

Agenda for the Special Selectboard Meeting Wednesday, January 17, 2018 at 5:30 PM
(Times Are Approximate)

Please note: earlier start time – 5:30 pm

- 1) Approval of Agenda (Action Item) 5 minutes
- 2) Public Comments (Discussion Item) 10 minutes
- 3) Town Plan Process – Board Deliberation (limited public comment) (Discussion Item) 30 minutes
- 4) Town Plan Survey – Continued Discussion (Discussion/Action Item) 30 minutes

Next Meeting – January 24, 2018 at 6:30 PM

To receive email notices of Selectboard meetings and hearings, agendas, minutes and other notices, send an email to manager-assistant@norwich.vt.us requesting to be placed on the Town Email List.

Memorandum
Date: 1/11/18
To: Norwich Select Board
CC. Miranda Bergmeier, Herb Durfee
From: Mary Layton
Subject: Process Ideas for Town Plan Draft Discussion

Hi All

Here are some ideas and questions regarding Town Plan “Process” that I hope to discuss on Wednesday.

Hopes and Concerns:

In a nutshell, mapping out some goals, deciding when to meet, having working sessions, having a standing PR committee to explain our process to the public, building a Power Point Frequently Asked Question document, considering the Town as a whole and considering “charged issues” thoughtfully and realistically.

We try to think of how the adopted Town Plan will affect all Town residents and resources.

It seems that some elements will require “balancing” when used in actual decision making. For instance, a field is valuable for agriculture, scenic and historic value, and potential development. In deciding what to do or not do with the field there are mutually exclusive uses.

In terms of informing and reassuring residents about our process it may be helpful to have a standing subcommittee that describes our process on the list serve as was recently done by Langhus and Pepper.

There are a couple of charged issues that we need to consider thoughtfully. I think it makes sense for the Town to allow more development at a reasonable density closer to route 5 and the interstate. There has been a lot of anxiety expressed about this idea via public comments. I am concerned that we will throw out the baby with the bathwater by yielding to the pressure of a few individuals without thinking through and discussing the issues as a Board. I think we need to spend some time discussing this issue. It may also be the case that not much development is actually possible in this area, and the fears of massive development are unfounded.

It makes sense to me also to encourage the development of affordable housing stock in town, but in reasonable numbers that do not strain services or alter the character of the Town. This is another charged issue that I feel is important to consider for the Town as a whole.

I think it would be helpful to create a Frequently Asked Question List that would list answers to questions about such topics as the Village Center designation and what grants and other benefits are available as a result of the Town Plan adoption. It could be built piece by piece as a Power Point presentation to use at public hearings.

My perception of the Select Board work with the Town Plan is that it is “De Novo”. It is our document and our judgement as to what we approve or change.

How will we decide how many “working sessions” to have? Can we identify what to review without getting bogged down or side tracked?

Mary

MEMORANDUM

TO: NORWICH SELECTBOARD
FROM: STEPHEN N. FLANDERS
SUBJECT: TOWN PLAN PROCESS
DATE: JANUARY 11, 2018
CC: TOWN MANAGER

1. *Summary* – The selectboard (SB) should identify a town meeting date for an advisory vote. If it chooses 6 March, then it should post an article that offers a draft for voter input by 28 February, conduct hearings and a survey to receive input on the draft received, provide a draft that reflects input received by the 28 February deadline, and complete the statutory steps required to adopt an ordinance, based on the results of the advisory vote. The SB should be prepared for the possibility of ambiguous or divided public input.
2. *Commitment for town advisory vote* – At least three board members have committed to receiving the advice of the voters, before adopting a new town plan. Apart from calling a special town meeting, the following dates are opportunities in 2018 for an article on a ballot: 6 March—Town Meeting Day, 14 August—Primary Election Day, and 6 November—General Election Day. These are the windows for having a draft of the town plan available. Warnings must be publicized no fewer than 30 days before these election dates. Planning for the August or November dates is not difficult, only the 6 March date presents a challenge. Note that special town meetings are likely to have poor turnout.
3. *Planning for a 6 March advisory vote* – If an article is to be ready for the 6 March town meeting, it must be formulated and adopted in the 24 February meeting to be published in the Town Report. If, after hearing from the public, the selectboard decides that the vote should be on the draft presented by the Planning Commission, then the language of the article can reflect that decision.

However, it's likely that the SB would ask for some changes to the current draft to reflect the totality of input received in the hearing. There would have to be a subsequent hearing, before adopting those changes in a town plan, but it would be possible to post the suggested text for the town advisory vote, in time for the election, perhaps with a deadline of 28 February. In this case, the warning adopted on 24 February would ask for an advisory vote for the draft that was available to the public on March 1. The SB would have to make an assessment at that time, whether it would be able to prepare a draft in February.

