

LEMINGTON TOWN PLAN

LEMINGTON, VERMONT

Adopted December 29, 1983

Readopted December 4, 1989

Readopted January 16, 1995

MUNICIPAL PLAN
TOWN OF LEMINGTON, VERMONT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Lemington Profile.....	1
Existing Land Use.....	1
Agriculture.....	1
Forestry.....	3
Residential.....	3
Community Facilities, Services, and Resources.....	4
Schools.....	4
Roads.....	4
Water Supply & Sewage Disposal.....	5
Recreation.....	5
Fire Protection.....	6
Public Buildings.....	6
Historic Sites.....	6
Natural Resource Factors.....	8
Soils.....	8
Steep Slopes.....	10
Agricultural and Forestry Lands.....	10
Higher Elevations.....	10
Streambanks.....	13
Wildlife Habitat.....	13
Population.....	13
Historic Trends.....	13
Present Population.....	14
Population Projections.....	14
Questionnaire Results.....	15
Recommendations.....	18
Maps	
Existing Land Use.....	2
Soil Characteristics.....	9
Slope Characteristics.....	11
Agricultural & Forestry Uses.....	12

INTRODUCTION

The Lemington Planning Commission has prepared this Municipal Development Plan in accordance with 24 V.S.A., Chapter 117, Section 4381. The purpose of this plan is to provide recommendations regarding the future development of Lemington. In addition it is intended to serve as a guideline should the town undertake the preparation of a zoning bylaw. As adopted, this plan will also serve to guide the District Environmental Commission in ruling upon Act 250 applications in the town.

In the preparation of this plan, the Lemington Planning Commission has considered the following factors: (1) existing land use; (2) community facilities, services, and resources; (3) natural resource factors; (4) population, and; (5) the opinions of the residents of Lemington. Assistance in the preparation of this plan was provided by Northeastern Vermont Development Association.

LEMINGTON PROFILE

The Town of Lemington is located in the Connecticut River Valley in northeastern Essex county and has a total area of 22,336 acres. It is bordered on the east by the Connecticut River and Colebrook, New Hampshire; on the north by Canaan, Vermont; on the west by Averill, Vermont; and on the south by Bloomfield, Vermont. It is located approximately seven miles south of Canaan Village, and eight miles south of the Canadian border.

Most of the land area in Lemington is hilly and forested with the exception of the lands bordering Route 102 and the Connecticut River. It is sparsely settled, with a population of 101 (1980). Most of the residents of Lemington work and shop in the neighboring communities of Canaan and Colebrook. Agriculture and forestry are the primary economic activities.

The Town of Lemington is particularly noted for Mt. Monadnock, the Columbia Covered Bridge, and a natural beauty which is typical of the communities in the upper Connecticut River Valley.

EXISTING LAND USE

Presently, land in Lemington is used for three basic purposes: (1) agriculture, (2) forestry, and (3) residential (see map #1).

Agriculture

There are eight active farms in Lemington, all of which are along Route 102 and the Connecticut River. One of these eight farms is

owned and operated by a resident of Lemington. This farm is the only dairy farm in Lemington. The remaining seven farms are owned or leased and operated by non-residents. These farms are used to raise hay and/or feed for dairy farms located in surrounding towns. Although these farms vary in size, they average approximately one hundred acres.

Although the number of farms in Lemington has constantly decreased over the years, information from recent state-wide surveys of agricultural trends indicate that the number of farms has begun to stabilize and can be expected to remain fairly constant over the next decade. Of course this will be largely dependent upon economic factors which influence the ability of the smaller farmer to remain in business and the aspiring farmer to begin a business.

Besides its economic importance, agricultural land in Lemington is an important factor in terms of the attractiveness and character of the town. It accounts for practically all of the open land in a town which is otherwise heavily forested, thus providing some visual diversity. It is also the dominant use of the fairly extensive flood plain in the town.

