

## **APPROVED Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting of November 9, 2010**

**Members Present:** Tom Cottrill (Chair), Michele Holton, Peter Bianchi (Board of Selectmen Representative), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), Paul Gorman (Alternate), John Tilley (@7:30p)

**Members Absent:** Jeff Hollinger (Vice Chair), Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate), Michael Doheny (Secretary)

**Others Present:** Ken McWilliams (Town Planner), Peter Stanley (Zoning Administrator)

Note: "PB" shall refer to the New London Planning Board

Chair Cottrill called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30pm. He asked Paul Gorman to sit in for Jeff Hollinger, as he was not present. He suggested they begin the meeting by reviewing the Flying Goose request that was on the agenda.

Mr. Stanley said that the owner of the Flying Goose wanted to install photovoltaic solar panels (electricity) behind the lower parking lot of the restaurant. They are also planning to install solar tubes (hot water heating) on the southerly facing roof. For electricity, it is anticipated they will use a 30 kilowatt unit for the possibility of net metering. Mr. Stanley felt it was necessary to contact Town Counsel to see if it was at a level that would be deemed an example of a change of use. He said they could go either way. It entrenches an existing nonconforming use and the goal of zoning is to make nonconforming uses go away, but on the other hand using the four part test, it is clearly not an expansion of a nonconforming use. He raised the question of whether the use arose due to better technology and decided that yes, this was the case. They are not adding any seats to the restaurant or more parking. They would be allowing the owner to operate his business in a more effective way. Would it change or would the expansion make it less adequate for use? Mr. Stanley answered that anyone else in a non business situation would have to come and they would get a permit without a review of any sort. This is not something that affects parking or any of the other dimensional aspects of the business. There will still be 77-75% of open space on the parcel, which is more than adequate. Will the change or expansion have a substantially different impact on abutting property or the neighborhood? Mr. Stanley said that in the lower parking lot where the basement access is, the septic rises to the left and is higher, which shields the cells from Andover Road. No neighbors will be able to see it. The Overlook terrace won't see it either. Mr. Stanley believed that there has been reasonable effort made to conceal the cells. He said that it is an accessory structure for a non-residential use. As such, the proposal technically requires site plan review. He said there are three options for the PB: 1) waive site plan review, 2) require full site plan review if the PB the proposal could impact the neighborhood, or 3) send it to the Zoning Board for consideration of the possible expansion of a nonconforming use. Mr. Stanley was of the opinion it was not an expansion of a nonconforming use.

The Planning Board agreed with Mr. Stanley.

**IT WAS MOVED (Peter Bianchi) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to waive the site plan review for the Flying Goose Pub to install solar equipment.  
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

CB Coburn

Mr. Stanley said that there has been a proposed change of occupancy in the former CB Colburn building across from the Town offices that was once retail. The proposal is to open a yoga studio. The yoga studio would propose to have classes from 3pm – 8pm and the size of each class would be a maximum of 10 students. Mr. Stanley felt it should have a site plan review because there is only 17 parking spaces for the whole building. The retail space required six spaces but now at any given time, they could have simultaneous parking of 10 people. He felt it needed some scrutiny beyond the fast track application. He noted that on the weekends, the yoga studio wished to increase their class size to 15.

Chair Cottrill wondered if this decision would be made using Page 35 of the Site Plan Review regulations which addressed required parking spaces for sports clubs/health spas. Under this category of sports clubs/health spas, the number of parking spaces is not listed, but rather leaves that determination to the PB. Mr. McWilliams suggested that they could adjust the class size during the week down to six students to allow for parking, but that would be up to the studio on how to respond to the suggestion. Chair Cottrill asked if the studio could borrow spaces from Colby-Sawyer College’s maintenance facility parking. Mr. Stanley said that this would be up to the studio, but he wanted to bring it to the Planning Board since it was not a fast-track decision. The PB said they would like this to come forward for discussion at the next regular meeting.

Zoning Amendments

**Swimming Pool Regulations:**

Mr. Stanley said that the first suggested amendment is to apply a standard for the fencing of swimming pools. There is a State standard which is a duplicate of national standards for swimming pools. The PB could amend article 2, section 16 to read “constructed in accordance with provisions of the New Hampshire building code...” If adopted, this suggestion would provide for a dimensional standard that nothing larger than 4” can pass through the fence.

