was not approved because Orford was scored lowest in the ranked list of projects being considered. There were too few units planned for the amount of money requested. Mark recalled that the memorandum of understanding indicated a need to acquire the adjacent parcel for additional units.

In concluding discussion on this topic, Paul noted that he still hasn't received a response from the Community Development Finance Authority to the letter he sent inquiring why their meeting wasn't noticed as per their stated procedures.

4. New Business and Public Comments

- [Mail File](#)

Jim circulated a letter from Sam Hanford, resigning from his position as alternate on the Planning Board. Jim accepted Sam's resignation.

Jim asked for others interested in taking over Sam's alternate role; Ruth indicated an interest. **Paul moved to nominate Ruth Hook as alternate to the Planning Board; Deb seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Jim and Kelley reviewed and approved invoices from Resilience.

- [Legislative Updates](#)

The group agreed to table this agenda item until February

- [Other Updates](#)

Dave shared feedback from a community member that the Board's last meeting had not been posted. The group concluded that someone had removed the agenda from where it had been posted in the Post Office.

Paul attended the transportation advisory meeting with Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission on January 9. The meeting covered the Governor's Advisory Committee and the 10-year highway plan.

Mark attended several Upper Valley Finance Committee meetings where the Committee discussed ways to avoid relying on federal and state funding.

5. Discuss February Agenda

The Board will come prepared to make decisions toward finalizing and distributing the master plan survey, and will discuss legislative updates.

Jim moved to adjourn, and Deb seconded. Motion passed unanimously (9:33 PM).

Action Pending

Date of decision	Property	Details
12/19/2016	Gerald D. and Jeannine A. Groff 135 Mud Turtle Pond Road (Tax map lot 8-0089-044)	Subdivision approved conditional on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curb cut permit • Country lane covenant and construction • Presentation of perimeter survey

2018 Business Concluded

Date	Action