

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MEETING MINUTES**

June 26, 2006

PRESENT:

Douglas W. Lyon, Chair, Board of Selectmen
Mark Kaplan, Selectman
Ruth I. Clough, Selectman
Jessie Levine, Town Administrator

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dan Fitzgerald, Assistant Assessor
Mark Wendling, New London property owner
Carol Fraley, Finance Officer
Pat Sheehan, Trustee of the Trust Funds
Ted Brown, Trustee of Trust Funds
Charlie & Marion Hafner, Cemetery Commission
Tom Ginter, Cemetery Commission
Debbie Cross, Intertown Record
Carolyn Dube, Argus Champion

Chair Lyon call meeting to order at 8:00 AM and welcomed Dan Fitzgerald, Assistant Assessor, to discuss the assessors' recommendations on the 2005 abatement applications.

Abatement Update: Dan Fitzgerald said the assessing office had received 11 abatement applications, three of which we will not address today (Graf property, unable to review property; Dan Wolf, Hodan properties, analysis unfinished; and the New London Housing Association). Chair Lyon noted that 11 abatements is a substantial drop from the previous three years. Mr. Fitzgerald walked the Selectmen through the abatement applications.

- Mulhern, 157 Owls Nest (141-001): Mr. Fitzgerald said he had inspected the property and made corrections to data records and reviewed land sales. He determined that the property is over assessed and estimated market value to be \$2,850,000, which is mostly attributable to the land value of equation. The owner's appraisal report for 2004 case stated that there was a downturn in the market in 2003-2004 but in 2005 the market came back to 2002 level. Mulhern had no issue with the value of his buildings. The assessors recommend a market value of \$2,850,000 for reduction in assessment of \$446,800.
- Bemis/Hoke, 111 Sunset Shores (091-015): Bemis bought out brother's half of property and had independent appraisals for that transaction and thought he was not being treated proportionally. Mr. Fitzgerald researched the market, including another sale on Sunset Shores in 2006 for \$1,812,500 and two other comparable sales. Recommends market value of \$2,050,000 for assessment abatement of \$115,500.
- Cate, 715 Route 103A (103-002): Two issues – ranch on one property and survey stated acreage differs from Town records, so assessors adjusted records as required. Second issue is house burnt down and assessors prorated taxes based on when house burnt down (owners had use of the house

for most of the summer so recommends reduction based on 59% of year for which dwelling was gone). Recommends reduction of \$181,779 for burnt house and \$2,200 reduction for acreage adjustment. Ms. Clough asked Mr. Fitzgerald if the assessment changes reflect the subdivision activity on the property, and Mr. Fitzgerald said the property is flagged in the system for follow-up in 2006. Ms. Levine said that it has been the Board of Selectmen's practice to abate taxes for buildings that burn down mid-year.

- Stevens, 217 Owls Nest Road (Map 135, Lot 001): Owner submitted an appraisal report by Fritz Giddings for estimated value of \$1.65 million. Property was purchased in 1999 for \$2 million. Mr. Fitzgerald's review came out at a market value of \$2.2 million. This property is not similar to the Mulhern property, which is only two acres including wetlands; this property has 6.76 acres and does not have a lot of zoning issues. It is a very nice lot and seasonal house makes up small percentage of total value of property. Ms. Clough said one would assume that market is at least stable if not higher than 1999. Mr. Fitzgerald agreed and referred to the sale of 53 Lighthouse View Road (former Yacht Club), which has fantastic views, and people are willing to pay more for that. However, he spoke to contractor on the job site and it was extremely expensive to renovate the property, which they're still working on. Mr. Fitzgerald said that 53 Lighthouse View is superior to the Stevens property with respect to the view. However, the Stevens property, because of the size of the lot, could be substantially developed and could possibly be subdivided. Mr. Fitzgerald did not agree with the representative's value of \$1.6M and instead recommends a market value of \$2.2 million and assessment reduction of \$336,800.

Ms. Levine noted that with all abatements, the market value is reduced to an assessed value using the 89% equalization ratio that existed in 2005. Mr. Fitzgerald agreed.