Chair Cottrill asked how many pools there were in town. Mr. Stanley said that there were a fair number and as far as he knows, most if not all have some sort of fencing. Mr. Bianchi asked what was wrong with current regulations. Mr. Stanley said that the State provision states that the fence has to be sufficient enough to keep out children.

The current provision in the town is that a fence around a pool must be “No less than four feet high to prevent uncontrolled access to small children.” An example of the problem with current town regulations is that a resident in town with a pool used a split rail fence around his pool, which is really not enough to keep out any child. Mr. Stanley noted that the current regulation applies to any pool constructed after 1997. This proposal would be a new requirement and will not affect anyone who has already had their pools fenced. Mr Stanley stressed that this was not a retroactive requirement. This requirement won’t

impact people from before this provision because they will become legal nonconforming; they existed before the ordinance.

Mr. Gorman asked that for the protection of children, wouldn't they want to make the provision retroactive? Mr. Stanley said there was resistance to the fencing requirement already and didn't feel they should enforce this retroactively. Mr. Gorman felt they should enforce it for all pools and not exclude anyone from making sure the children are safe. Mr. McWilliams said that all new zoning works like this, nothing is retroactive. Mr. Gorman said that they are talking about the safety of children, so why not make it retroactive? He wondered how many people would be affected by this. Mr. Stanley wasn't sure how many people in town had pools, but since he began working for the town there had been seven or eight pools put in. He estimated that there were between 12 and 18 pools in town. He added that Homeowners Insurance companies would generally require the fence to meet the national requirements. Chair Cottrill asked if other towns have gone retroactive in a situation like this. Mr. McWilliams said that they had not. Chair Cottrill asked why not. Mr. Stanley said that some pools are located in a remote place where there really is no danger of children falling in. In one particular case, a homeowner went to the Zoning Board and was denied a variance to not have a suitable fence. Now it has become an enforcement issue.

Mr. Bianchi asked how this new provision would make a difference. Mr. Stanley said it would make it clear that there was a standard that needed to be followed. Chair Cottrill said that right now the term "small children" is a subjective term, which is a problem. Mr. Stanley said that is why they want to use the State code. Mr. Bianchi asked if it would put the town at a liability if they don't enforce the fence regulation. Mr. Stanley said it would not put the town in any more of a liability situation than now. In the present case in town, the applicant has claimed that there was no standard and that they can build whatever kind of fence they wanted.

Chair Cottrill said that one thing the PB has been trying to do over the last several years, is to clear up potential confusion in zoning due to improperly written regulations. In this case, without a number assigned to the regulation, not only could it be anyone's own interpretation of what keeps out small children, but what defines "small children?" Mr. Gorman wondered why other towns haven't insisted on retroactivity when there is a safety issue. Mr. McWilliams said it has to do with legal rights of the land when it was purchased. Towns cannot apply new standards retroactively to a use that is already active. Legal rights have already been established. Mr. McWilliams said that they can legally require new installations to follow the code but that they cannot require prior built pools to conform. Mr. Gorman said that despite the fact, the purpose is to protect children. He added that there are all kinds of things in zoning to protect health, safety and welfare. Why can't they make this retroactive? Ms. Holton said that it was like requiring people to have firewalls in garages that are attached to their homes, which is also a safety issue.

Chair Cottrill noted the goal is to clear up some confusion. This was something that was not well-written in the past where the wording does not define the standard. Ms. Crane felt adopting the State code made sense. Mr. Gorman said that a lot of things having to do with zoning are for safety and aesthetics, but this is to take care of children, which moves it into a different place for him. He wondered how it would look if they passed this and next summer a child crawled into a pool without the right fencing and drown. Ms.

Holton responded that a child was in more danger from not having a firewall in their garage. Chair Cottrill said there is one more meeting to think about this. Mr. Tilley said he didn't think they could make people re-build a fence retroactively. Chair Cottrill thought it would be helpful to know the number of pools in town along with the number of pools with fencing. Mr. Bianchi asked if without this change the town could be held liable. Mr. Stanley said with better defined regulations based upon a state or national standard, most likely the town would be less liable.

