

# SUNAPEE WATERSHED INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT

## Development & Zoning Task Force Meeting

Meeting Minutes – February 17, 2009

Lake Sunapee Protective Association Offices; Sunapee, NH

- ✓ Participants were introduced to the project team and introduced themselves. An overview of the project, work done thus far, and the October 28, 2009 meeting were given to participants. A review of the evening work plan and flowchart\* was given.
- ✓ Participants identified specific consequences of stormwater issues related to development and zoning. The stormwater issues were identified at the October meeting. The results are as follows.\*

### **CONSEQUENCES:**

- Chalk Pond – delta, small lots run-off
- Messer Pond – road run-off, delta, road design
- Erosion filling culverts
- Erosion of banks, road wash-outs
- Road Salt
- Intense use-right on water, grandfathered zoning
- Rollins Hill has erosion along road
- Decreased water quality, impact on habitat and species
- Invasive biological pollutants
- Excess Nutrients
- Impact on abutters lands
- Silt enclosed in a cove make it hard to access
- Clear-cutting increasing run-off into ponds
- Significant impact occurring in time between clear-cut and fixing (wetlands permits)
- Natural absorption of water
- Kitter Brook creating delta in Little Lake Sunapee
- Property damage – public and private
- Route 103A and King Hill – older roads, hard to manage shoulders
- Increased milfoil
- Gloeotrichia

- ✓ Participants reviewed barriers previously identified at the October meeting, and added to the list as needed. The results are as follows.\*

### **BARRIERS:**

- Inadequate enforcement – penalties too small
- Lack of appropriate remedies
- Lack of funds – enforcement and remedies

- Individual ownership vs. common good (Live Free or Die)
  - State law limits what can happen locally (same for federal)
  - Planning Boards – Do they have enough info?
  - No standards for being on Planning Board and Zoning Boards
- ✓ Participants broke into three groups and brainstormed potential approaches to resolving the identified barriers. The results are as follows.\*
- POTENTIAL APPROACHES:**
- Set priorities for educating about needed topics to Planning Boards
  - Testify at hearings of legislature
  - Write/call/email legislators
  - Increase penalties
  - Create “Code Enforcer” Position – could be shared between multiple towns
  - More education
  - Create venues for communication, determine common ground
  - Create rewards for good developments
  - Coordinate protective association as leaders
  - Community education of benefits and/or ramifications
  - Require board members to have working knowledge of regulations
  - Have towns in a certain area/region have similar standards
  - Create better intra-governmental communications
  - Encourage term of alternate membership before full membership on planning boards
  - Network with local contractors, landscapers, architects, engineers, etc. to encourage and pass on smart growth to new residents
  - Transfer of regulatory and technical info between towns
  - Offer guidelines
  - Attend available trainings
  - Communicate to values/perspectives/opinion
  - Have local non-profit (i.e. LSPA) go to meetings and give info to Boards
  - Redistribute info that SAWC already created
  - Present info to local Boards – BE PERSISTENT
  - Demonstrations, How-To’s for rain gardens and other voluntary mitigation factors
- ✓ Participants prioritized approaches based on impact and feasibility of implementation. Top approaches will be worked into the flowchart for Solution Strategies and Action Plans at future meetings. The results are as follows.

\* See also attached Flowchart.

# Prioritization via Feasibility and Impact – Graph from Development and Zoning Task Force