- Shovan, 788 & 791 Little Sunapee Road (20-003 & 20-009): Mr. Fitzgerald met with the caretaker of the property, which is Little Lake Sunapee with Route 114 separating the house and beach. Two separate properties here – building on one side of the road and water access property with dock. The owner said the condition factor on the home was not accurate and that the value went up disproportionately to neighboring properties. Mr. Fitzgerald agreed with the owner about the condition of house (it is a seasonal home converted to year-round, with old style bath & kitchens and roof at the end of its economic life). He recommended a reduction on the house of \$10,200 based on change from average to below-average condition. The water access lot is a different story. He reviewed the properties presented by owner (other assessed properties in the neighborhood, not sales), and found they were not similar to the subject water access property. One comparable is part of Twin Lake Villa golf course with three golf holes (part of a business); another comparable is a waterfront lot with a house on it (buildable lot); and one comparable is Bucklin Beach (tax exempt property). Mr. Fitzgerald researched three comparable properties in the subject's immediate neighborhood, all with house on one side of the street and little water access lots. In the statistical update of fall 2005, the subject's water access lot went down 14.6%, and neighbors with similar situations were reduced 10.4, 13.2, 12.8%, so of the most similar properties, the subject received the greatest reduction. That said, their dock was being over-assessed for its condition (not a new dock), so he reduced the value of dock by \$900.
- Northcott, 1891 Little Sunapee Road (Map 43, Lot 26): Owners had appraisal report prepared because they are thinking of selling their property, which is next to the state's public boat launch. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that people sitting in the front yard of that property are close enough to have a conversation with the people at the public boat launch. Mr. Fitzgerald spoke to Peter Stanley about activity at the boat launch and noted that there are about 1000 boats launched per summer. Mr. Wendling asked when boat launch was first used and whether owner was surprised to find boat launch upon purchase of the property. Ms. Levine noted similarities between this property

and the sand bar issues near the Gordon property on Lake Sunapee that affects value of property due to intrusion/enjoyment of property. Chair Lyon noted that the calculation of the effects of such issues are somewhat subjective. Mr. Fitzgerald said he found two sales, however, one in the immediate neighborhood on other side of boat launch on Little Sunapee, and one in high-traffic area of Georges Mills. He recommends a market value of \$415,000, for a reduction of \$97,700. Ms. Levine asked if most of that reduction related to the land, and Mr. Fitzgerald said that it was; the cottage is valued at about \$30,000 due to its rough shape.

Chair Lyon noted the Town's ongoing struggle to establish market value of unusual properties using comparable sales, and said the assessors have to get into the issue of what is comparable, which involves subjective judgment. Their best efforts are to try to come up with defensible rationale. Mr. Fitzgerald said the use of a Georges Mills sale is a stretch based on what exists in Sunapee vs. New London for zoning requirements. The Jobs Creek property was a tear down but there are fewer restrictions on what could be built (Sunapee allows building on same footprint, whereas New London is more restrictive).

- Wyand, 756 Route 103 A (103-022): Mr. Fitzgerald did not work on the Wyand abatement; this review was conducted by Town Assessor Norm Bernaiche. Chair Lyon referred to the court's decision on the Wyand case. Ms. Levine said decision affected 2002 and there were subsequent abatement applications in 2003 & 2004. Those were settled earlier this year, leaving an abatement outstanding for 2005. Mr. Fitzgerald said the assessors' recommendation is a market value of \$2.6 million due to the lack of use of the land, for a reduction of assessment from \$3,143,600 to \$2,336,100.

Mr. Kaplan noted the assessor's statement in the Wyand memorandum that "the market has returned to the 2002 levels." He asked whether market went up and back down between 2002 and 2005, or went down and back up. Mr. Fitzgerald said he would talk to Norm Bernaiche about that distinction.

The Selectmen thanked Mr. Fitzgerald for his report, and he departed the meeting.

Meeting Minutes: Mr. Kaplan moved to approve the minutes of June 12, 2006. Ms. Clough seconded and approved 3-0.

Website: Ms. Levine reported that the Town's new website is up and running, although the final design has not been finished. She is still investigating e-mail newsletters.

Link Topics: Ms. Levine said she would like to send out a link newsletter this summer, and asked the Selectmen for topics they would like to include. Chair Lyon said the Selectmen should update residents on the Sewer Department, the roundabout, street lighting, Recreation Department, emergency planning, dump sticker/recycling update (including e-waste update) and hazardous waste day; Planning Board regulation update; second non-resident meeting; and mosquito control. All agreed.