Forestry

Almost 95% of the land in Lemington is forested, being mostly hardwood with an occasional stand of softwood. Most of this land is owned by St. Regis Paper Company, and is in various stages of growth and harvest. Harvesting practices have been conducted in such a way as to allow multiple use of the forests for activities such as hunting, hiking and fishing. Continued use of Lemington's woodlands for commercial forestry purposes is in the best interest of the town. However, certain forested lands, particularly those with moderate slope and adjacent to existing town roads, are suitable for scattered year round dwelling units and hunting and fishing camps.

Residential

There are approximately forty families residing permanently in Lemington in single-family detached dwellings. The largest concentration of dwellings is along Route 102 in the vicinity of the Colebrook Bridge. This is partly because the majority of the people residing in Lemington work in the neighboring towns of Colebrook and Canaan. The remainder of the dwelling units are scattered throughout the eastern and central portions of the town. The western portion of Lemington lacks access and is uninhabited. There are also approximately fifteen camps, generally located in isolated areas throughout the town used for seasonal occupancy.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND RESOURCES

Schools

Due to the fact that Lemington is a small community, it has no schools of its own. Both elementary and secondary school students attend school in Colebrook. Presently there are a total of 17 students; 8 elementary and 9 secondary.

Lemington pays tuition for each of its school children. Tuition in Colebrook is \$1803 per elementary student and \$2250 per high school student.

Lemington is also responsible for the cost of transporting students to school. The town hires a school bus at a cost of \$43.70 per day for students attending school in Colebrook.

Present school arrangements appear adequate. Any significant increase in the number of schoolchildren could force the town to seek alternative arrangements, since the present capacity of the Colebrook school system to absorb outside students is limited.

Roads

There are 16.3 miles of public road in the Town of Lemington. Mileage is divided among the various classes of roads as follows:

Town Roads	Miles
Class I	0.0
Class II	0.0
Class III	5.9
Class IV	3.0
State Roads	7.3
Total	16.2

There are 8.9 miles of town roads in Lemington. Of this total 3.0 miles are Class IV roads, which are simply publicly owned right-of-ways which the town does not have to maintain. The other 5.9 miles are Class III gravel roads which are maintained, and are generally in good condition.

Since Lemington has only 5.9 miles of road to maintain, it contracts on a yearly basis for plowing and grading. This arrangement has proved satisfactory, and will probably continue for the foreseeable future.

Route 102, which runs north and south along the Connecticut River, is classified as a major rural collector. It is the only state highway in the Town of Lemington.

Water Supply And Sewage Disposal

As might be expected in a small rural community, there are no central water supply or sewage disposal systems in Lemington. Individual homeowners rely on springs and/or wells for their water. Specifically, 24 families have springs, 13 have dug or driven wells, and two use a combination of spring and well water. Residents dispose of their sewage by the septic tank/leach field method.

Only one or two minor water supply or sewage disposal problems have been experienced. It is expected that present and future residents of Lemington will continue to rely on individual springs or wells for their water supply, and on site sub-surface disposal for their sewage.

Recreation

Much of the area of the Town of Lemington offers excellent opportunities for outdoor recreation, particularly hunting and fishing.

The abandoned farmland and hardwood forests serve as favorable locations for hunting a variety of species from game birds to black bear and deer. The areas around Sims Hill and Todd Hill are particularly popular. Some trapping occurs, and furbearers are mainly taken along the Connecticut River.

The Connecticut River is well known as a fishing spot for such cold water species as land-locked salmon, rainbow trout, brook trout, and brown trout. Some warm water species are also found in the Connecticut. Several tributaries of the Connecticut, such as Clough Brook, Blodgett Brook, Mill Brook and Willard Stream are located in Lemington and also provide good brook trout fishing. These brooks and streams are stocked regularly.

Hiking and canoeing are popular sports in Lemington. The trail to the lookout tower on top of Mt. Monadnock is frequently hiked. Another often used route for hikers is the "Gold Mine" trail, which branches off the Mt. Monadnock trail. Hikers occasionally camp in the Mt. Monadnock area. Canoeists frequently paddle the Connecticut River and often stop at several locations along its banks.