If the vote were affirmative, then the newly elected selectboard would fulfill the remaining statutory requirements before adoption of the draft ordinance.

4. *Developing a draft for public review on 1 March* – To prepare a draft town plan for public inspection by 1 March, I recommend that the SB employ the following additional inputs:
 - Public input from the two-part hearing on the 20th and 23rd of January.
 - The correspondence that the SB has received, including alternate draft language.
 - The selectboard-sponsored town-wide survey.
 - The results of the 2005 town-wide survey.
5. *Elements for resolution* – I suggest that the SB look for a few broad themes to inform its decision about whether or how to modify the draft town plan received from the Planning Commission. These themes are reflected in the survey that Mary and I have proposed. The board should look for whether the public favors maintaining the *status quo* or favors some form of *change*:
 - Growth of population and business: Density and distribution
 - Affordable housing: Increase and distribution
 - Emphasis on sustainability compared with growth

I suggest that most of the other questions brought to the SB, regarding the town plan are subordinate to these central issues. I also suggest that there are a limited number of passages in the draft received that would need to be adjusted, if they did not reflect input received on these themes.
6. *Ambiguous input* – The town plan draft received from the Planning Commission removed many of the points of concern that had been expressed to the SB in 2017. A few substantive differences remain that place the current draft at odds with the wishes of those, who have been most vocal to the SB. Both groups are Norwich citizens, so the preponderance of sentiment might be regarded as a draw at this point. After receiving input from hearings and the survey, the public sentiment may still be ambiguous as to where it lies. In that case, I believe that the board has three choices: 1) refer the plan back to the Planning Commission to resolve, based on the input received 2) adjust the draft, according to the collective judgment of the SB, or 3) choose to post either the planning commission draft or a competing draft as the basis for the vote on 6 March.
7. *Supporting resources* – I recommend that the board provide an on-line resource that has folders to contain the collated information, as follows:
 - The selectboard-proposed draft for the advisory vote, finalized by 28 February.
 - Draft town plan received from the Planning Commission
 - Public input that the Planning Commission has received: Correspondence, minutes, etc.
 - Correspondence received from townspeople, by contributor.
 - Minutes of the two-day public hearing.
 - Results of the selectboard-sponsored survey.
 - Results of the 2005 town-wide survey.

8. *Possible article* – If the board is confident on 24 January that it can adjust the draft to substantially reflect the input received in a new draft for posting by 28 February, the 24 January motion might be: *Shall the selectboard be advised to adopt a town plan that incorporates the essential elements of the draft that was posted for public review as of March 1, 2018?*

MEMORANDUM

TO: NORWICH SELECTBOARD
FROM: STEPHEN N. FLANDERS
SUBJECT: TOWN SURVEY FORMAT—INPUT TO DATE
DATE: JANUARY 12, 2018
CC: TOWN MANAGER

1. *Summary* – The SB has already received input on the first draft of a town-wide survey to inform it on what changes may be indicated. I recommend that the survey be as simple as possible in order to be carried out in the next few weeks.
2. *Status of survey* – In a December 28 memo Flanders and Layton suggested that the selectboard (SB) circulate a town-wide survey that would help the board decide on key issues pertaining to whether the draft town plan, as received from the Planning Commission, should be revised. The survey would supplement input received from the public in a hearing, correspondence and prior SB meetings. The SB has received input on the draft circulated from several sources, which will be discussed here in the order received.
3. *Input received from Frank Manasek* – Refer to Appendix A for an e-mail offering input from Frank Manasek. In it he endorses the clarity and brevity of the draft survey and offers a draft survey that he and some others were preparing for comparison and ideas.

I have included the cited draft survey as part of the packet.

4. *Input received from Jeff Goodrich* – Refer to Appendix B for an e-mail offering input from Jeff Goodrich. In it he offers assistance from the Planning Commission in conducting a survey and suggests that certain terms used should be subject to clear and unbiased definition.

I suggest that the survey is intended to elicit first-order attitudes from the respondents, based on their individual, plain-language understanding of the terms used. I recommend that the survey be implemented immediately, if it is to inform a possible set of suggested revisions to the draft town plan by 28 February.

5. *Input received from Jeff Lubell* – Refer to Appendix C for an e-mail offering input from Jeff Goodrich. In it he suggests that the apposition of “growth” and “sustainability” requires clarification of terms. He suggests that question 3e requires having read the town plan. He more broadly suggests some narrative background information.