### **Storage Containers:**

Mr. Stanley said that this issue had to do with Trailers (semi-truck trailers) rented for a period of time. Over time, these trailers have evolved into the box only (no wheels/tires) portion. For years, the town has not permitted such trailers in New London. This wording provides a definition of storage container and goes hand in hand with the "temporary structures" language for storage containers as well as temporary trailers. This would amend article 2, section 11 and would be a new definition by simply adding to it. The industry has evolved and the town should try to keep up with the terminology.

The sense of the Planning Board was that the proposed language was OK.

### **Temporary Fundraising Permits:**

Article 2, section XIV:c

Mr. Stanley said that non-profit organizations once had a limit of six fundraising events per year but that was changed to allow for more flexibility. However, if an event repeats itself frequently enough for it to become a new business or use, it should come before the Planning Board for site plan review. Mr. Stanley suggested that if an event were to occur "more than four times per calendar month," the event owners should go thru the site plan review process.

Mr. Bianchi said that no one on the PB had even realized there was a problem this summer when the Lake Sunapee Region Visiting Nurse Association ("VNA") was having a vegetable stand. He did not understand the reason for proposing this amendment. Ms. Holton said she went to the VNA after she had read the minutes from the last meeting. She said that the Renaissance Shop was devoid of any involvement in that event. The VNA knows that they are limited to the amount allowed for fundraising and have written permission every time they have a sale there. Ms Holton went to the person who was in charge of selling the vegetables to ask her about it. She and her husband had a big vegetable patch and the VNA had been so good to her mother that they tried to give a donation by selling vegetables. Ms. Holton said, with regard to a comment made at the previous meeting, that the VNA would never sell skis there and to remember that the VNA does so much good in the town.

Mr. Stanley stressed that this was not about the VNA. There are about 100 non-profits in New London and the town does not have a mechanism for non-profits doing more than six events in a year. Presently, there is no restriction on fundraising events. There should be a happy medium and it should be somewhat equivalent to what a normal business has to do to set up for parking and other details that should be considered when hosting an event.

Mr. Tilley said that a smoother way to deal with this could be to define “temporary” in the way they defined “storage trailer.” He sat through the conversation last time and feels that the intent wasn’t to make the VNA stop at all; it is to say “if you are doing something ongoing, it isn’t temporary” and if you are a regular for-profit business they’d have to go through a site plan. If they were to write a definition of what temporary was, it might be more acceptable.

Mr. Bianchi said the only case brought to his attention was the VNA and he felt it was a knee-jerk reaction. Mr. Stanley said this was simply gaining an understanding that there is an issue that could occur. The town had completely eliminated the restriction that was once there. Now, it seems the regulations are not fair to people who open a regular business and must go through a site plan review. Ms. Crane said that they are asking to be proactive rather than reacting and thought it made sense. Mr. Stanley said that this came as much from the town administrator as it did himself. He could see where it could have unintended consequences. Mr. Bianchi felt if there was a problem they should do something about it or look at it. However, he felt there was no problem. Mr. Stanley said that this was not a new regulation; just an improvement on an existing regulation to prevent something from happening in the future. These days, money is more difficult to get and requests for more fundraisers may come about. Mr. Bianchi didn’t see the need to make more regulations. Ms. Holton asked why Ms. Levine did not call the VNA. Mr. Gorman said it was a good idea to set standards so people know how to organize the things they do. One incident may have stimulated this, but it is reasonable to set a limit so everyone knows how to approach this issue.

Mr. Stanley said that they should come up with a definition of temporary. Mr. McWilliams said that temporary means different things in different cases throughout the regulations. Mr. Stanley he would try to restate the proposed amendment clean it up a little for the next meeting.

#### **Telecommunications Ordinance:**

Mr. Stanley said he hopes to request a proposal from the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and let them update it to reflect the most recent changes in telecommunications act and come up with a new application. He should have a proposal from them in the next week or so.

#### Master Plan Work Session

Mr. McWilliams said he was not planning to make these changes and in the schedule he gave to the Planning Board earlier, this was noted. He said he would not have time to do these corrections before he left his position with the Town of New London.

Mr. McWilliams also said they would have to change their meeting date a week sooner in December to finish up the land use chapter, as Mr. Stanley would not be available to attend a meeting during the second week of the month.

Mr. Stanley said that the PB should probably work with RPC to make changes to the various master plan chapters after reviewing them that night with Mr. McWilliams. Mr. McWilliams noted that he has used the minutes to clarify some changes in the past, so this could also be a source to help with future changes.