Winter sports are also popular in Lemington. Snowmobilers often travel the Mt. Monadnock trail, and other trail systems

throughout the town. Although little used, excellent opportunities for snowshoeing and cross-country skiing exist.

Fire Protection

Lemington has an arrangement with the Colebrook Volunteer Fire Department for fire protection. The Colebrook Department has 33 volunteers and five trucks; three pumpers, one ladder truck and one water truck. A central telephone number (237-5555) has been established for reporting fires. The cost of fire protection is borne by the town, and is paid by an initial fee and on an hourly rate basis.

Present arrangements for fire protection are judged to be excellent. The only possible improvement could be to insure adequate water supplies in the remote parts of Lemington.

Public Buildings

There is only one building owned by the town of Lemington. It is the Town Hall, formerly a schoolhouse, located near the junction of the Sims Hill Road and Route 102.

The Town Hall is a wood frame structure in fair condition consisting of one large meeting room. It is heated by a wood stove, and is used only occasionally throughout the year. It has no plumbing.

Recent repairs to the Town Hall include painting and the construction of new steps. A minor flooding problem occurs occasionally, and the building needs to be elevated.

Historic Sites

Although a small community Lemington is rich in historic heritage. Particularly important in this regard are its cemeteries, bridges, and the Connecticut River and its tributaries.

The oldest cemetery in town is a Protestant Cemetery located on what is known as "Glebe Lot 40", just north of the Columbia Bridge and almost in front of the John Daley home. Indications are that the cemetery was established about 1800. The oldest graves are dated 1801 and 1805, and are those of two sisters. Another grave dated 1806 is that of a young woman named Clarrissa Sims, who drowned in 1806 on her wedding day while attempting to cross the Connecticut River which was flooded due to runoff, and full of floating ice. In 1860 a piece of land adjoining this cemetery on the north was set aside for a Catholic cemetery. The oldest grave in the portion is dated 1862. In the late 1960's another plot of land was added on the north side of this

cemetery. Since then, these two cemeteries have been combined as one.

In the early 1850's a private burial plot known as Lyman Cemetery was set aside for the Lymans and their heirs. The earliest burial was 1856. In 1974, the heirs turned the cemetery over to the Town of Lemington.

The early settlers of Lemington, Minehead (Bloomfield, Vermont), and Columbia, New Hampshire had frequent business and social relations which necessitated crossings of the Connecticut River. In the winter they crossed on the ice, but the rest of the year presented a problem. Although foot bridges were made by felling the large pine trees that grew on the banks of the Connecticut, teams of horses had to resort to treacherous fords. A ferry operated for a time but did not prove very satisfactory.

About 1820 a toll bridge was built near the Cone farm in Columbia, but it was swept away by a flood in 1840. In 1844 the Columbia Union Toll Bridge Company, on the basis of a 1799 Charter issued by the legislature to Esquire Eliah DeForest, built a bridge by selling shares from \$11 to \$15 each. The Columbia Union Toll Bridge was destroyed by heavy winds in the early 1890's and another bridge was built by Jonathan Osgood. This bridge burned in 1910 and was replaced by the present bridge built sometime in 1912 by Charles Babbit.

The Columbia Bridge, as it is now known, is a fine example of the New England covered bridge. It was restored by the States of Vermont and New Hampshire with historic preservation funds in 1981.

The other bridge crossing the Connecticut in Lemington, the Colebrook Bridge, was similarly financed and built as a toll bridge in 1855. In the 1940's, it became unsafe, and a government Bailey bridge was erected within the old bridge as a temporary measure. The present, comparatively modern bridge was built in 1947.

During the days of the early settlers in Lemington, the Connecticut River was used a canoe route by the St. Francis indians. It is said that because of this, the earliest settlement was located in an area now known as Sims Hill. Arrowheads and other Indian relics are still occasionally found along the banks of the river. For a number of years the river was also used for log drives.