I suggest that the survey is intended to elicit first-order attitudes from the respondents, based on their individual, plain-language understanding of the terms used and be kept simple, based on people’s understanding of the town as it is. Question 3e might be

changed to say, “Are you concerned whether *new business development* outside the village might compete with in-town businesses?”.

6. *Input received from Stuart Richards* – In the 10 January SB meeting, Stuart Richards suggested using the 2005 town-plan survey, which I have submitted to the packet as a separate item, which are in Appendix D.

I suggest that such a survey best applies to informing the Planning Commission’s work at the beginning of the planning cycle. It would be time-consuming to code for on-line use and to analyze at this point in the decision process, which is trying to identify adjustments to the existing draft town plan.

7. *Input received from Marcia Calloway* – In the 10 January SB meeting, Marcia Calloway suggested that the survey address the twelve elements required for a town plan, which are summarized in Appendix D.

I suggest that whereas those elements must be in the plan, our survey need only cover those elements that may require further input to inform whether to develop a new draft.

8. *Possible motion* – I move to authorize the development and circulation of a town-wide survey to inform the selectboard on matters pertinent to the town plan, as discussed.

Appendix A: Input from Frank Manasek

On Jan 1, 2018, at 4:40 PM, F Manasek <fjm@fmanasek.com> wrote:

Dear Mary and Stephen

A while back we had planned to send out our own private townwide survey, focussing on questions that would provide meaningful answers yet be short enough to receive a good response. You'll note that we asked specifically about those things that residents move here and stay here for.

Your survey is admirable! it is concise and clear.

I'm attaching a marked up pdf copy of ours where we left off. You will see that we cover the same ground but sometimes in different ways.

Perhaps you might find parts of it it of interest.

Sincerely

Frank

<Survey with comments 12-17-17.pdf>

Appendix B: Input from Jeff Goodrich

From: Jeff Goodrich (redacted)
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 2:50 PM
To: Herb Durfee
Cc: Jeff Goodrich
Subject: Town Plan Follow Up

Herb, I offer this email as a personal document that should not be construed in any way to represent the Planning Commission.

As you might imagine, I appreciate the many hours that members of our Selectboard devote to serving the Town of Norwich and for the support given various Town boards and committees. Please let the Selectboard members know that the Planning Commission is available to provide input and feedback about the Town Plan as submitted to the Selectboard, offer comments about suggested revisions, and assist with modifications (e.g., for forestry, which the Planning Commission will discuss at our meeting tomorrow evening). Additionally, if the Selectboard believes that the Planning Commission's attempt to modify 2011 Town Plan warrants an overhaul, I am sure the Commission would be glad to receive guidance and direction from the Selectboard to provide such modifications.

While reviewing the Selectboard packet for the meeting tonight, I found suggestions from Steve Flanders regarding a town-wide survey. I offer the following general thoughts:

1. The town-wide survey circa 2004 formed the basis for work leading to the 2011 Town Plan.
2. If the Selectboard would like to conduct a new town-wide survey, please encourage the Selectboard to ask the Planning Commission to assist.
3. Although I believe Steve's December 28, 2017 memorandum was well intended, I would like to encourage the Selectboard to delegate (or allow) creation of questions that will lead to unbiased and meaningful information using clear terms. For instance, the "mediums" summary Steve offers is very complex and seems to conflate important matters. Additionally, there are a number of terms in this memorandum that should be defined (e.g., village, values, growth, population, business, affordable housing, stock, sustainability, greater community, social issues, solutions, role, priorities, dispersal, sewer (and its variants), development, etc.).
4. As a professional planner, I am concerned that Steve's use of the word "sustainability" does not reflect how the planning community would define the term (e.g., carbon footprint, how we use of fossil fuels or any natural resources, walkability, food, transportation, jobs, fiscal budgets, local and regional community interface, etc.).

As you know, Two Rivers-Ottawaquechee Regional Commission (TRORC) is available to assist the Town, including providing an example of the forestry needs for the Town Plan

at no cost (based on our current dues). TRORC also has the ability to assist with developing a meaningful questionnaire to guide the Town in accordance with legislative direction.

In closing, since members of the Planning Commission have devoted a great deal of energy to serving in our capacity, please encourage the Selectboard to continue to rely on us as committed community volunteers.

Jeff Goodrich

Appendix C: Input from Jeff Lubell

On Jan 10, 2018, at 4:50 PM, Jeff Lubell (redacted) wrote:

Hi, Steve,

Thanks for sharing a draft. I've only had a chance to skim, and would like to spend more time reviewing it. It's clear from my quick review that you put a lot of thought into it!

A few quick thoughts:

-- question 2d suggests an opposition between "growth" and "sustainability" but doesn't define these terms. I don't think people can really answer the question without knowing what you mean by these terms. In any event, I do not think of these concepts as mutually exclusive.