Chair Cottrill asked about the average town expenditure that has increased since contributing to the ambulance service. Mr. Stanley said the ambulance service came to the town and said they were in the hole, and needed assistance if they were going to maintain the service. They did that with all the towns they service and that is why it started. Every year it has been consistent until now since it jumped to \$132,000. They sound like they want to be out of the ambulance business.

Chair Cottrill wondered if there should be a paragraph for the ambulance service. It could describe the percentage of the total cost that New London contributes as well as the number of towns. Mr. Bianchi said the current thought is to share the total expense among all the towns. Mr. Tilley asked how this was reflected in the plan. Mr. Stanley said they should write about where the ambulance service came from and where they will go in the future. Mr. McWilliams said that page 11 and 12 in the chapter deal with the ambulance service. Mr. Bianchi said they won't give an abrupt stopping date for the ambulance service but they will allow a good amount of time to find a replacement. Also that Ms. Levine is to conduct a survey about ambulance needs in surrounding towns.

Chair Cottrill thought that figure 7-4 should go from year 2000 – 2010 instead of the reverse.

#### **Page 25**

Chair Cottrill asked to confirm the meaning of the 30% in the section that states that New London contributed \$81,000 over 10 years. He asked if it should show what the other towns paid.

Under the portion that says “Senior services include...education and (various wellness programs)” they should cross out the words “listed below” and delete the list. Mr. Tilley said that having the list there is good because it is helpful to classify “wellness.” Mr. Bianchi said other chapters include detailed lists, such as recreation. The same practice should happen in this chapter too. Everyone agreed that the list should not be deleted. Shorten the list and make it a double column list. Also, if keeping the list, it should start on page 25.

#### **Page 27**

Chair Cottrill suggested taking the exclamation point out of the end of first paragraph. Ms. Crane said that the exclamation point at the end of the fourth paragraph should be removed as well. Mr. Bianchi felt it was a valid point in the Master Plan that they do have an aging population in this town. The school district population is down 100 students. Mr. Tilley said that this happens nationally. Mr. Gorman asked if the external organizations referenced in this master plan provide the write-up, and if they do, the PB should think about whether the PB should simply accept what an external organization gives as facts. He said it is possible any particular organization may have an agenda and it may not be quite the way the town wants would prefer to state it. The briefer the better, he thought. Mr. Bianchi said they'd have to change all the other chapters if they cut everything down.

Chair Cottrill said in the first and second paragraph he wanted more information about how much the town does or does not contribute compared with other towns and what town contributes the most. It would be nice to talk about community effort among the towns.

#### **Page 29**

Chair Cottrill said that this was a huge paragraph at end of the bullet points. He doesn't like to go more than 4-5 lines in a paragraph. There should be a break the fourth line down "meet the needs". The next paragraph would begin at "the VNA will invest." Another paragraph should start with "in addition" and another at "finally."

Chair Cottrill said that the heading of "Issues: Social Services" should be re-written as "Issues: All Social Services."

Chair Cottrill thought that another paragraph should begin after the first sentence in issue 1.

### **Pages 29 & 30**

Chair Cottrill said he was not sure whether to fix the issue or the recommendation. The issue pointed out was transportation. Mr. McWilliams said that Ms. Levine wrote this and wasn't sure how she matched it up. Chair Cottrill said that recommendation one should say "Although there are efforts to meet this need, the town should possibly consider the provision of public transportation." This would make it match the issue for #1. Take out the question, "will the town...?"

Recommendation #2 should say that the "town should continue to provide financial support." The Issue is: there is a need for financial support to those who are less fortunate."

Chair Cottrill thought the third issue about Chapin Senior Center was lengthy. He wasn't sure if it should say that the Chapin Senior Center lacked space or if it should say "the town lacks space." Does the Town need a place for anyone to gather that can hold more than 48 people and includes kitchen facilities? Mr. Tilley mentioned the availability of the former middle school. Ms. Crane thought they should probably remove the section. Mr. Stanley said that this information should probably be in the COA's master plan, but not New London's. Mr. Tilley agreed and noted there are many churches in town with space for meetings, as well as the library, and the town office. It didn't seem to be a town wide problem. Mr. Stanley noted that the other spaces in town charge for use. It was agreed to remove this portion about lack of space.