Sewer Department: Chair Lyon reported that second pump at the Georges Mills Pump Station has been repaired and reinstalled. Mr. Kaplan complimented Richard Lee on his persistence on this project and said that Mr. Lee was on pins & needles the whole time the pump was down. Chair Lyon reiterated the need for a spare pump, which would allow the pump station to continue to operate on two pumps while one was being repaired, and would allow for a rotation schedule for maintenance. Chair Lyon said "that pump station is a critical part of the sewer system and cannot be taken lightly."

Information Booth Sign Regulations: Ms. Levine reminded the Selectmen that they wanted to review the sign regulations for the Information Booth. Chair Lyon said that when regulations were adopted they envisioned seasonal events but not season-long events. He can think of no solution off the top of his head but since there have not been complaints, the Selectmen could stick to what they are doing now. Ms.

Levine suggested considering an additional regulation for signs with some duration or recurring events. Mr. Kaplan said that the solution perhaps is to limit the number of signs so it does not grow. He does not want to restrict non-profit organizations from other towns from using the Information Booth. Ms. Clough said the problem seems to be season-long signs, and asked what we do if we reached the sign limitation and there were valid applications. Mr. Kaplan said it does not make sense to have 15-20 signs, but he does not want to eliminate them either. Chair Lyon said there have been no recent complaints, so perhaps we should let sleeping dogs lie and see whether complaints are raised. Ms. Clough noted that there is a limit to what can be read while driving by. Ms. Clough suggested maybe a permanent board with season-long events in one place and weekly signs that could go up and come down as necessary. The Selectmen decided to table the discussion for now.

Trustees of the Trust Funds & Cemetery Trustees: Chair Lyon welcomed the Trustees of the Trust Funds (Ted Brown and Pat Sheehan), the Cemetery Trustees (Charlie and Marion Hafner and Tom Ginter), and Finance Officer Carol Fraley. He asked Pat Sheehan to summarize events leading up to this meeting. Ms. Sheehan said over past two years, she has learned a tremendous amount about town funds through training and reviewing town files. The Trustees of the Trust Funds meet four times per year. In May 2006 when the Trustees met, they had investments of cemetery funds that had matured and needed reinvestment. The investment advisor at AG Edwards noted that there was a large amount of money sitting in cemetery funds and asked why it was not invested. Ted Brown and Bill Horne agreed that it should be invested, which created a complicated report because the state requires principal and income to be reported separately. At the Trustees meeting, this led to a discussion about the purpose and use of these funds and why all of this money is accumulated and nothing withdrawn for years.

Ms. Sheehan said an individual buys a cemetery plot for \$200, which goes to Carol Fraley and into the cemetery funds. Of this \$200, 60% goes to the cemetery trust fund for perpetual care, and 40% to cemetery maintenance. Each year, some funds come out of maintenance to maintain cemeteries. The portion that goes into the trust cannot be touched and continues to accumulate. Ms. Sheehan said there are 855 individual trusts that have to be reported to the state each year. The total income last year was a little over \$11,000, which gets allocated to each of those 855 trusts, which date back as far as 1897. Last year ten new trusts were added when people purchased cemetery plots. The principal has to stay there, so generated the question of whether we have to put 60% of money into the trust and 40% to maintenance, or whether there is flexibility.

Ms. Sheehan read the Trustees handbook and realized that the Town can use income for perpetual care. The handbook contained questions from other towns, such as whether income could be used for cemetery maintenance (the answer is the income could be used for perpetual care but not for cemetery maintenance). Question for cemetery trustees is "what is the difference between perpetual care and cemetery maintenance?" Mr. Kaplan said it sounds like the same thing. Ms. Clough asked if it's the difference between lawn mowing/fence care vs. care of markers. Mr. Hafner said the markers are owned and maintained by individuals and are not the responsibility of the town. Chair Lyon suggested perpetual care may be maintenance of the specific plot rather than general cemetery maintenance. Mr. Hafner said the Town has used the general maintenance fund for lawn mowing, etc., but used the other fund for something larger, like fence care. Mr. Wendling suggested that perpetual care relates to established trusts where the plot has actually been purchased, and those plots have a larger footprint that the Town maintains (perpetual care not being appropriate to unsold portions).