-- question 3e asks people what they think about the town plan and how it addresses business development outside of the village center. Most people will not have read the town plan at this point so it will hard for them to answer. In any event, the town plan does not promote business growth outside of the village center, but people may not know that since they haven't read it. Suggest adjusting the question in light of this.

-- It's useful to know people's general sentiment about future growth in the town, but given the importance of this question it would be more useful ultimately to know their opinions once they had some context for answering the question. For example, if the survey briefly described Norwich's growth pattern over time, the growth pattern of the broader region, and the future projections for school-age population, the residents would be in a better position to provide an informed judgment on this question.

-- The same point about context might be helpful for some of the other questions as well, such as regarding affordable housing.

Happy to look at the survey more closely if you plan to move forward. I'd also be happy to talk with you about any concerns you may have with the draft town plan.

Best,

Jeff

Appendix D: The Plan for a Municipality: Summary of Required Elements

From Title 24 : Municipal And County Government, Chapter 117 : Municipal And Regional Planning And Development, Subchapter 005 : Municipal Development Plan, § 4382. The plan for a municipality

A plan for a municipality may be consistent with the goals established in section 4302 of this title and compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region and with the regional plan. A municipal plan must include all the following:

1. A statement of objectives, policies, and programs of the municipality to guide the future growth and development of land, public services, and facilities, and to protect the environment; 1.
2. A land use plan consisting of a map and statement of present and prospective land uses that: indicates those areas proposed for forests, recreation, agriculture
3. A transportation plan, consisting of a map and statement of present and prospective transportation
4. A utility and facility plan, consisting of a map and statement of present and prospective community....
5. A statement of policies on the preservation of rare and irreplaceable natural areas, scenic and historic features and resources.
6. An educational facilities plan consisting of a map and statement of present and projected uses and the local public school system.
7. A recommended program for the implementation of the objectives of the development plan.
8. A statement indicating how the plan relates to development trends and plans for adjacent municipalities, areas and the region developed under this title.
9. An energy plan, including an analysis of energy resources, needs, scarcities, costs and problems within the municipality, a statement of policy on the conservation of energy, including programs....
10. A housing element that shall include a recommended program for addressing low and moderate income persons' housing needs as identified by the regional planning commission....
11. An economic development element that describes present economic conditions and the location, type, and scale of desired economic development, and identifies policies, projects, and programs necessary to foster economic growth;
12. A flood resilience plan that....

1. How long have you lived in Norwich?

- a) <5 yrs
- b) 5-10 yrs
- c) 10-15 yrs
- d) >15 yrs

2. Own?

Rent?

3. Do you have children in the Dresden Schools?

- a) Yes
- b) No

4. Why did you move to Norwich?

- a) Schools
- b). Outdoor activity friendly
- c) open space
- d) Short commute to work
- e) Job opportunities in Norwich
- f) Small town environment
- e) **Other**

7. Should Norwich **look to towns of comparable size to learn how they dealt with affordable housing? find successful existing affordable accommodations?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Undecided

8. If Norwich were to **plan for and build** additional affordable housing, should it be

- a) integrated in the town
- b) concentrated in a high density/ commercial strip
- c) Undecided

9. Should Rte 5 South be developed into such a high density residential/ commercial strip with loss of open greenspace?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) No opinion

10. Has there been adequate communication to make you aware that the Planning Board is working with Two Rivers Ottauquechee Regional Commission to extend the Village down to the Hartford line?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

11. Have you been made aware that development in a designated "Village Center" may be exempt from Act 250 protections, for wetlands, etc.?

- a) Yes
- b) No

12. Have you been made aware that the Planning Commission is proposing to re-zone about 350 acres for high density/mixed-use commercial, allowing up to 8 dwelling units per acre. This would be open to developers and would permit high concentration of people in one small area of town. Do you want to see our 'affordable housing' citizens segregated in this one area with mixed-use commercial development on Route 5 South and River Road?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) No opinion

13. How do you think high density/mixed use commercial development on Route 5 South and River Road will affect the responsibilities and required numbers of personnel in our Norwich Safety and Public Works Departments?

- a) Very much
- b) Somewhat
- c) Not at all

14. How do you think high density/mixed-use commercial development on Route 5 South and River Road will affect the traffic leading to Route 91 and Ledyard Bridge?

- a) Very much
- b) Somewhat
- c) Not at all

15. Who do you think will ultimately pay to maintain the infrastructure of high density/mixed-use development on Route 5 South and River Road?

- a) the developers
- b) the commercial tenants and landlords
- c) the Norwich taxpayer

16. Who do you think will ultimately pay to maintain the water and waste water requirements of high density/mixed-use development on Route 5 South and River Road?