Chair Cottrill said that recommendation number three seems to answer recommendation for #1.

Chair Cottrill suggested removing reference to Town facilities, as it was in relation to the recommendation they just took out. Mr. Stanley said he wasn't sure where the zoning part came from. It was agreed to delete recommendations #2 and #3.

### *Public Works*

Chair Cottrill suggested changing the first sentence to: Voters at the 2007 ... approved disbanding the sewer *commission* and... "placing" the *commission* under the Board of Selectmen.

Additionally, the third paragraph down, he wondered if they should remove the text after the word "radiant heat." Many agreed that this was too much information.

Mr. Tilley said that the paragraph that begins with "In 2004" it should refer to "the Highway Department" and not "Division." He suggested cutting the rest out until "the property also has an 18,000' state of the

art...” He then suggested cutting the bottom four lines of paragraph three and removing paragraph two after the “1998.” Mr. Tilley suggested leaving paragraph 4. He didn’t think an employee list was necessary but an inventory of the equipment would be helpful. Instead of listing out the dump trucks, it should say that they have five dump trucks with sanders and plows. He would suggest consolidating the items so it is not as itemized.

Mr. Stanley said to take the word “tree” out of “tree chipper.”

Chair Cottrill said they should refer to the CIP on how the town allocates money and remove the life expectancy of the equipment. It was suggested to leave the last paragraph after the list of equipment.

### **Page 32**

It was noted that the graph on page 33 should be at the bottom of page 32.

### **Page 34**

Chair Cottrill said that the results from the survey were good but this section should talk about the overall issues.

Mr. Tilley said they have discussed at various points the intersection at Pleasant Street as being inadequate. Mr. McWilliams said that this is covered in the transportation chapter. Chair Cottrill said some residents would say there is an issue with using salt on the roads, especially near lakes, ponds, streams, etc. The town should consider the cost and benefits of using salt vs. sand in the winter months. Chair Cottrill felt the buildings were a CIP issue. Mr. McWilliams said that the Master Plan should include guidance and direction for other departments, like the CIP committee for consideration of buildings that need improvement. It was suggested to combine recommendations one and two to maintain the upkeep of buildings. Mr. Tilley said they should specify the two buildings. The recommendation should be that they should have an annual look at the buildings.

### **Page 35**

#### *PWD – Waste Management*

Chair Cottrill asked if the second category should not be sewage disposal, but disposal of sludge. The actual sewer is in Sunapee. Mr. McWilliams said that it is septage pumped from individual onsite septage tanks in New London, not on the municipal sewer system. Page 37 goes into more detail about the septage disposal.

### **Page 36**

Chair Cottrill said that the information should be presented from past to present, not present to past.

Mr. Tilley said that at town meeting there has been an argument about recycling. The amount of money saved should be included in this section. It could be a financial “carrot” to encourage people to recycle. He thought it would be useful to show the amount saved over time.

Chair Cottrill suggested that below figure 7-7 second paragraph, third line down “actively investigating” and “single stream recycling” in bold.

### **Page 37**

Other items Chair Cottrill suggested being in bold:

“pay as you throw,” “include household hazardous waste collection,” “electronic waste,” “the old land fill,” “brush and metal disposal.”

It was noted that CFL light bulbs are being encouraged and it was asked if they could they be taken at the transfer station. They should address some disposal method for that in the long range plan, as they contain some mercury. This is not addressed and could be a pretty big issue.

Chair Cottrill suggested changing “Septage Disposal” to “Properties Not on Municipal Sewage System.”

### **Page 38**

Issues: Solid Waste Management. Chair Cottrill said that he would be inclined to say that the town must continue to be vigilant in monitoring the landfills.

Issue: potential land water contamination by Mountain Road landfill. The recommendation would be to continue to manage it.

Issue #1, make it a bullet and it will tie into recommendation #1.

Issue #2, it is a concern that households are not handling hazardous waste properly. The recommendation is to educate and motivate residents on how to dispose of hazardous waste. Mr. Stanley said that in the past there has been money available for this sort of thing. They should make a bullet point that there are not enough hazardous waste collection days. The recommendation is to have more hazardous collection days and additional educational for the public.

