

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING  
February 8, 2005**

PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Sue Ellen Andrews, Celeste Cook, Tom Cottrill, and Kenneth McWilliams (Planner)

ABSENT: Dale Conly, Jeff Hollinger, and Mark Kaplan (Selectmen's Representative)

Chair Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:34 PM.

**I. HARRY SNOW – Temporary Certificate of Performance: Snowcrest Subdivision  
(Tax Map 55, Lots 11, 12, & 15)**

Observing that Harry Snow was not in attendance, Chair Ebel asked if Ken McWilliams would be presenting Mr. Snow's request for a Temporary Certificate of Performance for the Snowcrest Subdivision.

Mr. McWilliams referred the PB to the letter from Peter Blakeman (Blakeman Engineering, Inc.) requesting that the present security of \$303,000 be reduced to \$40,000. The letter indicates that the only remaining work is the placement of the final pavement layer. Mr. McWilliams advised that Mr. Blakeman was in attendance and could answer any questions from the PB.

Mr. McWilliams advised that Richard Lee, New London Road Agent, recommended reducing the security deposit to \$40,000, which would include \$30,300 to comply with New London's one-year maintenance bond requirement and \$9,700 to cover the cost of the top coat of paving. Peter Stanley, Fire Chief, advised that the pond and installation of a dry hydrant met Fire Department specifications. He stated that the system had been tested and the results were fine.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **TO APPROVE A TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE SNOWCREST SUBDIVISION (TAX MAP 55, LOTS 11, 12, & 15) AND TO REPLACE THE EXISTING LETTER OF CREDIT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$303,000 WITH A NEW LETTER OF CREDIT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$40,000 TO COVER THE FINAL COAT OF PAVING AND TO MEET ONE-YEAR MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Peter Blakeman asked Mr. McWilliams if Mr. Snow would receive a letter advising what the procedure would be to reduce the Letter of Credit. Mr. McWilliams replied that Mr. Snow should turn in the \$303,000 Letter of Credit and present a new \$30,300 Letter of Credit to Carol Fraley, Finance Officer for the Town of New London.

**II. ED KERRIGAN – Discussion of Lighting at Jake's Market (Tax Map 59, Lot 26)**

Ed Kerrigan advised the PB that the three lights closest to County Road now have cones to direct light downward, rather than allowing it to bleed sideways. He stated that he had viewed the lights from the top of the incline behind the car wash, at roughly the height of the canopy, and found the results to be successful.

Chair Ebel asked if lower wattage bulbs had also been installed. Mr. Kerrigan replied that 320 watt bulbs are currently in place. He opined that using 250 watt bulbs, the next lower size for that type of light, might require changing the ballast in the lights. Chair Ebel asked what the cost of replacing the ballast would be. Mr. Kerrigan estimated that it would probably cost about \$200.

PB member Cottrill opined that, upon close inspection, it appears that the sideways bleed of the lights with cones has been reduced; however, it's very difficult to discern because of the bleed from the remaining lights. He recommended installing cones on all of the lights and, perhaps, using 250 watt bulbs as well. Chair Ebel asked if the canopy is let at all times. Mr. Kerrigan replied in the negative. Mr. Cottrill asked what the average life of one of the bulbs is. Mr. Kerrigan replied that he had replaced two bulbs in the last 18 months. He reiterated that using a lower wattage bulb would require changing the ballast to protect the life of bulbs. PB member Andrews asked if darkening some of the lights might be a solution. Chair Ebel asked if all of the lights had to be on all of the time. Mr. Kerrigan replied that he did not know, but would investigate. He added that he was not enthusiastic about using 250 watt bulbs.

Chair Ebel stated that it was important to have enough light to assure safety; she opined, however, that the brightness could be reduced without a loss of customers. Mr. Kerrigan opined that removing one-third of the bulbs would significantly darken the area where customers fill their car gas tanks. He stated that he could adapt all canopy lights with shields and, if the results seem inadequate, then he could eliminate some of the bulbs. PB member Cottrill suggested that Jake's might darken the surround of the lights, e.g., spray paint the outside black, to reduce reflection of light. Peter Stanley, Zoning Administrator, suggested darkening the light area on one of the lights to see what the effect would be. In response to a question regarding the expense of installing shields on all of the lights, Mr. Kerrigan replied that the cones cost approximately \$20 a piece and could be installed within about ten days. The results could be evaluated and, if inadequate, he could spray paint the surround to reduce reflection. He agreed to advise Ken McWilliams when the replacements are complete. Mr. McWilliams will then advise the PB.