- a) the developers
- b) the commercial tenants and landlords
- c) the Norwich taxpayer

17. Who do you think will ultimately pay to maintain the road maintenance of high density/mixed-use development on Route 5 South and River Road?

- a) the developers
- b) the commercial tenants and landlords
- c) the Norwich taxpayer

18. How do you think such an extended Village center might affect the quality and vigor of existing town businesses (eg Dan & Whit's) by new businesses such as Jiffy Mart?

- a) Would bring more people

- b) Would reduce patronage in places like Dan & Whit's
- c) Don't know

19. In many parts of the country open space is being threatened.
Should Norwich

- a) Be proactive in preserving open space
- b) Consider its role in the larger region to allow large development
- c) No opinion

20. If you answered yes to 19(b) would you like to see in
Norwich

- a) job opportunities within the town
- b) restaurants and night life
- c) convenience stores

21. If there are more of the amenities mentioned in #20, should
Norwich population change from the current 3300? If so should
it

- a) stay about the same
- b) increase significantly
- c) grow organically

21a The Planning Commission wants to rezone 350 acres for
8 dwelling units per acre. That's 2800 dwelling units. At an
average of 2.5 persons/dwelling unit, that's 7,000 people that
the proposed zoning will permit. Do you want this for
Norwich?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Undecided
- d) I don't believe your numbers

22. How important to you are Norwich's unique rural Vermont
qualities?

- a) Very

- b) Somewhat
- c) Not at all

MEMORANDUM

TO: NORWICH SELECTBOARD
FROM: STEPHEN N. FLANDERS, MARY LAYTON
SUBJECT: TOWN PLAN SURVEY IDEAS
DATE: DECEMBER 28, 2017
CC: TOWN MANAGER

1. *Summary* – The draft town plan received by the Norwich Selectboard on 6 December 2017 appears to be unsupported by a town-wide survey. Such a survey could help the selectboard inform its decisions on what changes to make, if any. Here are some ideas.

2. *Mediums* – I recommend that the survey be conducted with an on-line utility, such as SurveyMonkey, supplemented by paper copies that could be made available at the town clerk’s office and the public library. Paper submissions would then be entered into the on-line utility manually. The survey might be structured, as follows:
 - a. *Demographics* – Resident? Work in town? Residence direction from village?
 - b. *Aspirations* – Growth? Sustainability? Affordable housing?
 - c. *Approaches* – Sewer? Distribution of affordable housing? Distribution of businesses?

Draft questions for the survey follow:

1. *About you* – Please tell us something about your connections to Norwich.
 - a. Are you a resident? (Y or N)
 - b. Are you a property owner? (Y or N)
 - c. Do you work in town? (Y or N)
 - d. What best describes the location of where you live?
 - In the village
 - North of the village
 - East of the village
 - South of the village
 - West of the village
 - Elsewhere
 - _____

2. *About your values* – Please tell us something about your values connected to Norwich’s future by picking the option that best matches your preference.
- a. With respect to growth of the town’s *population*, would you like to see it grow over the next ten years by:
 - More than 5%
 - 5% or less
 - Not at all
 - It should shrink
 - _____
 - b. With respect to growth of the town’s *businesses*, would you like to see it grow over the next ten years by:
 - More than 5%
 - 5% or less
 - Not at all
 - It should shrink
 - _____
 - c. With respect to growth of the town’s *affordable housing stock*, would you like to see it grow over the next ten years by:
 - More than 5%
 - 5% or less
 - Not at all
 - It should shrink
 - _____
 - d. With respect to *sustainability and growth*, in general, would you emphasize:
 - Strongly *growth* over sustainability
 - Somewhat *growth* over sustainability
 - Neutral/Don’t know
 - Somewhat *sustainability* over growth
 - Strongly *sustainability* over growth
 - _____
 - e. With respect to Norwich’s *responsibilities to the greater community* of the Upper Valley with regard to social issues and their solutions do you feel that the town should:
 - Take a prominent role
 - Be involved somewhat
 - Focus on its own issues
 - _____
3. *About your priorities* – Please tell us something about your priorities that would affect Norwich’s future by picking the option that best matches your preference.