The Mill Brook, a tributary of the Connecticut River, is so named because of the succession of mills along its banks. The erection of mills was encouraged by the town. On October 6, 1974, the town proprietors appointed a committee to:

"...lay out in said Lemington two hundred acres for the encouragement to any persons who will build a good and sufficient grist mill and that said two hundred acres should be held in fee simple by such person as will build the mill..."

In addition to its cemeteries, bridges and former mill sites, the old families in Lemington form part of this historic heritage. For instance, the Roger Covell farm was purchased by his great grandfather on land layed out in the 1790's by Governor Wentworth, and known as Governor's Corner. Also a house now owned by Mary Jane Holbrook was built in the early 1800's by Thomas Holbrook, great great grandfather to Nelson Holbrook, a current resident of Lemington.

NATURAL RESOURCE FACTORS

An important consideration in any municipal development plan are the natural resources of the community and the limitations they place on future land development. In Lemington these resources and limiting factors include: (1) soils, (2) steep slopes, (3) agricultural and forestry lands, (4) higher elevations, (5) streambanks, and (6) wildlife habitat.

Soils

Soil conditions which can limit future development include: (1) shallow depth to bedrock, (2) instability, (3) inability to absorb moisture, and (4) excessive wetness. Any one of these conditions can present problems in terms of sub-surface sewage disposal and foundation construction. General soils information available from the Soil Conservation Service indicate that at least 50% of the land area of Lemington has soils with one or more of these characteristics, (see map #2). Despite these generally poor soil conditions, pockets of suitable soils can be found in scattered locations throughout the town, and there are sizeable areas of soils that have few or moderate limitations to development. The most accessible of these areas are on the western side of Route 102.

In general, soil conditions in Lemington will require a moderate to low density of development with selected areas of more intense development. Two factors that will encourage development consistent with soil limitations are: (1) that much of the land area with soil limitations is relatively inaccessible, and (2) that under the Vermont Agency of Environmental Conservation's Environmental Protection Rules capability for on site sewage disposal must be demonstrated for all lots of less than ten acres in size.

Steep Slopes

Much of the land area of Lemington is hilly and mountainous, and approximately one-half of the town has a slope of greater than 15%, (see map #3). Areas of particularly steep slopes include the Mt. Monadnock area, and the forested lands in the southwestern and northwestern portions of town. Within these areas of steeply sloped land, however, lands can be found that are fairly level and suitable for development.

Steep slopes tend to erode once disturbed and present limitations in terms of road construction. They, therefore, are unsuitable for intense development. Since the most steeply sloped areas are relatively remote and inaccessible, it is expected that little development of Lemington will occur in these areas in the future.

Agricultural And Forestry Lands

Certain areas within the Town of Lemington are particularly suited for agriculture and forestry, (see map #4).

The Connecticut River Valley land is particularly good agricultural land and accounts for most of the land currently in agricultural production in Lemington. Areas of high forestry potential include lands within the Willard Stream areas, the area to the northwest of the Meacham Swamp, and lands along the Mill Brook and Clough Brook. Much of this land is currently in forest production.

Low density residential and recreational development can be compatible with agricultural and forestry use, however once developed good agricultural and forestry lands cannot easily be returned to production.

Most of Lemington's forestry lands are relatively inaccessible, and are expected to remain in forestry production well into the future. Some of the agricultural lands, however, are also highly suitable locations for residential development. While the conversion of agricultural lands will to a large extent depend on economic trends, residential development should be encouraged only on marginal or abandoned farmlands at a moderate density.

Higher Elevations

Under Vermont's Land Use and Development Act (Act 250), elevations at or above 2500 feet are singled out for special protection due to the fact that fragile environments are found to exist at such elevations. In Lemington, the most notable higher elevation is Mt. Monadnock which reaches a height of 3140 feet. Three other peaks which reach the 2500 foot elevation are located in the western and southwestern portions of the town.

All of these higher elevations are essentially inaccessible and can be expected to remain undeveloped well into the future. Forestry operations now being carried out in some of these areas are being conducted according to Act 250 standards.