Issue #3 is actually the recommendation resulting from issue #2. #3 would be added to the end of the #2 as far as the recommendations.

### **Page 39**

Issue #4 goes with recommendation #3. Increasing recycling rate would be beneficial without significant financial impact.

Recommendation #4 - Possible expansion to help increase the recycling rate.

### *Cemeteries*

Mr. Gorman thought it would be interesting to know how many vacant lots were remaining. Mr. McWilliams said that on page 40, last paragraph there was some information in there on the availability of plots.

Chair Cottrill suggested adding a column to the table to show the space available. Mr. Tilley said the issue is space and it should be under the recommendations. Make the bullet point – not enough space, and merge the paragraph into one.

#### **Page 42**

It was noted that the issues were not numbered and should be. Chair Cottrill suggested the first issue be modified to read “keep up with technology, monitor trends and calls for service.”

Mr. Tilley noted that if Colby-Sawyer College continues to grow, the town would really need to provide additional resources as well as the College doing so. Mr. Tilley wondered if it was “our” needs or “their” needs and encouraged the Town and the college to work together. Chair Cottrill said to end the sentence after “resources may be required.”

#### **Page 45**

Mr. Tilley said that the first figure should remain as it is a graphic example of the growth in this department.

Chair Cottrill suggested a column showing the number of structural (house) fires, not just car accidents, rescues or calls for service.

#### **Page 46**

Chair Cottrill opined that the last paragraph was left hanging the community survey results. They should add a sub-title called “Sources of Firefighting Water.” Mr. Stanley suggested the title “Water for Fire Protection.”

#### **Page 47**

Chair Cottrill said the four issues should be: 1. Adequate Water; 2. EMS Services; 3. Staffing; 4. Apparatus.

Recommendations:

Mr. Bianchi and Mr. Stanley felt the ambulance and fire should remain separate as they were two separate entities and cannot cross over. Mr. Stanley said they do mesh at many levels and the level of service may be changed if/when the hospital discontinues the service. Whether affiliated with the fire department or not, they could work out of the same location. Mr. Gorman said if it doesn’t make sense for the two to be combined they should say that the fire department is concerned with the availability of the ambulance service in the town. Chair Cottrill agreed and determined that the recommendation should be back where the ambulance info is located.

#3: Mr. Bianchi said he talked to Chief Lyon about this. He didn’t think there was an issue with the New London Fire Department not being at a situation in a timely fashion. Chief Lyon is looking to the future, said Stanley. When going to a full-time department they will have fewer people and more calls for service. It will also be much more expensive. If they can provide some housing for younger people, it

could attract membership. Mr. Tilley wondered if it belonged in the town's long range plan. Mr. Stanley said it wasn't in the town's long range plan, but it was for the Fire Fighter's Association.

Issue & recommendation #2 should go into the area where ambulance information is.

Recommendation 1, fourth line down and/or b – take out “recommending to Planning Board” and changing to “developers of new subdivisions provide...” and b. “*four* lots or greater will need to provide adequate plan for water supply.”

#### **Page 48**

Chair Cottrill felt there should be a historical reference to the 1941 part of the building as well as the current status of the building, that it remains empty.

#### **Page 50**

2010 enrollment numbers - Mr. Stanley said they are still waiting for this number. Table 7-8 is the actual enrollment number from the district. 7-9 are projections done by Mitchner and Joyce for the school district in November of 2003. That was the most recent information for projections; not actual numbers. Everyone thought Table VII-8 (Page 51) and the paragraph before it on page 50 should be removed. Mr. Stanley should see about getting the last 10 years, actual.

#### **Page 51**

Chair Cottrill suggested re-working of the fourth paragraph down to help it make sense. Additionally, update it to note that the Master Plan will not to be completed until Sept 2011.

#### Minutes review from October 26, 2010

**IT WAS MOVED (John Tilley) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve the minutes from October 26, 2010, as circulated. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The next meeting was re-scheduled for Wednesday, December 8<sup>th</sup> at 7pm. Members should anticipate a busy agenda.

At the meeting on Tuesday, January 4<sup>th</sup> from 6-7:30, the LSPA will present.

January 25<sup>th</sup> will be the last meeting in January, at 7pm.

**IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (Peter Bianchi) to adjourn the Planning Board meeting of November 8, 2010. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:09pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary  
Town of New London