- a. With respect to future housing development, do you generally favor:
- Wide dispersal (multi-acre lot sizes per residence)
 - Medium dispersal (one-acre lot sizes per residence)
 - Low dispersal (less-than-one-acre lot sizes per residence)
 - Concentrations of housing units, surrounded by substantial open space
 - _____
- b. With respect to *sewage and septic systems in a new development*, do you favor:
- Sewer in certain areas to allow more buildings
 - Septic systems to limit the number of buildings
 - Don't want new developments
 - No opinion/don't know
 - _____
- c. With respect to the *availability of affordable housing in town*, do you believe:
- There is an adequate supply in town or nearby
 - There should be a limited amount more
 - There should be substantially more
 - No opinion/don't know
 - _____
- d. With respect to the *distribution of affordable housing in town*, do you recommend:
- It should be concentrated in a few places
 - It should be distributed throughout town
 - No opinion/don't know
 - _____
- e. Are you concerned whether the town plan encourages *new business development* outside the village that could compete with in-town businesses?
- Strongly concerned
 - Concerned
 - Neutral/don't know
 - Not very concerned
 - Not at all concerned
 - _____
- f. What other concerns or suggestions do you have?
- _____

DRAFT Summary of Survey 2005

Norwich Planning Commission

February 14, 2006

This summary provides the totals of responses to each answer without any analysis. The total number of surveys responding to each question is given and for some questions the percentages are calculated for the answers shown. Please note that a responder may have selected more than one response even if told to check only one, so the total of the percentages for all answers may be greater than 100%.

NOTE: Summary Data are DRAFT subject to correction using original data spreadsheets.

Total surveys responded to = 990 (Total surveys with more than just comments only = 985)

1. How long have you lived in Norwich? 18.6 years average
(Total number responding to question = 975)

2. Please check all of these that apply to you:
(Total number responding to question = 978)

60	(6%)	Rent your housing
842	(86%)	Own your housing
78	(7%)	Own undeveloped property in Norwich
111	(11%)	Raised in Norwich
762	(77%)	Vote in Norwich
51	(5%)	Vote elsewhere
36	(3%)	Student

3. What neighborhood is your primary property interest in? (Please refer to map.)
(Total number responding to question = 961)

52	River North
82	Union Village
69	Four Corners
99	New Boston
20	Norford Lake
92	Turnpikes
70	Beaver Meadow
13	Tigertown
69	Jericho
14	Bragg Hill
188	Village
26	near village South
55	near village West
66	near village NE
42	Hawk Pine
25	River near village
15	Lewiston

4. What would you like to see happen to the population of Norwich? (Please check only one.)
 (Total number responding to question = 963)

- 17 (1%) Reduced significantly
- 61 (6%) Reduced some
- 457 (47%) Remain relatively stable
- 413 (42%) Grow some
- 22 (2%) Grow significantly

5. How do you view the quality of life in Norwich? (Please check only one.)
 (Total number responding to question = 931)

- 92 (9%) It's getting better
- 596 (64%) It's staying about the same
- 244 (26%) It's getting worse

6. What types of housing should Norwich encourage in the different zoning districts in the town?
 (Check all that apply.)
 (Total number responding to question = 935)

	Rural Residential	Village Residential	Village Commercial/Business	Industrial	Not at all
a. Apartments in garages or existing buildings	538	622	439	269	117
b. Clusters of single family houses, closer to one another with common open space	441	519	133	132	157
c. Attached townhouses	204	498	203	159	214
d. Multi-unit housing (3 or more units)	182	402	199	169	250
e. Single-family houses on individual lots	685	519	155	99	76
f. Mixed residential and commercial buildings	81	216	506	418	169
g. Apartment houses:					
4-8 units	160	378	237	200	263
9-16 units	73	198	149	135	411
17-25 units	39	77	53	65	551
More than 25 units	32	50	37	35	603

7. The maximum height for buildings in Norwich is 35 feet (or 3 stories). Would you like to see this:
(pick one)

(Total number responding to question = 972)

19	(1%)	Increased
120	(12%)	Increased in selected areas
793	(81%)	Kept the same
47	(4%)	Decreased

8. In the future, should development be more dense or less dense in the Village and Rural zones?
In each column check only one.

(Total number responding to question = 955)

Village Rural

87	33	Make the zone much more densely developed.
357	211	Make the zone more densely developed.
467	496	The density should remain relatively the same in these zones.
44	155	Make the zone more sparsely developed in the future.
24	91	Make the zone much more sparsely developed in the future.

9. What would you like to see happen to the amount of commercial and business activity in Norwich?
(pick one)

(Total number responding to question = 971)

7	(0%)	Reduce a lot each year
15	(1%)	Reduce a little each year
396	(40%)	Remain relatively stable
517	(53%)	Increase a little each year
42	(4%)	Increase a lot each year

10. Should commercial developments (those that are larger than home businesses or home occupations) be permitted in a Rural Residential zoning district of town? (Please check only one.)

(Total number responding to question = 965)

395	(40%)	No, not at all
475	(49%)	Yes, where suited
79	(8%)	Yes, a little
18	(1%)	Yes, anywhere within it

11. If you would like more commercial growth in town, what would you like and where would you like to see it occur? (Check all that apply.)