Other elevations in Lemington, which are less than 2500 feet, but represent important scenic resources include Sims Hill and Todd Hill.

Streambanks

The banks of the Connecticut River and its tributaries should be protected from unsuitable development. Clough Brook, Blodgett Brook, Mill Brook and Willard Stream, represent an important natural resource in the Town of Lemington. These bodies of water are important in terms of outdoor recreation as well as contributing significantly to the natural beauty of Lemington. The stretch of the Connecticut River which winds slowly past Lemington is particularly scenic. In addition, the Connecticut floods periodically, and much of the land lying to the east of Route 102 is floodplain. Minor flooding due to the spring run-off occurs along the banks of its tributaries, particularly Mill Brook.

Wildlife Habitat

To date, only one deer yarding area is known to exist in Lemington. The deer yard is a small one, and apparently does not hold deer every winter. It is a "pocket yard" at best, and probably does not hold more than 5 to 10 deer. Its continued existence is important in that deer yarding habitat is extremely limited, not only in Lemington, but for some distance around Lemington.

Lemington has significant amounts of abandoned farmland that serve as habitat for both big and small game. These areas provide both excellent food and cover for these populations.

The Connecticut River provides most of the waterfowl habitat in Lemington. Two small ponds lying east of Route 102 provide additional habitat for nesting as well as migratory waterfowl.

POPULATION

Historic Trends

Lemington's population peak probably occurred sometime prior to 1890, before general population figures were compiled for all communities in the State of Vermont. The peak population was

probably about 300 persons. The table below indicates the population trends for the last eighty years.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Population</u>
1890	227
1900	204
1910	138
1920	145
1930	133
1940	131
1950	105
1960	112
1970	120
1980	101

The table reveals that the population of Lemington, after having been in a general decline for 60 years, increased slightly between 1950 and 1970, only to decrease again between 1970 and 1980.

Present Population

The 1980 census determined the population of Lemington to be 101 persons. This figure represents a total of 52 males and 49 females. The males make up 51.4% of the population, and the women account for 48.5%.

The town's population has also been broken down into three age groups: 18 and younger, 19 to 59, and 60 and over. The largest of these three groups is the 19 to 59 year olds. They account for 58 persons, (30 males and 28 females), or 57.4% of the town's population. The next largest group is those 0 to 18 years of age. There are 28 persons (16 males and 12 females), or 27.7% of the residents, in this group. Those age 60 or older are the smallest group, with only 15 persons (6 males, 9 females), or 14.9 % of the residents.

Population Projections

It is extremely difficult to accurately measure the future population of a small community like Lemington. The most accurate estimates are those that provide a range of possibilities.

The State Planning Office has estimated that, in the next 30 years, the population of Essex county will increase at an annual rate of 0.5%. However it is also estimated that 85% of this growth will occur in the communities of Island Pond, Canaan, Concord, and Lunenburg.

If we take the 0.5% figure as the highest possible growth rate with 0.25% as an intermediate rate and no net increase in

population as the lowest possible growth rate, the future population of Lemington might range as follows:

	<u>1985</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>
High	104	106	109	111
Medium	102	104	105	106
Low	101	101	101	101

Barring any unforeseeable circumstances, it can be seen from these projections that population growth in Lemington will not have a significant impact on community services. On the other hand, anything that might occur to raise the population above the levels projected above should be carefully evaluated as to its impact on the community.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

In order to determine the desires and the needs of the citizens of Lemington a questionnaire was developed by the planning commission and distributed to all taxpayers. Approximately 44% of the questionnaires were returned. The results, which are summarized below, have served as a guide to the planning commission in the preparation of this plan.

Those responding to the questionnaire were divided among the age groups as follows:

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Percent</u>
18-25	5%
26-35	14%
36-50	36%
51-65	22%
over 65	23%

The distribution is weighted slightly in favor of older persons when compared to the actual age distribution, and consequently, the questionnaire results are somewhat more reflective of the opinions of older persons.

Approximately 61% of the respondents indicated they reside in Lemington year-round. In actuality, year-round residents account for 58% of the taxpayers, so the results are only slightly weighted in favor of the year-round residents.