Ms. Sheehan read from Trustees' Handbook: Can income from perpetual care funds be used for general cemetery maintenance? Answer: no – excess perpetual care income may not be used for general maintenance or capital improvement without special permission from probate court under legal process. Perpetual care funds are private, not public, and is for maintenance of specific cemetery lots. May be breach of trust to spend for general maintenance. Ms. Sheehan said that as of 12/31/05, there was

\$86,840 in the income portion of perpetual care. So far in 2006, twenty-five plots have been sold, so the principal will continue to get bigger.

Mr. Kaplan said we cannot be the only town that is having this problem. He asked what they do in Concord, Nashua, Manchester, etc., where there must be experience between administration and the state related to this problem. Ms. Sheehan asked why there is a 60/40 split and whether the plot deed showed the amount of money that the trust created. Marion Hafner said that's the way it has always been done, and she does not know whether that split is set by law or some other decision. Mr. Lyon suggested it could be changed, and Ms. Levine said Plaistow is 50/50. Mr. Hafner offered to talk to the NH Cemetery Association.

Mr. Kaplan asked what would happen if the cemetery sold out and people needed space. He asked if funds could be utilized to purchase lands for that purpose. Ms. Fraley and Ms. Sheehan believe that they could not because it is a trust and belongs to the people who purchased the individual plots. Ms. Levine reiterated that it is private money. Ted Brown said that it is not taxed as private money, which is a conflict. It does not seem fair that the Town has to maintain these funds that are private.

Chair Lyon asked how interest is defined; does principal appreciate or is appreciation considered interest? Ms. Sheehan said capital gain gets added to principal. Chair Lyon said appreciation in principal is part of the corpus that cannot be touched (e.g. appreciation on principal cannot be spent). Ms. Sheehan agreed. Chair Lyon said he would like to explore that because on endowment funds for colleges or hospitals, UMIFA in New Hampshire says that appreciation on restricted funds is unrestricted. The trap is that so many of the old trusts were defined by the donor to limit spending to interest. Ms. Levine said that even if appreciation can be spent as interest, it still only relates to perpetual care. Chair Lyon said he believes it would be unrestricted. Mr. Kaplan thinks that there is a difference due to the purchase of cemetery lots. Ms. Sheehan said there is not much capital gain, and when there is it is allocated to the principal of these 855 plots. She said that there are actually 11 pages of the MS-9 that support the annual report in the Town Report. The MS-9 is required to be filed with the state every year listing the individual trusts.

Ms. Clough asked if plots are inherited. The Hafners said yes; Ms. Hafner said that for instance, her parents' lot goes to their heirs. Ms. Sheehan said the oldest plot belongs to Elefanta Gay, purchased in 1892. Her plot had 67 cent capital gain and had \$10.95 in income on a total principal of \$201.87. The law as Ms. Sheehan reads it says the income is for perpetual care of her plot. Ms. Sheehan noted that there are three cemeteries, so supposedly they would have to differentiate among cemeteries as well. Ms. Clough asked the Hafners what funds were used for trees. Ms. Fraley said that it has traditionally been from the Tree Warden's expense. Ms. Levine said sometimes families donate towards a tree that the Town plants and maintains.

Ms. Sheehan asked if the 60/40 allocation could be different, which would put less money into the individual trusts and more into the maintenance funds. She asked what we have to put in for perpetual care. Her second question is whether the money already in perpetual care could be withdrawn and put into the general maintenance fund, or each year take income that is earned at the end of each year and put it in the budget for the cemetery. Chair Lyon said it seems we could make the argument that while doing cemetery maintenance we are also doing perpetual care. Ms. Sheehan said that as a trustee, she would be comfortable saying that maintenance meets perpetual care.

Ms. Clough said that according to the cemetery trustees, one issue is the need for expansion of cemeteries. She is hearing that none of the money from existing trusts would be appropriate to spend for that purpose. Ms. Sheehan said the Selectmen could apply to court for permission. Ms. Levine said she would investigate that process.