(Total number responding to question = 929)

	Route 5 North	Route 5 South	VillageRiver Business	Road	Rural	VillageNot Residential	Residential	at all
a. Gas stations	144	294	90	57	10	14		449
b. Auto dealerships	43	137	16	22	6	5		684
c. Cinemas	65	147	170	40	9	24		543
d. General stores	146	191	271	103	66	65		374
e. Department stores:								
up to 7,500 square feet	54	118	78	36	7	9		604
up to 15,000 square feet	28	67	36	18	7	3		637
up to 30,000 square feet	10	25	8	6	5	4		671
any size	12	31	11	7	5	6		688
f. Convenience stores	151	254	148	83	37	40		467
g. Offices	347	541	596	322	99	175		107
h. Retail	216	380	531	187	39	82		169
i. Restaurant	423	501	649	368	135	191		97
j. Community center	180	256	503	177	84	244		146
k. Warehouse	152	301	40	105	29	18		432
l. Farm	511	435	124	380	635	147		53
m. Farmstand	589	616	372	479	456	260		63
n. Contractors' Yard	267	388	57	189	88	27		320

12. In the left column indicate what you would like to have in the town in general. In the right column, indicate what you would like to be able to walk to or have in your neighborhood. (Check all that apply.)
 (Total number responding to question = 923)

In Town	In Neighborhood	
574	292	Apartments in existing buildings
281	74	Apartment buildings
386	136	Attached townhouses
270	65	Auto repair shop
597	401	Bed & Breakfast
126	35	Buildings with more than 3 stories
588	349	Bus stop
516	112	Business
728	266	Café
535	229	Child or day care facility
263	52	Cinema or theater
462	300	Clusters of single-family houses, close to one another, with common open space
611	170	Community center (local)
405	96	Cultural facility
317	153	Duplexes
80	52	Earth resource extraction or storage
344	527	Farm (animals)
344	561	Farm (crops)
530	530	Farm stand
497	59	Gasoline sales
609	150	General store
350	130	Group home
640	207	Inn
149	28	Manufacturing facility
406	82	Mixture of residential and commercial buildings
100	98	Mobile homes
290	112	Multi-unit (3 or more) housing
392	174	Nursing home or Residential care facility
617	148	Offices
474	585	Open space
296	48	Parking lot
132	65	Private club

(Answers to Question 12 continued)

In Town	In Neighborhood	
549	333	Recreational play fields
521	577	Recreational trails
288	94	Research facility
700	247	Restaurant
536	120	Retail
450	461	Single-family homes on standard-sized individual lots

13. For the treatment of wastewater in parts of Norwich, which do you prefer? (Please check only one.)
(Total number responding to question = 840)

- 182 (21%) A Norwich owned municipal treatment facility.
- 248 (29%) Only privately owned, on-site, wastewater treatment systems for individuals or multiple users.
- 428 (50%) Hook up with a municipal treatment facility in neighboring towns of Hartford or Hanover.

14. How many affordable housing units should be built in the next five years? (Please check only one.)
(Total number responding to question = 924)

- 125 (13%) None
- 275 (29%) 1 - 20 units
- 290 (31%) 21 - 40 units
- 130 (14%) 41 - 60 units
- 106 (11%) 61 or more units

15. If affordable housing is developed, what types of housing units would you like to see?
(Check all that apply.)

(Total number responding to question = 902)

- 328 (36%) Apartments
- 604 (66%) Combination of multi-unit and single-family houses
- 351 (38%) Duplexes
- 357 (39%) Farmstead cluster
- 308 (34%) Multi-unit houses
- 210 (23%) Shared housing
- 488 (54%) Single-family houses

16. If affordable housing is developed where should it be constructed? (Check all that apply.)
(Total number responding to question = 901)

- 266 (29%) Anywhere in town
- 258 (28%) In Rural Residential areas
- 487 (54%) In the Village Residential areas
- 466 (51%) In Commercial areas on Rt. 5 South
- 415 (46%) In mixed-use areas

17. To increase the supply of affordable housing, the Town should: (Check all that apply.)
(Total number responding to question = 876)

- 658 (75%) Work in partnership with a housing trust, like Twin Pines, to develop affordable housing.
- 393 (44%) Acquire land for affordable housing to be developed by a public or private entity.
- 444 (50%) Provide tax relief for housing units that are deeded to be perpetually affordable.
- 134 (15%) Rely on neighboring communities and region to provide affordable housing.
- 91 (10%) Rely on private sector employers to provide employer assisted affordable housing.
- 373 (42%) Require private sector developers to include some percentage of affordable units in their projects.