**III. PETER DZEWALTOWSKI, UVLSRPC – Presentation and Discussion of the Draft “New London Parking & Traffic Study**

Given the low attendance of PB members and the fact that two of the members present had already heard the presentation, it was agreed that it would be better to defer the presentation until all members of the PB could be present.

**IV. LESLEY HADLEY – Knitting and Yarn Shop: Need for Site Plan Review (Tax Map 85, Lot 42)**

Lesley Hadley appeared for a determination of the need for a Site Plan Review regarding her plans to open a yarn and knitting shop at 428 Main Street. Her letter of inquiry stated that the space had previously been occupied by Distinctive Floral Designs, a retail occupant, with 2.5 parking spaces allotted in off-street parking behind the Village Green. She indicated that the building has 435 square feet downstairs available for retail and 200 square feet upstairs where she hopes to offer knitting classes.

PB member asked for and received clarification about the location of the proposed shop. Ken McWilliams advised that the PB must determine if the proposed change in use is significant enough to warrant a Site Plan Review. He confirmed that the shop would be located in a stand-alone building in the Village Green.

Chair Ebel asked how soon Ms Hadley intended to open her shop. Ms Hadley replied that she had signed the lease effective February 1 and hoped to open by March 1.

PB member Cook asked if there is adequate parking available behind the building. Ms Hadley replied in the affirmative. Mr. McWilliams added that the available parking exceeds regulatory requirements. Chair Ebel asked if the proposal to offer knitting classes would change anything. Mr. McWilliams replied in the negative.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT NO SITE PLAN REVIEW BE REQUIRED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A YARN AND KNITTING SHOP AT 428 MAIN STREET (MAP 85, LOT 42). THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

**A. NH OFFICE OF ENERGY & PLANNING:** Ken McWilliams called the PB's attention to the announcement of the Annual Spring Planning Conference sponsored by the NH Office of Energy & Planning. He advised any PB members interested in attending to contact Amy Rankins. He added that funds were available to cover conference participation fees.

**B. MASTER PLAN UPDATE:** Ken McWilliams distributed a proposed outline for the process agreed upon at a prior PB meeting. He noted that the PB plan was a departure from the usual procedure inasmuch as it calls for the collection of data at the onset of the review. The updated data will be reviewed and key issues determined. A day-long vision workshop involving a wide variety of (invited?) members of the community will follow the data gathering and review. After the vision workshop, a community attitude survey will be conducted. Once results are available, the PB will review sections of the existing Master Plan and draft revisions.

Mr. McWilliams suggested that the next step is the procedure will be to establish a timeline for the various processes. PB member Cottrill asked if the New London Tax Maps are updated each year. Peter Stanley,

Zoning Administrator, replied in the affirmative. In response to a question regarding how the population changes would be tracked, Mr. McWilliams replied that data from the 2000 census, plus building permits issued since then, plus a multiplier to estimate future growth would be used. Mr. Cottrill asked how New London has been doing using its own multiplier, rather than the state or national standard. Mr. McWilliams replied that New London had estimated growth of approximately 100 people per year and opined that the estimate is pretty close to the actual. He added that the NH Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) has issued 2003 population information. PB member Andrews asked about the time table used for the existing Master Plan. Mr. McWilliams replied that the process started in 1994, the report was finalized in 1995, and the Master Plan was adopted in 1998.

Chair Ebel asked if the invitation to participate in a vision workshop would be a town-wide invitation or an invitation to specific people. Mr. McWilliams replied that the invitation is usually by public notice to encourage wide participation. PB member Cook asked how many people participated last time. Mr. McWilliams replied that last time many New London citizens attended the workshop, but that a different process had been used. He added that the prior workshop had been conducted in conjunction with Vital Communities, which had conducted its "generic" workshop, despite UVLSRPC's request and Vital Communities' agreement to make it more New London specific. This time UVLSRPC will conduct the workshop, and the emphasis will be on New London. He recalled that, following the workshop, a small group of interested citizens, perhaps 15, worked through the planning process. Peter Stanley, Zoning Administrator, opined that usually master plan workshops attracted lots of developers and lots of conservation folks, but very few ordinary citizens. Ken McWilliams opined that a vision workshop should try to encourage a good exchange of ideas from a wide variety of groups and individuals. Chair Ebel asked how long a vision workshop would last. Mr. McWilliams replied that the usual timeframe was 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM. Chair Ebel suggested that daycare would have to be provided to encourage attendance of those with small children. Mr. McWilliams replied that there would be many organizational issues to be resolved. PB member Cottrill asked if anyone has targeted certain groups, e.g., age groups, for separate meetings to draw out ideas. PB member Andrews suggested that age groupings might be one way to split off into groups as part of a larger meeting. Chair Ebel asked if there were various subject areas, would the public be allowed to choose which to attend. Mr. McWilliams replied in the negative indicating that group assignments would be random. He also advised that age group responses could be elicited on an attitude survey by cross-referencing questions, e.g., length of time in the community, gender, etc.