Chair Lyon summarized that there are two questions: 1) find out if the 60/40 policy is discretionary and can be changed; and 2) whether these trust funds either are or are not subject to UMIFA. It is too bad that we have to keep looking at these investments that are restricted, leaving an awful lot of money on the table. He recalls that Ed Taylor looked into alternatives when he was a selectmen and found that there were really not any. Ms. Clough would also like to find out if saved funds could be used to address the need for more space within cemetery. Chair Lyon suggested asking Bart Mayer or the statewide organization. Mr. Hafner said he would also like to find out from town counsel if the cemetery trustees' deed form is appropriate for the sale of plots.

Mr. Wendling asked if the 60/40 split generates enough money for perpetual care. Ms. Sheehan said cemetery budget is \$32,000, and cemetery trustees gave \$5,000. Ms. Levine said that if funds were reallocated going forward, this could release more money for maintenance to offset the Town budget. Mr. Lyon said if the funds are allocated on a plot-by-plot basis with \$10 per plot, this is not adequate for perpetual care and to follow the wishes of the donor. He also questioned whether \$200 continues to be an adequate price for the cemetery plots.

Mr. Kaplan said these cemeteries are public properties, but surely there are also cemeteries that belong to religious institutions that are private. He wondered whether the state treats them differently. Ms. Hafner referred to Pine Hill in Wilmot, which is private and has to operate within their budget, so maintenance quite often goes neglected because there are no monies available. Mr. Kaplan said the state should take a broad picture and enable anyone who is in that position to function. Chair Lyon suggested that the Selectmen could talk to local representatives about changes to state statutes if they are not functional and not working well. Mr. Hafner said New London is fortunate to only have three cemeteries; some towns have 20.

Mr. Brown asked if a document is issued when one purchased a cemetery plot. Ms. Hafner said the cemetery trustees issue a deed. Mr. Brown asked if there were a document establishing the 60/40 split, and Ms. Sheehan said there is not. Ms. Sheehan read from the Trustees Handbook: "be advised that court will include provision stating that taxpayers will raise and appropriate funds to care for cemetery lots if perpetual care exhausted." Mr. Kaplan asked why principal could not be touched if it's for perpetual care. Ms. Sheehan asked if trust could be created for \$1 and \$199 goes into general cemetery maintenance trust, with understanding that taxpayers will maintain cemetery.

Ms. Sheehan moved on to the general endowment fund, which has \$52,000 in it. She said she had wondered where these funds came from and what they could be used for. Archives could not find anything about funds, but there are three donors: Emery (1976), Addie Gay (1983), and Lash (1993). Ms. Sheehan wrote to Terry Knowles, director of the Charitable Trust division of the State Attorney General, and called her on Friday. She spoke to paralegal Audrey Blodgett, who pulled out the New London file and found only paperwork relative to the Bandstand Committee. So Ms. Sheehan's question to the Attorney General is: if the town wants to use general endowment funds, what can they be used for and who are the agents to expend? Ms. Blodgett promised to talk to Terry Knowles and get back to Ms. Sheehan with the answer. Chair Lyon said that would be a candidate for total return concept. Ms. Fraley said the money was given "for the good of the town" and was combined into one account. We do not know if there is restriction on the principal. Ms. Sheehan said they can be invested together but must be reported separately.

Mr. Hafner will contact the NH Cemetery Association, and Ms. Hafner recommended talking to Terry Knowles. Mr. Hafner asked Ms. Levine to have Town counsel review deed to make sure that it reflects sale of "burial rights," rather than purchase of actual plot of land (given that the Town still owns the land).

Mr. Wendling asked about electronic mapping of burial plots and whether GPS would be appropriate. Ms. Clough thought that might be a good project for a Colby-Sawyer College intern.

Tracy Library Request to Serve Alcohol: Ms. Levine referred to a request from Tracy Library to serve alcohol on June 29 at their reception for Donald Hall. Mr. Kaplan moved to approve. Ms. Levine said that the Library and Morgan Hill Bookstore expect a larger than usual crowd, so she has alerted police that they may need to control traffic and parking. She said that Chief Seastrand had raised the question of whether the Library needs a permit to serve alcohol, but Ms. Levine found that permits are required only when alcohol will be sold. In this case, it will be a free wine social. Ms. Clough seconded the motion and approved 3-0.