18. To what extent do you support the creation of small village-like centers (Hamlets), with higher density housing and some business and commercial uses, located away from the existing village?
(Check only one.)
(Total number responding to question = 933)

- 196 (21%) Strongly support
- 376 (40%) Some support
- 65 (6%) Don't care
- 183 (19%) Don't support
- 114 (12%) Strongly don't support

19. If you support Hamlets, where should they be located? (Check all that apply.)
(Total number responding to question = 397)

- 349 Beaver Meadow
- 327 Lewiston
- 370 River Road
- 406 Union Village
- 114 Others, where? (See data spreadsheets for write in answers.)

20. What types of commercial development belong in small village-like centers (Hamlets)?

(Check all that apply.)

(Total number responding to question = 809)

- 599 Cafés
- 385 Community Center
- 256 Gas stations
- 552 General stores
- 385 Inns
- 38 Manufacturing
- 81 Movie theaters
- 382 Offices
- 432 Restaurants
- 371 Smaller retail stores. (Not big box stores like those on Rt. 12A in W. Lebanon.)
- 118 None

21. How do you feel about the current amount of automobile traffic in the center of town? (Check only one.)

(Total number responding to question = 962)

- 113 (11%) There's too much traffic and congestion.
- 553 (57%) During rush hours there is too much traffic and congestion, but otherwise it is acceptable.
- 275 (28%) It's not a problem at present.
- 33 (3%) There is plenty of capacity to support increased traffic flows.

22. How do you feel about the current amount of automobile traffic in your neighborhood? (Check only one.)

(Total number responding to question = 953)

- 90 (9%) There's too much traffic and congestion.
- 131 (13%) During rush hours there is too much traffic and congestion, but otherwise it is acceptable.
- 668 (70%) It's not a problem at present.
- 69 (7%) There is plenty of capacity to support increased traffic flows.

23. Should Norwich develop a park and ride system?

(Total number responding to question = 907)

- 702 (77%) Yes
- 206 (22%) No

24. If yes, should this be for Norwich residents only?

(Total number responding to question = 717)

- 158 (22%) Yes
- 559 (77%) No

25. How satisfied are you with the condition of our roads? (Please check only one.)
(Total number responding to question = 958)

85	(8%)	Not satisfied
684	(71%)	Satisfied
192	(20%)	Very satisfied

26. Should the town spend a greater share of the town budget on: (Please check only one.)
(Total number responding to question = 888)

152	(17%)	Road maintenance
77	(8%)	Road improvements and upgrades
124	(13%)	Both
546	(61%)	Neither

27. Should the town protect these resources with more, the same, or less regulations.
(Total number responding to question = 887)

More	Same	Less	
380	431	54	Agricultural land
450	380	40	Brooks, streams, and rivers
440	375	51	Critical wildlife habitat
394	410	49	Forest and woodland
423	377	56	Open spaces
286	497	66	Recreational land
382	405	65	Ridgelines
343	442	60	Scenic views
318	458	67	Steep slopes
357	444	59	Trails
326	470	59	Vernal (Seasonal) pools
381	417	63	Wetlands

28. How many hiking and recreational trails should Norwich have? (Please check only one.)
(Total number responding to question = 939)

396	(42%)	More than at present
518	(55%)	The same
20	(2%)	Fewer
8	(0%)	None

29. How much public conservation and recreation land should Norwich have? (Please check only one.)
 (Total number responding to question = 929)

432 (46%) More than at present
 470 (50%) The same
 22 (2%) Less
 7 (0%) None

30. What effect do you think an increase of the following will have on the quality of life in Norwich?
 (Total number responding to question = 964)

	Improve it	Have no effect	Erode it
a. Affordable housing	569	211	134
b. Automobile traffic	4	196	726
c. Commercial growth	292	183	416
d. Hamlets	438	219	232
e. Increased housing density	234	228	408
f. Municipal sewer system	405	223	226
g. Open Space	713	174	25
h. Paving gravel roads	166	263	479
i. Recreational trails	626	271	25
j. Repaving paved roads	385	484	30
k. Residential growth	274	250	332
l. Road maintenance	479	401	28
m. Village Sidewalks	613	259	51

31. How much would you be willing to see your taxes increased to develop these community resources?

(Total number responding to question = 955)

	None	Not much	Some	A lot	A whole lot
a. Affordable housing	383	197	321	33	11
b. Conservation, recreation, and trails	305	190	382	45	18
c. Connecting to Hartford or Hanover's municipal wastewater facilities	473	169	244	27	8
d. Norwich municipal wastewater facility	535	160	192	19	8
e. Road improvements	358	296	260	11	6