The majority of the respondents shop, bank, and seek medical services in Colebrook.

Approximately 50% of the respondents indicate they work in Lemington, and most of the rest work in Colebrook.

The vast majority of respondents, 92%, rated the town of Lemington as an excellent place to live. Residents and non-residents alike share this opinion. No one rated the town as a poor place to live, and only four respondents rated the town as a fair place to live.

Most people would prefer Lemington to remain a small residential community, with no business or industrial establishments, and most of the land forested or used for agriculture. Only ten respondents would like to see Lemington remain small, but gain a few business or industrial establishments. There was very little difference in the feelings of residents and non-residents on this issue.

Consistent with the desire to see Lemington remain a small residential community, the vast majority would like the population of Lemington to remain the same. Furthermore, the majority of respondents do not feel there are any types of business or industrial establishments which should be encouraged. Those that felt otherwise mentioned commercial recreational facilities, small non-polluting industries, shopping facilities, and commercial forestry and agricultural activities.

Respondents were evenly divided with regard to whether there are or are not adequate job opportunities in the area around Lemington. There was no particular difference in the attitudes of residents or nonresidents.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents felt that increased residential development would increase property taxes, and only slightly fewer felt that increased commercial development would have the same effect.

Also with regard to property taxes, most people felt that they are at a satisfactory level. Only a few feel they are high, while about the same number feel they are low.

With regard to community services, about 80% of the respondents rated the schools as good, with no significant differences between the opinions of residents and non-residents.

Road maintenance was rated as good by 56% of the respondents, while 31% rated this service as fair, and 13% feel it is poor. This service was rated slightly better by residents than nonresidents.

Fire protection was rated as good by 45% of the respondents, fair by 30% and poor by 25%. Residents of Lemington, however, rated this service higher than non-residents, with 52% rating it as good, and the rest equally divided between fair and poor. One respondent suggested that some sort of local fire department,

volunteer or otherwise, might result in lower insurance rates to the extent that it could be financially feasible.

Police protection received the lowest rating of any service. It was rated as only fair or poor by 70% of the respondents. Although this service was rated slightly better by full-time residents of Lemington than non-residents, the general opinion is that the quality of the service is less than desirable. As an indication of this, several respondents stated that they feel police protection is nonexistent. One respondent cited vandalism and property destruction as particular problems, and several suggested that a roving full-time or part-time police patrol would be a good idea.

Although recreational opportunities were judged to be good by 44% of the respondents, 34% rated this service as poor, and the remainder giving it a fair rating. Full-time residents rated this service significantly lower than non-residents, with only 32% rating it as good, 40% poor, and the remainder fair. Several respondents indicated that, while the opportunities for hunting and fishing, and other outdoor recreational activities are virtually unlimited, other types of recreational opportunities, particularly for younger people, are limited. One respondent suggested there should be some place for children to play.

Health services were judged as good or fair by 90% of the respondents. There was no significant difference between the opinion of residents and non-residents.

The remaining questions on the survey dealt primarily with zoning and land use controls. Approximately 70% of the respondents feel that Lemington should adopt some sort of zoning. Presently Lemington has interim zoning which will remain in effect for only one more year. Although support for zoning was not quite as strong among full-time residents of Lemington as non-residents, a significant majority still favor this type of control.

A second question with regard to zoning asked if it would be reasonable to require different amounts of land on which to build in different parts of town; for example requiring one acre in some areas, and more than one acre in other areas. The respondents were divided on this particular approach to land use control with a slight majority in favor. However, the difference between residents and non-residents was significant. Only 37% of the full time residents supported this type of control, while it was supported by 81% of non-residents.

A third question on zoning asked whether it would be reasonable to prohibit certain types of land uses in some areas of Lemington, while allowing them in other areas of the town. A fair amount of support was expressed for this concept with 63% in favor and 37% opposed. Support was less among residents than

non-residents with only a slight majority of the residents supporting this concept.