First Baptist Church Ceremony: Ms. Levine referred to the individual from the First Baptist Church for the ceremony on July 2 at 10:30 AM to recognize the Meetinghouse's addition to state and national historic registers. Cheryl Cook has requested a proclamation from the Selectmen, which Ms. Levine will prepare this week.

Non-Resident Taxpayer Meeting: Ms. Levine asked the Selectmen what topics they wanted to cover for the July 10 Non-Resident Taxpayer Meeting. She has invited department heads for departmental updates. Mr. Kaplan said he would like to discuss the roundabout, dump stickers, recreation, and sewer. Ms. Clough said there may be concerned about where the funding coming from for the sewer department. Mr. Kaplan asked Mr. Wendling what he would like to hear. Mr. Wendling said would like to hear about roundabout, sewer update & water service area and drainage updates on Balsam Acres. He also would like an update on the lack of e-mail newsletter.

Old Business:

Fiber Project Update: Ms. Levine reviewed the progress on the fiber project. She attended a meeting of the health applications committee on Friday that was well-attended and generated great ideas. Final report will be delivered on July 11 at 1:00 PM.

Zoning Violation: Ms. Levine said another letter to the Gibsons on Balsam Acres has gone out.

Chair Lyon moved to go into non-public pursuant to RSA 91-A:3 II (a) personnel and (e) litigation. Second Mr. Kaplan. Roll call vote: Lyon – yes; Kaplan – yes; Clough – yes.

Upon returning to public session, the Selectmen signed the following documents.

Building Permits:

- Michael and Anita Gelcius, 193 Fairway Lane (Map 124, Lot 010), amended permit to add 370 square foot deck to exterior of home between house and garage – Approved (Permit 05-084)
- Paul and Joanne Lazdowski, 40 Moyah's Lane (Map 103, Lot 015), permit to replace a non-conforming boat house per ZBA Article XX B-3-b – Approved (Permit 05-100)
- Paul and Joanne Lazdowski, 40 Moyahs Lane (Map 103, Lot 015), permit to install a new foundation under an existing house and deck partially located within the fifty-foot setback from Lake Sunapee by variance per ZBA Article XVI H-2 (Permit 05-101)
- David and Maureen Patten, 465 Little Sunapee Road (Map 046, Lot 018), amended permit to remove existing second floor and reframe – Approved (Permit 06-033)
- Theodore and Cheryl Clark, 58 Old Coach Road (Map 123, Lot 023), amended permit to build 9' x 14' pool shed – Approved (Permit 06-066)

Selectmen's Meeting Minutes

June 26, 2006

Page 8 of 9

- Charles and Marion Hafner, 44 Everett Park (Map 072, Lot 029), permit to add 24' x 38' addition to the end of existing home, garage with living space on second floor – Approved (Permit 06-068)
- Carl & Patricia Fitz, 756 Bunker Road (Map 076, Lot 050), permit to install a 2' x 2' cupola with a 2' weather vane on top of boat house and replace existing pole – Approved (06-070)
- Townsend and Ann Marie Thomas, 838 Route 103A (Map 103, Lot 018), permit to install a 4' wide stone walkway and 6 flagstone steps down to the beach – Approved (Permit 06-071)
- Lance and Susan Hansen, 17 Castle Lane (Map 129, Lot 033), permit to construct 16' x 16' storage shed in backyard – Approved (Permit 06-072)
- Bothy Properties Ltd., 104 Little Brook Road (Map 035, Lot 044), permit to add small addition to expand dining room, kitchen, second floor bedroom and bathroom and add roof over deck – Approved (Permit 06-073)
- David and Celeste Cook Trust, 79 Whitney Brook Road (Map 052, Lot 005), permit to construct 20' x 26' barn plus attached outdoor kennel run plus outside propane-driven generator (back-up) – Approved (Permit 06-074)
- Bruce Herring, 300 Lakeshore Drive (Map 036, Lot 011), permit to build 7,400 square foot new home – Approved (Permit 06-075)
- Barry Wright, 217 Main Street (Map 073, Lot 081), permit to install walk-in refrigeration unit in the rear of the building – Approved (Permit 06-076)
- Begin Construction, LLC., 60 Castle Lane (Map 130, Lot 015-005), permit to build new colonial, three bedroom, two bath and two car garage – Approved (Permit 06-077)
- Chester and Mary Piekorski, Wilder Lane (Map 111, Lot 011), permit to build new three bedroom home – Approved (Permit 06-078)