PB member Cottrill asked about the use of focus groups. Ken McWilliams replied that the process should aim for maximum participation and inclusivity to try to get people to come. He added that there has never been the problem of having too many people respond. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that the attitude survey had been the most valuable part of the process last time.

- C. L.C. ENGINEERING COMPANY, LLC: Ken McWilliams called the PB's attention to a letter sent to Lou Caron (L. C. Engineering Company, LLC) regarding construction and erosion control services for a major subdivision and cluster development on the Granger property. Mr. McWilliams advised the PB that the Granger subdivision will be on the March 8, 2005 PB agenda. He stated that Peter Blakeman (Blakeman Engineering, Inc.) will forward a set of plans to Mr. Caron, who will propose a letter of agreement and cost estimates to present to Austin Eaton.

PB member Andrews asked what the scope of Mr. Caron's oversight would be. Mr. McWilliams replied that it would include road design, sediment, and erosion issues. Ms Andrews suggested that, although Mr. Caron is a good civil engineer, he might not be the most qualified person to evaluate environmental issues. She opined that the focus of the issues differs. She recalled that prior discussions had suggested Ray Lobdell as the person to oversee construction, etc., from an environmental standpoint. Although she remembered that the PB had used Caron previously, she could not recall the specific instance. Peter Stanley agreed that a conventional engineer would provide oversight for Blakeman Engineering; however, he opined, Mr. Lobdell would be a better choice for broader environmental issues. Mr. McWilliams suggested that either Chair Ebel or Ms Andrews call Mr. Caron to ascertain his expertise regarding the issues of concern. Chair Ebel recalled that, at an earlier meeting, Mr. McWilliams had opined that one person who could oversee the entire range of issues would be preferable to two individuals. Ms Andrews opined that two experts might cover diverse issues better. Mr. Stanley reminded the PB that on previous occasions Mr. Lobdell had not only provided advice on specific issues identified by the PB, but had also provided ideas for solutions and future planning.

PB member Cook asked if the combination of the proposed community center on Pleasant Street and the proposed Granger development would both drain into Pleasant Lake. An affirmative answer was given. PB member Andrews agreed to call Mr. Caron to discuss environmental concerns and obtain information that will permit the PB to determine his areas of expertise. Ms Andrews stated that she would like to delay any final review of the Granger development until bare ground is visible and spring run-off can be evaluated. Chair Ebel asked if the decision regarding selection of the individual(s) to provide oversight of the development must be made at a PB meeting. Mr. McWilliams confirmed that it must. Chair Ebel asked if the decision must be made before the Preliminary Site Plan Review. She indicated that she would prefer to wait until after the Preliminary SPR before calling a meeting of the subcommittee. She opined that it would be most helpful to have as much information as possible available for consideration by the subcommittee. Mr. McWilliams replied that the PB needs to decide what outside assistance is desired so that the Grangers/Eatons can be notified. PB member Cook asked if the Grangers/Eatons must obtain permits from the Zoning Board of Adjustment and the State before the Preliminary SPR. Mr. McWilliams replied in the negative. Chair Ebel stated that she would prefer to determine what expertise might be necessary after the Preliminary SPR and after the subcommittee has discussed the matter.

Peter Stanley, Zoning Administrator, offered to provide some questions for Ms Andrews to ask Mr. Caron in her telephone call. He also showed the group an example of a Hydrologic and Nutrient Loading Analysis and indicated that such a study would be used to determine the impact that development of the former Maple Leaf Golf Course would have on Kezar Lake in Sutton.

- D. Land & Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP): Chair Ebel noted that the deadline for applying for LCHIP funding is February 14, 2005. Peter Stanley opined that New London would be much better served pursuing local funding sources to conserve land, because LCHIP has no funding at present and no real prospect of getting significant funding in the near future.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **8:40 PM**.

Respectfully submitted,  
Judith P. Conduct, Recording Secretary  
New London Planning Board

DATE APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_

CHAIRMAN \_\_\_\_\_