Two questions were asked on the regulation of mobile homes. Overwhelming support was expressed for the prohibition of mobile home parks with 85% in favor of the prohibition. This support was only slightly less among residents than non-residents. On the other hand, 71% of the respondents did not oppose single mobile home units. Support of single mobile home units was slightly stronger in full-time residents than non-residents.

A final question on land use controls asked whether there were any natural resource areas or open space areas where development should be severely restricted. Slightly less than 70% of the respondents indicated that they feel there are areas where such controls should be instituted, with only a slightly smaller percentage of residents responding the same. Particular areas mentioned in this regard were Mt. Monadnock, agricultural lands, and major streams.

The final question on the questionnaire asked for any other suggestions as to how to make Lemington a better place to live. Some of these have been mentioned in connection with other more specific questions. Other suggestions included the advice that the town should not allow growth to occur faster than the expansion of public services. one respondent indicated that since people have more time and money than ever before, Lemington has the potential to become a major recreational center. On the other hand, a respondent expressed dissatisfaction with the large amount of tourist traffic, especially during the summer. A few respondents suggested that a few property owners would do well to improve the appearance of their properties. Finally, several persons emphasized keeping Lemington the way it is now, and expressed particular concern over the possible conversion of agricultural land to other uses.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations set forth below are intended to serve as proposals with regard to the future development of the Town of Lemington. In addition, these recommendations serve as guidelines should the town undertake the preparation and adoption of a zoning bylaw. Finally, these recommendations are intended to provide guidance and information to state officials should they be involved in making decisions that will affect the future of Lemington.

In the preparation of these recommendations the various sections discussed in the previous sections of this plan have been taken into account. They include information and data on: (1) existing

land use, (2) community facilities, services, and resources, (3) natural resource factors, (4) population, and (5) the opinions of the residents of Lemington.

In addition, these recommendations are aimed at achieving the following goals and objectives:

1. To keep Lemington rural in character.
2. To provide adequate educational opportunities.
3. To consider the needs of all residents in the provision of services, facilities, and amenities, at a reasonable cost to the town.
4. To control industrial and commercial development, housing development, and general growth in proportion to available public services.
5. To encourage productive farming, agricultural, natural recreational, and forestry enterprises.
6. To encourage the protection of streams, mountains, and other natural resources.

This plan recommends the following:

1. The future development of the lands lying easterly of route 102 should be limited to agricultural uses. These are prime agricultural lands and a vital scenic resource. In addition, much of this land area is periodically subject to flooding.
2. Agricultural lands west of Route 102 should be designated for residential use at a minimum density of two acres per dwelling unit with commercial development allowed only with special approval. In order to minimize the impact on these important agricultural lands, a road frontage requirement should be imposed. This area has a great deal of potential for residential and compatible commercial development due to the fact that access is good, soil limitations are slight or moderate, and the land is gently sloped.
3. Lands adjoining the Todd Hill Road, the Sims Hill Road, and the roads that branch off from them (except those sections that are Class IV) should not be developed at a density of less than five acres per dwelling unit. These lands are suitable for residential development, but to maintain a rural atmosphere, the lower density is recommended, coupled with no commercial development.

4. All other areas of the town are primarily forested with scattered farmland. These lands should continue in these uses, and in addition camps and vacation homes should be allowed.
5. Mobile homes on individual lots should be treated as single-family dwellings with the same lot size requirements.
6. Gravel pits should be allowed throughout the town, but new ones, or significant expansion of present operations should be subject to special standards to insure compatibility with adjacent uses.
7. The banks of the main tributaries of the Connecticut River, including Clough Brook, Blodgett Brook, and Willard Stream, should be protected by requiring that all structures have a minimum setback from these streams.
8. Efforts to restore and maintain the cemeteries in Lemington should continue.
9. Consideration should be given to making gradual improvements to the Town Hall so that in the near future it would be available for greater use. Improvements should include new plumbing and heating facilities, and the correction of the flooding problem.
10. The present arrangements for road maintenance, education, police, and fire protection should be continued.