Sign Permit Applications:

- Application for Temporary Sign Permit for the New London Bandstand Committee for Sandwich Board Sign to be placed at the Information Booth indicating Free Concert at the Ausbon Common Haddad Bandstand on June 23, 30, July 7, 14, 28 and August 11, 18, 25, 2006 – Approved
- Application for Temporary Sign Permit for Friends of New London Hospital for Sandwich Board Sign to be placed at the Information Booth indicating Rummage Sale for Sunday, October 15, 2006 from 8:00 AM to 2:00 PM – Approved
- Application for Temporary Sign Permit for Wilmot Farmer's Market for Sandwich Board Sign to be placed at the Information Booth indicating Wilmot Farmer's Market Every Saturday 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM July through September – Approved

Other Items for Signature:

- Disbursement and Payroll Voucher for the week of June 26, 2006 – Approved
- Notice of Intent to Cut Wood or Timber for New England Forestry Foundation, Burnt Hill Road and Little Sunapee Road (Map 017, Lot 003 and Map 030, Lot 031) – Approved

- Application for the Use of the New London Town Commons by David DiLorenzo on July 15, 2006 at 3:00 PM. – 8:00 PM. for a Community Benefit Concert for Sudanese Genocide Victims with local bands with different types of music – Approved
- Application for the Use of the New London Town Common by New London Hospital ABC's Child Care on July 17, 2006 from 5:30 – 8:00 PM with electrical connect – Approved

Abatement Recommendations:

Cate Family NH Realty Trust, 715 Route 103A (Map 103, Lot 002) – Approved
Mary Katharine Wyand Trust 2005, 756 Route 103A (Map 103, Lot 022) - Approved
Christine Northcott Revocable Living Trust, 1891 Little Sunapee Road (Map 043, Lot 026) – Approved
Dorothy Shovan, 791 Little Sunapee Road (Map 020, Lot 003) – Approved
Dorothy Shovan, 788 Little Sunapee Road (Map 020, Lot 009) – Approved
Robert D. Stevens, 217 Owls Nest Road (Map 135, Lot 001) – Approved
Delavan and Janet Cate, 765 Route 103A (Map 103, Lot 001) – Approved
David Bemis and Lisa Allen Hoke, 111 Sunset Shores (Map 091, Lot 015) – Approved
Patrick and Kathleen Mulhern, 157 Owls Nest Road (Map 141, Lot 001) – Approved
ROAM Realty Trust, 29 Boulder Point (Map 115, Lot 002) – Approved

Applications for Current Use:

Elizabeth S. Trayner Trust, Shaker Street (Map 111, Lot 018), (Map 111, Lot 019) – Approved
John B. Garvey Trust, Seamans Road (Map 086, Lot 023) – Approved
Janewood Trust, 246 Lakeshore Drive (Map 036, Lot 012-001) – Approved
Columbus Green Realty Trust, Route 11 (Map 120, Lot 002-004), (Map 120, Lot 002-002) - Approved
Columbus Green Realty Trust, Old Main Street (Map 120, Lot 002), (Map 120, Lot 002-003) - Approved
Columbus Green Realty Trust, Williams Drive (Map 093, Lot 019), (Map 081, Lot 001) – Approved
Columbus Green Realty Trust, Burpee Hill Road (Map 082, Lot 024) - Approved
Columbus Green Realty Trust, Shadow Lane (Map 082, Lot 008) - Approved
William Green, Jr. Revocable Trust, Route 11 (Map 132, Lot 012) – Approved
William Green, Jr. Revocable Trust, Old Main Street (Map 120, Lot 004) – Approved
Debra Perkins, Lamson Lane (Map 049, Lot 024), (Map 049, Lot 025) – Approved
Debra Perkins, Bunker Road (Map 062, Lot 014) – Approved
Brian Carey, Columbus Avenue (Map 081, Lot 012) – Approved
Kendrick and Pamela Child Revocable Trust, 575 Newport Road (Map 058, Lot 025) - Approved

There being no further business, the Board of Selectmen adjourned the meeting at 11:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessie W. Levine
Town Administrator